This volume explores an underappreciated feature of the standard Tiberian Masoretic tradition of Biblical Hebrew, namely its composite nature. Focusing on cases of dissonance between the tradition’s written (consonantal) and reading (vocalic) components, the study shows that the Tiberian spelling and pronunciation traditions, though related, interdependent, and largely in harmony, at numerous points reflect distinct oral realisations of the biblical text. Where the extant vocalisation differs from the apparently pre-exilic pronunciation presupposed by the written tradition, the former often exhibits conspicuous affinity with post-exilic linguistic conventions as seen in representative Second Temple material, such as the core Late Biblical Hebrew books, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, rabbinic literature, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and contemporary Aramaic and Syriac material. On the one hand, such instances of written-reading disharmony clearly entail a degree of anachronism in the vocalisation of Classical Biblical Hebrew compositions. On the other, since many of the innovative and secondary features in the Tiberian vocalisation tradition are typical of sources from the Second Temple Period and, in some cases, are documented as minority alternatives in even earlier material, the Masoretic reading tradition is justifiably characterised as a linguistic artefact of profound historical depth.
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## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1st-person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Aleppo Codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Talmud Bavli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>Before the Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDSS</td>
<td>Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ben Sira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>circa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>common (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBH</td>
<td>Classical Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch.</td>
<td>chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chs</td>
<td>chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col.</td>
<td>column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cols</td>
<td>columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSBA</td>
<td>Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSBH</td>
<td>Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn.</td>
<td>footnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leningrad Codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH</td>
<td>Late Biblical Hebrew (Esther, Daniel, Ezra–Nehemiah, Chronicles)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LBH+ Late Biblical Hebrew+ (Ps. 119; Job 1–2; 42.7–17; Qohelet, Esther, Daniel, Ezra–Nehemiah, Chronicles)
ln. line
lns lines
LXX Septuagint
m. Mishna
M masculine
MT Masoretic Textual Tradition
NBDSS Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls
PL plural
QA Qumran Aramaic
QH Qumran Hebrew
RH Rabbinic Hebrew
s singular
SH Samaritan Hebrew
SP Samaritan Pentateuch
t. Tosefta
TA Targumic Aramaic
TAM Tense, Aspect, Mood
TBH Transitional Biblical Hebrew
TJ Targum Jonathan
TO Targum Onqelos
tr. transitive
y. Talmud Yerushalmi
INTRODUCTION

This book focuses on an acknowledged dimension of the received Tiberian Masoretic biblical tradition the extent and significance of which is seldom fully appreciated: dissonance between its pronunciation and spelling arising from its composite nature. At issue are cases of linguistic disharmony wherein the written and reading components of the tradition, i.e., its consonantal text and vocalisation, diverge.¹ Sometimes, such differences are explicitly signalled within the Tiberian manuscript tradition via the mechanism known as ketiv-qere and/or are noted in masoretic grammatical treatises. In many other cases, however, dissonance is not so acknowledged, and is detectable only in apparent mismatch between orthography and vowel pointing.

The composite nature of the Tiberian tradition is not a novel object of enquiry; nor are apparent instances of resulting dissonance.² Indeed, in the case of many of the individual phe-

¹ Of course, the extant so-called consonantal text is not purely consonantal, as it includes numerous matres lectionis that represent vowel sounds. There is also a degree of dissonance internal to the Tiberian reading tradition itself, i.e., between vocalisation and accentuation; see M. Breuer (1980; 1981, 262); Y. Breuer (1991, 191–242; 2022); Kogut (1994); Price (2006); Revell (2015, 1–3); Habib (2021, esp. 13–14, 186–315).

nomina summarised in this introduction or discussed in chs 1–18 below, scholars have previously raised the possibility of dis-
cord within the combined Tiberian written-recitation tra-
dition. It is also commonplace to attribute the dissonance in question to secondary developments in the reading tradition vis-à-vis the tra-
dition reflected in the consonant text. Against this scholarly background, the present monograph is intended to make a pair of contributions.

One is the mere collection of relevant features in a single resource. It is hoped that this will serve to improve upon the cur-
rent situation, in which important discussions of Tiberian writ-
ten-reading dissonance are scattered among various studies, so that the frequency of the phenomenon goes underestimated and the combined significance under-appreciated.

The other innovation involves the attempt to contextualise more precisely than is often done secondary deviation of the pro-
nunciation tradition from the ostensible earlier pronunciation re-
flected in the consonant tradition. Sensing secondary develop-
ment, scholars often correctly, but rather cursorily and vague-
ly, declare the pronunciation tradition that has been preserved in the Tiberian vocalisation anachronistic and unreliable, without plumbing its historical depth. Obviously, the pronunciation tradition predates the medieval development of the graphic symbols with which it was eventually recorded, but by how much? As is repeatedly emphasised in this study, though the Ti-erian pronunciation tradition regularly preserves Iron Age fea-
tures and is not immune to Byzantine and medieval develop-
m ents, the regularity of meaningful affinity between its apparent
secondary developments and acknowledged Second Temple forms of Hebrew demands that the Tiberian reading tradition be considered a product of Second Temple times.

But this is not the whole story. First, because much of the Tiberian pronunciation tradition accompanies a consonantal tradition anchored in First Temple times, its linguistic testimony cannot be considered exclusively representative of the Second Temple Period. The Tiberian reading tradition may have largely crystallised in the Second Temple Period, with clear indications of drift in the direction of later norms, especially where the ambiguity of certain consonantal forms made them amenable to secondary realisations. Yet, beyond the fact that the similarity between Iron Age and Second Temple Hebrew far exceeds the difference that distinguishes them, some degree of linguistic evolution was prevented by the unambiguousness of many consonantal forms that were not amenable to secondary realisations. In other words, in the marriage of the reading and written components, the latter acted as a brake of sorts, preventing fuller development of the reading tradition in line with Second Temple linguistic conventions.

Second, as is regularly stressed below, many of the secondary, characteristically late developments discussed in this study, have clear antecedents in CBH and/or Iron Age epigraphic Hebrew. This means that, while they may accurately be described as especially typical of Second Temple Hebrew, they often crop up as minority alternatives in earlier material. Thus, even in palpable cases of dissonance there is continuity between the First Temple Hebrew of the CBH consonantal tradition and of Iron Age
epigraphy and Second Temple deviations in the Tiberian pronunciation tradition.

1.0. *Ketiv-Qere, Qere Perpetuum, and Beyond*

The works that comprise the Hebrew Bible reflect diverse authors, sources, genres, locales, social groups, time periods, and secondary hands. It would be reasonable to expect substantial linguistic diversity. Yet various processes of standardisation have resulted in the levelling of a great deal of the expected diversity, so that the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition is remarkably uniform. Even so, Tiberian BH shows signs of diverse idiolects, registers, genrelects, regional dialects, sociolects, andchronolects.

Another aspect of BH diversity stems from variation in the traditions in which the Hebrew Bible has been transmitted. For example, the Tiberian, Babylonian, and Samaritan traditions present different manifestations of BH, with differences ranging from pronunciation to grammar.

Even within the dominant Tiberian Masoretic tradition, readers confront differences between the written and reading components of the tradition, i.e., the consonantal text and the vocalisation, respectively. In many places in the text, such dissonance is explicitly acknowledged and marked by the mechanism known as *ketiv-qere*. In the majority of such cases—the approximate number of which, estimated between 800 and 1500, varies depending on the manuscript and expert opinion (Yeivin 1980, 55; Ofer 2019, 92; Habib 2020, 285)—divergence between what is written (*ketiv* = the Aramaic passive participle כתיב ‘written’) and what is read (*qere* = the Aramaic passive participle Kear)
‘read’) is indicated via vocalisation of the written form with the vowels of the form to be read, the consonants of which are given in the side or intercolumn margin. The discrepancy can involve a single letter, a whole word, or spacing between words. In other cases, the reading tradition has no parallel for a word or phrase, or, alternatively, requires the recitation of a word or words not included in the accompanying consonantal text. Sometimes, the qere specifies the meaning of a ketiv (Khan 2013a, 45–46; 2021, 33–49).

In cases of consistent conflict between the written and reading components of the tradition, no marginal note signals the discrepancy between consonantal spelling and pronunciation. Rather, the vocalisation alone signals the correct reading (Khan 2021, 34). Examples include realisation of the tetragrammaton יהוה as יהוהָ ‘LORD’ ( = ‘Lord’) or יהוהָ ‘GOD’ ( = ‘God, god’); see below, ch. 1) and of ירושלם כ ‘Jerusalem’ (cf. שָלֵם ‘Salem’ Gen. 14.18) as יֶרֶשְׁלָם (see below, Introduction, §3.1). The phenomenon of consistent replacement of the ketiv with the qere is commonly known as qere perpetuum.

Whatever the exact explanation for individual cases of ketiv-qere, they constitute, at their most basic level, acknowledged instances of divergence between the written and pronunciation traditions, wherein the latter supersedes the former for purposes of oral recitation.

The ketiv-qere phenomenon is relevant to the subject of this monograph in two respects. First, many such divergences apparently reflect secondary developments in the reading tradition vis-
à-vis the corresponding earlier, i.e., more original, consonantal feature, e.g., the tetragrammaton יהוה realised as יְהֹוָֹה or יהוה יֹהְוָה יָהְוָה יְּהוֹוָה ‘LORD’ or יהוה יֹוהֶם ‘GOD’.3

Additionally, notwithstanding their secondary character—and despite the fact that evidence for the (inter)marginal mechanism for signalling ketiv-qere and of qere perpetuum in masoretic codices comes no earlier than medieval manuscripts—the specific forms encountered in the qere tradition are clearly not just Byzantine or medieval developments, but are rooted in antiquity. This is borne out by several pieces of evidence, be it rabbinic, textual/versional, or perceptible within the Masoretic tradition itself.

First, several types of ketiv-qere are mentioned in the Talmud (Yeivin 1980, 56, §98, 58–59, §§102–4).

Euphemistic qere:

ח”ר (חננ רבמן) כל המקראות הכתוביות בתורה לנגא קוריין
לשבת...

Our Sages taught: All of the scriptures that are written in the Torah in impolite language are read in language beyond reproach…” (Megilla 25b; see below, ch. 3)

Qere wela ketiv ‘read but not written’ and ketiv wela qere ‘written but not read’:

אמר רבי י짖ק מקרא סופרים ועיטור סופרים וכריין ולא כתיבן
ולא קרין חלה למשה מصيان...

3 But cf. the discussion in Hornkohl (2022), where it is emphasised that there is not always clear diachronic linguistic progression between ketiv and qere readings of more or less equal plausibility.
Rabbi Yitzḥak said: “The vocalisation of the scribes, and the ornamentation of the scribes, and the verses with words that are read, but not written, and those that are written, but not read, are all halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai…” (b. Nedarim 37b)

Qere perpetuum:

ר’ אבינא רמי כתיב זה שמי לעלם וזה זכרי לדור דור אמר הקב”ה לאaszashaאינ�名חנןאניכנאמראניבריידיה”א DWCNICieceיוכיתב활”ת

Rabbi Avina posed a challenge: “It is written זה שמי לעלם וזו זכרי לדור דור ‘This is my name forever and this is my memorial for all generations’ (Exod. 3.15). The Holy One, blessed be he, said: ‘Not as I am written am I read. I am written with yod and heh, but I am read with ʾalef and dalet.’” (b. Pesahim 50a)

Moreover, qere-type forms (along with ketiv-type forms) are routinely reflected in the ancient translations and non-Masoretic biblical traditions.⁴ An intriguing case discussed below (ch. 3, §1.1) is that of the Latin Vulgate rendering of ketiv ‘their urine’ versus qere מים יתַּלַעְלוֹת ‘water of their feet’ (Isa. 36.12b). Jerome’s rendering is urinam pedum suorum ‘urine of their feet’, which looks to be a conflation of the ketiv and qere traditions. This and other examples show that the interpretive diversity that many ketiv-qere cases reflect significantly preceded the literalisation of said diversity via the medieval masoretic ketiv-qere mechanism. As further evidence, consider the preliminary figures

⁴ See Gordis (1971, 55–66) for the relationship between ketiv-qere and the ancient versions. See Hornkohl (2022) for a comparison of Tiberian ketiv and qere and the combined Samaritan written and reading tradition.
given by Hornkohl (2020a, 412, fn. 5), who reports approximately equal proportions of agreement with ketiv and qere among the 159 cases of MT ketiv-qere paralleled in the BDSS.\(^5\)

There are also instances of inner-biblical diversity that indicate the adoption of a secondary tradition over an earlier one in the case of parallel texts. CBH Josh. 21.11–39 presents around fifty instances of the word מִגְּרָשׁ ‘pastureland’ followed by the 3\(3\)FS possessive suffix ה. Written מִגְּרָשָה, these show that the word was treated as a singular, presupposing a Tiberian realisation along the lines of מִגְּרָשׁ ‘its pastureland’.\(^6\) In the LBH parallel to Josh. 21.11–39 in 1 Chron. 6.40–66, the orthography is consistently different, מִגְּרָשֶּה, the added yod indicating that the noun had come to be construed as a plural, ‘its pasturelands’. Intriguingly, the vocalisation of the form in Josh. 21.11–39, i.e., מִגְּרָשֶּה, is not that of the singular implied by the orthography in Joshua, but corresponds instead to the plural morphology reflected in the spelling (and vocalisation) in 1 Chron. 6.40–66, מִגְּרָשֶּה ‘its pasturelands’ (Barr 1984). The crucial point in the context of the present discussion is that the plural construal in question and the resulting dissonance between the written and reading compo-

---

\(^5\) More precisely, of the 159 cases of MT ketiv-qere paralleled in the BDSS, 70 show at least partial agreement with the qere, 72 partial agreement with the ketiv, and in 17 cases the form agrees with neither or is ambiguous. See also Kutscher (1974, 519–21).

\(^6\) This form may be attested in the phrase לָבַַֽז מִגְּרָשֶָ֖הּ לְַ֥מֵּ֥עַן (Ezek. 36.5), cf. ESV ‘that they might make its pasturelands a prey’, but the phrase is also analysable as an Aramaic-style infinitive (see below, ch. 12, §2.2, fn. 17).
nents of the tradition in Joshua should be dated no later than the consonantal text of the Chronicles passage (Khan 2020, I:57).

Beyond demonstrating special affinity between the Tiberian pronunciation of a CBH text and the orthography and pronunciation of its LBH parallel against the pronunciation tradition ostensibly reflected by the CBH orthography, the foregoing example also draws attention to an important point regarding explicit notation: the written-reading divergence in Joshua is nowhere acknowledged in the Masoretic tradition as an instance of ketiv-qere dissonance. This highlights the necessity of moving beyond cases of ketiv-qere dissonance formally acknowledged in the Masoretic tradition in order more fully to appreciate the historical depth of the Tiberian BH linguistic tradition. To be sure—and this is of critical importance in the present connection—the extent of divergence between the Tiberian written and reading traditions exceeds instances of written-reading divergence explicitly recognised as ketiv-qere or qere perpetuum. Indeed, most of the studies of written-reading divergence collected in the present volume have not traditionally been considered cases of ketiv-qere.

At this point, it is worth dedicating a few lines to terminology. In several of his studies, Khan (2013b, 464; 2020, I:34) utilises the terms qere and ketiv not just for acknowledged instances of dissonance explicitly recorded as cases of ketiv-qere and qere perpetuum, but also for cases of dissonance unacknowledged in masoretic sources. This is justified, since the extent of diversity within the Tiberian tradition is not exhausted by its recognition in masoretic sources. Notwithstanding the unassailable logic Khan’s broad definitions of ketiv and qere, however, in deference
to common usage and to avoid misunderstanding, the terms ketiv and qere are in the present work reserved for traditionally acknowledged cases. For their part, instances of written-reading dissonance not explicitly recognised in masoretic notations and treatises are referred to herein as differences between ‘the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition’ or, more briefly, as differences between ‘the Tiberian written (or orthographic or spelling) and reading (or pronunciation or recitation) traditions’.

This terminology is not entirely satisfying. Beyond its verbositiy, it is admitted that the labels suffer from a degree of inconsistency and imprecision. For one thing, the Tiberian written and reading forms are alternately treated as divergent elements of a single composite tradition and as related but separate traditions. The reader should bear in mind both the interrelatedness and the independence of the two elements.

Moreover, it is clear that the written tradition (or the written component of the combined tradition) was more than just the product of scribal transmission, but presupposes its own accompanying oral realisation. From this perspective, even within the composite Tiberian written-reading tradition, the reading tradition (or the reading component of the combined tradition) is not the sole pronunciation tradition reflected. The spelling of the consonantal text also presupposes a corresponding pronunciation tradition. Further, the written tradition (or component), often referred to as the ‘consonantal text’, itself likely incorporates multiple layers, probably including material that was at one time written in (more) purely consonantal orthography and only later
augmented with final and internal *matres lectionis*. This obviously means that the orthographic tradition itself likely reflects various strata of oral realisations. While this level of diversity rarely has implications for the phenomena discussed throughout the monograph, where it is significant, e.g., in the case of 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms, in ch. 17, it is discussed in detail.

Finally, as already noted, the extant Tiberian pronunciation tradition manifests a degree of diversity. The occasional divergence between vocalisation and accents has already been mentioned (above, fn. 1). Beyond this, diversity in the Tiberian pronunciation tradition sometimes arises from differences in opinion and realisation among representatives of the tradition (Khan 2020, 92–99). For example, see below, ch. 4, on diversity among Tiberian authorities on the graphic representation and phonetic realisation of the proper name *Issachar*.

**2.0. The Tiberian Reading Tradition in Historical Context**

As is well known, it was not until the Middle Ages that the Tiberian vocalisation was definitively literised in the form of diacritics added to consonantal manuscripts. In contrast to the Tiberian consonantal tradition, which is already reflected in proto-masoretic DSS manuscripts (as one tradition among several repre-

---

7 Consider, in this connection, the orthographic disparity between Deut. 2.24–35; 3.14–4.1 as reflected in 4Q31 (4QDeut\(^d\)) and in the MT. While both show final and internal *matres*, the Qumran rendition is consistently more defective than the MT rendition, thereby almost certainly reflecting an earlier stage in orthographic development, though there is no obvious evidence of linguistic disparity and only slight textual incongruence.
sented in the Dead Sea fragments), the comparatively late written attestation of the vocalic tradition has led some to regard it with suspicion, as a largely secondary product of dubious textual, exegetical, and linguistic credibility. This scepticism arises from two considerations: first, the acknowledged oral nature of the reading tradition; second, the presumed temporal distance between textual composition and crystallisation of the reading tradition, at least as far as CBH material is concerned. All things being equal, it is reasonable to suspect that an unwritten tradition temporally far removed from its written counterpart would be more vulnerable to change than a similar written tradition, a temporally proximate oral tradition, or a temporally proximate written tradition.

While such concerns cannot be dismissed, they arguably betray a degree of misunderstanding. First, it is important to bear in mind that there was never a time when the written tradition of the Hebrew Bible was unaccompanied by audible tradition. Barr (1981, 35) states:

Reading traditions existed in the temple and synagogue from ancient times. Such reading traditions may well have antedated, rather than followed, the acceptance of a particular manuscript tradition as authoritative. When a more or less authoritative written text came to be accepted, it was found that no manuscript agreed entirely with the reading tradition that was already deemed to be correct.

In this way Barr accounts for acknowledged instances of ketiv-qere dissonance. But it is equally applicable to divergences between the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition unregistered as instances of ketiv-qere in masoretic sources.
As to the matter of the presumed relative vulnerability of an orally transmitted pronunciation tradition vis-à-vis a written tradition, it is illustrative to present as a corrective the Karaite view noted by Khan (2021, I:123–24):

The Karaite Hebrew grammarians of the tenth and eleventh centuries were, in general, concerned with the reading tradition (*qere*) reflected by the Tiberian vocalization signs and showed little concern for the orthography of the written text (*ketiv*) (Khan 2000b; 2003; 2013b). The Karaite al-Qirqisānī, in his discussions of the bases of authority for the Hebrew Bible, contended that the ultimate authoritative source was the reading tradition of the people of Palestine (by which he meant Tiberias), rather than the written form of the text with orthographic inconsistencies. One of his justifications was that the reading tradition had been transmitted by the whole community (*ʾumma*) since the time of the prophets whereas the written orthography had been transmitted on the authority of small circles of scribes, which is, therefore, more liable to corruption or wilful change. (Khan 1990c)

The textual centrality of the oral tradition among the Karaites is illustrated by, among other things, their practice of recording biblical texts in Arabic letters. Crucially, the letters are not mere transliterations of the Hebrew consonantal tradition, but transcribe the oral realisation of the biblical text (Khan 2021, I:122–23). Similarly, as already seen, while masoretic scribes were obliged to reproduce the established consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible without changes, the definitive form of the biblical text read in public was that represented by the consonants with the vocalisation and accentuation, and—decisively—the *qere* when this differed from the *ketiv*. 
And what of the time span that is thought to separate the composition of the biblical texts and their final vocalisation? Even if one or more communities eventually managed to preserve an ancient oral tradition, is it reasonable to imagine that such traditions might extend back to the biblical period? In the present volume an effort is made to answer this question. In the meantime, several preliminary considerations may be raised.

First, it is important to acknowledge that, as far as the relationship between the consonantal text and the vocalisation is concerned, instances of written-reading dissonance, while not rare, are far from the norm. Throughout the vast majority of the biblical text, the consonantal text and pronunciation tradition seem to be in harmony, with no reason to suspect divergence between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition.

Second, focusing on the relatively rare cases of written-reading dissonance, it is true that points of divergence between the Tiberian tradition’s written and reading components often reflect secondary developments in the reading tradition. Significantly, however, these secondary divergences frequently correspond to developments especially characteristic of the language of Second Temple sources. The marked affinity between the Tiberian reading tradition and Second Temple Hebrew is strong evidence that the reading tradition was largely finalised in the Second Temple Period.

But there is need for nuance. The reading tradition’s late crystallisation should not be taken to mean that it is uniformly comprised of Second Temple Hebrew. Beyond the fact that com-
monalities linking First and Second Temple Hebrew far outnumber differences that divide them, there is no reason to doubt the routine preservation of genuine Iron Age linguistic features in a tradition that acquired its final shape in the post-exilic period.

Finally, it is here emphasised that many cases of dissonance between the Tiberian consonantal and vocalisation traditions, though secondary and relatively late, are not in fact Second Temple innovations. Rather, they frequently constitute minority Iron Age developments whose distinctive Second Temple character relates to late proliferation. Indeed, it was precisely on the basis of such Second Temple proliferation that their use was extended within the biblical reading tradition to pre-Second Temple material. In other words, the anachronistic character of the recitation tradition’s deviations from the pronunciation implied by the consonantal text frequently lies not in the nature of the deviation—many of which are attested in early material—but in the extension of such secondary features, often to the point of their standardisation. It is this standardisation, rather than mere occurrence, that is diagnostic of Second Temple crystallisation.

If the arguments in this volume prove compelling, then the Tiberian reading tradition must be deemed a linguistic artefact of considerable historical depth. The analogy of depth can be understood in two ways, i.e., the linguistic tradition both extends deeply into history and comprises multiple layers of material (Hornkohl 2020b, 228–29). Indeed, its most obvious secondary features, in the form of divergences from the written tradition—which, again, it must be emphasised, are comparatively few—reflect dates no later than the Second Temple Period and, in many
cases, represent secondary developments already attested in the CBH consonantal tradition and/or Iron Age epigraphy. This, in turn, demands a broad scholarly reassessment of the ramifications of the reading tradition’s antiquity for exegetical, textual, and linguistic research. No longer can the Tiberian vocalisation be summarily dismissed as hopelessly anachronistic, with little to no connection to the earliest linguistic forms of the biblical texts. Rather, it merits serious consideration, even in its most obviously secondary and most conspicuously late features.

3.0. Examples

Before turning to the eighteen individual studies that make up the bulk of this monograph, it will be helpful to prime the reader with brief summaries of known cases of dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition, most of which have been discussed elsewhere. In the following cases, the Tiberian reading tradition is characterised by the standardisation of a secondary development known from post-exilic sources. Even so, in some cases, the secondary feature has roots in CBH and/or Iron Age epigraphy.

3.1. The Toponym ‘Jerusalem’: יְרוּשָלַם versus יְרוּשָלִים

The accepted Tiberian pronunciations of the toponym ‘Jerusalem’—namely, contextual יְרוּשָלַּם yǝrūšalāyim (pausal יְרוּשָלַּם yǝrūšālayim) and contextual directional יְרוּשָלָּמְךָ yǝrūšalāyma (pausal directional יְרוּשָלָּמְךָ yǝrūšālayma)—conflict with the dominant spellings of the name in the written component of the Tiberian

8 Hornkohl (2013a, 91–95).
biblical tradition, namely יְרוּשָלָם (which spellings occur in all but five of 643 cases). The orthography does not reflect the triphthong in the ending -ayim (pausal -ֲּּיִמ) or the diphthong in the ending -aymā (pausal -ֲּּיָּמ). This mismatch has resulted in the unique situation of two vowels being marked between the last two consonants of the word: יְּרוּשָלָם (pausal יְּרוּשָלַם) or יְּרוּשָלַּמָה (pausal יְּרוּשָלַּמָּה). A similar strategy is employed in the Babylonian tradition, though it not infrequently shows just a single vowel between the ‗lamed and mem. Yeivin (1985, 1088–89) attributes such incomplete vocalisations in the most ancient stratum of the tradition and in the composite vocalisation to no more than a lack of rigour on the part of punctuators, whereas he entertains the possibility that the frequency of such vocalisations in the tradition‘s intermediate stratum reflects a different phonological realisation.

Aside from dominating in the Tiberian and Babylonian written traditions, the spelling יְּרוּשָלָם is also found in the earliest epigraphic attestation of the city‘s name, in an inscription from Khirbet Beit Lehi (5.2), which dates to the late sixth century BCE. And such spellings persist in Second Temple documents and literature. The realisation represented by the spelling might have been expected to yield something along the lines of Tiberian יְּרוּשָלֵם ᴮ. Similar realisations with monophthongs in the final syllable are found in BA יְרוּשֶׁל̄ם, TA יְרוּשֶׁל̄ם, Syriac يَرُوشَلَم, Greek Ἰεροὺσαλήμ, and Latin Jerusalem (HALOT 437a). Consider also the form of the toponym שלם ‘Salem’ (Gen. 14.18; Ps. 76.3).
However, against the view that the Tiberian reading tradition’s pronunciation יַרְעָשַּׁלַיִם is a medieval innovation, spellings presupposing the diphthongal ending, in the form of ירושלים and ירושלים, appear five times in the Tiberian written tradition (Jer. 26.18; Est. 2.6; 1 Chron. 3.5; 2 Chron. 25.1; 32.9) and are common in non-Tiberian biblical and post-biblical sources, e.g., DSS biblical and non-biblical material, coins from the Second Temple Period, and rabbinic literature.

The overall distribution of the spelling ירושלים in ancient Hebrew sources, including the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition, indicates that a realisation along the lines of יַרְעָשַּׁלַיִם represented a Second Temple convention that was standardised in the Tiberian reading tradition despite the dominant orthography. This is consistent with the view that the Tiberian reading tradition took its essential shape in the Second Temple Period. Evidence is insufficient to substantiate whether or not the sort of pronunciation preserved in the Tiberian reading tradition predates the Second Temple Period.

3.2. Univerbalisation of the Infinitive Construct with Prefixed -ֶּל

In the Tiberian tradition, the phonetic realisation of the qal II-bgdkpt construct infinitive varies depending on whether or not the form is preceded by a prefixed preposition and on the identity of the preposition. Blau (2010, 213–14) explains as follows:

The construct infinitive is frequently governed by prepositions, especially by ל. Originally this ל had a fully preposi-

---

tional meaning, as, e.g., ‘in order to’ (e.g., וַיֵּ֣רֶד יְּהוֵָ֔ה לִרְּאֵֹת אֶת־הָעִֶ֖יר ‘and the Lord came down to see the town’ Gen 11:5); later the ה became a part of the infinitive.... This is reflected both by the form and by the syntactic usage of the preposition. Formally, the ה became integrated into the infinitive. In some forms of the qal infinitive, the ה appears to be in close internal juncture: the šwa that begins the infinitive behaves as a genuine quiescent šwa, and subsequent ב, ג, ד, ה, ו letters are vocalized as stops, e.g., לִנְּפֹל ‘to fall’, as opposed to simple נְּפֹל and בִּנְּפֹל/כִּנְּפֹל ‘when falling’. In Rabbinic Hebrew the univerbalization of the infinitive with ה is even more progressed: the ה is always attached to the infinitive, even after other prepositions, and the infinitive is totally remodelled after the prefix-tense.... The special vocalization of the construct infinitive in Biblical Hebrew after ה, corresponding to the vocalization of the prefix-tense... is undoubtedly in the line of Rabbinic Hebrew (and may even reflect the impact of Rabbinic Hebrew on the Masoretes) (see also Blau 2010, 115).

However, several lines of argumentation converge to show that the apparent distinction between the Tiberian written and reading traditions is not as neat and tidy as a mere dichotomy of BH versus RH. Rather, pre-rabbinic evidence, including some from the Tiberian written tradition itself, shows that the process of univerbalisation that is attested in the reading tradition and that culminated in RH, was also earlier very much underway. Significant pieces of evidence include:

1. apparent DSS transitional forms, e.g., *liggoa‘ to touch’ (4Q53 f2–5i.5; cf. BH לִנְּגֹעַ/לִגַּע and RH לִיגַע), which was secondarily corrected to לִנְּשַׁל and *liššol ‘to clear away’ (1QM 10.1–2; cf. BH לִנְּשַׁל and RH לִישַׁל).—
the apparent assimilation of $n$ in these forms was possible only after the vowel following $n$ had shortened to zero;

2. the distinction in preposition vocalisation, -ל, on the one hand, versus -ב and -כ, on the other, in qal I-y and II-w/y verbs, e.g., לֶדֶת ‘when bearing’ versus בְּלֶדֶת ‘to bear’ and בְּבוֹא ‘in coming’ and כְּבוֹא ‘after coming’ versus לָבוֹא ‘to come (in the Tiberian as well as Babylonian traditions, and with parallels in the Samaritan tradition);

3. the overall rarity of infinitives construct without a preceding preposition in all biblical consonantal traditions and the dominance of infinitives with -ל in late material, e.g., Tiberian LBH, BA, DSS Hebrew, the Hebrew of BS, and RH;

4. the predominantly late character of structures involving an infinitive with -ל preceded by another preposition;

5. the substitution in late material of infinitives with preceding -ל for CBH infinitives without preceding -ל.

It has been argued that the Tiberian phonological realisation of qal II-bgdkpt construct infinitives is a rabbinic or later anachronism alien to older BH phonology. Against this claim, phonological, morphological, and syntactic evidence may be adduced to demonstrate that the univerbalisation of the infinitive construct with -ל was underway in the linguistic stratum reflected in classical biblical consonantal material. The corresponding CBH reading tradition may indeed reflect a later stratum, perhaps vaguely contemporaneous with the combined Tiberian LBH written-reading tradition, but the difference more of degree than essence, since both strata lie at points on the same developmental line, which culminated in RH.
3.3. **versus** ‘The Sixth Day’ and Similar\(^\text{10}\)

BH norms of noun-attribute concord typically involve agreement in gender, number, and definiteness. However, exceptions, especially in terms of agreement in definiteness, have long been known. Further complicating matters is the apparent dissonance between the written (consonantal) and reading (vocalic) components of the Tiberian biblical tradition, especially in poetry (Ley 1891; Lambert 1898; GKC §126h; Barr 1989, 310–12, 325–33).

In poetic compositions in the Hebrew Bible, when the sequence [noun + article + adjective] is preceded by a clitic preposition, e.g., ב-, כ-, or ל-, the double-article DETERMINED NOUN + DETERMINED ADJECTIVE formulation dominates; but when the noun has no attached preposition, the construction occasionally has a single-article ANARTHROUS NOUN + DETERMINED ADJECTIVE formulation.

Conspicuous in this connection—even outside of poetry—are expressions comprising the noun בָּיָם ‘day’ and an attributive ordinal numeral. In the Tiberian biblical tradition, when this combination is preceded by a clitic preposition, it consistently comes in the symmetrical, double-article formulation DETERMINED NOUN + DETERMINED ORDINAL (of the 126 occurrences, 125 involve ב-, one ל-). Conversely, on eight occasions when there is no preceding clitic preposition, an alternative, asymmetric, single-article ANARTHROUS NOUN + DETERMINED ORDINAL syntagm obtains. The incongruity is especially conspicuous in the local discord

\(^{10}\) Hornkohl (2020b).
among the three relevant cases in (1), which occur in successive verses.

(1) והכל אלוהים בורח משיבים מלאכתו איש ששה והשתה בורח משיבים והlarındanו...

‘And on the seventh day God finished his work that he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work that he had done. So God blessed the seventh day and made it holy…’ (Gen. 2.2–3a)

Consider also the diversity between the three cases in (2):

(2) חֲשַׁבְתָּ הַיּוֹם מִצְחַת הַשָּׁוְאָל אֶל בְּיוֹם הַרִּאשֹּׁן מִבָּהֵן כִּי יַכְּתֵּב וְהָלַךְ הַנּוֹשֶׁה הַהִוא מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל מִיּוֹם הָרִאשֹּׁן עַד יּוֹם הַשָּׁבִיעִי׃

‘Seven days you shall eat unleavened bread. On the first day you shall remove leaven out of your houses, for if anyone eats what is leavened, from the first day until the seventh day, that person shall be cut off from Israel.’ (Exod. 12.15)

Broadly speaking, there are two approaches to explaining the clash between single- and double-article יום + ordinal constructions in the Tiberian biblical tradition. According to the first approach, they are to be viewed as abbreviations of common phrasal constructions in which the initial article has been deleted, perhaps under vernacular pressure. This is in line with S. R. Driver’s ([1892] 1998, §209) observation on such RH cases as כנסת הגדולה ‘the great synagogue’ (m. Ḥevi'ah 10.10) and ירר הער ‘evil inclination’ (m. Ḥ. Avot 2.11) that “the usage appears to have arisen in connexion with familiar words, which were felt to be sufficiently definite in themselves without the addition of the ar-
article.” Parade Masoretic BH examples of single-article constructions include חָצֵֵ֥ר הַפְּנִימִִ֖י ’inner court’ (Ezek. 40.28), בִשְּנַת֙ הַָֽרְּבִיעִֵ֔ית ’in the fourth year of Jehoiakim’ (Jer. 46.2), and בְּדֵֶ֥רֶ הַטּוֹבֶָ֖ה וְּהַיְּשָרַָֽה ’in the good and right way’ (1 Sam. 12.23). While some such ‘pseudo-construct’ expressions are likely genuine vestiges that reflect a linguistic stage before the standardisation of determination agreement (Borg 2000), others (like the three preceding examples) are probably secondary results of construal as fixed compounds, whether the resulting nouns were deemed common (lexicalisation) or proper (onymisation) (Moshavi and Rothstein 2018, 116, fn. 54).

Single-article יוֹם + ordinal constructions are arguably to be explained differently (GKC §126w, fn. 9). Several pieces of evidence may be cited in support of the view that, in this case, an archaic single-article construction was secondarily supplanted by a double-article alternative. First, within Tiberian BH, the complementary distribution of single- and double-article יוֹם + ordinal constructions is suspiciously suppletive. The double-article alternative obtains only where a cliticised preposition permits its articulation before יוֹם, or, in the absence of such a preposition—crucially—in acknowledged late contexts: LBH Dan. 10.12 and Neh. 8.18 and NBDSS 4Q216 7.12 = Jub. 2.21 and 4Q284 f2ii 3–4; f3.2.

Further evidence of the Second Temple character of the symmetrical DETERMINED NOUN+DETERMINED ORDINAL construction comes from Aramaic and Syriac. Not only do the Targums and the Peshitta, respectively, rather consistently present double-article constructions composed of DETERMINED NOUN + DETER-
MINED ORDINAL—including, notably, in most of their renderings of the eight cases of Masoretic CBH single-article formulation—but this agreement is routine in those languages outside of biblical translations, too. It is possible that convergence with Aramaic contributed to the process of movement from single- to double-article יוֹם + ordinal structures, though the process may well have begun within Hebrew in connection to the standard norm of adjectival agreement.

If double-article יוֹם + ordinal structures are indeed secondary in ancient Hebrew, then this explains the suppletion in Tiberian CBH. The single-article construction was preserved only where the consonantal text was not amenable to double-article vocalisation. On the basis of the consistency of single-article יוֹם + ordinal when יוֹם is preceded by ב or ל, it stands to reason that BH at one time knew structures of the type יוֹם הַשָּׁשִי, in accord with the type יוֹם הַשָּׁשִי. If so, at least some portion of the extant cases of the type בְּיוֹם הַשָּׁשִי must be due to secondary reinterpretation, which has led to the current dissonance between the vocalisation implied by the consonantal tradition and the Tiberian vocalisation.

As already noted, the recognition of dissonance is not new (Lambert 1895; GKC §126h; Sperber 1966, 603; Barr 1989, 310–12, 325–33; Borg 2000, 31, 33; JM §138b). It is commonly hypothesised that the consistent double-article syntax of expressions of the type בְּיוֹם הַשָּׁשִי is due to secondary recasting in line with both standard BH noun-adjective concord and post-exilic consonantal evidence of the double-article structure יוֹם + ordinal. Borg (2000, 33) goes so far as to speculate that all biblical and
DSS ordinal expressions with cliticised prepositions were originally single-article constructions. This seems extreme, given the occurrence of consonantally unambiguous double-article constructions in LBH and the DSS. A plausible hypothesis in light of the evidence is that Second Temple Hebrew was characterised by genuine cases of the type בַיומָהֶשֶׁב שִׁי, as well as persistence of the type בְּיומָה שִׁי*

Barr’s (1989, 330) comments on early poetry have broader application:

[A]lthough we cannot assume that every ‘article’ marked upon a preposition b, k, or l in early poetry was ‘really’ there, it is unwise scepticism to suppose that none of them were really there or that only those marked with the consonantal h can be taken as actual…. Though the reading tradition was not always ‘right’, this is not an adequate reason for supposing that in this respect it was always wrong....

The use of the article was in a process of change during—perhaps one should even say ‘throughout’—the biblical period; and I have said nothing of the post-biblical usage, which certainly deserves to be taken into consideration here as well. This could mean that some of the reconstitution of patterns in the later reading tradition was in continuity with processes that were taking place during biblical times; it could even mean that some of this reconstitution was already under way within the formation of the Bible.

The Second Temple consonantal evidence adduced above for בַיומָהֶשֶׁב שִׁי gives a latest possible date for the development of the syntax reflected in masoretic vocalisations of the type בְּיומָה שִׁי. Significantly, however, establishing an earliest possible
date is precluded by a frustrating lack of evidence. One might speculate that, with a larger sample size of CBH cases without clitic prepositions, sporadic CBH cases of the type יומ הוששי might conceivably have occurred. Irrespective of this eventuality, a scenario can be imagined in which doubly-determined בַיוֹם הַשִשִי structures developed without double-article יומ הוששי ever having enjoyed widespread currency. Indeed, this is the most straightforward reading of the evidence, since double-article יומ הוששי is very rarely attested in any phase of ancient Hebrew. Indeed, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that doubly-determined expressions with clitic prepositions, like בַיוֹם הַשִשִי, preceded and influenced the development of doubly-determined cases without clitic prepositions, like יומ הוששי. If suppletive syntax could take hold in the Tiberian reading tradition, why not earlier? One cannot discount the possibility that the double-article structure בַיוֹם הַשִשִי developed in Iron Age Hebrew, coexisting with single-article יומ הוששי, and that the Tiberian reading tradition merely standardised the double marking where possible.

In sum, while single-article constructions without prepositions of the type יומ הוששי likely predate double-article יומ הוששי alternatives, the Tiberian vocalisation of double-article expressions with prepositions, as in בַיוֹם הַשִשִי, are likely secondary in some CBH contexts, but are in line with unequivocal LBH and DSS Hebrew consonantal evidence. A dearth of evidence precludes determining when the double-article formulation was coined. It was certainly established by Second Temple times; it may well have arisen earlier.
3.4. The 3MPL Gentilic: יִים versus יִים-11

The typical Tiberian BH MPL gentilic ending is generally the same as that characteristic of MPL substantives, i.e., יִים- -ימ. It seems clear in the case of 3MPL gentilics that this is due to secondary syncope of an earlier phonetic realisation with consonantal y, e.g., -iy(y)im/-i:im/-iʾim/-im < -iyyim.12 In view of the consistently defective spelling of plural -im in Iron Age Hebrew inscriptive sources (Gogel 1998, 61–73), the yod in such forms as the Arad letters’ ‘Kittites’ is almost certainly consonantal, i.e., kittiy(y)im. A similar picture emerges from cognate inscriptions, with spellings like Phoenician דנניים danuniy(y)im and Ugaritic ʾuɡṛtym/ ʾugaritiy(y)im ‘Ugarites’.

Turning to Second Temple sources, the DSS present orthographic evidence consistent with both the continued consonantal realisation of y (or some reflex thereof) and contraction to simple -im. Forms spelled with double yod outnumber those with a single yod by counts of 23:18 in the BDSS and 11:3 in the NBDSS (for details, see Hornkohl 2018a, 89, fn. 51). While the phonetic values of the relevant spellings cannot be determined with certainty, it is reasonable to assume that they reflect a variety of pronunciations, presumably a continuum from geminated or singleton consonantal realisation, through hiatus, glottal ephenesis, and/or extended i-vowel, to complete contraction to -im (Reymond 2014, 120–22; cf. Qimron 1986, 24; 2018, 95–97). Codex


12 The gemination of y in such cases may itself be secondary, though early (Suchard 2019, 59 and fn. 8).
Kaufmann of the Mishna, material from BS, and the Samaritan reading tradition, in all of which contracted MPL gentilic dominates, furnish confirmatory evidence of the late proliferation of syncope.

Coming to the relevant form in the Tiberian reading tradition, we find that it is with very few exceptions syncopated to -īm, corresponding to the standard MPL suffix on non-gentilic substantives, -īm. Given the evident incidence of syncopated realisations of MPL gentilic ס- in the DSS, BS, the Samaritan biblical reading tradition, and RH, it is clear that the Tiberian reading tradition presents a phonetic realisation in line with late Second Temple practices.

But might such a syncopated realisation date to even earlier? There is evidence, albeit ambiguous and/or limited, suggesting that it might. The Tiberian consonantal tradition presents a single potential case of contracted 3MPL gentilic ending. Consider example (3):

(3) וְיָקְּשָן יָלֵד אֶת־שְּבֶא וְאֶת־דיָדְּן הָיוּ אָרָחִים וּלְטָשִּׂים וּלְאֻמִים׃
‘And Jokshan fathered Sheba and Dedan. And the sons of Dedan were Assurim and Letushim and Leummim. (Gen. 25.3)

While identification of the form אָשָׂרִים as a gentilic with syncopated -īm ending arguably suits the genealogical context, it may be otherwise explained (Kiel 2000, 204).

More promising, but still questionable evidence for syncope comes from Iron Age Hebrew epigraphy. In contrast to the routine consonantal y in the Arad Letters’ חֲדֵימ Kittiy(y)im ‘Kittites’ comes potential evidence of contraction -iy(y)im > -im in the
form אדומים, presumably ʾadomim ‘Edomites’ (Arad 3.12). Though the context is broken, mention of Edom elsewhere in the corpus, most explicitly in Arad 24.20 (see also 21.5; 40.10, 15) lends support to this interpretation. Intriguingly, the main argument raised in objection to the reading of a MPL gentilic here is the otherwise unattested contracted realisation of the MPL gentilic ending in the ancient Hebrew epigraphic corpus (see Gogel 1998, 182, fn. 217, and the works cited there).

The most secure supporting evidence for the early contraction of the MPL gentilic ending is found in the relatively frequent Phoenician reference to צדנם ‘Sidonians’, which goes as far back as the 8th century BCE.13

In its consistent presentation of a syncopated MPL gentilic ending, the Tiberian reading tradition reflects standardisation of a secondary development. Though secondary, the development in question is not only well represented in Second Temple consonantal sources, but apparently sporadically evidenced in even earlier written material. The contraction -im < -iy(y)im is presumably an early vernacular phenomenon, only sporadically preserved in early sources, that came to dominate in certain Second Temple traditions, including the Tiberian reading tradition.

---

13 KAI 31.1 (8th cent BCE); 13.1–2 (5th cent BCE); 14.1–2, 13–15, 18, 20 (5th cent BCE); Gibson 1971–1982, no. 29 (3x) (400 BCE).
3.5. The 3\text{MS} Possessive Suffix on Singulars and Similar: \(\pi\)- versus \(\bar{i}\)-\textsuperscript{14}

In all traditions of BH, the dominant \(3\text{MS}\) possessive (nominal) suffix for singular nouns and similar is \(\bar{i}\)-. In the Tiberian tradition, the written and reading components agree on this morphology in 7710 of 7765 cases (Andersen and Forbes 1986, 183, 323). In the 55 exceptions, the written tradition presents \(\pi\)-. Sometimes this is the \textit{ketiv} and the accompanying \textit{qere} calls for \(\bar{i}\)-. On other occasions, the standard vocalisation is simply imposed upon the anomalous orthography in the form of \(\pi\bar{o}\)-. Either way, these appear to be instances of phonological dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition.

The spelling \(\pi\)- dominates for the \(3\text{MS}\) possessive suffix in ancient Hebrew epigraphy (Gogel 1993, 155–56). It is generally thought to have developed to reflect realisations of the type \(\text{-ahū}, \text{-ihū}, \text{or -uhū}\). Yet, given the propensity for marking final long vowels in ancient Hebrew inscriptions, it is not impossible that \(\text{-ahū}\) had already shifted to \(\text{-ō}\) (via elision of \textit{heh} and monophthongisation of \(\text{-aw}\)) (Zevit 1980, 17, no. 23). Another possibility is that \(\pi\)- in the inscriptions and the Bible was meant to reflect something along the lines of \(\text{-ēh}\), which is the standard Aramaic parallel (Young 1993, 105–6, 126).

Assuming BH \(3\text{MS}\) \(\pi\)- reflected some realisation other than standard \(\text{-ō}\), there is strong evidence that the dissonance on this point between the Tiberian tradition’s written and reading components is early. In other words, though \(\pi\)- is clearly archaic and

\textsuperscript{14} See Hornkohl (2012, 67–69).
was probably not originally meant to represent -ו, there are strong indications that 3MS -ו is itself quite ancient. Not only is it the dominant form throughout the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition;\(^\text{15}\) it is also attested as a minority form in Iron Age Hebrew epigraphy (‘and send [MS] it!’ Arad 13.4 [verbal]; ב ‘in him’ Ketef 111.11). Moreover, Tiberian 3ms -ו is sometimes paralleled in the BDSS by -ו (e.g., ), while in SH, it is consistently paralleled by -ו -ו. Ancient transcriptional evidence also reflects -ו— the Secunda has -ו (Bruce 1943, 362) and Jerome has -ו.\(^\text{16}\)

While the difference between the majority Iron Age epigraphic orthography -ו and the majority biblical spelling -ו must

\(^{15}\) The orthography -ו pointed with holam is common in the Tiberian biblical tradition in other categories as well, especially proper nouns, like שלמה ‘Solomon’, פרעה ‘Pharaoh’, שלוח ‘Shiloh’, סוכות ‘Socoh’, and גילה ‘Gilo’, and the III-y qal infinitive absolute forms. In contrast to the spelling of 3MS -ו, which largely gave way to -ו, the spelling of such proper names and toponyms with -ו persists throughout all chronicles of Hebrew.

\(^{16}\) I am grateful to my friend and colleague, Benjamin Kantor (f.c.), for supplying the following data from his forthcoming book: brucho || BHS ברווח ‘in his spirit’ (Ps. 32.2); dercho || BHS דרץ ‘his way’ (Prov. 8.22); baaphpho || BHS בַּאַפ ‘in his nose/nostrils’ (Isa. 2.22); mnuatho || BHS מְנֻחָת ‘his residence/resting place’ (Isa. 11.10); cadeso || BHS כָּדָשׁ ‘his holiness’ (Isa. 63.10); chullo || BHS כָּל ‘all of it [MS]’ (Ezek. 11.15); aphpho || BHS אַפ ‘his anger’ (Amos. 1.11); masio || BHS מְסִיח ‘what his meditation [is]’ (Amos. 4.13); messio || comments on BHS מְשִיח ‘his Messiah’ (Amos. 4.13); baemunatho || BHS בֵּאֵמוּנָת ‘by his faith’ (Hab. 2.4); iado || BHS מִיָּדו ‘from his hand’ (Hab. 3.4). Note that the Tiberian form in Ezek. 11.15 ends in heh: כֻּלָּה.
be explained (by a Second Temple orthographic revision?) and while there is no certainty that First and Second Temple spellings with י- were necessarily read with an o-vowel, the combination of the unanimous testimony of the ancient transcriptions and the Masoretic Tiberian and Babylonian reading traditions makes an o-vowel the most likely candidate (against Samaritan -u < -hu). In this case, then, the antiquity of the Tiberian reading tradition’s -ō where the written tradition has י- seems to be vouchedsafed by robust Second Temple evidence. Assuming that the minority epigraphic and dominant Masoretic spellings י- also represent -ō, the phonology in question can be traced all the way back to First Temple times. Alternatively, the realisation was -aw, for which -ō is a later reflex.

3.6. The 3ms Possessive Suffix on Plurals and Similar: י- versus יִָיו-17

In the Tiberian biblical tradition, the standard 3ms possessive suffix on plural nouns is written י-, but realised as -āw [ɔːv]. Such a written-reading corelation is counterintuitive, but sufficiently established that a number of words without the 3ms suffix that end in -āw [ɔːv], have also acquired spellings with י-, e.g., MT ketiv and qere יַחְּדִיו ‘together’, MT qere סְתָיו ‘winter/autumn, rainy season’, MT qere יִָיו ‘humble’, DSS עָנָיו ‘Esau’, DSS עָנָיו ‘hook’, RH עָנָיו ‘now’.

Two general explanations have been offered for the unexpected presence of a yod in a suffix pronounced -āw [ɔːv]. One is that it was added secondarily as a grammatical mater lectionis to

indicate plurality. The other is that it is not secondary, but reflects an oral realisation different from the one preserved in the Tiberian pronunciation tradition. Specifically, it is thought that it represented triphthongal -ayu or -eyu in contrast to the diphthongal Tiberian pronunciation -āw [ɔːv]. Given the not-infrequent occurrence in the Tiberian written tradition of - without yod in cases where the combination of a plural with 3MS suffix is expected, along with the dominant use of - alone in such cases in Iron Age Hebrew epigraphic sources, the view that attributes the dissonance between the written and reading components to diversity in pronunciations of the 3MS suffix is arguably the more compelling of the two.

Crucially, however, no matter which explanation is adopted, both presuppose the relative antiquity of the form preserved in the reading tradition vis-à-vis the standard orthography. For whether the orthography - is due to secondary addition of a grammatical mater or reflects genuine phonology with consonantal yod, the extant historical evidence points to the antiquity of the spelling - and of a realisation consistent therewith, whether -aw (> -ɔ?) or -ew, with inscriptions from Gezer (ninth-tenth century BCE), Yavne Yam (= Mejad Ḥashav-yahu; late seventh century BCE), and Lachish (early sixth century BCE). If so, this constitutes a rather rare situation in which the reading component of the Tiberian biblical tradition may preserve a feature older than that reflected in the corresponding written component.

But there is more to the story. The spelling - is also known form ancient Hebrew epigraphy, specifically from the mid-sev-
enth-century BCE Ketef Hinnom silver inscriptions. If so, then the spelling נ-, apparently representative of a triphthongal realisation, might constitute an ancient minority feature, which was standardised in the Tiberian written tradition. By contrast, an apparently majority ancient spelling-pronunciation tradition underlies the dominant Tiberian pronunciation, which is also preserved in a minority of spellings in the MT. Later, the co-occurrence of the spelling נ- and the realisation -aw/-av led to the extension of the use of written נ- to other instance of realisations of -aw/-av, even where there was no 3MS suffix.

If the above discussion is correct, the dominant 3MS traditions of both the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition are authentically old, but the normal situation, according to which the reading tradition reflects the standardisation of an ancient minority feature in line with Second Temple conventions, has been reversed. For in this case, it is the written form נ- that is the minority form in unambiguously dated early material, becoming common only in Second Temple sources. Against this, apparently diphthongal נ- is the majority Iron Age form and is preserved in the Tiberian reading tradition.

3.7. Attenuation of a to i

Narrowly interpreted, the Tiberian Hebrew a > i vowel shift traditionally termed ‘attenuation’ is a case of dissimilation operative when there are two consecutive closed syllables with /a/ vowels, the second of which is stressed: C₁aC₂C₃aC₄ > C₁iC₂C₃C₄. Well-known examples include מִגְּדָל ‘tower’ (< magdal), מִרְיָם ‘Miriam’ (< maryam), and שִׁבְעָה ‘seven (M)’ (< šabʿat). The process is said
to be blocked if $C_2 = C_3$ (i.e., if the syllable is closed by gemination), e.g., מַתָנָה ‘gift’, מַסַע ‘journey’; if $C_1 = C_3$ or $C_2 = C_4$ (i.e., in the case of reduplication), e.g., גַלְגָּל ‘wheel’ (but cf. גִלְגָּל ‘Gilgal’); and by the presence of a guttural or, sometimes, /r/ or /l/, e.g., מַעְגָּל ‘circle’, מַרְבָּד* ‘carpet, tapestry’, קָמִלְפַּה* ‘prod, ox goad’. Once these cases are accounted for, there are very few exceptions (Koller 2013; see also Sivan and Qimron 1995, 20–26). Broader interpretations of attenuation that lump together various other sorts of shifts $a > i$ under the same heading are today largely rejected (Blake 1950; Lambdin 1985; Koller 2013).

Because attenuation seems to be largely absent from the Greek and Latin transcriptions, as well as from SH, and because it is far less extensive in the Babylonian biblical pronunciation tradition than in Tiberian Hebrew, its extensiveness in the Tiberian biblical tradition is widely regarded as a very late development (Blau 2010, 132, §3.5.7.6.13; Koller 2013; Hendel 2016, 32). Indeed, since Jerome still has Magdal in his Latin translation of the Bible (c. 400 CE), Rendsburg (2013, 108) dates the shift to sometime between 400 and 850 CE. The frequent exceptions to attenuation are also taken by some as evidence that the shift was late and never completed (Blau 2010, 132, §3.5.7.6.13).

There seems little doubt that from the perspective of the extent of attenuation $a$ to $i$, the Tiberian biblical pronunciation tradition reflects greater innovation than what is seen in the pronunciation evidence of the LXX, Origen’s Hexapla, Jerome, and the Samaritan and Babylonian reading traditions (see Khan 2020, I:66–67). But does this necessarily entail the view that the sound shift began post-400 CE, i.e., that it was unknown in earlier He-
brew? In light of the historical precedence seen in other linguistic features that became standard in the Tiberian reading tradition, it seems worth entertaining the possibility that in the case of attenuation, too, a relatively early feature of limited extension was eventually regularised in Tiberian pronunciation.

Indeed, there are sporadic signs of $a > i$ attenuation in pre-Tiberian Hebrew sources. In his discussion of the Second Column of Origen’s Hexapla (i.e., the Secunda, c. 250 CE\(^{18}\)), Brønno (1943, 284–85) lists the forms $\mu \varsigma \gamma \alpha \beta$ || MT $\text{מִשְּגַָֽב־}$ ‘stronghold’ (Ps. 46.8, 12) and $\mu \varsigma \chi \nu \omega \alpha \mu$ || MT $\text{מִשְּכְּנֹתָם}$ ‘their dwellings’ (Ps. 49.12). Consider also the burial epitaph $שלום ע$[[ל מישכבך’] [peace upon your resting’ (CIJ 1414), dated by Tal (2008, 162, no. 23) to the third century CE. In all of the above cases, however, it is possible that the preceding sibilant triggered the shift $a > i$.

Conversely, no such conditioning factor applies in the case of the Greek $\Phiυλής$ Μιγδαληνων ‘tribe of the Migdalenes’ from the Hellenistic–Roman Periods of what is modern day Syria (Waddington 1870, no. 2483; Burke 2007, 34, 52).\(^{19}\) Whatever the language of the people group in question—presumably, a Hebrew or Aramaic dialect—Trombley (2014, 359–61) dates the arrival of the Migdalenoi to no later than the third century CE, to which period he also dates the relevant inscription.

\(^{18}\) Kantor (2017, 9–17) argues for a late Roman date, i.e., 150–225 CE (“mid-to-late second or early third century CE”) for the compilation of the pre-Secunda, on which source Origen is thought to have based the Second Column of the Hexapla.

\(^{19}\) I owe this citation to Jan Joosten.
Consider also the spelling מירם ‘Miriam’ in a burial inscription from Beth Shearim that Mazar (1973, 54, 197–98) dates to the third-century CE (Tal 2012, 187, no. 5, fn. 13, dates it more generally to “Pre-352,” because “This is the year in which Beth She‘arim was destroyed”; see also Tal 2012, 38, §7.5.1). The *plene* form representing an *i*-vowel in the first syllable is especially striking in contrast to the Greek form Μαριαμένη with *a*-vowel in another inscription in the same chamber, evidently referring to the same person (Mazar 1973, 197).

Though admittedly meagre, the foregoing come as indisputable evidence of a pre-400 CE *a* > *i* shift consistent with Tiberian attenuation representing various times and locales in pre-Tiberian Hebrew. Though they do not prove the antiquity of attenuation’s extensiveness as reflected in the Tiberian tradition, they at least show that Tiberian pronunciation standardised a feature sporadically documented in late antiquity. What is more, given the limited, fragmentary, and equivocal state of the extant relevant data from the period, it is likely that the historical picture remains somewhat obfuscated. One should bear in mind, among other considerations, that though *plene* spellings with *yod* unambiguously represent an *i*-vowel, defective spellings do not unequivocally reflect *a*. It is thus not unreasonable to speculate that results of the *a* > *i* shift in question were more common in various types of Hebrew and Aramaic far earlier than the Masoretic tradition crystallised and, therefore, that the apparent innovation that Tiberian Hebrew exhibits might rather be a case of the preservation and standardisation of a relatively early second-
ary development, perhaps especially characteristic of specific types of Hebrew or Aramaic.

4.0. Structure of the Monograph

Like the seven cases summarised above, the vocalic realisations treated in the body of this monograph must be regarded as departures from the pronunciation tradition reconstructable on the basis of the consonantal text. In this sense, the extant Tiberian vocalisations are secondary and relatively late. This, however, is only part of the picture. In all cases, the realisations attested in the pronunciation tradition are themselves characterised by substantial historical depth. Their innovation in no case postdates the Second Temple Period, as is clear from their attestation in the combined Tiberian LBH written and reading tradition, DSS Hebrew, SH, the Hebrew of BS, Tannaitic RH, and forms of Second Temple Aramaic. What is more, in several instances, CBH and/or Iron Age epigraphic material shows that the relevant secondary feature had already developed as a minority alternative prior to Second Temple times. In such cases, the Tiberian reading tradition engages in what may be characterised as the late extension of an otherwise early peripheral feature. This is consonant with the reading tradition’s profile as one that crystallised during Second Temple times, simultaneously absorbing late features and preserving genuine Iron Age traits.

The monograph is divided into two parts. The shorter Part I focuses on what may be considered conscious, theologically motivated developments. In such cases, certain phenomena the oral realisation of which had come for various reasons to be deemed
problematic were substituted in the pronunciation tradition, though not in the consonantal text, with more acceptable alternatives. Such examples serve as a useful introduction into the conceptual domain of written-reading dissonance in the Tiberian biblical tradition. They differ in kind, however, from many of the features discussed in Part II. These seem to reflect written-reading dissonance that resulted from developments within Hebrew that had greater effect on the pronunciation tradition than on the orthographic tradition. Crucially, whatever the character of the development—whether motivated by concerns of propriety or driven by unconscious linguistic evolution—all the features listed below are similarly characterised by a degree of mismatch between their written representation and their oral realisation. This is most often due to secondary development—again, either deliberate or unconscious—in the Hebrew preserved in the reading tradition. In a few cases, conversely, it seems that the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition present alternatives of more or less equal antiquity that became fused in the combined written-reading tradition.

The structure of the monograph is as follows:

Part I: Conscious Replacement

- ch. 1: The Tetragrammaton
- ch. 2: לְרַאוֹת אֶת־פְּנֵי יְּהוָה and Similar
- ch. 3: Ketiv-Qere Euphemisms

Part II: Linguistic Development

- phonology
  - ch. 4: The Proper Name Issachar
In some of the cases discussed, the notion of divergent pronunciation traditions—one embodied in the Tiberian vocalisation, the other underlying the Tiberian written text—is uncontroversial or, at the very least, represents a commonly suggested scholarly option, e.g., those discussed in chs 1–3 and 10–13. In other cases, such an explanation has been only rarely proposed and alternative accounts are far more frequently suggested in the literature.

For example, according to a common approach to the Tiberian 2MS endings ī- and itti- in ch. 6, there is no written-reading
dissonance. Rather, both components of the tradition are thought to reflect vowel-final endings, with the routine lack of a final *mater* attributed to an anomalous (though now standard) orthographic convention. Likewise, explanations for the *qere perpetuum* הִוא in the Tiberian Pentateuch in ch. 8 typically hang on the move from defective to *plene* orthography and similarity in letter shape. Though the rather implausible prospect of an epicene 3cs form has also been raised, the possibility that the spelling and vocalisation might both correctly reflect divergent realisations of the 3fs independent subject pronoun has been rarely entertained.

Notwithstanding the existence of plausible and accepted alternative explanations in the case of some of the phenomena discussed in the studies below, the approach here is intentionally programmatic. That is, a conscious effort is made to explore the suitability and ramifications of the view that phonetic dissonance plays a determinative role in all of the relevant features and, as such, is a reality that should routinely be taken into consideration in biblical studies, whether linguistic, exegetical, textual, or literary.

The study closes with a conclusion that summarises results, highlights meaningful trends, and discusses ramifications and potential avenues of future study.
PART I:
CONSCIOUS REPLACEMENT
1. THE TETRAGRAMMATON

The routine spelling יהוה in both biblical and extra-biblical sources implies an originally phonetic realisation along the lines of *yahwe. Additionally, the contraction יהוה *ha(y)-yahwe (< יהוה *hay yahwe) in Iron Age epigraphy (Arad 21.5; Lachish 3.9; cf. Lachish 6.12; 12.3) presupposes that the form היהוה was realised with an initial consonant identical to that with which it ends (Suriano 2013, 752).

Whatever the exact ancient pronunciation of the divine name, by the time that the medieval Tiberian Masoretic reading tradition was textualised in the form of vowel points, any phonetic pronunciation had long been eclipsed by alternative realisations:

1. Usually, the phonetic realisation is that of the dedicated plural-of-majesty + 1cs possessive suffix אֲדוֹנָי 'my Lord', resulting in such consonant-vowel combinations

1 The trifold division of labour of forms of the noun אָדֹן 'lord, master' with 1CS possessive suffixes is itself a result of secondary development. Almost without exception, possessed forms of אָדֹן are plurals of majesty, whether the referent is human or divine: thus is the referent is human or divine: thus אֲדוֹנָי 'your (ms) lord/Lord' (22x), אֲדוֹנֶי 'your (fs) lord/Lord' (2x), אֲדוֹנֶיהָ 'her lord/Lord', אֲדוֹנֶיךָ 'your lord/Lord' (11x; סָפֵנָח), אֲדוֹנַי 'his lord/Lord' (42x; ketiv אֲדוֹנַי 'his lord/Lord' (42x; ketiv with no yod 1x), אֲדוֹנִי 'our lord/Lord' (11x; אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲדוֹנִי אֲدوֹנִי אֲדוֹn}
as יהוה (L Gen. 3.14) and יהוה (L Gen. 3.13), both pronounced ʾāḏōnāy.²

2. Alternatively, when preceded or followed by the word אֲדֹנָי ʾădōnay ‘my Lord’, the realisation is that of אֱלֹהִים ʾĕlōhīm ‘god’, e.g., יהוה (L Gen. 15.2) or יהוה (L Deut. 3.24), both pronounced ʾĕlōhīm.³

deity. Cf. the lone instance of preservation of the non-divine plural אֲדֹנֵי ʾădōnay ‘my lords’ (Gen. 19.2). In the Samaritan reading tradition, phonological processes have resulted in the levelling of any distinction between forms of וָאֵד with 1cs suffixes that refer to humans—Tiberian אֲדֹנִי ʾădōnay ‘my (human) lord’ and אֲדֹנֵי ʾădōnay ‘my lords’ are both realised as אדוני אדנני. The form אדני in reference to the deity in the Samaritan tradition is generally realised as אדני, i.e., with no gemination. The Samaritan realisation of the tetragrammaton is šēmā.

² JM (§16f fn. 1) opines that the vocalisation יְהוָה (lacking ḫolam) common in L (as opposed to the rarer יהוה, with ḫolam) is based on Aramaic šēmā ‘the name’, also known from the Targumic reading tradition and similar to the Samaritan. However, beyond the fact that the realisation ʾĕlōhīm is also often represented by forms lacking an explicit ḫolam vowel sign, e.g., יהוה (L Gen. 15.2), certain features in the Masoretic vocalisation (also noted in JM §16f) show that šēmā cannot have been the Tiberian realisation. For example, the vocalisation of the prepositions -מ-, -ב-, and -ל- presuppose a following ā-vowel, as in ʾāḏōnāy, whereas šēmā would have required preceding -ם-, -ב-, and -ל-, respectively.

³ According to Khan (2013b, 464), the vocalisation of יהוה with simple shewa (as opposed to the composite shewas in אֲדֹנִי and אֱלֹהִים) “is a vestige of a primitive stage of the development of Tiberian vocalization, in which a shewa rather than a hateph sign was written on the ʾalef.” Cf. the vocalisation of יהוה with composite shewa in accord with the vocal-
In other words, according to the medieval Tiberian tradition, the written form יהוה is consistently to be read with the consonants and vowels of an alternative divine epithet.⁴

1.0. Second Temple Evidence

But this medieval convention has far earlier roots. Against the suspicion that substitutive readings for יהוה such as ʾādōnāy and ʾĕlōhīm should be chalked up to rabbinic or medieval hypersensitivity to sacrilege, it should be noted that the practice of reserving special treatment for the divine name was already widespread in the last centuries before the Common Era and may extend more deeply into history. In some DSS Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts, e.g., 11Q5 (=11QPsᵃ); 1QpHab; 4Q243 (=4QpsDanᵃ ar), and in certain some Greek manuscripts, as well, e.g., 8HevXII gr (Roberts 1951, 173–75; Vasileiadis 2014), the name is distinguished from the surrounding words via the use of old Canaanite script. In some Aramaic DSS, the name is replaced by dots (see, e.g., 4Q196 f18.15). Presumably reflecting special reverence for the name (Yeivin 1980, 59, §103), such strategies had the practical effect of reminding readers to avoid pronouncing it as written. Consider, e.g., הָיָה in Ps. 151 as preserved in 11QPsᵃ 28.6, 11 (underlined below in lns 3, 8 of Figure 1).

⁴ Readers unfamiliar with the convention of pronouncing יהוה with the vowels of אֲדֹנָי, inadvertently coined on the basis of the written-reading combination יהוה, the hitherto unknown divine name yĕhōvā, i.e., ‘Jehovah’.
Similarly, as already noted, in the Samaritan and Aramaic reading traditions, God’s name was replaced with the Aramaic word שֶׁמֶא šǝṃa ‘the name’. In the Greek, Syriac, and Latin versions, it was replaced with words meaning ‘Lord’—κυρίος, μέσα, and Dominus, respectively—an approach commonly perpetuated in modern Bible translations. And in some cases where the Masoretic Bible vocalises יהוה as ʾădōnāy ‘my LORD’ or ʾĕlōhîm ‘GOD’, a parallel DSS text has the actual consonants of the replacement form, e.g., יוהי (MT Deut. 32.27) || אדוני (1Q5 f16–19.9), אדני (MT Isa. 50.5) || אדוני אלהים (1QIsa 42.6).
2.0. Iron Age Epigraphy and the Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

But at least two questions remain: (1) does the convention of reference to the Israelite deity as אדני ‘my Lord’ predate the Second Temple Period and, if so, by how much? (2) Does the convention of replacing the original pronunciation of יהוה with that of אדני predate the Second Temple Period and, if so, by how much?

On the first question, epigraphic evidence seems clear. In the admittedly meagre corpus of Iron Age Hebrew inscriptions, referents designated by the forms יהוה and אדני are kept rigidly distinct, the former consistently referring to a human and never substituting for the latter. The Aramaic equivalent to אדני, i.e., מרא, does, however occur in the fifth-century documents from Elephantine.

Moreover, אדני appears in reference to the Israelite deity as a minority form throughout the Tiberian consonantal tradition, including in acknowledged CBH texts in the Pentateuch, Former Prophets, and Latter Prophets. Excluding sequences of אדני יהוה and יהוה אדני (where אדני was originally in apposition to *yahwe), MT instances in which אדני refers to the Israelite deity total some 133 cases (against more than 6800 cases of יהוה). In books where אדני occurs, it normally makes up a small minority of references to the Israelite deity. See Table 1. There may be a diachronic factor in the above distribution, as the statistical outliers are the post-exilic compositions of Daniel (where cases of אדני in reference to the Israelite deity outnumber those of יהוה; Daniel also has instances of מרא in reference to the Israelite deity: Dan.
2.47; 5.23) and Lamentations (where אֲדַנִּי comes in over a third of the cases).

Table 1: אדני for יהוה in the written component of the Tiberian biblical tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Instances of אדני</th>
<th>% אדני</th>
<th>Instances of יהוה</th>
<th>% יהוה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Instances of יהוה</th>
<th>% יהוה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam.</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obad.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nah.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hag.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qoh.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chron.</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One is inclined to question the authenticity of CBH cases of יהוה אדני. However, when it comes to the fourteen occurrences in the Pentateuch (Gen. 18.3, 27, 30, 31, 32; 19.18; 20.4; Exod. 4.10, 13; 5.22; 15.17; 34.9, 9; Num. 14.17), it is worth noting that the composite Samaritan written-reading tradition agrees with the Tiberian consonantal tradition on thirteen; the exception is Exod. 15.17 where MT מִקְדָּשׁ אֲדַנִּי כוֹנְנֵנִי יָדֶךָ城市建设, O LORD, that your hands established’ || SP מקדש יהוה כוננו ידך maqdâš šēmâ kūnênu yêḏâk, which also in 4Q14 6.41 reads מקדש יהוה כוננו ידך.
Beyond the Pentateuch, MT Isaiah’s אדני is regularly paralleled by the same in 1QIsa; of the 23 MT instances, 1QIsa reads אדני in seventeen of them (Isa 3.18; 4.4; 6.1, 8; 7.20; 8.7 [erasure of יהוה]; 9.16; 10.12; 11.11; 21.6, 8; 29.13; 30.20; 37.24; 38.14, 16; 49.14). MT אדני is also paralleled by the same in other DSS Isaiah material (MT Isa. 3.17 || 4Q56 3i.12; MT Isa. 21.16 || 4Q55 f10–11i + 12–14.35; MT Isa. 38.16 || 1Q8 16.4; MT Isa. 49.14 || 4Q58 4.23) and elsewhere (MT Amos 9.1 || Mur88 8.7; MT Ps. 2.4 || 11Q7 f1–2.3; MT Ps. 35.17 || 4Q83 f6.3; MT 38.16 || 4Q83 f9ii.2; MT Ps. 38.23 || 4Q83 f9ii.5; MT Ps. 54.6 || 4Q83 f11–12.8; MT Ps. 66.18 || 4Q83 f14ii.30; MT Ps. 86.5 || 1Q10 f1.1; MT Ps. 89.50 || 4Q87 f8.1; MT Ps. 89.51 || 4Q87 f8.2; MT Lam. 1.15 || 4Q111 3.6).

On the above evidence, the interchange of אדני and יהוה dates back to at least the late Second Temple Period. The fact that the Tiberian Torah and the SP agree on אדני as nomenclature for the Israelite deity points to a convention that had become rooted before the separation of the proto-Tiberian and proto-Samaritan traditions (see Kartveit 2009; Pummer 2012; Kantor 2020, 108–9 for background).

Regarding the antiquity of the avoidance of the pronunciation of יהוה, unambiguous information is much harder to come by, since it is difficult to reconstruct the pronunciation that originally accompanied the Tiberian consonantal text, before it became wedded to the Tiberian reading tradition. In other words, assuming that the graphic sequence יהוה was originally pronounced along the lines of *yahwe, does the Tiberian written tradition give any hint as to avoidance of this pronunciation in
accord with what is seen in the Tiberian reading tradition and the other Second Temple traditions listed above?

Schniedewind (2004, 32) notes that Chronicles “often replaces the sacred four letter name of God in its source (known from the books of Samuel and Kings) with the more generic Elohim (which translates simply as ‘God’)” (see Japhet 2009, 24, fn. 64). Japhet (2009, 24–30) disagrees with this assessment of Chronicles, but makes a similar claim about Qohelet and the Elohistic Psalter (on the latter see also Ben-Dov 2010, 81–82, 87–88, 101–4; Suriano 2013, 752). The latter, encompassing Pss 42–83 and showing no signs of LBH, are apparently classical works evincing reticence to overuse of the tetragrammaton. Suriano (2013, 752) sees even earlier avoidance of יהוה in the preference for אלהים in the E source of the Pentateuch, though this is considered a separate issue by Japhet (2009, 29, fn. 85).

3.0. Conclusion

Given the extant evidence, it is not entirely clear how long the supposed realisation יְהֹוָה persisted. However, avoidance of the name dates as far back as the composition of CBH texts (the Elohistic Psalter, if not the putative E source of the Pentateuch). Further, the pronunciation of the tetragrammaton as ʾădōnāy reflected in the medieval Tiberian vocalisation signs clearly preserves pre-medieval sensitivities characteristic of multiple Second Temple biblical traditions, wherein early use of the pluralis majestatis epithet אדני ‘my Lord’ for the Israelite deity was

5 In the Elohistic Psalter the counts of divine epithets are אלהים 245 times, יהוה 45 times, and אדני 23 times.
extended and became standard, even where יהוה was still written. Indeed, the graphic form of name of the Israelite deity יהוה was so identified with pronunciations along the lines of ʾadônây, that the writing of אדני itself came to be proscribed in Second Temple texts (Japhet 2009, 16–19; cf. 31, fn. 96).
Eleven times in the Tiberian biblical tradition readers encounter an expression composed of a form of the *nif'al* נִרְאָה and the phrase פְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים/יְהוָה, with or without an intervening direct object marker or preposition. Standard renderings include ‘appear before the face of God/the LORd’ and ‘appear in God’s/the LORd’s presence’.

It has been claimed, however, that in all such cases the consonantal spelling was actually intended to represent a form of the *qal* verb רָאָה, with the meaning ‘see God’s/the LORd’s face’, and that the form was only secondarily interpreted as *nif'al* out of concerns for theological propriety (BDB 816b, 908a). Such changes were presumably made both in deference to a general aversion to anthropomorphising the Israelite deity and for the sake of theological harmony in adherence to the prohibition against seeing the divine visage, which employs *qal* רָאָה ‘see’, in (1).

(1) וַיָֹ֖אמֶר לֵֹ֥א תּוּכֶַ֖ל לִרְּׁא ּ֣ת אֶת־פָנָָ֑י כִ֛י לַֹֽא־יִרְּׁאַּּ֥נִי הָאָדֶָ֖ם וָחַָֽ֖י׃...
כָּפֶרֶּרֶּנֵֽיָּ֑ת אֲחֹרָָׂ֖י וּפָנַֹּֽׁ֖י לּאַיָּֽוּ׃

‘And he said, “You cannot see my face, because no mortal will see me and live…. And I will remove my hand, and you will see my back, but my face will not be seen.”’

(Exod. 33.20, 23).

By avoiding the *qal* form in other verses, readers might be helped to avoid the misconception that God’s face could be seen.
Instances where qal in רָאָה (אֶת־/אֶל־)פְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים/יְהוָה ‘see the God’s/the LORD’s face’ are thought to have been reinterpreted as nifʿal due to theological concern may be contrasted with cases in which רָאָה (אֶת־/אֶל־)פְּנֵי ‘see X’s face’ has no divine referent and was maintained.¹ There are even comparable cases in which qal רָאָה is preserved with the face of a divine referent as object.²

The current chapter examines cases of apparent substitution for qal, attempting to determine whether the hypothesis of secondary development is equally applicable to all of them. It then seeks to gauge the antiquity of the reinterpretation.

1.0. Unambiguous Cases of Dissonance

Evidence of morphological mismatch involving both orthography and vocalisation suggest that at least some cases of nifʿal* נִרְּאָה (אֶת־/אֶל־)פְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים/יְּהוָה are secondary reworkings of original formulations with qal רָאָה. The most conspicuous cases of mismatch between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition are reproduced in examples (2)–(4).

(2) ...וְּלֹא־יַחְּמֵֹד אִיש֙ אֶַֽת־אַרְּצְּךֵָ֔ בַעֲלַֹֽת לֵרָאוֹת אֶת־פְּׁנֵי יְּהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהִֶ֔יך שָלֵֹ֥ש פְּעָמִֶ֖ימי בַשָנַָֽotypicalן

‘...and no one shall covet your land, when you go up to appear before the face of the LORD your God three times in the year.’ (Exod. 34.24; SP לְרַרְדָּאْוֶת; Greek ὕψωτα; Vulgate et apparente; TO לאתחזאה; Syriac לֵקֶמתוּ)

¹ Gen. 31.2, 5; 32.21; 43.3, 5; 44.23, 26; 46.30; 48.11; Exod. 10.28, 28; 34.35; 2 Sam. 3.13, 13; 14.24, 32; 2 Kgs 25.19 (|| Jer. 52.25); Jer. 52.25 || (2 Kgs 25.19); Est. 1.14; Dan. 1.10.
² Gen. 32.31; 33.10; Judg. 6.22; Jer. 18.17; Job 33.26.
3. When all Israel comes to appear before the face of the Lord your God at the place that he will choose,…’ (Deut. 31.11; SP לֵרָאוֹת נִרְּאָה; Greek ὑπεράντη; Vulgate ut apparent; TO לאתחזאה; Syriac לַחַהַזְּאָה)

4. ‘When you come to appear before me, who has required of you this trampling of my courts? (Isa. 1.12; 1QIsa לֵרָאוֹת נִרְּאָה; Greek ὑπεράντη; Vulgate ante conspectum meum; TJ לַחַהַזְּאָה; Syriac לַחַהַזְּאָה)

In all of the above, an infinitive construct with transparently qal spelling (i.e., lacking the heh of the corresponding nifʿal infinitive) is realised as nifʿal in the pronunciation tradition. While syncopé of heh is common in certain environments in ancient Hebrew, the nifʿal infinitive is not one of them. For example, unambiguous nifʿal infinitive construct forms of נִרְּאָה come ten times in the Hebrew Bible, consistently with the expected heh, even following a cliticised preposition. The three exceptional cases in (2)–(4) above, where the infinitives are read as nifʿal despite apparent qal orthography, all make reference to the deity’s face/presence. The exclusive connection between the mixed qal-nifʿal form לֵרָאוֹת and contexts including reference to the divine face/presence is unlikely to be random.

In all instances, ancient versional evidence agrees with the Tiberian reading tradition on the meaning ‘appear’. This extends to the Samaritan written tradition, which has the unambiguous

---

3 Lev. 13.7, 14; Deut. 31.11; Judg. 13.21; 1 Sam. 3.21; 2 Sam. 17.17; 1 Kgs 18.2; Isa. 1.12; Ezek. 21.29; Mal. 3.2.
nifʿal theological lectio facilior תָּהְמָה in both of the Pentateuchal instances.

It is of interest that in the parallel to (4) in the Great Isaiah Scroll, the spelling לַרְאוֹת (1QIsa* 1.14) is also most straightforwardly analysed as a qal infinitive. The form in the Peshīṭta is also a match for that represented by the Tiberian written tradition, while the Greek, Latin, and TJ reflect the same understanding as the Tiberian reading tradition.

Syntactically, it is worth pointing out that, in the case of a variety of verbs, אֶת־פְּנֵי and אל־פְּנֵי פָּנָ֑י, meaning ‘before, in the presence of’, is synonymous with לִפְּנֵי פָּנָ֑י meaning ‘before, in the presence of’.

The particle אֵת in such cases is most plausibly analysed as the comitative preposition אֵת ‘with’. If so, in cases (2) and (3), the nifʿal realisation in the Tiberian recitation tradition also involves the reinterpretation of the originally accusative/direct object particle אֵת as the homonymous preposition אֵת ‘with’.

In (4), the presumed original syntax of qal infinitive לִרְאוֹת ‘my face, presence’ with no intervening preposition or particle is within the bounds of acceptable BH usage. The grammaticality of the same formulation with nifʿal is more difficult to gauge. On the one hand, phrases with יְמִנָּה have two char-

---

4 Gen. 19.13, 27; 27.30; 33.18; 43.34; Exod. 10.11; 32.11 (?); Lev. 4.6, 17; 10.4; 1 Sam. 2.11, 17, 18; 22.4; 1 Kgs 12.6; 13.6 (2x?); 2 Kgs 13.4 (?); 16.14; Jer. 26.19 (?); Zech. 7.2 (?); 8.21, 22 (?); Ps. 16.11; 21.7, 140.14; Job 2.7; Prov. 17.24; Est. 1.10; Dan. 9.13 (?); 2 Chron. 33.12 (?).

5 See, e.g., Gen. 32.21; 33.10, 10; 43.3, 5; 44.23, 26; 48.11; Exod. 10.28, 29; 2 Sam. 14.32; Job 33.26, all with qal רָאָה ‘see’ preceding יָמִינָה ‘face’ with no intervening particle.
acteristics common for so-called accusatives of place, in that (a) they begin construct phrases and (b) they begin with a bilabial (GKC §118g). Also, in some LBH texts, פָּנִים functions as a locative adverbial in the sense ‘before, toward, in front, eastward’ (see BDB 815, §6). For example, consider (5).

(5) וְנֵשָאַתָּם אֲתֵּ֥מ בָּ֣שׁוֹר הַנַּֽחַל פְּנֵֹ֖י מִדְּבֵַ֥ר יְּרוּאֵַֽל׃

‘...You will find them at the end of the valley, east of/in front of the wilderness of Jeruel.’ (2 Chron. 2.16)

The syntax of qal רָאָה פְּנֵי is clearly acceptable, that of nifʿal נִרְּאָה פְּנֵי questionable. Since the orthography in (4) is transparently qal, syntactic considerations there only confirm the secondary status of the nifʿal recasting. But questionable syntax may be a more decisive factor in the assessment of ambiguous cases.

Before proceeding to more ambiguous cases of possible qal > nifʿal shift, it is worth examining potentially related cases involving qal and hifʿil. Example (6) presents an apparent instance of the shift qal > hifʿil.

(6) הַהֹלֵָֹ֨ךְ לִפְּנֵיכֶֶ֜ם בַּדֵֶ֗רֶךְ לָתֵ֥וּר לָכֶ֛ם מָקֶ֖וֹם לַַֽחֲנַֹֽתְּכֶָׂ֑ם בָאֵ ש ׀ לֵַ֗יְּלָה

‘...who went before you in the way to seek you out a place to pitch your tents, in fire by night and in the cloud by day, to show you by what way you should go.’ (Deut. 1.33; SP להראותכם; 4Q35 f2–4.26: εἰδέων ὑμῖν; Vulgate ostendens vobis; TO לאחזיותכון; Syriac صُمِحَ)

6 All four instances in which nifʿal נִרְּאָה precedes פָּנִים with no intervening particle are among those identified as potential cases of revocalised qal forms: Exod. 25.15; 34.20; Isa. 1.12; Ps. 42.3. All are discussed in the present study.
According to the *hif'il* realisation in the Tiberian reading tradition, explicit in the orthography of SP and 4Q35, the Tiberian written component’s לראתכם is to be understood as the causative ‘make you (MPL) see, show you (MPL)’, which interpretation is supported by the versions. The ostensible *qal* לִרְּאֹתְּכֶם ‘for your (MPL) seeing, for you (MPL) to see’ would presumably have referred to the purpose of providing light on the road at night. If this is indeed a case of recasting, the motivation would seem to be to forestall misunderstanding, lest readers conclude that God could be seen.

Example (7) exhibits a potential *hif'il > qal* shift.

**(7)** כְּרַֽוּחַ־קָדִֵ֥ים אֲפִיצֵֶ֖ם לִפְּנֵ י אוֹיֵָׂ֑יב עָֹ֧רֶף וְּלַֹֽא־פָנִ֛ים אֶרְּׁאֵֹׁ֖ם בְּיֵ֥וֹם אֵידַָֽם׃  

‘I will scatter them before their enemies like dust blowing in front of a burning east wind. (My) back and not (my) face I will show them on the day of disaster.’ (Jer. 18.17; Greek δείξω αὐτοῖς; Vulgate ostendam eis; TJ אחזינון; Syriac ܐܰܗܘܐ ܐܢܘܢ)

Here, were it not for the vocalisation, the most straightforward reading would arguably be as *hif'il* אַרְּאֵם*. This not only fits the ellipses ‘knape and not face I will show them’, but has the support of the versions and modern translations. The Tiberian reading tradition’s *qal* may betray aversion to the notion that God might actually show his face. But the resulting phraseology, presumably entailing adverbial accusatives, gives the awkward ‘(with) knape and not (with) face I will see them’.
2.0. Ambiguous Cases

Whereas cases (2)–(4) above present unequivocal cases of dissonance between a written *qal* and a *nifʿal* in the pronunciation tradition, other cases of mismatch are not so readily apparent.

Consider (8).

(8) צָמְּאָָ֬ה נַפְּשִָֹ֨י לֵאלֹהִים לְּאֵֵ֪ל חֵָ֥י מָתֵַ֥י אָבָׂ֑וֹא וְְ֝אֵרָאֶֶ֗ה פְּׁנֵ֣י אֱלֹהִִֽים׃

‘My soul thirsts for God, for the living God. When shall I come **that I might appear before God**?’ (Ps. 42.3; Greek ὀθήσομαι; Vulgate *et parebo*; Targum וואראה זיו שכינתא דיהוה; Syriac *ואראה זיו שכינתא דיהוה*)

The lack of a preposition or particle after the verb makes it possible that consonantal ואראה represents an original *qal*, ואראה* ‘that I may see’. Additionally, while the Greek and Latin show theological concern like that ostensibly behind the Tiberian vocalisation, the Targum and Syriac support a *qal* ‘see’ reading (though the Targum mitigates by replacing ‘face’ with ‘glory of the presence of the LORD’).

Other ambiguous cases include (9) and (10).

(9) אַתְּחַיֵּהוּ הַמַּכְּאָ֑ה תִשְּמֹר שִבְּעַ ת יָמִים תֹאכַָֹ֨ל מַצֶ֜וֹת כַַֽאֲשֶ ר צִוִּיתִֵ֗ךָ לְּמוֹעֵד֙ חֹ דֶש הַָֽאָבִֵ֔יב כִּי־בֶ֖וֹ יָצָ אתָ מִמִצְּרָָׂ֑יִם וְּׁל א־יֵרָאּ֥וּ פָנַֹּׁ֖י רֵיָקַָֽם׃

‘You shall keep the Feast of Unleavened Bread. As I commanded you, you shall eat unleavened bread for seven days at the appointed time in the month of Abib, for in it you came out of Egypt. **None shall appear before me** empty-handed.’ (Exod. 23.15; SP יררא ʾu; Greek ὀθήσομαι; Vulgate *apparebis*; TO יררא ʾu; Syriac *ואראה זיו שכינתא דיהוה*)
The firstborn of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb, or if you will not redeem it you shall break its neck. All the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem. And none shall appear before me empty-handed.’ (Exod. 34.20; SP ייראו, yirra’u; Greek ὁφθήσῃ, Vulgate apparebis; TO ייתחזון; Syriac ﻭذتخاذ

In both, the verb can easily be read as a qal. The lack of any particle or preposition between the verb and ‘my face, presence’ makes a nif‘al reading in the sense ‘will (not) appear’ questionable. Also, the shift in referent from 2nd- to 3rd-person is jarring. Why not continue each verse with וְלֹא תֵרָאֶה* ‘and you will not be seen, appear’, if that is the intended meaning? The ancient versions universally translate ‘appear before’, as if נַעֲרָה were equivalent to נֶפֶשׁ or נֶפֶס were an accusative of place (see above). Some modern translations deftly sidestep part of the problem via impersonal rendering, e.g., ‘And none shall appear before me empty-handed’. Yet, this does not resolve the problem of the lack of a preposition or particle. In both cases it seems more likely that the verbs are either impersonal qal forms, ירא* ‘(none) will see’, or nif‘al forms with נַעֲרָה ‘my face’ as subject, i.e., ‘my face will not be seen in vain’. Cf. the clear instance where פָנִים ‘face’ serves as subject of nif‘al רָאָה in example (11) (though, in that instance, too, a qal reading is possible).

“And I will remove my hand, and you will see my back, but my face will not be seen.”’ (Exod. 33.23)
Now, consider (12)–(14).

(12) שָלֵֹ֥שׁ פְּעָמִֶ֖ים בַשָנָָ֑ה יֵרָאֶה  כָל־זְּׁכוּרְּׁךִ֔אֶת־פְּׁנֵֵ֛י הִָֽאָד ּ֥ן ׀ יְּהוֶָ֖ה אֱלֹהֵֵ֥י יִשְּרָאֵַֽל׃

‘Three times in the year will all your males appear before the Lord, the Lord God of Israel.’ (Exod. 34.23; SP יירר; Greek ὀφθήσεται; Vulgate apparebit; TO יתחזון; Syriac ﻲِنِّﺌُﺤْܙَܐ)

(13) שָל וֹש פְּעָמִ ים ׀ בַשָנָָ֡ה יֵרָאֶֶ֨ה כָל־זְּׁכוּרְּׁךָ֜אֶת־פְּׁנֵּ֣י †יְּׁהוָֹׁ֖ה אֱלֹהֶֶ֗יךְ בַמָקוֹם֙ אֲשֶ ר יִבְּחֵָ֔ר בְּחַָ֧ג הַמַצ֛וֹת וּבְּחֵַ֥ג הַשָבֻעֶ֖וֹת וּבְּחַ ג הַסֻכָׂ֑וֹת

‘Three times a year will all your males appear before the Lord your God at the place that he will choose: at the Feast of Unleavened Bread, at the Feast of Weeks, and at the Feast of Booths…’ (Deut 16.16a; SP יירר; Greek ὀφθήσεται; Vulgate apparebit; TO יתחזון; Syriac ﻲِنِّﺌُﺤْODEV)

(14) ...וְּלָ֧א יֵרָאֵֶ֛ה אֶת־פְּנֵ֥י יְּׁהוָֹׁ֖ה רֵיָקַָֽם׃

‘...and they shall not appear before the Lord empty-handed.’ (Deut. 16.16b; SP יירר; Greek ὀφθήσῃ; Vulgate apparebit; TO יתחזון; Syriac ﻲِنِِّﺌُﺤْODEV)

In cases (12)–(14), the fact that the sequence אֶת־פְּנֵי can be taken as a prepositional phrase in the sense of ‘before, in the presence of’ legitimises the nifʿal reading of the verbal form יֵרָאֶה in the meaning ‘will appear’. This is the understanding in the versions. Admittedly, however, the nifʿal reading is no more grammatically felicitous than qal יִרְּאֶה ‘will see’ would be, in which case the ensuing אֶת would be construed as the marker of the definite accusative/direct object.

Another equivocal case is presented in (15).
The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition

But Hannah did not go up, for she said to her husband, “As soon as the child is weaned, I will bring him, so that he may appear in the presence of the LORD and dwell there forever.” (1 Sam. 1.22; Greek ὀφθήσεται; Vulgate apparet; TJ יתחז; Syriac ﻮܢܬܚܙܐ)

Here, the graphic unit ונדראה has three contextually defensible analyses: (1) 3MS nif'al weqatal נראית ‘and he will appear’, as in the Tiberian reading tradition; (2) 1CPL nif'al we-yiqtol נראית* ‘that we may appear’; (3) 1CPL qal we-yiqtol נראה* ‘that we may see’.7 Thus, while the possibility that an original qal was recast as a nif'al exists here, the 3rd-person nif'al option is at least as fitting as the two 1st-person plural options, one of which is, in any case, also nif'al. Unsurprisingly, the ancient versions agree with the Tiberian reading tradition on the meaning ‘appear’.

3.0. The Antiquity of the Interpretation

Having identified cases in which developments in the Tiberian pronunciation tradition either likely or possibly constitute secondary shifts to avoid a theological difficulty, the most relevant question for this study is: when did the purported qal > nif'al (or qal > hif'il) recasting take place? Its secondary nature in some of the aforecited cases seems beyond question. Yet, what should be emphasised is that, even where secondary, the nif'al reinterpre-

7 The ensuing spelling וישב is also contextually ambiguous: weqatal וישב ‘and he will dwell’ or we-yiqtol וישב ‘that he might dwell’. See below, ch. 18.
tation cannot be explained as Byzantine- or medieval-period intervention. Rather, it is firmly rooted in the Second Temple Period—when Hebrew was, crucially, still a living vernacular. That this is so is evidenced by the widespread agreement among the ancient translations and the consistent Samaritan nif'al reading—to the point that the latter has unambiguous consonantal nif'al infinitives (with heh) in Exod. 34.24 and Deut. 31.11, i.e., examples (2) and (3), respectively, above. The agreement between the Tiberian and Samaritan traditions on this point likely dates to a period before the two respective proto-traditions had diverged, i.e., no later than the second century BCE, and probably earlier. The DSS support for the Tiberian reading tradition’s hif’il form at Deut. 1.33 in example (6) also comes as evidence of the antiquity of discomfort with qal readings potentially understandable as indications that God could be seen.

What is more, from the perspective of the Tiberian consonantal tradition, in several cases, a nif'al reading must be considered at least as felicitous as a qal reading, if not more so. This applies to the case of 1 Sam. 1.22 in example (15) above. It is also true of example (16).

(16) שָלֵֹ֥שׁ פְּעָמִֶ֖ים בַשָנָָׂ֑ה יֵרָאֶה כָל־זְּכ וּרְּךֵָ֔ךְ אֶל־פְּׁנֵֹׁ֖י הָאָד ּ֥ן יְּׁהוִָֽה׃

‘Three times in the year will all your males appear to the Lord, the LORD.’ (Exod. 23.17; SP ייירא יירָּן; Greek ὁφθήσεται; Vulgate apparebit; TO יתחזון; Syriac נתחזון)

Unless the preposition אֶל here is due to corruption, it would seem to furnish consonantal support for an original nif'al reading,

---

8 The collocation רָאָה אֶל is uncommon, occurring only in Ezek. 43.3, where אֶל < יִשְׂרָאֵל (?). In the MT the construction אֶל פְּנֵי often involves a
since the ostensible qal רָאֵה אֶל פְּנֵי, while perhaps not impossible, is far less expected than רָאֵה אֶל פְּנֵי ‘appear to/before the face/in the presence of’.

4.0. Conclusion

In sum, in the case of the expressions in question, the Tiberian biblical tradition presents several cases of probable mismatch between its written and reading components. In these cases, the vocalisation in the reading component almost certainly reflects the theologically motivated replacement of qal ‘seeing God’s face’ with nifʿal ‘appearing before God’. A few other morphological shifts may also be part of the same strategy. Though secondary, the ancient Hebrew and translational evidence substantiates the profound historical depth of the nifʿal interpretive tradition for ‘appearing before God’. This interpretation dates back to at least the Second Temple Period, as is clear from the unequivocal hifʿil spelling in a DSS version of Deut. 1.33 shown above in example (6). In other cases, the consonantal form is ambiguous. In any of them, the form may well represent an original qal; however, the apparently genuine nifʿal in Exod. 23.17 means that several may alternatively constitute genuine nifʿals.

motion verb, e.g., Lev. 9.5; 14.53; 16.2; 17.8; Ezek. 44.4; Neh. 2.13; 2 Chron. 19.2. More comparable to the case in Exod. 23.17 are Lev. 6.7; Num. 20.10; Ezek. 41.4, 12, 15, 25; 42.2, 3, 7, 10, 10, 13; 45.7, 7; 48.21; Job 2.5; 13.15. The occurrence of אֵת in SP Exod. 23.17 is unsurprising given that version’s harmonistic tendencies in the case of both content and grammar.
3. **KETIV-QERE EUPHEMISMS**

A rather rare type of *ketiv-qere* mismatch involves the evidently euphemistic replacement of a written form deemed inappropriate for public reading with a more acceptable alternative (Ofer 2019, 98–99; see also Yeivin 1980, 56; Cohen 2007, 264–71). Words deemed impolite or vulgar may refer to objects, notions, or actions, often involving such ‘unmentionables’ as excreta, shameful infirmities, and rape, but can also extend to potential theological misunderstandings.

Euphemistic *ketiv-qere* instances are mentioned explicitly in the Talmud (b. Megilla 25b):

>All of the scriptures that are written in the Torah in impolite language are read in language beyond reproach, such as ‘ravish her’ is read ‘lie with her’ (Deut. 28.30); ‘with haemorrhoids’ is read ‘with tumours’ (Deut. 28.27); ‘dove-droppings’ is read לְאַכְּלוֹל אָתָא חָרֵיִון וְלְשָׁוְתָא אָתָא מִמִּי רֻגִּיָּהוּ (2 Kgs 6.25); ‘to eat their excrement and drink their urine’ is read לְאַכְּלוֹל אָתָא צוֹאֵת וְלְשָׁוְתָא אָתָא מִמִּי רֻגִּיָּהוּ (2 Kgs 18.27); ‘latrines’ is read ‘toilets’ (2 Kgs 10.27). (Ofer 2019, 98)
1.0. Euphemistic Ketiv-Qere Cases in the Tiberian Tradition and Other Ancient Witnesses

1.1. Excreta

The terms written but not pronounced are *חרא* ‘faeces’, *שין* ‘urine’, and *מחראה* ‘latrine’. They are replaced in the reading tradition with the respective synonyms *דִב* or *צֹאָה*, *מֵימֵי רַגְּלַיִם*, and *מוֹצָאָה*.

In (1) the ketiv חרי is read aloud as qere דִב.

(1) וַיִּהֶָֹ֨י רָעַ֤ב גָדוֹל֙ בְּשֹ מְּרֵ֔וֹן وְּהִנֵ֥ה צָרִ֣יָּם עָלֶָׂ֑יהָ עַ דָּ֖הּ יָוֹתְרִ֗ים בִשְּמֹנִ יָם֙ כֵֶ֔סֶף וְּרֹ֛בַע הַקֵַ֥ב חֲרִיִּים (K)צֹאָה (Q)

‘And there was a great famine in Samaria, as they besieged it, until a donkey’s head was sold for eighty shekels of silver, and the fourth part of a kab of dove’s dung for five shekels of silver.’ (A 2 Kgs 6.25; Greek κόπρου περιστερῶν; Vulgate stercoris columbarum; TJ יובל ממקה יניא; Syriac מֵימֵי רַגְּלַיִם מֵאְשָׁר אֶחְיָה כּוֹכָב יֹיִֽונים..Circle)

Cohen (2007, 265) observes a difference between L and A regarding this ketiv-qere. In L, it applies to the entire graphic string חריונים, read as דִבְּיוֹנִֶ֖ים; no space separates the two words in either the internal text or the marginal note and a shewa is written beneath the ר in the internal text, i.e., חֲרַיִוֹנִים.1 By contrast, in A the ketiv-qere is restricted to the elements חרי and יונים; a space separates the words חרי and יונים in the internal text, the marginal note

---

1 Indeed, the singular דביון is found in the Hebrew of Saadia Gaon (see יוצרות לשבתות השנה, ויקרא, In. 19, accessed via the Ma’agarim website of the Academy of the Hebrew Language).
has only דִב, and no shewa is written beneath the ר in the internal text, i.e., חִרי֯ יוֹנִֶ֖ים. A’s testimony is preferable, with the substitute for חִרי, יֹנִֶ֖ים, ‘doves’ serving as the nomen rectum in a construct formation.

The lexeme דִב is a hapax legomenon in BH. It is thought to be an Aramaism or dialectal form related to Hebrew זָב ‘flow’ (Co- hen 2007, 266, cites Rashi and Qimḥi). Since the ketiv and qere forms are synonyms, the testimony of the ancient versions is rather opaque with regard to the identity of the term being translated, i.e., the ketiv or the qere, though TJ’s explanatory gloss is reminiscent of the qere’s circumlocution.

Examples (2)–(5) deal with parallel verses that include both חִרי֯ (א) ims and שִׁנִּים.² According to the qere, they are to be read aloud, respectively, as צוֹאָה and רַגְּלַיִם מֵימֵי.*

² HALOT (1479) notes that the two terms also occur together in Ugaritic. Intriguingly, the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition consistently agree on a verbal form related to ketiv שֶתֶן ‘urine’. Six occurrences of the word מַשְּתִין ‘urinator’ (1 Sam. 25.22, 34; 1 Kgs 14.10; 16.11; 21.21; 2 Kgs 9.8) come in BH. Thought to be a Gt-stem participle (BDB 1010; HALOT 1479), the form was reanalysed as a hifʿil of שֶתֶן, from which the noun שֶתֶן ‘urine’, first attested in Talmudic Hebrew (t. Bekhorot 7.5 [44b]), was secondarily derived.

³ Cf. the development in select English translations of 2 Kgs 18.27, which testify to the shifting acceptability of English terms for excreta:

‘...toordis... pisse’ (Wycliffe, 1380s)
‘...donge... stale’ (Coverdale, 1535)
‘...doung... pisse’ (KJV, 1611)
‘...vilest excretions’ (Webster’s KJV Revision, 1833)
‘...dung... urine’ (RSV, 1946)
‘...excrement... urine’ (NIV, 1978)
The qere lexeme צֹאָה is variously analysed as reflecting the roots צ"א ‘be foul’, י"צ ‘exit’, and י"צ ‘pollute’ (BDB 844a; HALOT 992a). Beyond the qere usages under discussion, it is attested in BH at Isa. 4.4; 28.9; and Prov. 30.12, where it possibly has the...
more general sense of ‘filth’. It may be related to the lexeme צֵאָה ‘excrement’ (Deut. 23.14; Ezek. 4.12). The lexeme צֹאָה is common in RH for reference to ‘excrement’. Among the ancient versions, TJ’s rendering might be evidence of an etymological translation of the qere, but this is not the only explanation. It is significant that 1QIsa explicitly agrees with the ketiv.

The qere parallel for קֶּמָּהּ בְּרֲבָלָהּ in is not found elsewhere in BH. It is a common term for ‘urine’ in RH. 1QIsa reflects the ketiv, TJ the qere. The Latin rendering in Isa. 36.12b, urinam pedum suorum ‘urine of their feet’, is noteworthy because it seems to reflect a conflation of the respective ketiv and qere traditions, ‘their urine’ and ‘water of their feet’. Other ancient renderings furnish arguably ambiguous evidence of the term being translated.

In (6), the ketiv noun מחראות, denoting a place for defecation is read as מֵוֹצָאּוֹת, apparently representing a common nominal pattern of the יָצ”א root.

(6) וֵ֔וֵיִתְּצֹאָה אֵ֖ת מַצְּבַתְּ הַבָּֽעַל וֵַַּֽיִתְּצוּ֙ אֶת־בֵּית הַבַָ֔עַל וַיְּשִׁמֵּ֣וּהוּ לְּֽמִֽוֹצָאּוֹת (K) לְּֽמִֽוֹצָאּוֹת (Q) דְּרָכָיו:

‘And they demolished the pillar of Baal, and demolished the house of Baal, and made it into a latrine to this day.’ (2 Kgs 10.27; Greek: εἰς λατρῶνας; Vulgate: latrinas; TJ: מבית; Syriac: מסכאת אנס)

---

4 E.g., m. Berakhot 3.5; Shabbat 16.7; ‘Avoda Zara 4.5; ’Avot 3.3; Ḥullin 3.5; Kelim 10.2; Miqwa’ot. 9.2, 4; Makhshirin 5.6.

5 E.g., m. Shabbat 9.5; Bava Batra 2.1; ‘Eduyot 5.1, 4; Kelim 1.3; Tohorot 4.5; Miqwa’ot. 10.6; Nidda 4.3; 9.6, 7; Makhshirin. 6.5, 6; Zavim 5.7.
The ms form מְזוֹא ‘place/time of going out, utterance, source’ is common in the Bible, while the fs מְזוֹאָה occurs only here and in Mic. 5.1, where it may mean ‘origins’ or ‘goings out = activities’. The form in 2 Kgs 10.27 is possibly a homonym that derives from צְא ‘be foul’ or צָא ‘pollute’ (see above). The lexical tradition reflected in the ancient versions is not sufficiently clear to identify the source word—though, again, TJ’s circumlocution בית המקה אנש looks to be a calque of the qere—on the assumption that מְזוֹאָה here means, or was understood to mean, ‘place of excretion’ or ‘outhouse’.

1.2. Shameful Infirmities

Six times in the Tiberian tradition, the ketiv plural עָפְלִים is replaced by the qere טְחֹרִים. These are given in (7)–(12).

(7) יַכְּכָָֹ֨ה יְּהוֶָ֜ה בִשְּחִַ֤ין מִצְּרַ֙יִם֙ וּבְעָפְלִים (Q) וּבַטְּׁח רִִ֔ים (K) וּבֶחָָׂ֑רֶס אֲשֵֶ֥ר לֹא־תוּכֶַ֖ל לְהֵרָפֵַֽא׃

‘The LORD will strike you with the boils of Egypt, and with tumours and scabs and itch, of which you cannot be healed.’ (Deut. 28.27; SP ובשפלים ובטחורים ובכרס; Greek ἐν ταῖς ἕδραις; Vulgate et parte corporis per quam stercora digeruntur; TO ובטוחרין; Syriac י郏חורה)

(8) וַתִכְּבַָ֧ד יַד־יְּהוָ֛ה אֶל־הָאַשְּדוֹדִֶ֖ים וַיְּשִמֵָׂ֑ם וַיֵַַ֤֣֣ךְ את־אַשְּדֶ֖וֹד וְאֶת־גְּבוּלֶַֽיהָ׃

‘The hand of the LORD was heavy against the people of Ashdod, and he terrified and afflicted them with tumours, both Ashdod and its territory.’ (1 Sam. 5.6; Greek εἰς τὰς ναῶς; Latin in secretiori parte natium; TJ ובשثورין; Syriac י郏חורה)
‘But after they had brought it around, the hand of the LORD was against the city, causing a very great panic, and he afflicted the men of the city, both young and old, so that tumours broke out on them.’ (1 Sam. 5.9; 4Q51 5b–c.6:ぼ[ヱビルɡ; Greek ἐδρας; Latin extales; TJ ベチュウリア; Syriac ﻋܐ)geh)てかる imageView

The men who did not die were struck with tumours, and the cry of the city went up to heaven.’ (1 Sam. 5.12; Greek eις τὰς ἐδρας; Latin in secretiori parte natium; TJ ベチュウリア; Syriac ﻋܐ)geh)てかる imageView

‘And they said, “What is the guilt offering that we shall return to him?” They answered, “Five golden tumours and five golden mice, according to the number of the lords of the Philistines, for the same plague was on all of you and on your lords.’ (1 Sam. 6.4; 4Q51 6a–b.13:ぼ[ヱビルɡ; Greek ἐδρας; Latin —; TJ ベチュウリア; Syriac ﻋܐ)geh)てかる imageView
The matter is complicated by apparent textual divergence in the Samuel narrative, as well as by a lack of semantic certainty regarding the meaning of the ketiv and qere terms. Suffice it to say that, whatever its meaning, ketiv ‘tumours, haemorrhoids’ was deemed inappropriate for public reading and was replaced in the reading tradition with qere ‘tumours, haemorrhoids’.

As is their wont, TO and TJ agree with the qere. Where extant, 4QSam⁵ (5Q51) preserves the ketiv. Whether the ketiv, qere, or another reading lies behind the other ancient witnesses cannot be determined with anything approaching certainty. Interestingly, the qere טחוריהון is shared by the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition in two instances in the Samuel narrative; see (13) and (14), neither paralleled in DSS Samuel material and one without a parallel in the Greek.

(13) וּוַיָּשִֽׁמַּ֖ת אֶת־אֲרֵ֥וֹן יְּהוָ֖ה אֶל־הָעֲגָלָָׂ֑ה וְּאֵ ת֙ הָאַרְּגֵַ֗ז וְּאֵֶ֖ת עַכְּבְּרֵ יִ֖זָּהֵָ֔ב וְֵ֖ת צַלְּמֵֵ֥י טְּׁח רֵיהִֶֽם׃

‘And they put the ark of the LORD on the cart and the box with the golden mice and the images of their tumours.’ (1 Sam. 6.11; Greek —; Latin anorum; TJ סחוורית; Syriac ܐܬܘܪܝܘܚܝܐ)
1.3. Rape

Four times in the Tiberian biblical tradition, the ketiv has a verb with the root שג"ל in a context of wartime rape. On all occasions the qere calls for a verb with root שכ"ב ‘lie (down)’.

אִשָּׁה תֵּאָרֵֵ֗שׁ וְּאִַ֤ישׁ אַחֵר֙ ישגלנה (Q) (K) (אֵַּישׁ) (בֵֵ֥ית הָבַָ֤נה וְּלֹֽא־תֵשֵׁ ב (15)

‘You shall betroth a wife, but another man shall ravish her. You shall build a house, but you shall not dwell in it. You shall plant a vineyard, but you shall not enjoy its fruit.’
(Deut. 28.30; 4Q30 f50.3 [ишג] תונת; SP ישכב עמה yiškāb imma; Greek ἐξειατήν; Latin: dormiat cum ea; TO ישכבנה; Syriac شگلنة)

וְּעֹלְּלֵיהֵ֥ם יְּרֻטְּּשֶ֖וּ לְּעֵַֽינֵיהֶָׂ֑ם יִשַ֙סוּ֙ (K) תִָֽשְכִֵֽׁבְּׁנָה (16)

‘Their infants will be dashed in pieces before their eyes; their houses will be plundered and their wives ravished.’
(Isa. 13.16; 1Qlsaא 11.24 [טנוה] תנח; 1Q8 6a–b.2 [ננ] תנח; 4Q55 f8.13 [נ] תנח; Greek ἀποκεφαλῆται; Latin violabuntur; TJ ישוחבת; Syriac شخبنت)
Shear replicas on the scrolls of Q and K indicate אֶת־כָּל־הַגוֹיִם (Q) וְּאָסַפְּתִי אֶת־כָּל־הַגוֹיִם (K) לַמִּלְּחָמָה. ‘Lift up your eyes to the bare heights, and see! Where have you not been ravished? By the waysides you have sat awaiting lovers like an Arab in the wilderness. You have polluted the land with your vile whoredom.’ (Jer. 3.2; Greek ἐξεφύρθης; Latin prostrata sis; TJ אתחרה על דרכים; Syriac אתחברת למלוחôle)

The euphemistic employment of שָכַב ‘lie (down)’ in reference to sexual relations is common throughout BH (and is matched by euphemistic renderings in the ancient versions). This usage was also extended to cases of ketiv שֶׁכֶּב ‘rape’. The change could not be effected, however, without certain grammatical modifications. First, in reference to sex, שָכַב normally takes one of the comitative prepositions עִם or אֵת both ‘with’ (Orlinsky 1944). On seven occasions one encounters שָכַב with a form of -ה—apparently the definite accusative/direct object marker—but in six of the seven, the vocalisation alone indicates that the particle is not
3. Ketiv-Qere Euphemisms

The preposition אֵת ‘with’. Second, the verb שָכַב nowhere in BH bears an object suffix except where it is read as the qere for presumably qal ketiv שָכַב, as in (15) above. Third, BH lacks a nifʿal שֶׁכֶּב except where it is read instead of apparently nifʿal נִשְׁכַּב*, in examples (16) and (18) above. Finally, and of crucial significance, unambiguous consonantal nifʿal נִשְׁכַּב* is first attested in material in the NBDSS and persists in RH. Relatedly, no passive qal or puʿʿal cognate of שָכַב is known from ancient Hebrew beyond that in the qere of (17) above. All of the above point to the likely secondary development of שָכַב אֹת, perhaps in the early Second Temple Period (cf. שָכַב אֹת with mater waw in Ezekiel) (Beuken 2004, 663). In other words, the expression שָכַב אֹת is itself a case of ketiv-qere mismatch unacknowledged within the Masoretic tradition and is in line with the correspondence under discussion.

1.4. Potential Misunderstanding


(19) (Q) אֶנְוַי לִרְאֵה יְהוָה בְעֵינִּי (K) וְאוֹלַ֛י יִרְּאֵֶ֥ה יְּהוֶָ֖ה בְּׁעֵינִָ֑י ’It may be that the LORD will look upon my eye…’ (2 Sam. 16.12; Greek ταπεινώσει μου; Latin adflictionem meam; TJ דמעת עיני; Syriac דﲪ所所; Ezek. 23.8).

---

6 -אֹת: Gen. 34.2; Lev. 15.18, 24; Num. 5.13, 19; 2 Sam. 13.14; -אֹת: Ezek. 23.8.
7 4Q270 f5.19; 4Q271 f3.12.
8 Ancient Hebrew attests no piʿʿel.
The ketiv is doubly problematic, in that the context calls for a word meaning ‘suffering, misfortune, plight’, whereas, on the one hand, וֵשֶׁנָּה presupposes an element of guilt not evident from the context and, on the other, it does not generally denote mere suffering. Some modern commentators assume that the text should reflect ди ‘suffering’ or נִי ‘my suffering’ (BDB 730b; cf. the Greek, Latin, and Syriac). Cohen (2007, 269–70, fn. 29) posits a semantic shift, whereby the meaning of וֵשֶׁנָּה developed from ‘sin, guilt’ through ‘punishment’ to ‘trouble, suffering, torment, anguish’. Even if the proposed semantic shift is valid, the ketiv remains contextually difficult, given the standard force of וֵשֶׁנָּה. The qere בְּעֵינִי can be taken either elliptically, for ‘tear of the eye’ (cf. the Targum), or metonymically, with ‘eye’ standing for the entire self (Cohen 2007, 270–71).

2.0. Diachronic Considerations

Given the obvious euphemistic status of the qere forms discussed above, there seems no need to prove their secondary status. Even so, the regular apparent agreement of the ketiv with the DSS (where extant) and the ancient versions is evidence of the primacy of the ketiv tradition (though many of the individual renderings of the ancient translations leave room for doubt).

Against the general agreement of the other ancient versions with the ketiv, the Targums regularly accord with the qere tradition. Sometimes, the qere and the Targums both resort to terms common in RH, as in the case of צואה and מימי רגלים. The Vulgate’s urinam pedum also seems partially influenced by the rabbinic idiom.
However, it is also important to point out non- or pre-rabbinic evidence for qere forms. For example, the qere form טְחוֹרִים used in place of ketiv עפלים is not restricted to the Tiberian reading tradition, but appears twice in the Tiberian consonantal tradition, as well. Also, qere שכ"ב for ketiv שב"כ finds support in the combined Samaritan biblical written and reading tradition, the BDSS, and is in line with both general biblical euphemistic use of שׁכֵּב in relation to sex as well as with an apparently secondary usage according to which the verb came to be used transitively. This latter development, manifested in the verb’s use with the accusative/direct object particle, with object suffixes, and in the appearance of cognate qal internal passive or nif'al verbs, is clearly one rooted in the Second Temple Period, its initial stages seen in the orthography of exilic or post-exilic biblical passages and DSS Hebrew.

3.0. Conclusion

While the euphemistic qere alternatives for public reading are secondary and reflect relatively late sociolinguistic concerns, where clear evidence exists, it shows that the readings are in the main Second Temple developments, no later than Tannaitic Hebrew, and are sometimes validated by DSS and, albeit rarely, even Tiberian CBH written evidence.
PART II:
LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENTS
4. THE PROPER NAME ISSACHAR

In the case of the proper name Issachar, the relationship between orthography and phonetic realisation is famously anomalous.¹ Put simply, the name’s pronunciation according to most biblical reading traditions is at odds with the dominant Hebrew spelling. The mismatch is blatant in the standard Tiberian qere perpetuum יִשָּׂשכָר, wherein readers are consistently instructed to ignore the form’s third consonant in favour of the articulation yiśśå̄ḵå̄r,² as if the form were written יִשָּׂכָר*.³

The dissonance in question is evidently a result of secondary phonological development. It seems to be a case of gemina-

---

¹ Early awareness of variation in the name’s pronunciation is evidenced in Mishaʾel ben ʿUzziʾel’s tenth- or eleventh-century Judaeo-Arabic Kitāb Al-Khilaf ‘Book of Differences’ (Hebrew Sefer ha-Hillufim), which focuses on points of dispute in the respective biblical reading traditions of the leading Masoretes Ben Asher and Ben Naftali. The first difference that Ben Uzziʾel cites is that of the name Issachar (see the edition by Lipschütz 1964; 1965).


³ The vocalisation of יִשָּׂשכָר is consistent in the extant cases in the A. In about one-third of the cases in L (14 of 43), the dagesh is missing from the מ: Gen. 46.13; Num. 10.15; 34.26; 1 Kgs 4.17; Ezek. 48.25–26; 1 Chron. 2.1; 6.47, 57; 7.1, 5; 12.41; 26.5; 27.18. A rafe is marked over the second ש once in L (Exod. 35.23), never in the extant portions of A. Yeivin (1985, 1090) lists several graphic representations of the name’s vocalisation in the Babylonian tradition, all of which correspond to the accepted Tiberian convention.
tion due to anticipatory assimilation of the first of two originally distinct sibilants—likely šš < šš—possibly reflecting the contraction of an earlier compound, such as יֵשָׂכָר *יֵשׁ שָׂכָר ‘there is a wage’ or אִישָׂכָר *אִישׁ שָׂכָר ‘man of wage’. Aharon ben Moshe ben Asher’s representation of the standard Tiberian realisation yiśṣəḵăr by means of the accepted (but highly irregular) consonant-diacritic combination יִשָּׂשכָר, was not the only possibility. Another early Masorete, Moshe Moḥe, opted for the alternative graphic representation יִשְׂשא Carson (see the image on the front cover), which in Tiberian Hebrew would have had the same phonetic value as Ben Asher’s yiśṣəḵăr (see below on the alternative Tiberian realisation given by Ben Naftali).

---

4 See BDB sub. voc. and HALOT sub. voc. for these and other suggestions. Ancient interpretations can be found in Jerome’s commentaries: unde et issachar, qui interpretatur: est merces, ex uirtutibus nomen accepit ‘Whence is also Issachar, which is interpreted: there is a wage, has taken the name from manliness’; unde et issachar interpretatur: est merces; et sachar μέθυσμα, id est ebrietas, ceteri que ebrios; soli lxx mercenarios transluterunt ‘Whence is also Issachar interpreted: there is a wage; and sachar as μέθυσμα, that is, intoxication, others also as drunken ones; only the Seventy have translated it as those hired for wages’ (on Isaiah, lib. 6, 14.24–25; Migne 1844–1855, XXIV, col. 227); et de issachar legimus, quod supposuerit humerum suum ad laborandum, et uir agricola sit ‘And from/about Issachar we read, that he placed his upper arm to work, and was a farmer/agricultural man’ (on Hosea, lib. 2, 6.9; Migne 1844–1855, XXV, col. 871); issachar enim interpretatur merces ut significet pretium proditoris ‘For Issachar is interpreted as wage so as to signify the price of a traitor’ (on Matthew, lib. 1, 10.4; Migne 1844–1855, XXVI, col. 63).

5 In the Tiberian pronunciation tradition, shewa on the second of two identical consonants was silent after a short vowel, e.g., וחנני hinni (Khan
The question that the present study seeks to answer involves the antiquity of the dissonance between the Tiberian written and reading traditions, specifically, how far back the reading tradition reflected by the Masoretic vocalisation signs reaches.

1.0. Diversity in Antiquity

1.1. Double-sibilant Realisations

The first thing to note is that, while converging lines of evidence point to the early emergence of a phonetic realisation similar to what was to become standard in the Tiberian tradition, there are also traditions reminiscent of the Tiberian orthography, i.e., that reflect the pronunciation of two distinct sibilants.

1.1.1. The Samaritan Tradition

For example, though the Samaritan Hebrew consonantal spelling is identical to that of Masoretic Hebrew, the Samaritan phonetic realisation is ܝbcd. As Samaritan Hebrew preserves just one phoneme represented by the grapheme 钹, namely 钹, the quality of the sibilant is unsurprising. The Samaritan realisation of a vowel between the two sibilants is, however, unique among pronunciation traditions. The vowel in question not improbably developed from an earlier shewa, as Samaritan Hebrew routinely parallels Tiberian shewa with a full vowel, long in open syllables

________________________________________________________________________

2013, 100; 2020, I:352–53; cf. Ofer 2018, 196). The Ma’agarim website of the Academy of the Hebrew Language’s Historical Dictionary Project lists a number of variant spellings in agreement with the standard received pronunciation.
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(Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 53–55). If so, this seems to have been an alternative to the gemination due to assimilation known from other traditions, one that allowed for the preservation of the distinct realisation of once-adjacent sibilants.

1.1.2. The Tiberian Tradition according to Ben Naftali

Possible evidence of a pre-assimilation realisation may also be reflected in the alternative Tiberian vocalisation advocated by Ben Naftali, namely, יִשְׂשַׂכָּר, which shows the sequence of two distinct sibilants, i.e., šš (Khan 2020, I:94). Such a realisation might be characterised as purist and/or etymological, possibly an attempt to combat the perceived ‘lax’ or ‘slurred’ yiśśarkār pronunciation recorded by Ben Asher and eventually accepted as the standard. Khan (2020, I:103), however, emphasises the possibility that the realisation advocated by Ben Naphtali rather represents an innovative attempt at orthoepy, and that it may not preserve a genuinely archaic pronunciation.

1.1.3. The Temple Scroll (11QTα = 11Q19)

Similar purist and/or etymological tendencies may also have factored in the writing of the name in the Temple Scroll from Qumran (11QTα = 11Q19). In all five of its occurrences in this manuscript (and nowhere else in the Dead Sea Scrolls), the name is written as two separate words, i.e., יש שכר. These are reproduced
in examples (1)–(4) (note that the final example includes two tokens).  

(1) 

יש שכר (11Q19 24.15)  

(2) 

יש שכר (11Q19 39.13)  

(3) 

] יש שכר (11Q19 41.4)  

(4) 

יש שכר לبني יש שכר (11Q19 44.16)  

This written representation may be an early example of orthoepic effort, that is, the attempt to promote correct enunciation, presumably in the face of the perceived threat of hurried and/or lax articulation. Alternatively—or, additionally—the word spacing possibly reflects exegetical concerns. Crucially, if the division of the name into distinct graphic words reflects a realisation like ייש sakar, it comes as indirect early evidence of alternative realisations to Ben Asher’s Tiberian יישנָאָקָר yiśšāḵār.

---

6 The images in examples (1)–(4) are from the Temple Scroll, 11Q19, Qumran, late 1st century BCE–early 1st century CE, reproduced here with permission of the Shrine of the Book, The Israel Museum, Jerusalem.

7 On the orthoepic character of the Tiberian vocalisation system see Khan (2018b).
1.2. Single-sibilant Realisations

1.2.1. The Versions

But additional direct early evidence is also available. First, in contrast to the double-sibilant realisations in Samaritan יָּשַׁסַּקָּר, Ben Naftali’s יִשָּׁסְקָר, and 11QT’s יש שכר, other ancient traditions agree on forms of the name with a single sibilant sound. Thus, Greek has Ἰσσαχαρ, Latin Isachar, TA יששכר, and Syriac ༼אܝܣܟܪ. Clearly, this evidence points to the relatively early emergence and diffusion of a realisation (or realisations) in which the presumably original sequence of discrete sibilants indicated by the dominant spelling יששכר and preserved in a minority of traditions (like Samaritan, Ben Naftali, and the Temple Scroll) was realised as a one sibilant, whether geminate or singleton.

1.2.2. 4Q522: Apocryphon of Joshua

Second, and of more immediate relevance to the possibly orthoepic motivation for the Temple Scroll’s explicit representation of the name Issachar as two discrete graphic words, is the form of the name as presented in an apparent allusion to Josh. 17.11 found in the Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q522 f8.3), where the name is written ישכר. See example (5).

(5) ![Image](image.png)

8 Image used by permission of the Israel Antiquities Authority.
4. The Proper Name Issachar

Cf. the Masoretic version in example (6).

(6) וַיְּהִי לַמְּנַשֶּׁה בְּׁיִשָּׂשכָר וּבְּאָשֶׁר בֵּית־שְּאָן וּבְנוֹתֶיהָ...

‘And it was: to Manasseh were assigned within Issachar’s and Asher’s territories Beth Shean and its villages (Josh. 17.11)

Under different circumstances, the spelling ישכר for Issachar—unique in the DSS—might be considered a mere scribal lapse, the accidental graphic omission of a repeated consonant with no phonetic import. However, given the aforementioned versional evidence, which demonstrates the existence in antiquity of single-sibilant realisations, the DSS ישכר orthography has the look of a phonetic spelling along the lines of [jis:akar] (< yiśśakar)—apparently confirming the antiquity of the type of phonetic realisation also preserved in Tiberian יִשָּׂשכָר.

To DSS ישכר one may add later spellings of this type, such as those that crop up in texts from the Cairo Geniza, where a minority of forms with single-sibilant spellings evidently reflect phonetic realisations. While the single-sibilant realisation (with or without gemination) became conventional in most Hebrew (and foreign) pronunciation traditions, the classical double-sibilant orthographic tradition was successfully preserved. In Jewish Hebrew and Aramaic pronunciation traditions, this led to mismatch, first, between the written and reading traditions and, eventually, between the consonants and vocalic diacritics that combine to make up the written Masoretic tradition.
2.0. Historical Considerations

The historical depth of single-sibilant realisations is unclear. Judging by 11QT’s author’s apparent call for a realisation of the type *yiśšakar* via the spacing in —possibly in the face of the *yiśšakar*-type realisation underlying 4Q522’s —the single-sibilant pronunciation goes back to the late Second Temple Period, at the latest. Since such realisations were sufficiently widespread to achieve representation in the LXX and at Qumran (as well as in the later Latin, Aramaic, and Syriac traditions), they may well have emerged earlier.

It is likewise difficult to assess the extent of the penetration of the single-sibilant realisations. The five cases of in the Temple Scroll and the lone case of in 4Q522 are transparent enough, but what of the more standard DSS orthography , which comes five times in the biblical DSS and twice in non-biblical material? Does their double-sibilant spelling indicate a corresponding double-sibilant realisation, or should 11QT’s be construed as evidence that is mere historical spelling for what had already come to be pronounced as *yiśšakar* or *yissakar*? Is there significance to the fact that classical double-sibilant spellings characterise DSS biblical material, while six of the eight forms in non-biblical texts (including the cases from the Temple Scroll and from 4Q522) have unconventional orthographies? There seems no getting around the ambiguity of the DSS spelling . It could conceivably have been

---

9 BDSS: 4Q1 f17-18.1 = MT Exod. 1.3; 4Q11 f1 + 39.6 = MT Exod. 1.3; 4Q13 f1.4 = MT Exod. 1.3; 4Q27 f3ii + 5.1 = MT Num. 13.7; Mas1c faii + b.2 = MT Deut. 33.18. NBDSS: 4Q484 f1.1; 11Q20 6.14.
used by writers and scribes to reflect diverse phonetic realisations and may have been subject to various articulations on the parts of readers.

3.0. Conclusion

Be that as it may, the available evidence is plausibly interpreted as indicating relatively ancient dissonance between the standard double-sibilant Tiberian Hebrew orthography יִשָּׂשכָר and single-sibilant oral articulations, of which the Tiberian reading tradition’s יִשָּׂשכָר is a well-known representative. In this case of divergence between the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition, both are shown to reflect comparatively old realisations. The admittedly secondary single-sibilant articulation dates to no later than Hellenistic times, though there is arguable indirect evidence that it emerged and diffused earlier.
5. **LIQRA(ʾ)T**

In view of its semantic link to קָרָה I (= קָרָא II) ‘meet, befall, happen’, combined with consistent orthography with the radical ‘alef characteristic of קָרָא I (= קָרָה II) ‘call, read’, the Masoretic BH infinitive-cum-preposition לִקְרַאת ‘to meet; opposite, toward’ is anomalous. Cf. the expected infinitive construct of קָרָא I in לִקְרֹא and of קָרָה I in לִקְרוֹת.

It also, arguably, furnishes an especially instructive glimpse of dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition of BH. In this case, not only can divergence of the spelling and vocalisation traditions be substantiated, but there is evidence that each reflects a realisation of profound historical depth, with roots stretching back to the Iron Age. If so, the disharmony, though evidently secondary, reflects truly ancient diversity. When one takes seriously the testimony of the individual components, the ostensible ‘problem’ inherent in a scriptural tradition composed of discordant elements proves invaluable in tracing the phonological development of the specific form in question as well as characterising the historicity of the components of the tradition.

1 A clear case of conflation in the MT is לְבִלְתִי, ‘not to call’ (Judg. 8.1). The merger of א''ר and ה''ר is more advanced in RH, where infinitival forms such as ת(א)ר(ל)ק(ו)ר to read, call, recite (the Shema’) outnumber those of קְרֹא. The expected III-γ infinitive of קָרָה I in לִקְרוֹת may be attested in 4Q179 f1i.3, but seems otherwise undocumented until piyyuṭ in the Byzantine Period.
1.0. The Tiberian Spelling and Similar Traditions

The Masoretic spelling—which is also the dominant orthography in the DSS, the Samaritan written tradition, and RH—is לִקְּרַאת. As ’אlef is traditionally grouped with heh, waw, and yod as matres lectionis, in the case of phonetic realisations of לִקְּרַאת along the lines of Tiberian liqraṯ, it is sometimes assumed that the otherwise otiose ’אlef serves as a mater lectionis for a. There is widespread agreement, however, that quiescent ’אlef in the Masoretic written tradition is nearly always etymological and that only at a relatively late date, under the influence of Aramaic spelling conventions, became a pure mater for a-vowels (GKC §7e; Andersen and Forbes 1986, 32, 49; Ariel 2013, 942). The use of ’אlef as a mater for a is comparatively common in the DSS (Reymond 2014, 43–47).

While the exact Iron Age pronunciation of the consonantal form לִקְּרַאת, including whether it was realised with or without an audible ’אlef, must remain conjectural, the consistency of the spelling with ’אlef in Masoretic and other sources can be interpreted as evidence of the erstwhile existence of a matching pronunciation characterised by a word-internal glottal stop. How long such a pronunciation endured is difficult to determine given the available evidence.

2.0. The Tiberian Pronunciation and Similar Traditions

Conspicuous in the Tiberian phonetic realisation לִקְּרַאת liqraṯ is syncope of the ’אlef consistently preserved in the orthographic tradition. Similar pronunciations are known from the Babylonian
The Samaritan realisation alqēʾrāt appears to result from normal phonological processes that resolve syllable-initial consonant clusters, presupposing a form along the lines of lqrat. Given SH’s penchant for eliding gutturals, it is no surprise that the ʿalef goes unpronounced here, as in the Tiberian and similar traditions. Interestingly, however, the ultimate stress in the form alqēʾrāt may constitute indirect evidence of a formerly realised glottal stop, since ultimate stress in the Samaritan recitation tradition is restricted to words with a guttural second or third radical (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, §§4.4.2–3).

On the assumption that the ʿalef in the standard Tiberian spelling לִקְרַאת represents historical etymology, the form is arguably best explained as an infinitive in the (lǝ)qiṭlā (< PS qaṭlatu [or (lǝ)qāṭlā < qaṭlatu]) nominal pattern, primarily associated with semantically stative verbs, e.g., לְּאַהֲבָ הָֽוָ֑ת ‘to love them’ (Deut. 10.15), לְּשַׁמְּרָה לָֽהֶב ‘to become guilty thereby’ (Lev. 5.26), אַחֲרֵי זִקְּנָתָה ‘after becoming old’ (Gen. 24.36), לְּקָרֵֹבָה לֹא ‘to become unclean thereby’ (Lev. 15.32), לְּקָרָא אֵחֶר ‘to fear me’ (Deut. 4.10), לְּקָרָה לֹא ‘to approach to the work’ (Exod. 36.2), לְּקֶרֶב ‘to lie with it’ (Lev. 20.16), לְּקָרַו ‘to be far’ (Ezek. 8.6), וּמִשְנָאָה אֶחָד ‘and from his hating them’. In the specific case of לִקְרַאת, preservation of the final tav is explained in line with consistent construct status. The vowel pattern is explained as follows: qarʾat > qarat, due to weakening of the ʿalef; qarat > qǝrat (liqrat), due to reduction of vowel distant from primary stress in construct state (GKC §§19k, 45d; Bauer and Leander 1922:...
The use of the feminine infinitival form permitted semantic disambiguation: לִקְּרַאת is ‘to meet; opposite, toward’, whereas לִקרָה is ‘to call, read’. Again, the expected infinitive for קָרָה I is לִקרָת.

3.0. Ambiguous Traditions

Jerome’s transcription lacerath for לִקְּרַאת (Amos 4.12) is ambiguous. Brønno (1970) concluded that gutturals were preserved in Jerome’s Hebrew. They are often reflected by helping vowels, e.g., וּלְﬠַמִּים et Loommim ‘and Leummim’ (Gen. 25.3), or Latin h, e.g., רָאָי Asrihelitarum ‘the Asrielites’ (Num. 26.31), וְתַרְּאֲלָה Rahaia ‘Reaiah’ (Ezra 2.47). However, the lack of any representation of ’אlef here cannot be taken as unequivocal evidence of pronunciation without a glottal stop in light of such transcriptions as פִרְּאָם Pharam ‘Piram’ (Josh. 10.3) and וְתַרְּאֲלָה et Tharala ‘Taralah’ (Josh. 18.27). The a-vowel after ה and the e-vowel after ק are both conventional in the transcription of his Hebrew tradition (Yuditsky 2013, 807–8, 821).

4.0. The Antiquity of the Realisation without ’אlef

Assuming the validity of the explanations proffered above, two principal questions remain unanswered. First, how long did a pronunciation of לִקרָת preserving the glottal stop persist in Hebrew? While the extant reading traditions unanimously disregard it, it is legitimate, given its consistent orthographic representa-

---

2 This paragraph is an expanded and corrected revision of Hornkohl (2013a, 124, fn. 50).
tion, to wonder whether and to what extent it may have continued to be realised. There is no definitive answer to this question. The second question is: what is the historical depth of the phonetic realisation with syncopation of the glottal stop?

4.1. Second Temple Evidence

For purposes of answering the second question, the available information is clearer. As has been noted, notwithstanding the received pronunciations of לִקְּרַאת without a glottal stop, the form is regularly written with an ʼalef.

There are, however, exceptions. As early as the Second Temple Period, minority spellings without ʼalef in the DSS apparently reflect phonetic realisations with an elided glottal stop: לִקְּרַאת (1QIsa.a 12.10 || MT Isa. 14.9); לִקְּרַאת (4Q481a f2.4 || MT 2 Kgs 2.15); perhaps also לִקְּרַאת (4Q200 f5.1 || Tobit 11.10); לִקְּרַאת וּלְקַרְא מִן (4Q504 f1–2Riii.13). Though the exact realisation of these forms is unknown, the omission of ʼalef comes as evidence of pronunciation without a glottal stop.

4.2. Iron Age Evidence

But there is even earlier evidence of a realisation without the word-medial glottal stop. The Siloam inscription, which dates to ca. 700 BCE, includes the sentence לֵיקָרַאת וּלְקַרְא מִן [וֹּלָקַרְא מִן] בַּשׁוֹם-וֹלָקַרְא מִן (KAI 189, lns 3–4). As in the case of the DSS examples above, there is no certainty regarding every phonetic
detail. Yet, the absence of ‘alef in an official inscription comes as compelling testimony in favour of an Iron Age pronunciation of תקר (א)ת without a glottal stop, not dissimilar from that preserved in the Tiberian reading tradition.

According to one approach, no glottal stop (i.e., ‘alef) was lost in the Siloam inscription’s תקרת. Rather, the spelling reflects a realisation along the lines of liqrot. If so, the ‘alef in the Tiberian and other traditions is to be considered secondary. So reason, among others, Aḥituv, Garr, and Fassberg (2016, 61), thought it is not clear whether they believe that the ‘alef in question was ever pronounced as a glottal stop in the many traditions of BH and extra-biblical Hebrew in which it appears.

By contrast, the view propounded here is that the spelling with ‘alef תקרת is historical, i.e., reflects an ancient realisation with a medial glottal stop, and that the Siloam inscription’s תקרת is an early manifestation of the secondary syncope of the glottal stop seen in the Tiberian reading tradition and similar pronunciations and in minority spellings in the DSS. The syncope in question was presumably due to lax realisation, possibly connected with vernacular Hebrew, but which at some point came to be recognised as standard despite the spelling convention with ‘alef (which may have come to be considered a mater). It should also be noted that phonetic erosion is comparatively more common in the case of function words that have undergone grammaticalisation (Heine 1993, 106), which here seems to have involved the shift from lexical infinitive to preposition.³

³ I am grateful to Geoffrey Khan for calling my attention to this perspective.
5.0. Conclusion

Giving due consideration to both orthographic and recitation traditions, the spelling-pronunciation mismatch of the infinitive-turned-preposition לִקְרַאת לִקְרַאת appears to reflect the intersection of divergent written and reading traditions. The written traditions bear witness almost exclusively to a pronunciation that up to some point preserved a word-medial glottal stop. Occasionally, written material omits the ʾalef and, in so doing, furnishes early (Iron Age, Second Temple) evidence of realisations in which the presumed word-medial glottal stop had become syncopated. This is the dominant sort of pronunciation preserved in most of the extant reading traditions (Tiberian, Babylonian, RH; Jerome’s Latin transcriptions and the Samaritan form with ultimate stress are possible, though by no means certain, exceptions).

While it is not known when pronunciations without the glottal stop came to dominate in Hebrew, it is evident from minority Second Temple and Iron Age occurrences of לִקְרַאת (without ʾalef) that such realisations were attested long before the medieval textualisation of the Tiberian reading tradition.

It is not impossible that the ubiquity of pronunciations without the glottal stop in the extant reading traditions somewhat obscures a degree of variation in the word’s realisation. Perhaps in antiquity, forms with and without glottal stops could be heard. Be that as it may, it is plausible to conclude on the basis of the earliest cases of לִקְרַאת that any potential anachronism with regard to this form in the Tiberian reading and similar traditions does not apply to the phenomenon of syncope of the glottal stop, but only to the extent of the syncope. In other words, while the
pronunciation without glottal stop is likely secondary, and while its standardisation may be late, early evidence confirms the deep historical roots of the feature eventually made standard.
6. THE 2MS ENDINGS

In the combined Masoretic biblical written-reading tradition, word-final qames (ָּ) typically co-occurs with a mater heh, i.e., ָו. This norm applies across a variety of categories, including

(a) substantives with the feminine singular ending, e.g., אישה ‘woman’, גְּדוֹלָה ‘great, large’;

(b) the qatal 3fs verbal ending, e.g., נתנה ‘she gave’;

(c) the qatal of 3ms III-y forms, e.g., היה ‘he was’; and

(d) adverbial endings of various sorts, e.g., עתה ‘now’, ארץ ‘the land/ground’.

Conspicuously exceptional in this regard are the 2ms nominal (i.e., object/possessive) suffix -ך and the 2ms verbal ending -ת, both of which routinely end in -ָו, but—anomalously—employ defective word-final orthography, regularly eschewing the respective plene alternatives כה- and תָה-.1 Correspondingly, note that the zero vocalisation of the -t of the 2fs qatal verbal ending and the 2fs independent subject pronoun תָה are regularly represented by a written shewa sign, i.e., תָה, as are all voiceless final kaf, e.g., ת; no other final voiceless consonants are so treated.

---

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

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

² Note on terminology: throughout this chapter, ה- andritos, throughout this chapter, ה- and נ- are referred to as 2MS nominal endings, וה- and נ- as 2MS verbal endings; the orthographies ת- are termed short spellings, ה- and וה- long spellings; the phonetic realisations -k/-t are designated consonant-final, -ka/-ta vowel-final; there is no presumption that the spellings ת- and נ- were originally intended as defective for vowel-final pronunciations.
brew morphology across dialects, chronolects, registers, and traditions as well as to plumb the historical depth of the variants.\(^3\)

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

1.0. Comparative Semitic Perspective

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

In Comparative Semitic perspective, there is general agreement that the Proto-Semitic 2MS object/possessive suffix from which the various ancient Hebrew forms developed was some form of -ka, the precise quantity of the vowel of which remains unclear (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 15–18; Moscati 1964, 109, §13.23; 3 Other notable cases in which word-final *qames* (-ā) goes orthographically unmarked in the Tiberian tradition include: (a) the 3fs object/possessive suffix ṣe-, e.g., ṣe לֶהָ ‘to her’, not ṣe לֶיהָ; (b) נּעַר ‘girl’, eight times the *qere perpetuum* in Genesis (24.14, 16, 28, 55, 57; 34.3, 3, 12)—note also the 13 cases of *qere* רֶהֶנְעַ for *ketiv* רֶעַ in Deuteronomy (22.15, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29) against a single case of written-reading agreement in רֶהֶנְעַ ‘the girl’ (Deut. 22.19); (c) the 2FPL/3FPL verbal endings (see below, ch. 9); (d) יָמִנְת ‘now’ (Ezek. 23.43; Ps. 74.6).
Blau 2010, 169, §4.2.3.3.1; Huehnergard 2019, 54). The development of the consonant-final -k realisation is debated, with explanations involving variable (anceps) vowel length, Aramaic contact, and vernacular (perhaps RH) influence being suggested as factors (see Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 18, 59–64; Steiner 1979, 158–61; cf. Blau 1982).

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

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

2.0. Diversity within the Tiberian Tradition

Turning to Tiberian BH, another point of similarity between the 2Ms verbal and nominal afformatives is that both exhibit some degree of diversity within Masoretic Hebrew. The nominal suffix has the short spelling in around 92 percent of its 2850 tokens. Likewise, the verbal suffix is written short in nearly 92 percent of its 1800 + occurrences. This means that in both cases, not insignificant minorities of the two afformatives are written long, i.e., with heh.
A salient difference in this connection is that in some 200 instances of the nominal suffix, the spelling and vocalisation agree on consonant-final realisation. These consist of the 2MS pausal forms צָכָ, צְכָ, צְנָ, צְנָ, and צְנָ. As many pausal forms are thought to safeguard archaic phonology (Fassberg 2013, 54; cf. Blau 2010, §§3.5.8.8n, 3.5.12.2.5n, 3.5.13.4), in the case of the 2MS nominal suffix, they purport to preserve vocalic evidence of the consonant-final realisation that underlies the written tradition’s standard צ- orthography. Similar consonant-final forms of the verbal ending are not known in the pronunciation tradition, though instances of the apparently masculine independent pronoun הוא realised as ’atta are attested in rare cases of ketiv-qere (1 Sam. 24.19; Ps. 6.4; Job 1.10; Qoh. 7.22; Neh. 9.6) and in still rarer cases of written-reading agreement on הוא (Num. 11.15; Deut. 5.27; Ezek. 28.14).

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spelling</th>
<th>pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>majority</td>
<td>צ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority</td>
<td>נב-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, as can be seen in Table 1, the pausal realisation -אק agrees with the majority written short spelling, whereas the long spel-
ling with *heh* agrees with the majority vowel-final pronunciation -<i>ka</i>.

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

Table 2: Majority and minority forms of the 2<i>MS</i> verbal ending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>spelling</th>
<th>pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>majority</td>
<td>ṣ&lt;tt&gt;-&lt;/tt&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority</td>
<td>ṣ&lt;tt&gt;ה&lt;/tt&gt;-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The long verbal ending is especially common in certain weak verbs, e.g., ṣ<tt>-</tt>- (64 of the 147 total cases of 2<i>MS</i> ḫ<tt>al</tt> forms end in ṣ<tt>-</tt>-), III-y, hollow, geminate, and hifʿil I-n (Barr 1989b,
116–19, 124–24). It also exhibits a possible prosodic connection: in 19 cases רָ- correlates with a major disjunctive accent. Be that as it may, in most of these categories, the long spellings remain the minority option (see §10.2 for citations).

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

3.0. Kahle’s View

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

4.0. Diversity beyond the Tiberian Tradition

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

Turning to the 2MS verbal suffix, a consonant-final -t pronunciation is found in the Greek and Latin transcriptions (Ben-Ḥayyim 1954, 43–46; Kahle 1959, 178; Yuditsky 2016, 109–10; 2017, 112–13, §3.2.1.1) and Palestinian liturgical texts (though not piyyut proper) (Kahle, 1959, 178–79). Not surprisingly, these traditions also tend to favour the consonant-final form of the related 2MS independent subject pronoun, ṭāʾ at (Yuditsky 2016, p. 107).

4 The Samaritan tradition, like its Tiberian counterpart, is composite, comprising written and pronunciation components. Of the 39 cases of plene 2MS ḫā- found in the Tiberian Pentateuch (see below, §10.1.1), the Samaritan written tradition has ḫā- just seven times (see §10.2.1). For its part, the Samaritan reading tradition shows even greater preference for the -k realisation at the expense of -ka, even occasionally contradicting the spelling ḫā- in the Samaritan consonantal tradition, e.g., in the case of איכה and יכה (see §10.2.2). In the Samaritan reading tradition, this leaves only באה bāka ‘your coming’ (Gen. 10.30; 13.10; 25.18) with the 2MS -ka suffix, though Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 228, §3.2.2) observes that the suffix was often otherwise interpreted.
109–10; 2017, §3.1.1). By contrast, joining the Tiberian reading tradition with a vowel-final ending are the Babylonian biblical reading tradition (Yeivin 1985, 427), the Samaritan reading tradition (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 103, §2.0.13), and the RH written and reading tradition. In all four of the traditions just mentioned, the dominant form of the 2MS independent subject pronoun is also a-final (Yeivin 1985, 1103; Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 225–26, §§3.1–3.1.2; Breuer 2013, 735; but see below). Significantly, in the case of the reading components of the Samaritan biblical tradition and of RH, the a-final verbal ending conflicts with the characteristic consonant-final nominal suffix.

---

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

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

7 Samaritan Hebrew knows no remnant of the 2MS independent subject pronoun אָתָא. In the Tiberian tradition of RH, אָתָא comprises a sizable minority, e.g., in Codex Kaufmann, the 2MS independent subject pronoun is usually אָתָא, but 2MS אָתָא comes in 23 of 138 cases. On the Babylonian RH tradition see Yeivin (1985, 1103 and fn. 6).
Important, but somewhat complicated evidence may also be adduced from the DSS and from Iron Age epigraphy, each of which corpora is treated in detail below (§§5.0; 7.0).

5.0. The Dead Sea Scrolls: General Picture

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>בד</th>
<th>ה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDSS</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBDSS</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the BDSS, both the short and long spellings of the nominal suffix are common, short outnumbering long by a margin approaching 1050 to 800. The NBDSS present a different picture. Here, overall, for each instance of the 650 cases of the spelling without heh, there are more than three instances of the spelling with heh.

---

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

9 The totals are approximately, ב- 650 and ח- 2000. The figures are based on Accordance (v. 13.1.4) searches using Abegg (1999–2009) and excluding probable Aramaic material. Though uncertainty about the language of composition, broken cases, and ambiguity, inter alia, make precise counts elusive, the picture painted is sufficiently indicative for the purposes of this study.
Turning to the verbal ending, consult Table 4 for incidence of alternative spellings.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ת-</th>
<th>ה-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDSS</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBDSS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

5.1. Nominal Suffix

5.1.1. Biblical Material

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

---

10 An Accordance search of the Hebrew material in Abegg et al. (2009) returned figures of 262 for ת and 165 for ה-. However, broken endings make 80 apparent cases of ת ambiguous; the same is true for a few cases of ה-. 
Table 5: BDSS Mss with high incidence of \( \tau \) - (minimum ten cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>( \tau ) -</th>
<th>Manuscript (cont’d)</th>
<th>( \tau ) -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QIsa(^a) 1–27</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4QSam(^a) (4Q51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QIsa(^b) (1Q8)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QIsa(^b) (4Q56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QPs(^a) (1Q10)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QDeut(^a) (4Q41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QPhyl (1Q13)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QJer(^a) (4Q70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen–Exod(^a) (4Q1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QJer(^c) (4Q72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoGen–Exod(^l) (4Q11)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QPs(^b) (4Q84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod(^c) (4Q14)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QPs(^c) (4Q85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoExod(^m) (4Q22)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4QPs(^g) (4Q89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^h) (4Q29)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^e) (4Q130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^c) (4Q30)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^f) (4Q134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^e) (4Q32)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^f) (4Q145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^i) (4Q33)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5QDeut (5Q1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^d) (4Q34)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8QPhyl (8Q3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^j) (4Q36)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8QMez (8Q4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoDeut(^c) (4Q45)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11QpaleoLev(^a) (11Q1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>877</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>( \pi ) -</th>
<th>Manuscript (cont’d)</th>
<th>( \pi ) -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QIsa(^a) 28–54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^a) (4Q128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev(^g) (4Q27)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^b) (4Q129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^h) (4Q38a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^f) (4Q137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QSam(^c) (4Q53)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^h) (4Q138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QIsa(^c) (4Q57)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^i) (4Q139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QXI(^e) (4Q82)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^m) (4Q140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QPs(^a) (4Q83)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11QPs(^a) (11Q5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>675</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: BDSS Mss with mixed use of \( \tau \) - and \( \pi \) - (minimum ten cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>( \tau ) -</th>
<th>Manuscript (cont’d)</th>
<th>( \pi ) -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^l) (4Q37)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4QPhyl(^b) (4Q135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most scrolls show a discernible predilection for one form or the other. This includes a marked difference between the two halves of 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}, cols 1–27 (see above, Table 5) and cols 28–54 (see above, Table 6; see Kutscher 1974, 564–66; Abegg 2010, 40–41). In two-thirds of the manuscripts listed above (29 of 45), \(\text{ך}\) is the preferred variant. Nearly 600 of the approximately 800 occurrences of \(\text{ך}\) in the BDSS are found in the selection of material comprised of the two large scrolls 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} (ך- 121; \(\text{כת-} 230\)) and 11QPs\textsuperscript{a} (11Q5) (ך- 6; \(\text{כת-} 232\)), along with the phylacteries from Cave 4, 4QPhyl\textsuperscript{a}–4QPhyl\textsuperscript{b} (4Q128–4Q146) (ך- 91; \(\text{כת-} 164\)).\textsuperscript{11} Among texts with ten or more cases of the nominal suffix, only 4QDeut\textsuperscript{d} (4Q37) and 4QPhyl\textsuperscript{h} (4Q135) show truly mixed usage, with no obvious preference for short or long spelling.

5.1.2. Non-biblical Material

NB\textsuperscript{DSS} material presents a different picture. Here, overall, for each instance of \(\text{ך}\), there are more than three instances of \(\text{כת}\). See Tables 8–10.

Table 8: NB\textsuperscript{DSS} Mss with high incidence of \(\text{ך}\) (minimum ten cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>(\text{ך})</th>
<th>(\text{כת})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QLitPr\textsuperscript{b} (1Q34bis)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q Non-Canonical Pss B (4Q381)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q Barki Nafshi\textsuperscript{d} (4Q437)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q Narrative and… (4Q372)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QapocrPs (11Q11)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{11} However, certain individual phylacteries in this group show a decided preference for \(\text{ך}\), as does 8QMezuzah (8Q4).
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Table 9: NBDSS Mss with high incidence of ה- (minimum ten cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ה-ך</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ה-ך</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28 4Q Instructionb (4Q416)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QSb (1Q28b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74 4Q Instructionc (4Q417)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM (1Q33)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98 4Q Instructiond (4Q418)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QHa (1QHa)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>409 4Q Instructione (4Q418a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QInstruction (1Q26)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 4Q Instructionf (4Q423)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QHymns (1Q36)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 4QHg (4Q427)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QRPa (4Q158)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 4QHb (4Q428)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4JUb (4Q219)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 4Q Narrative Work… (4Q460)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpapJubb (4Q223–224)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 4QMh (4Q491)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QBar (4Q286)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 4QapocrLam B (4Q501)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QBarb (4Q287)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 4QpapRitMar (4Q502)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4RPb (4Q364)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 QpapPrQuot (4Q503)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4PEnosh (4Q369)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22 4DibHamh (4Q504)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QapocrMosesa (4Q375)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 4QPrFêtesh (4Q508)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QapocrJoshuaa (4Q378)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12 4QpapPrFêtesi (4Q509)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q pap paraKings… (4Q382)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24 QpapRitPur B (4Q512)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4RitPur A (4Q414)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 4Beat (4Q525)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q Instructiona (4Q415)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 11QTa (11Q19)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS  205 1644

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ה-ך</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ה-ך</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QTest (4Q175)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 4QapocrJoshuaa (4Q378)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QTanh (4Q176)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 TOTALS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most texts strongly favour one option over the other, though co-occurrence of the two within a single text and/or line is not uncommon. The overall preference for ה- in the NBDSS is apparent, particularly in comparison to the preference for ה- in BDSS material. Beyond this, however, it is difficult to discern meaningful usage patterns. Focusing on texts with mixed usage (Table 10)—two of the three include verbatim biblical citations, but the ה-
6. The 2MS Endings

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

5.2. Verbal Ending

5.2.1. Biblical Material

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ה- הָ-</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ה- הָ-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QIsaᵇ (1Q8)</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>4QDeut⁸ (4Q34)</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-27)</td>
<td>11 1³</td>
<td>4QpaleoDeut⁷ (4Q45)</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28-54)</td>
<td>17 2</td>
<td>4QPhyl⁵ (4Q130)</td>
<td>6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>90 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

¹³ = MT Exod. 12.44.
Table 13: BDSS Mss with mixed use of ת- and הָת- (minimum five cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ת-</th>
<th>הָת-</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>ת-</th>
<th>הָת-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeutα (4Q41)</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4QSamα (4Q51)</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>6 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By dint of its length, the Great Isaiah Scroll often skews statistical presentations of DSS material. Such is the case here, as 1QIṣaα accounts for just under half of the cases of both 2ms qāṭal forms in general (85 of 180) and 2ms הָת- spellings specifically (73 of 160). Similar outliers characterised by the use of הָת- are 11QPsα and many of the Cave 4 phylacteries. If 1QIṣaα, 4QPhylα-s, and 11QPsα are excluded from consideration, the ת- to הָת- ratio is about 150 to 50 (compared to 180 to 160, as above).

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

---

14 While there is some disparity in the use of qāṭal ת- versus הָת- between the two halves of the scroll (Table 11), they are far more similar in their usage of the 2ms verbal ending than in the case of the variants of the 2ms nominal suffix (§5.1.1 and Tables 5–6).
 Vader- and ✓- (cols 1–27: 18 versus 101; cols 28–54: 212 versus 20) obtains in the case of ה- and ✓- only in the second half of the scroll (cols 1–27: 24 versus 8; cols 28–54: 49 versus 4). While cols 28–54 show striking preferences for both ה- and ה-✓, cols 1–27 prefer ה-✓ to ✓- (24 versus 8) but not ✓-✓ over ✓-, the latter far more prevalent than the former (✓- 18 versus ✓- 101). Though involving far smaller numbers, a similar situation obtains in the case of 4QSam (4Q51), where ✓- is far more common than ✓-✓ (37 to 2), but ✓- is less frequent than ✓-✓ (2 to 5). Such differences are reminiscent of the situation in the Samaritan reading tradition and RH, all confirming the importance of independent analysis of the 2MS nominal and verbal morphology.

5.2.2. Non-biblical Material

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>✓-✓-✓</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Q Non-Canonical Pss B (4Q381)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>יה-</th>
<th>יה-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM (1Q33)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QHa (1QHa)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDM (1Q22)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q Barki Nafshi(a) (4Q436)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q DibHam(a) (4Q504)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QFêtesb (4Q508)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpapPrFêtesc (4Q509)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q Instructiond (4Q418)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QHb (4Q428)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>יה-</th>
<th>יה-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Q Barki Nafshi(d) (4Q366)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Yet, biblical citation or allusion is certainly no guarantee of a יה- spelling. Consider מוצאشفחתה חשופו נאבר נזרת נורחת ‘What passes your lips take care, as you have vowed a freewill offering with your mouth, to do as you have vowed’ (11Q19 54.13) || מוצאشفחתה חשופו לועשית נאבר נזרת.
What passes your lips take care of and do, as you have vowed to the LORD your God a freewill offering that you have spoken with your mouth’ (MT Deut. 23.24), where MT ā- is consistently paralleled by ḥ- (and ḥ- by ḥ̄-). By the same token, MT ḥ- occasionally parallels DSS ḥ-, as in וַתָּהָה הַפֶּסַח (Deut. 14.26), despite the fact that the ḥ- ending is dominant in the MT in the case of 2MS qatal ḥ̄.  

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

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

5.3. DSS Summary

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

15 Though, in the present case, it might be argued that the first heh in a sequence of two consecutive hehs has simply dropped out.
from Cave 4, contain three-quarters of the long nominal spelling and nearly 70 percent of the long verbal spelling.

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

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

---

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

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

\(^{18}\) Outside of 1QIṣa\(^a\), where co-incidence of 2\(MS\) \(\tau\)- and \(n\)- in a single line is encountered 45 times, intralinear co-occurrence is chiefly, but
points to the possibility that some cases of the short spellings are defective representations of vowel-final realisations under the influence of classical biblical spelling practices.¹⁹

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

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

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

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

---

20 The three cases of disparity between Masoretic BA and DSSBA all come in the same scroll, 4QDan* (4Q113), which preserves only these three cases: אֲב֗וּך ‘your father’ (Dan. 5.11) || אֲבִיהַֽהְוָֽהּ (4Q113 f1–4.3); ketiv עליך qere יָּֽהּ ‘about you’ (Dan. 5.16) || עליכָֽה (4Q113 f1–4.14); אלהיָּֽהּ ‘your God’ (Dan. 6.21) || אלהיָּֽהְוָֽהּ (4Q113 f7ii–8.18).
In the case of the verbal suffix in Aramaic, variety ensues. Masoretic BA shows the following pattern of incidence: ה- 6, ת- 16, ח- 3. The related 2MS independent subject pronoun likewise shows deviation from uniformity: according to the ketiv, it is תָּנָא 1, תָּנה 14; according to the qere, תָּנָא all 15 times. In DSSBA, all six 2MS suffix conjugation forms end in ת-, but the 2MS independent subject pronoun is thrice תָּנָא and twice תָּנה. And in non-biblical QA, vowel-final forms of both the 2MS verbal ending and the 2MS independent subject pronoun prevail—verbal ending: ת- 15; תָּנה/תָּנָה 23; pronoun: 0 תָּנָא; 26 תָּנה. Short spellings are standard in Aramaic documents from elsewhere in the Judaean Desert, as well as in Syriac and later forms of Aramaic. As in the case of the 2MS nominal suffix, it seems that early diversity eventually gave way to later preference for short spellings, whatever their phonetic realisation.

7.0. Iron Age Inscriptions

A fundamental question involves the historical depth of the Hebrew vowel-final -ka and -ta realisations. The earliest unequivocal attestation usually proffered consists of the dominant DSS long spellings. As noted above, this firmly anchors vowel-final pronunciations like those of the Tiberian reading tradition in the Second Temple Period. The affinity between the Tiberian pronunciation tradition and Second Temple written evidence is not a coincidence, as there are many salient commonalities between the Tiberian vocalisation and Second Temple Hebrew material (LBH, DSS), where both appear to deviate from the linguistic testimony of the Masoretic written tradition of CBH material. Cru-
cially, though, in many cases where it seems that the Tiberian reading tradition reflects relatively late secondary standardisation of a feature, the feature itself proves to have far earlier roots. This also applies to the 2MS afformatives under discussion here, as is evident from Iron Age inscriptive material.

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

1. לְשׁוֹנוֹתיכה
   ‘to change/recount to you’ (Horvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 2; Hutton 2013, 967b; cf. Aḥituv 2008, 173–74)

2. וּרְשָׁנוּתיכה
   ‘your arms’ (Horvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 11; Hutton 2013b, 967; cf. Aḥituv 2008, 173–74)

3. כֵּב[ר]כִּיה
   ‘your tomb[b]’ (Horvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 12; Aḥituv 2008, 173–7722)

4. וּקְבָּרְכִּיה
   ‘and your tomb’ (Horvat ‘Uzza Literary Text ln. 13)

---
21 This is Cross’s reading according to Beit-Arie (1993, 64); cf. Beit-Arie (1993, 61).
22 This is Lemaire’s (1995) reading according to Aḥituv (2008, 176).
6. The 2ms Endings

(5) אלהיכה

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

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

(6) יברך/ך יהוה / ישרך

‘may Yhwh bless you (?) , keep you’ (Ketef Ḥinnom 1.14)

(7) יברך/ך יהוה / ישרך

‘may YHWH bless you (?) , keep you’ (Ketef Ḥinnom 2.5)

(8) ברכתך. ל/וה תמן / ולאשרתה יברך/ך יהוה ויתמרך

‘I have blessed you to YHWH of Teman and to his Ashera.

May he bless you (?) and keep you’ (Kuntillet ‘Ajrud 2.4–7)

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

---

23 An alternative explanation, namely, that the omission is due to scribal lapse, seems implausible, given that it assumes the mistake was made all three times the phrase was written in two separate corpora. Further, note that in only one case is the end of the word line-final.
a vowel-final form.\textsuperscript{24} This is far from certain, however, and there are alternative views.

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

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

\textsuperscript{24} For Aḥituv (2008, 53) the writing of a single \textit{ך} might be a labour-and/or space-saving strategy, whereby it serves double duty, like the \textit{yod} in ‘as surely as \textit{YHWH} lives’ (Arad 21.5) and because (my lord) says’ (Lachish 3.8–9). In the cases of \textit{ky’mr} for \textit{ки я смер}, \textit{ybrk} for \textit{ybrkk(a), the relevant double-duty letters presumably signal geminated consonants. Cf. Aḥituv, who postulates two phonetic options without gemination: \textit{yĕbārēk’ka} or \textit{yĕbārēka}. The first is arguably a poor candidate for double-duty spelling with \textit{ך}, because the \textit{k} consonants are separated by a reduced vowel. The second goes one step further, assuming gemination followed by degemination (and a fricative \textit{ק}). Regardless, both assume a -\textit{ka} realisation of the 2\textit{MS} suffix.
The extant inscriptive corpus includes twelve relevant examples. Some of the cases provide unequivocal evidence of ר- as the spelling of the 2MS qatal sufformative. While this spelling is phonetically ambiguous, in light of the routine usage of matres lectionis for final vowel sounds in the corpus (Gogel 1997, 59; Hutton 2013b, 965), they are commonly taken as evidence of a consonant-final -t phonetic realisation. Consider examples (9)–(14):

(9) והסבת מצור  
   ‘and you will make the rounds tomorrow’ (Arad 2.5–6)

(10) והמצ-ות-נות-תunu ללחמה  
   ‘and if there is still vinegar, you will give (it) to them’  
   (Arad 2.7–8)

(11) וצררת/אתמ-בטק  
   ‘and you shall bind them’ (Arad 3.5–6)

(12) וה określon-ת-מת- possibilità 1 שמות  
   ‘and you will take therefrom 1 (unit of) oil’ (Arad 17.3–4)

(13) והשתת באת [בנד ע[בחד  
   ‘[and] you [will retu]rn the [garment of] your [se]rvant’  
   (Yavne Yam 14)

(14) מי-עקב/כלב-[?):שלחתת אל עבד/כ-?הספורת ה-  
   ‘Who is your servant (but) a dog [that] you have sent to your servant the letters like this? (Lachish 5.3–6)\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{25} Against the spelling שלחתה reconstructed by some scholars, see Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 320–21); but cf. Gogel (1998, 83, 86).
In other cases, the spelling הַֽהַ- appears. This spelling is also often ambiguous and, as such, is variously interpreted. Consider the alternative renderings in examples (15)–(20):

(15) ![הַֽהַ-כָּבַּדָּה לַפְּנֵי ]

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

(16) הָנָּו

‘And behold, you knew/know…’ – or –
‘And behold, you knew/know it…’ (Arad 40.9)

(17) דָּבָּר אָשָּר לָא יְדֻעֶה

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

(18) וְהָנָּו כְּהַאֲמָר לָא שֵּׁלַח תּ ה אָלָה יְדֻעֶה

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

(19) מַחְבִּית עַל הַדַּלּת כָּלָה אָשָּר שֵּׁלַח תּ ה אָלָה יְדֻעֶה

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

Summing a correct reconstruction as above, a 2ms qatāl form with heh would be strong evidence of plene spelling of -ta.
6. The 2MS Endings

and because my lord said, “You do not know (how) to read a letter” – or –
‘and because my lord said, “You do not understand it. Call a scribe!”’ (Lachish 3.8–9)26

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

26 Similarly, some render the words לא ידעתי והוה הוהו וראתי הוהו ‘you do not understand it—call a scribe!’ (see below).
single scribe) to utilise orthographic and/or phonetic variants that differed in terms of final spelling and/or phonetic realisation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Turning to example (20)—again, the conviction that הנה must include a pronominal suffix seems to have led a number of
scholars to render לא ידעתה/קרא ספר as ‘you don’t understand it’—call a scribe!’ (Lachish 3.8–9). While the consonantal string ספר is ambiguous, representing something along the lines of Tiberian סֹפֵר ‘scribe’ or סֵפֶר ‘letter’, Schniedewind (2000b, 160) is correct to problematise the semantic elasticity assumed for the verb ידוע by those who render it ‘understand’ (pace Cross 1985, 43–46; Rollston 2006, 62, fn. 42). In this case, too, then, the long spelling תָּה- seems merely to indicate a vowel-final 2MS realisation -ta.

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

It is a testament to the complexity of the problem that Cross and Freedman are compelled to make several counterintuitive claims. First, in this connection they consider the Masoretic consonantal
tradition, with the spelling ʕ-, more innovative than the Tiberian reading tradition, which preserved the -kā of “elevated speech and literary works.” Such a view runs counter to common scholarly attitude regarding the diachronic relationship between the Masoretic written and reading traditions, whereby the reading tradition is generally considered the more evolved of the two. Second, they argue that in this case it is the consonantal tradition that reflects the form associated with “popular speech,” the vocalisation reflecting a conservative manuscript tradition. Again, while not impossible, this is at odds with the usual linking of the Tiberian reading tradition to Second Temple vernacular conventions, especially as seen in RH.

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

The distinctive features of Palestinian pronunciation, which are particularly discernible in the non-biblical manuscripts with Palestinian pronunciation, have close parallels with what is known about the vowel system of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic [Fassberg 1991, 28–57]. Unlike Tiberian and Babylonian, the Palestinian biblical reading is unlikely to be a direct descendant of the proto-Masoretic reading, but rather it has its roots in other traditions of reading that were current in Palestine in antiquity. The Greek transcription in Origen’s Hexapla (the middle of the third century C.E.) reflects a reading that has even more evidence of influence from the Aramaic vernacular, especially in the pronominal suffixes, such as the 2ms suffix -akh, e.g. σεμαχ ‘your name’ (Tiberian ׃ןא Bereich Psa. 31.4) [Brønno 1943, 110, 196–200]. This is also a feature of the
Samaritan tradition, e.g. yēdāk 'your hand' (Tiberian טָּא). Some of these features, such as the Aramaic type of pronominal suffixes, appear in medieval non-biblical texts with Palestinian vocalization. In the second half of the first millennium, however, it appears that the popular biblical reading converged to a greater extent with the prestigious Tiberian tradition. As a result, the Aramaic type of suffixes were eliminated in the biblical reading [Yahalom, 1997, Introduction].

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

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

---

28 See also Blau (2010, 171, §4.2.3.3.5).
in the line of RH? Is only the DSS spelling נב- to be considered innovative and popular, but the -ka realisation it surely reflects conservative and prestigious? The intersection of various considerations to do with orthography, phonology, chronolect, dialect, register, and transmission within various traditions complicates the discussion.

Bauer and Leander (1922, 30) and Cross and Freedman (1952, 66) consider the widespread reduction of -ka to -k a very early phenomenon. Steiner (1979, 162 and fn. 9) agrees that it “must be dated to a time when Hebrew was still a living language,” but that the evidence for Aramaic influence adduced by Ben-Hayyim [1954] and Kutscher [1963] makes it difficult to accept the suggestion of Bauer and Leander (1922, p. 30) that the development in question had already taken place during the Biblical period, in a dialect different from the one which formed the basis of the Masoretic vocalisation.

However, given (a) the regularity of final -a marked by נ- in the case of non-2MS morphology in both Iron Age inscriptiveal Hebrew and all traditions of BH, (b) the regular absence of נ- in cases of the 2MS suffix in Iron Age inscriptiveal Hebrew and the Masoretic consonantal tradition, and (c) the usual affinity between Iron Age inscriptiveal Hebrew and the Masoretic consonantal tradition, a relatively strong case can be made for routine Iron Age realisation as -k. Indeed, in both the inscriptions and the Masoretic consonantal text, it is the נב- spelling—the only unequivocal evidence for the -ka realisation—that constitutes the decisive minority.
It is likely that, as time passed, the original variation became further complicated, whether due to dialectal, registerial, or mixed factors. Aramaic was almost certainly a factor, both for ה- and -כ (RH, the DSS, the transcriptions) and thereagainst (BH reading traditions, the DSS). Second Temple vernacular registers, such as that later documented as Tannaitic RH, must also have played a role, again, both for ה- and -כ (RH, the transcriptions) and against them (the DSS). So, too, if Steiner is correct about pausal forms, elevated reading practices must also have played a part (in BH, RH, and the DSS). From this perspective, it is interesting that among the DSS the ה- spelling, while overall the minority form, is comparatively more common in biblical than in non-biblical material, though, as Qimron (2018, 266) notes, כ- occurs in DSS biblical material “even where other phases of Hebrew use the apocopated form, e.g., with the prepositions עמה, אתרה, בצ, עמכך in pausal position....” Whatever pronunciation DSS ה- represents, adherence to classical spelling

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

30 Here it seems fitting to acknowledge Schniedewind’s (1999; 2000a; 2021) theory of Qumran Hebrew as an anti-language; cf. Tigchelaar (2018). It may also be worth considering in this connection two Qumran compositions the Hebrew of which is often considered uniquely representative of contemporary vernacular traits. In the Copper Scroll (3Q15; on the language of which, see Wolters 2013), all three cases of the 2MS suffix are ה-; in 4QMMT (comprising 4Q394–397, 4Q399; on the language of which, see Yuditsky 2013a), there are four cases of ה- (all in 4Q399) and five of כ- (all in 4Q397).
norms seems to have been more common in biblical than in non-biblical sources. As for the DSS נב- spelling and -ka realisation—the regularity of the orthography is clearly a late phenomenon, but as the related phonetic realisation tallies with the minority Iron Age inscriptional orthography, there seems no reason to doubt a genetic link between the two involving -ka, which until the late Second Temple Period, seemingly by chance, enjoyed only sporadic orthographic representation.

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

31 In an Iron Age Hebrew dialect with 2MS -k, it is not clear how related and complementary morphology would be realised. For example, forms similar to the Tiberian reading tradition’s 2MS independent subject pronoun ʾattā are the norm in the Masoretic consonantal text (where 2MS נָי ‘you’ [Num. 11.15; Deut. 5.27; Ezek. 28.14] and cases of ketiv נָי read as qere נָי [1 Sam. 24.19; Ps. 6.4; Job 1.10; Qoh. 7.22; Neh. 9.6] are rare), the Babylonian reading tradition (Yeivin 1985, 1103), the DSS (Qimron 2018, 260), Ben Sira, SH (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 225–26, §§3.0–3.1, 3.1.2), the Secunda [normally ʾabha, just once ʾab] (Yuditsky 2013b, 811), Jerome (attha, ath); RH, though נָי occurs in a sizeable minority of cases (Breuer 2013, 735). Obviously, users of some forms of Hebrew
In terms of detailing the merger and explaining things as they now stand, Barr’s (1989b, 123–25) view is an attractive place to begin. The Hebrew Bible’s oldest material probably exhibited greater spelling (and, thus, phonological) variety, i.e., a larger number of cases of יָּהֵן. But early Second Temple scribes, copying and composing during the period of LBH, standardised the spelling יָּהֵן, leaving only a tiny remnant of יָּהֵן (a spelling that certain factors helped to preserve). This standardisation may well have been influenced by a dialect and/or register in which the use of -כ had largely pushed out that of -כָּה, whether due to convergence with Aramaic, diffusion of liturgical or vernacular apocope, or some combination of these. Crucially, however, the scribal process responsible for depiction of the 2MS suffix in the Masoretic written tradition did not dictate a matching realisation in the

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

Finally, it is also interesting to consider the 2FS object/possessive suffix. As is well known, in the Tiberian reading tradition the pausal form of the 2MS suffix is identical to that of the 2FS suffix in the case of certain particles. This evinces toleration of a certain degree of ambiguity, also characteristic of various forms of the corresponding Samaritan suffixes. On the assumption that the Masoretic consonantal text regularly reflects 2MS -כָּה, the standard Tiberian 2FS -כָּה would have been sufficient for gender disambiguation; other 2FS alternatives include RH and Aramaic יָּהֵן -כָּה and the variously represented יָּהֵן -כָּה, which is sporadic in the Tiberian written and reading traditions and rare in DSS orthography—though Qimron (2018, 267–68) posits -כָּה as the majority (defectively spelled) DSS realisation—but well attested in Aramaic dialects (including the Syriac written tradition) and Deir ‘Alla.
proto-Tiberian reading tradition. Here, too, there was a process of levelling, but in this case -kā became the standard (except in pause in the case of a few forms)—perhaps out of resistance to the very factors that led the expansion of ׁ and -k in the written tradition. Of course, much of this proposal is conjecture, neither verifiable nor falsifiable, but it arguably fits the facts and is somewhat reminiscent of other cases of dissonance between the Masoretic written and pronunciation traditions examined in this monograph.

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

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

What this all means for the literary Hebrew of the early Second Temple Period, to say nothing of the Iron Age, has been a matter of some controversy. Kahle (1959, 174–77) downplayed the historical relevance of the DSS spelling ׁ for the question of the dissonance between the Tiberian vocalisation and conso-
nantal text. Barr (1989b, 117–18) seems to imply that Kutscher (1982, 32–35, §46), or his followers, were guilty of overstating the importance of DSS הָכ-:

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

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

10.1. Tiberian Biblical Tradition

10.1.1. Cases of the Plene 2ms Nominal Suffix

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

10.1.2. Cases of the Plene 2ms Verbal Ending

In order of frequency, the most salient categories are: יִתְנַתְּה – 64x (Gen. 3.12; 15.3; Exod. 21.23; 25.12; 26.32, 33; 27.5; 28.14, 24, 25, 27; 29.12, 20; 30.6, 36; 40.5, 6; Num. 3.9, 48; 7.5; 27.20; 31.29, 30; Deut. 11.29; 14.25, 26; 15.17; 26.10, 12, 15; Josh. 15.19; 17.14; Judg. 1.15; 1 Sam. 1.11; 1 Kgs 8.36, 36, 40, 48; 9.13; Jer. 29.26; Ezek. 4.1, 2, 2, 3, 9; 43.19, 20; Ps. 4.8; 18.41; 21.3, 5; 39.6; 60.6; Ezra 9.13; Neh. 9.15, 20, 36, 37; 2 Chron. 6.25, 27, 30, 31, 38; 20.10); III-y – 32x יִתְנַתְּה (Gen. 45.19); יִתְנַתְּה (Num. 27.13; 2 Sam. 18.21; Ps. 10.14; 35.22; Lam. 3.59, 60); יִתְנַתְּה (Num. 27.19; Jer. 32.23; Ps. 119.4; Lam. 1.10); יִתְנַתְּה (Judg. 11.6; 2 Sam. 10.11); יִתְנַתְּה (Judg. 11.36; 1 Sam. 14.43; 15.6; 24.19, 20; 2 Sam. 3.24; 12.21; 16.10; Ezek. 35.11); יִתְנַתְּה (1 Sam. 15.3; 2 Kgs 9.7; Jer. 5.3); יִתְנַתְּה (2 Sam. 7.27); יִתְנַתְּה (1 Kgs 9.3); יִתְנַתְּה (Jer. 25.15); יִתְנַתְּה (Jer. 38.17); יִתְנַתְּה (Obad. 5); יִתְנַתְּה (Ps. 31.6); יִתְנַתְּה (Ps. 60.5); strong verbs – 22x יִתְנַתְּה (Gen. 31.30); יִתְנַתְּה (Exod. 18.20); יִתְנַתְּה (Deut. 17.14);
10.2. Samaritan Biblical Tradition

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

איכה (Gen. 3.9); הבאה (Gen. 10.30; 13.10; 25.18); הבאה yikkāk (the LORD) will strike you’ (Deut. 28.22, 27, 35).

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

איכה (Gen. 3.9); הבאה bāka ‘your coming’ (Gen. 10.30; 13.10; 25.18); הבאה yikkāk (the LORD) will strike you’ (Deut. 28.22, 27, 35; cf. ניב SP Deut. 28.28 || MT yikkāk; MT ניב is twice entirely unparalleled in SP Gen. 10.19; SP ניב | MT yikkāk ‘(the LORD) will strike you’ (Deut. 28.22, 27, 35); SP ניב | MT yikkāk ‘and on you’ (Exod. 7.29); SP ניב | MT yikkāk ‘and for you’ (Gen. 27.37); SP ניב | MT yikkāk ‘and on you’ (Exod. 15.11 [2x]); SP ניב | MT yikkāk ‘like you’ (Exod. 13.16); SP ניב | MT yikkāk ‘‘your hands’ || MT yikkāk ‘your hand’ (Exod. 15.11); SP ניב | MT yikkāk ‘‘your hand’ || MT yikkāk ‘your soul’ will live’ (Jer. 38.17). Barr (1989b, 116, 125–27) lists 146, omitting נן (Gen. 45.19) and נן (Neh. 9.15), while including ketiv תש qere הם קע (Ps. 90.8).
7. THE 2FS ENDINGS

A degree of diversity characterises ancient Hebrew 2FS morphology. Specifically, the 2FS independent subject pronoun, the 2FS suffix conjugation ending, and the 2FS nominal (object/possessive) suffix all exhibit both majority consonant-final forms, namely, standard יָּהָי, יָּהּ, יָי, and their respective minority vowel-final alternants, יָּהֵי, יָּהָ, יָּי (Hornkohl 2013, 112–19). The present chapter focuses on dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition involving the realisation of such 2FS morphological forms.

1.0. The Combined Tiberian Biblical Tradition

Examining the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition in terms of 2FS morphology, one encounters slight deviation within broad uniformity. Consider Table 1.

Table 1: 2FS morphological variety in the MT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
<th>Dissonance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prounom</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>-CV ketiv CV, qere -V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal ending</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal suffix</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 demonstrates that in the case of all of the categories of 2FS morphology under discussion, the dominant scenario is one of written-reading agreement on consonant-final morphology,

For detailed reference lists, see below, §5.1. Cf. the comparable, but slightly different figures given in Hornkohl (2013, 114).
i.e., נָּא, נָ, and נַ-. Instances of written-reading dissonance, in the form of ketiv-qere mismatches, occur in all categories, though with very different relative frequencies. The incidence of verbal יָּא in place of נָּא and of verbal ending יָּ in place of נַ- is relatively high in comparison to that of the nominal suffix יָּ in place of נַ-. Interestingly, when it comes to both the verbal ending and the nominal suffix, the ketiv forms are not the sole evidence of vowel-final 2FS morphology. They are confirmed by cases of apparent vowel-final 2FS morphology where the written and reading components of the tradition agree. While the vowel-final occurrences of the nominal suffix יָּ are unambiguous, those of the verbal יָּ merit note. In all seven of these cases, it is possible that the preservation of vowel-final forms in the reading component of the tradition owes to their having been interpreted as cases of 1CS morphology.² Also relevant are 2FS suffix conjugation forms with object suffixes; a majority of these have an -i- linking vowel before the suffix, which is sometimes represented by a mater yod in the tradition’s corresponding written component (see Hornkohl 2013a, 112, fn. 17, for detail).

2.0. Beyond the Tiberian Tradition

2.1. Biblical Hebrew Material

Non-Tiberian biblical material also presents dedicated 2FS morphology. In the traditions represented by this material, vowel-

² Cf. the Syriac and TJ at Judg. 5.7, 7; Jer. 2.20, 20; the Greek, Syriac, and TJ at Ezek. 16.50; and the Vulgate at Mic. 4.13.
final endings dominate to the near exclusion of consonant-final forms—the latter of which are, however, occasionally attested.

The Samaritan tradition displays its own mixture of forms and traditions (see Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 107–8, 225–26, 228).

Table 2: 2FS morphological variety in the SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>harmony</th>
<th>dissonance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>-CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun (יָת atti/åtti)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal ending (ת- -ti, יָת- -ti)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal suffix (יָת(-) -k, יָכ- -ki)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent subject pronoun is written יָת and realised atti/åtti, i.e., both the written and reading components of the tradition attesting vowel-final morphology. According to the written component of the Samaritan tradition, the verbal ending varies between consonant-final ת- and vowel-final יָת-, but in the reading component it is consistently vowel-final -ti. Conversely, the 2FS nominal suffix is written יָת(-) and pronounced with no final vowel, despite written-reading agreement on vowel-final morphology in a single case of יָכ- -ki: מָלֵךְ līki ‘what troubles you (FS)?’ (Gen. 21.17).

The scrolls from the Judaean Desert also exhibit variety when it comes to the relevant 2FS forms.

---

3 For detailed reference lists, see below, §5.2. Cf. the comparable, but slightly different figures in Hornkohl (2013, 118, fn. 28).

4 The apparent exception יָת wit (Num. 5.20) is analysed as a demonstrative (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 226, §3.1.3, 237–38, §3.3.1.3).

5 Similar to Aramaic and RH, SH routinely distinguishes between the 2MS and 2FS nominal suffixes via the quality of the vowel that links the noun to the suffix (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 228–29, §§3.2.2–3.2.2.1).
Table 3: 2fs morphological variety in the BDSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1QIsa</th>
<th>Other BDSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>-CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prounoun (את, אתי)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal ending (ת, -תי)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal suffix (ך, כי)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the independent subject pronoun is written אתי in the Great Isaiah Scroll (against אֲת in MT Isaiah), other biblical scrolls present את: the latter include parallels to cases of Tiberian written-reading agreement on את, parallels to Tiberian qere forms against ketiv את, and parallels to Tiberian forms that graphically resemble את. Likewise with the verbal ending: 1QIsa, which accounts for 30 of the 45 extant cases, has 12 instances of ת- and 18 of י- (all ת- in the MT); in the rest of the biblical scrolls, there are 23 instances of ת- and just two of י- (all but one of which parallel ת- in the MT, the exception a ketiv-qere discrepancy where the DSS = ketiv). In the case of the nominal suffix, the biblical scrolls show 395 cases ofך and 28 cases of כי. Again, however, there is a distinction between 1QIsa and the other biblical scrolls. In 1QIsa, cases ofך outnumber those of כי by a margin of 216 to 27; in the rest of the biblical scrolls, the counts areך- 179, כי- 1 (the single case of כי in 4Q84 is parallel to ב- in the corresponding Tiberian text: Ps. 116.19; however, the five remaining instances of ב- in MT Ps. 103.3–5 are paralleled byך in 4Q84).

---

6 For detailed reference lists, see below, §5.3. Cf. the comparable, but slightly different figures in Hornkohl (2013, 118, fn. 27).
Precious few examples come in Greek and Latin transcriptional material.\(^7\) The lone extant case of the verbal ending is vowel-final: Jerome’s *carathi* || MT וְּקָרֵָ֥את ‘and you will call’ (Isa. 7.14). There is more substantial evidence for the 2FS nominal suffix, all of it indicating consonant-final morphology: Theodotion’s Ἐλωαἰχ ‘your God’ || MT וְּאֱלֹהֶַֽי ‘your (MS) God’ (Mic. 6.8); Jerome’s *semmathech* || MT וְּסָמְתֵּ ‘your veil’ (Isa. 47.2); Jerome’s *gebulaic* || MT וְּגֶבְוָלִי ‘your borders’ (Ezek. 27.4); Jerome’s *bonaich* || MT וְּבֹנַָ֕י ‘your builders’ (Ezek. 27.4). Transcriptions of the 2FS independent pronoun are evidently unattested.

### 2.2. Extra-biblical Hebrew Material

Iron Age epigraphy is entirely lacking in 2FS morphology. The same is true of BS. In the NBDSS, the picture is similar to that of the BDSS, excluding 1QIsa\(^a\) (see above, §2.1).

Table 4: 2FS morphological variety in the NBDSS\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-C</th>
<th>-CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>pronoun</strong> (את, אתי)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>verbal ending</strong> (ת- , ת- )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nominal suffix</strong> (ך-, כ- )</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarising Table 4, the single fragmentary instance of the 2FS independent subject pronoun appears to be vowel-final. The two consonant-final suffix conjugation endings come in a biblical citation where they are also consonant-final. Relatively more data

\(^7\) My thanks to Ben Kantor for the citations.

\(^8\) For detailed reference lists, see below, §5.4. Cf. the comparable, but slightly different figures in Hornkohl (2013, 118, fn. 28).
are available regarding the 2FS nominal suffix: י- outnumbered by כ- by a margin of 39 to six.

RH, for its part, is more informative on Second Temple 2FS morphology. In Codex Kaufmann of the Mishna, the 2FS independent pronoun, the verbal ending of the suffix conjugation, and the nominal suffix are consistently consonant-final.⁹

### 2.3. Aramaic

Aramaic 2FS morphology is summarised in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pronoun</th>
<th>verb ending</th>
<th>nominal suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>י-ך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>אנת/ינת</td>
<td>ת-</td>
<td>י-ך (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac</td>
<td>אנת/ית</td>
<td>ת-</td>
<td>כ-ק</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BA has no relevant forms, and DSSA has only י- forms of the 2FS nominal suffix. In TA, the forms in all three categories are generally consonant-final, with a small minority of י- nominal suffixes. Syriac’s written-reading dissonance is well known. The written component reflects ancient vowel-final 2FS morphology in all three categories, but the final vowel goes unpronounced in the reading tradition (and is unrepresented in a minority of cases of the verbal ending).

---

⁹ The apparent 2FS ending י- in m. Nedarim 10.4b is evidently an error on the part of the vocaliser. As in SH, the 2MS and 2FS nominal suffixes are frequently distinguished by an i-vowel before the latter, often indicated in the spelling by a mater yod.
2.4. Realisation of 2fs Morphology in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The orthographic evidence adduced above concerning the oral realisation of 2fs morphology in the DSS is partially ambiguous. On the one hand, it is reasonable to hypothesise that the mater in forms ending in yod reflects the vowel-final realisation -i (cf., however, the situation in Syriac mentioned above, §2.3). On the other hand, forms ending in ר- or ז- are variously understood by scholars. Hornkohl (2013, 112) favours assuming “the correspondence of the written and pronunciation traditions, i.e., that orthographic forms ending in a consonant were indeed pronounced without a final vowel.” Against the background of widespread gender confusion, Kutscher (1974, 213) raises the possibility that no final vowel was pronounced on the relevant 2fs (and 2ms) forms. At the other extreme, Qimron (2018, 154–55, 259–60 and fn. 11, 265, 267–68) argues on the basis of mixed usage in single texts or lines that all the relevant 2fs categories consistently ended in some shade of i-vowel (perhaps e), no matter their spelling, in which case consonant-final orthography is merely defective.

In light of the statistics given above (§§2.1–2), a nuanced view may be the most plausible. Qimron’s view of consistent vowel-final realisations seems most tenable in the specific cases of the subject pronoun and verbal ending in 1QIsa. The dominance of consonant-final forms of the independent subject pronoun and verbal ending outside 1QIsa support the view that consonant-final realisations were the norm in most of the DSS. Regarding the nominal suffix—as vowel-final spellings are rare
throughout the DSS, including 1QIṣa\textsuperscript{a}, it would appear as though consonant-final realisations were the norm.

Though the patterns of phonetic realisation suggested above cannot be absolutely confirmed, they do find support in extant Hebrew pronunciation traditions. 1QIṣa\textsuperscript{a} patterns like the combined written-reading tradition of SH, with vowel-final independent subject pronoun רָפָא ʾatti and verbal ending רֹ-ti paired with consonant-final nominal suffix ר-כ. Throughout the rest of the DSS, the norm would seem to be רָפָא ʾat, ר-כ-כ, and ר-כ-כ, which is in line with the testimony of the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition.

3.0. Diachronic Considerations

The written-reading dissonance concerning 2\textit{fs} morphology differs from many other situations of dissonance discussed in the present work. First, apparent instances are relatively rare. Second, in contrast to cases in which the reading tradition diverges from the written tradition in agreement with late propagation of an early minority form—e.g., vowel-final 2\textit{ms} morphology (ch. 6)—in this instance, the consonant-final alternant standardised in the reading tradition appears also to have been the dominant option in the written tradition. More than anything, then, in this case, the departure of the reading component from its written counterpart can be described as one of levelling, whereby minority irregular forms, especially the independent pronoun and the verbal ending, were regularised. Verbal forms that escaped regularisation were evidently read as 1\textit{cs} forms. When it comes to the nominal suffix, genre is determinative: \textit{ketiv} ר-כ is normalised to
qere - in prose, but the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition agree on - wherever it appears in poetry.

On the assumption that the written tradition’s heterogeneity reflects an earlier linguistic reality than the reading tradition’s more homogenous presentation of 2FS morphology, there is very little information that might aid in dating the latter’s deviation from the former. If the DSS spellings are to be taken at face value—i.e., apparently consonant-final spellings are not in large measure defective and apparently vowel-final spellings are not merely graphic morphological indicators (historical spelling, as in Syriac)—then, with the notable exception of 1QIsa, they seem to indicate a standardisation of consonant-final 2FS morphology more advanced than what is seen in the written component of the Tiberian tradition, but consistent with the Tiberian reading component. In other words, when it contradicts its written counterpart, the reading component of the Tiberian biblical tradition is more or less in agreement with the normalisation of consonant-final 2FS morphology dominant in most of the DSS.

Of course, it is important to point out that the Tiberian reading tradition’s divergence from the written tradition is not particularly frequent, radical, or innovative. Unless the dominant consonant-final 2FS spellings characteristic of the written tradition are regularly defective, the written tradition itself testifies to the hegemony of the same consonant-final realisations that the reading tradition further standardised. Thus, while the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition offer ‘windows’ on the chronological development of the spelling and realisation of 2FS morphology, there is relatively little diachronic change to
speak of. In the vast majority of cases, the images seen through the two windows are identical; in a minority, the window afforded by the reading component reveals the advance of regularisation, the effects of which are, however, already widespread in the corresponding written component. Finally, it is also important to bear in mind that other factors may have contributed to morphological diversity, e.g., especially, but not exclusively, genre.

4.0. Conclusion

In the case of 2$FS$ morphology, the reading component of the Tiberian biblical tradition is rarely out of tune with the corresponding written component. On the view that the tradition of oral realisation was largely fixed by Second Temple times, one might expect that it maintains First Temple conventions while at the same time implementing Second Temple innovations. The innovation in this case was the further expansion of consonant-final 2$FS$ morphology already standard in the written component of the Tiberian biblical tradition. In this way, the Tiberian reading tradition diverges from the corresponding written tradition, but only marginally, and in so doing merely continues the developmental journey already largely accomplished in the written tradition along the same trajectory.

5.0. Citations

5.1. Tiberian Biblical Tradition

The following list includes only vowel-final cases of the relevant 2$FS$ morphology, excluding cases of the standard consonant-final forms on which the written
and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition agree. **Pronoun**—יָתִּי: Judg. 17.2; 1 Kgs 14.2; 2 Kgs 4.16, 23; 8.1; Jer. 4.30; Ezek. 36.13. **Verbal ending**—יָתִּי: Judg. 5.7, 7; Jer. 2.20, 20; Ezek. 16.50; Mic. 4.13; ketiv יָתי—|| qere יָתי: Jer. 2.33; 3.4, 5; 4.19; 31.21; 46.11; Ezek. 16.13, 18, 22, 31, 31, 43, 43, 47, 51; Ruth 3.3. 4. **Nominal suffix**—יָתי: Jer. 11.15; Ps. 103.3, 3, 4, 4, 5; 116.7, 7, 19; 135.9; 137.6; ketiv יָתי—|| qere יָתי: 2 Kgs 4.2, 3, 7, 7; Song 2.13.

5.2. Samaritan Pentateuch

**Pronoun**—יָתִּי atti/datti: Gen. 12.11, 13; 24.23, 47, 60; 39.9. **Verbal ending**—יָתִּי: Gen. 16.11, 11; 27.12 (|| MT 1cs יָתִּי ‘and I will bring’); Num. 5.19, 20, 20; יָתִּי: Gen. 3.13; 16.8; 18.15; 30.15 (|| MT infinitive construct [?] יָתִּי ‘and to take’); Num. 22.29. **Nominal suffix**—יָתִּי: Gen. 3.16, 16, 16, 16; 12.12, 12, 13, 13; 16.6, 6, 6, 9, 10, 11, 11; 20.16, 16, 16; 21.18; 24.14, 17, 23, 43, 45, 60; 25.23, 23; 30.2, 14, 15, 15, 15; 35.17; 38.11, 13, 16, 18; 39.9; Exod. 2.7, 7, 9; Num. 5.19, 19, 20, 20, 20, 21, 21, 21, 21, 22, 22.29; Deut. 33.8; יָתִּי: Gen. 21.17.

5.3. Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

In the following lists, the parallel MT form is consonant-final unless otherwise specified. **Pronoun**—יָתִּי: 1Q8 22.22 || MT Isa. 51.10; 2Q17 f.1.5 || MT Ruth 3.16; 4Q107 f2ii.7 || MT יָתִּי Song 4.8; 4Q107 f2ii.7 || MT יָתִּי Song 4.8; 6Q4 f15.2 || MT ketiv יָתִּי qere יָתִּי 2 Kgs 8.1; Mur88 17.19 || MT Nah. 3.11; Mur88 17.20 || MT Nah. 3.11; יָתִּי: 1QIsa* 42.24 || MT Isa. 51.9; 1QIsa* 42.25 || MT Isa. 51.10; 1QIsa* 42.28 || MT Isa. 51.12. **Verbal ending**—יָתִּי: 1Q1 f.2.3 || MT Gen. 3.13; 1QIsa* 14.16 || MT Isa. 17.10; 1QIsa* 23.9 || MT Isa. 29.4; 1QIsa* 41.20 || MT Isa. 49.21; 1QIsa* 43.6 || MT Isa. 51.17; 1QIsa* 47.7 || MT Isa. 57.8; 1QIsa* 47.8 || MT Isa. 57.8; 1QIsa* 47.8 || MT Isa. 57.8; 1QIsa* 47.9 || MT Isa. 57.10; 1QIsa* 47.9 || MT Isa. 57.10; 1QIsa* 47.10 || MT Isa. 57.10; 1QIsa* 47.9 || MT Isa. 57.11; 1QIsa* 50.13 || MT Isa. 62.3; 1Q8 20.19 || MT Isa. 47.6; 1Q8 26.8 || MT Isa. 60.5; 1Q8 26.23 || MT Isa. 60.16; 1Q8 26.23 || MT Isa. 60.16; 1Q8 26.27 || MT Isa. 60.18; 1Q8 27.1 || MT Isa. 62.3; 1Q8 27.7 || MT Isa. 62.8; 2Q16 f2ii–4ii.8 || MT Ruth 2.19; 2Q16 f5ii–6ii.6 || MT Ruth 3.2; 2Q16 f6ii–7.3 || MT Ruth 3.4; 2Q16 f6ii–7.3 || MT Ruth 3.4; 4Q51 f102ii + 103–106.43 || MT 2 Sam. 14.2; 4Q51 f102ii + 103–106.44 || MT 2 Sam. 14.3; 4Q55 f.9.4 || MT Isa. 17.10; 4Q56 f8–9.3 || MT Isa. 17.10; 4Q58 11.15 || MT Isa. 57.10; 4Q58 11.15 || MT Isa. 57.10; 4Q58 11.16 || MT Isa. 57.11; 4Q62a f.2.4 || MT Isa. 57.8; 4Q72 f34ii + 36–43.18 || MT Jer. 31.4; 4Q16 f2ii.14 || MT Song 7.7; Mur88 21.5 || MT Zeph. 3.11; יָתִּי: 1QIsa* 14.15 || MT Isa. 7.10; 1QIsa* 17.4 || MT Isa. 22.2; 1QIsa* 39.25 || MT Isa. 47.6; 1QIsa* 39.25 || MT Isa. 47.6; 1QIsa* 39.26 || MT Isa. 47.7; 1QIsa* 39.26 || MT Isa. 47.7; 1QIsa* 39.30 || MT Isa. 47.10; 1QIsa* 40.1 || MT Isa. 47.12; 1QIsa* 40.4 || MT Isa. 47.15; 1QIsa* 41.24 || MT
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12.6; 4Q60 f3–6.7 || MT Isa. 1.22; 4Q62a f2.2 || MT Isa. 57.6; 4Q64 f1–5.6 || MT Isa. 29.3; 4Q64 f1–5.6 || MT Isa. 29.4; 4Q66 f1–3.1 || MT Isa. 60.20; 4Q68 f1.4 || MT Isa. 14.30; 4Q69a f1.2 || MT Isa. 54.11; 4Q69a f1.3 || MT Isa. 54.12; 4Q72 f1ii.4 || MT Jer. 4.14; 4Q72 f12–21.8 || MT Jer. 22.21; 4Q72 f12–21.9 || MT Jer. 22.22; 4Q72 f47–48ii + 51–54.10 || MT Jer. 31.21; 4Q77 f3.1 || MT Zeph. 3.19; 4Q78 f24–29 + 48.4 || MT Amos 3.11; 4Q78 f24–29 + 48.4 || MT Amos 3.11; 4Q72 f3ii + 4ii + 5–7.11 || MT Hos. 2.22; 4Q84 f15iiii + 20–22.15 || MT y- Ps. 103.3; 4Q84 f15iiii + 20–22.16 || MT y- Ps. 103.4; 4Q84 f15iiii + 21ii–24.1 || MT y- Ps. 103.4; 4Q84 f15iiii + 21ii–24.2 || MT y- Ps. 103.4; 4Q84 f15iiii + 21ii–24.3 || MT Ps. 103.5; 4Q84 f15iiii + 21ii–24.4 || MT y- Ps. 103.5; 4Q85 f12.5 || MT Ps. 45.11; 4Q86 2.1 || MT Ps. 147.13; 4Q86 2.1 || MT Ps. 147.13; 4Q86 2.2 || MT Ps. 147.14; 4Q105 f4.5 || MT Ruth 1.15; 4Q106 f2i + 3–5.8 || MT Song 4.1; 4Q106 f2i + 3–5.8 || MT Song 4.1; 4Q106 f2i + 3–5.9 || MT Song 4.2; 4Q106 f2i + 3–5.11 || MT Song 4.3; 4Q106 f2i + 3–5.11 || MT Song 4.3; 4Q106 f2i.10 || MT Song 7.4; 4Q106 f2i.11 || MT Song 7.5; 4Q106 f2i.13 || MT Song 7.6; 4Q107 f1.2 || MT Song 2.10; 4Q107 f1.6 || MT Song 2.13; 4Q107 f1.9 || MT Song 2.14; 4Q107 f1.9 || MT Song 2.14; 4Q107 f2i.2 || MT Song 4.1; 4Q107 f2i.3 || MT Song 4.2; 4Q107 f2i.5 || MT Song 4.3; 4Q107 f2i.5 || MT Song 4.3; 4Q107 f2i.6 || MT Song 4.3; 4Q107 f2i.6 || MT Song 4.3; 4Q107 f2i.10 || MT Song 4.9; 4Q107 f2i.11 || MT Song 4.9; 4Q107 f2i.11 || MT Song 4.10; 4Q107 f2i.12 || MT Song 4.10; 4Q107 f2i.13 || MT Song 4.10; 4Q107 f2i.14 || MT Song 4.11; 5Q6 f1iv.2 || MT Lam. 4.21; 5Q6 f1iv.4 || MT Lam. 4.22; 11Q4 f3b + 6.2 || MT Ezek. 5.12; 11Q5 3.8 || MT Ps. 122.2; 11Q5 3.12 || MT Ps. 122.6; 11Q5 3.12 || MT Ps. 122.7; 11Q5 3.12 || MT Ps. 122.7; 11Q5 3.13 || MT Ps. 122.8; 11Q5 14.9 || MT Ps. 135.2; 11Q5 21.1 || MT Ps. 137.9. מ: 1Qlsa^a 1.25 || Isa. 1.23; 1Qlsa^a 17.4 || Isa. 22.1; 1Qlsa^a 33.8 || Isa. 40.9; 1Qlsa^a 38.22 || Isa. 45.14; 1Qlsa^a 38.22 || Isa. 45.14; 1Qlsa^a 38.22 || Isa. 45.14; 1Qlsa^a 39.26 || Isa. 47.7; 1Qlsa^a 41.15 || Isa. 49.15; 1Qlsa^a 41.17 || Isa. 49.18; 1Qlsa^a 41.28 || Isa. 49.26; 1Qlsa^a 43.7 || Isa. 51.19; 1Qlsa^a 43.7 || Isa. 51.19; 1Qlsa^a 43.12 || Isa. 51.23; 1Qlsa^a 44.24 || Isa. 54.2; 1Qlsa^a 45.1 || Isa. 54.5; 1Qlsa^a 45.5 || Isa. 54.8; 1Qlsa^a 45.9 || Isa. 54.10; 1Qlsa^a 45.12 || Isa. 54.13; 1Qlsa^a 49.15 || Isa. 60.12; 1Qlsa^a 50.12 || Isa. 62.2; 1Qlsa^a 50.13 || Isa. 62.3; 1Qlsa^a 50.14 || Isa. 62.4; 1Qlsa^a 50.15 || Isa. 62.4; 1Qlsa^a 50.16 || Isa. 62.5; 1Qlsa^a 50.25 || Isa. 62.12; 4Q84 f28i.18 || MT y- Ps. 116.19.

5.4. Non-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

In the following lists, the parallel MT form is consonant-final unless otherwise specified. Pronoun— Pike: 4Q223–224 f2ii.11 || Jub. 35.17. Verbal ending— ר: 4Q169 f3–4ii.10 || Nah. 3.5; 4Q169 f3–4ii.11 || Nah. 3.5. Nominal suffix— ת: 1QM 12.14, 14, 14, 14, 14; 19.6, 6, 6; 4Q168 f1.4 || Mic. 4.10; 4Q169 f3–4ii.10 || Nah. 3.5; 4Q169 f3–4ii.11 || Nah. 3.5; 4Q169 f3–4ii.11 || Nah. 3.5;
4Q169 f3–4iii.1 || Nah. 3.6; 4Q169 f3–4iii.1 || Nah. 3.6; 4Q169 f3–4iii.1 || Nah. 3.6; 4Q169 f3–4iii.2 || Nah. 3.7; 4Q169 f3–4iii.2 || Nah. 3.7; 4Q169 f3–4iii.6 || Nah. 3.7; 4Q169 f5.3 || Nah. 3.14; 4Q176 f1–2ii.5 || Isa.49.16; 4Q176 f8–11.6 || Isa. 54.4; 4Q176 f8–11.6 || Isa. 54.5; 4Q176 f8–11.8 || Isa. 54.6; 4Q176 f8–11.8 || Isa. 54.6; 4Q176 f8–11.9 || Isa. 54.7; 4Q176 f8–11.9 || Isa. 54.7; 4Q176 f8–11.10 || Isa. 54.8; 4Q176 f8–11.10 || Isa. 54.8; 4Q176 f8–11.11 || Isa. 54.9; 4Q385a f17a–eii.4, 5, 7; 4Q415 f2ii.2, 5, 7; 4Q492 f1.6, 6, 7; 4Q522 f22–26.5 || Ps. 122.7; ע: 4Q161 f5–6.7 || Isa. 10.30; 4Q176 f8–11.6 || Isa. 54.4; 4Q176 f8–11.7 || Isa. 54.5; 4Q176 f8–11.12 || Isa. 54.10; 4Q176 f50.1; 4Q223–224 f2i.47 || Jub. 35.8.
8. THE QERE PERPETUUM

In the majority of sources that represent ancient Hebrew traditions, the 3Fs independent subject pronoun is written with medial yod, e.g., DSS (היא). Likewise, in extant pronunciation traditions, it is realised with a corresponding i-vowel, e.g., standard Tiberian (non-Pentateuchal) BH and RH היא, SH i. The written component of the Tiberian tradition of the Pentateuch, exhibiting the spelling הוא, is an outlier. Whereas the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition in the MT Prophets and Writings routinely exhibits the unified consonantal-vocalic form היא (in 282 of 286 cases), in the Torah such unity is rare (just 18 of 212 cases). 1 Instead of היא, the anomalous graphic spelling-vocalic combination הוא is normative in the Tiberian Pentateuch.

1.0. The Tiberian Tradition

On four occasions in the Hebrew Bible, readers are explicitly instructed via the (inter)marginal ketiv-qere mechanism to read 3Fs היא instead of apparently 3Ms written היא (Deut. 13.16; 1 Kgs 17.15; Isa. 30.33; Job 31.11). In five additional cases, the ketiv-qere gives the opposite instruction, that is, to read 3Ms告诉他 for the apparent 3Fs spelling היא (1 Kgs 17.15; Ps. 73.16; Job 31.11; Qoh. 5.8; 1 Chron. 29.16). 2 Finally, in 192 instances in the Pentateuch

---

1 The figures given here are representative, but scholars differ on their counts. Throughout the MT, written-reading agreement on היא obtains in about 300 out of 500 instances.

2 Thus, 1 Kgs 17.15 and Job 31.11 each involve both changes.
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and once in the Prophets, the written form הוא is vocalised with הִירִיק to signal the qere perpetuum הוא. As already noted, in the Tiberian Pentateuch, the orthography and vocalisation agree on the realisation of 3FS הוא just 18 times in 210 cases (see §5.1 for citations).

Scholarly explanations for the routine written-reading mismatch in the Tiberian Pentateuch vary from the graphic to the linguistic. According to one widely accepted version of the graphic approach, the Tiberian Torah ultimately goes back to a manuscript characterised by defective spelling, where both the 3MS and 3FS independent subject pronouns were originally written הוא (cf. the 3MS forms in Arad 18.10, 12; Kuntillet Ajrud 9.1; Lachish 21.5; Mesha' [KAI 181] 6, 21; Deir 'Alla [KAI 312] 1). Into this form in a manuscript of the proto-Masoretic tradition, so it is claimed, a scribe mechanically inserted mater waw, not realising that הוא often represented the 3FS independent pronoun (GKC §32l). In a variation of the same approach, the scribe attempted to distinguish the two pronouns, but wrote waw and yod so similarly (a practice common in the DSS), that later copyists, unable to discern any difference, reproduced waw on all occasions. Even later copyists, loathe out of respect for the manuscript to modify the apparent 3FS הוא spellings, left them uncorrected (Cross 1998, 222–23; JM §39c). Neither explanation accounts for the Masoretic Pentateuch’s 18 exceptions in which the written and reading traditions agree on 3FS הוא (Fassberg 2012, 171–72).

---

3 Rendsburg (1982, 353) gives the figure 120, which is repeated by Fassberg (2012, 171).
A well-known linguistic proposal is that the Hebrew of the Tiberian Torah preserves an epicene 3CS pronoun ם(ו)הֹ הū (Green 1872, 96; Lambert 1946, 34, fn. 3; Rendsburg 1982; Tropper 2001; Morgenstern 2007, 49–50). The spelling in the Tiberian Pentateuch would thus preserve an old feature that is out of line with the corresponding Pentateuchal recitation tradition as well as with the combined written-reading tradition of the rest of the Masoretic Bible. According to recent versions of this approach, the explanation for the epicene pronoun in the Pentateuch is Hittite or Hurrian influence (Rendsburg 1982) or a single 3CS oblique pronoun הָו [hu’ā] (<*huʾāt) (as opposed to distinct 3MS and 3FS nominative pronouns) (Tropper 2001). The problems with approaches of this sort are that (a) the alleged feature is not known outside the written component of the Tiberian tradition as preserved in the Pentateuch; (b) the Semitic languages commonly distinguish 3MS and 3FS pronouns; and, perhaps most decisively, (c) Tiberian BH grammar, e.g., the verbal system, pronominal suffixes, including that reflected in the written component of the tradition in the Pentateuch, consistently reflects gender distinction in the 3rd-person singular.

The current chapter takes as its jumping-off point a different sort of linguistic hypothesis. As suggested by Cohen (2007, 113–15) and buttressed by Fassberg (2012), the היא spelling common to the 3MS and 3FS independent subject pronouns in the written component of the Tiberian tradition reflects distinct morphological forms, namely 3MS *huwa or *hūw and 3FS *hiwa or *hīw, which in the corresponding Pentateuchal reading tradition,
and the Masoretic biblical reading tradition more generally, shortened to \( hū \) and \( hū \), respectively (see further below, §3.0).

### 2.0. Non-Tiberian Biblical and Extra-biblical Evidence

Beyond the Tiberian biblical written and pronunciation evidence, it is instructive to consider additional ancient Hebrew evidence. The rather opaque inscriptional \( 3MS \) form \( הָא \) has already been cited. The quality of its medial vocalisation is uncertain, as is the presence, quality, and quantity of a final vowel (though final long vowels are generally thought to have been marked in ancient inscriptional Hebrew). No \( 3FS \) form is attested in the extant epigraphic corpus.

Babylonian Torah manuscripts know the same phenomenon seen in the Tiberian Pentateuch. Yeivin (1985, 1103) notes the written-reading mismatch in a vocalised Babylonian manuscript at Deut. 11.10.

In DSS Hebrew, alongside the more standard spellings \( הוּא \) and \( הוּאָה \), respectively (Qimron 1986, 57–58; 2018, 261–62; Reymond 2014, 158). The two sets of forms occur in both biblical and non-biblical manuscripts, the former more frequently than the latter. Crucially, where the written component of the Tiberian biblical tradition has \( 3FS \), corresponding DSS manuscripts usually have \( הוּאָה \) or \( הוּא \), showing agreement with the qere perpetuum of the recitation tradition (see §5.2
A minority of BDSS manuscripts appear to match the Tiberian written tradition with 3FS הוָה (see §5.2 for citations; but cf. Reymond 2014, 158).

The combined written-reading tradition of the SP furnishes important information. The written component of the tradition, as evidenced in the Shechem Synagogue Ms 6 (C), consistently has הוָה against Tiberian written 3FS הוָה (Ben-Hayyim 2000, 226, §3.1.4). This is in agreement with the Samaritan pronunciation tradition, according to which הוָה is realised as i.

In BS manuscripts from antiquity and the Middle Ages, 3FS הוָה is consistently distinguished from 3MS הוא.

The same is true for the Tannaitic RH tradition of Codex Kaufmann of the Mishna, where the form is הוא.

Most of the evidence cited in this section shows Second Temple unanimity regarding a realisation of the 3FS independent subject pronoun in line with the standard non-Pentateuchal Tiberian orthography הוָה. According to a straightforward reading of the data, the Tiberian reading tradition of the Torah joins in with the combined Tiberian written and reading tradition of the rest of the Bible and with various Second Temple traditions on pronunciation resembling הִי, including הִיָּא, הִיָּה, and i.

---

4 This assumes that the relevant editor has correctly distinguished waw and yod in texts where the distinction can be anywhere from minimal to non-existent.
3.0. A Linguistic Explanation for 3FS הוא in the Written Component of the Tiberian Torah

Both internal and external evidence militate against the theory that apparently 3FS הוא in the written component of the Tiberian Torah reflects an epicene 3CS pronoun. Beyond the fact that the Semitic languages, in general, and ancient Hebrew, more specifically, routinely distinguish gender in the 3rd-person singular, the Tiberian written tradition of the Torah reflects gender distinction in 3rd-person singular morphology, including pronominal suffixes and the verbal system. An epicene 3rd-person singular independent pronoun would thus from multiple perspectives be exceptional.

Explanations based on the graphic similarity of waw and yod are also probably to be rejected, since they fail to account for the generally correct distinction between waw and yod in other words in the Tiberian Torah and leave a number of cases of standard הוא unexplained.

If the 3FS הוא spelling is not to be attributed to graphic factors, a different sort of the linguistic explanation must be sought. As mentioned above, Cohen (2007, 113–13) has proposed an intriguing alternative. In his view, development of the standard Tiberian 3FS independent subject pronoun הוא may be schematised as follows (Cohen 2007, 114–15):

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
*hi’a-tu & *hi’at & *hi’a & *hiwa & *hiya & *hiy & hi
\end{array}
\]

It is worth quoting Cohen in full:
According to this hypothesis, it appears that the ketiv and the qere before us—הִוָא/י—are in fact nothing but different forms of the same 3FS pronoun, testifying to different stages of development in the form of this pronoun (stage 4 "hiwa [ = * closest] and final stage 7 ُه [ = ُא]), and it is not impossible that these two forms, which were a sort of doublet in Hebrew, served contemporaneously in two parallel linguistic traditions. (Cohen 2007, 115, my translation)

This approach has the advantage of making sense of the otherwise anomalous 3FS spelling ُهو. Moreover, it is not incompatible with the minority DSS spelling הי, which can be viewed as the retention of a comparatively archaic form (Qimron 1986, 57–58; 2018, 261–62; cf. Kutscher 1974, 433–34). In allowing for the contemporaneity of the two pronunciations, it also comprehends diversity both within and beyond the Torah. Finally, the typologically later hi realisation in the Tiberian reading component of the Torah is consistent with the combined written-reading tradition in the rest of the Hebrew Bible, apparently reflecting standardisation of a Second Temple feature with early roots as a minority form.

Yet, Cohen’s approach is not without problems. Fassberg (2012, 175, fn. 13) observes that the conjectured development from stage 3 "hiʾa to stage 4 "hiwa is unexpected, a y glide being expected contiguous to an i-vowel, as in Arabic هي hiya. If "hiwa or "hiw (Fassberg 2012, 177) are behind the spelling of 3FS ُهو in the Tiberian Torah, then one must assume that the unexpected shift of -ʾa to -w(a) was motivated by analogical pressure from the more common corresponding 3MS form, where the development "huʾa to "huwa is expected.
Fassberg (2012, 177) also entertains the possibility that 3fs הוא in the Tiberian written tradition of the Pentateuch reflects the realisation *hū, apparently not as an original epicene pronoun, but as a result of phonetic neutralisation, presumably along the lines of *hiwa > *hiw > hū. In any case, it may be that Cohen’s proposed scheme should be reordered and modified to allow for parallel developments, i.e.,

```
\[1\] *hi’a-tu → *hi’a-ta → *hi’a → *hiya → 5a
\[2\] *hi’a-tu → *hi’a-ta → *hi’a → *hiya → 6a
\[3\] *hi’a-tu → *hi’a-ta → *hi’a → *hiya → 7a
\[4\] *hi’a-tu → *hi’a-ta → *hi’a → *hiya → 7b
\[5\] *hi’a-tu → *hi’a-ta → *hi’a → *hiya → 5b
\[6\] *hi’a-tu → *hi’a-ta → *hi’a → *hiya → 6b
\[7\] *hi’a-tu → *hi’a-ta → *hi’a → *hiya → 7c
```

According to this revised scheme, the Tiberian reading tradition reflects stage 6a, the DSS stages 3, 4, and/or 6a, the Samaritan reading tradition 7a, and the Tiberian written tradition of the Torah 5b, 6b, or 7b (with the passage from stage 4 to 5b due to the aforementioned analogy to 3ms *hu’a > *huwa). It is also not impossible that the 3fs pronunciation hī in the Tiberian Torah in 7c (= 6a) could have developed naturally from *hiw. While the diphthong iw is expected to resolve to ū, the alternative development to i is not unknown (Blau 2010, 97, §3.4.3.3).³⁵

³⁵ It is worth noting that according to the approaches adopted here, the earliest form included a glottal stop, the orthographic representation of which persisted despite its eventual elision. Also, the early form begin-
4.0. Conclusion

On the assumption that the spelling of הִו in the Tiberian Pentateuch represents a linguistic reality different from הִיא of the Tiberian reading tradition, it would not be surprising that it preserves an authentically old variant pronunciation, nor that it should be replaced in the reading tradition by a rival ancient form that became common in Second Temple Hebrew. As a conservative linguistic tradition, the Tiberian recitation component preserves genuine Iron Age features. But as a tradition that crystallised in the Second Temple Period, it was also subject to the standardisation of certain Second Temple conventions.

5.0. Citations

5.1. Tiberian Biblical Tradition

3FS התו: Gen. 2.12; 3.12, 20; 4.22; 7.2; 10.11, 12; 12.14, 18, 19; 14.7, 8; 17.14; 19.20, 38; 20.2, 3, 5, 12; 21.22; 22.20, 24; 23.2, 15, 19; 24.44; 25.21; 26.7, 9, 9, 12, 12; 27.38; 29.2, 9, 25; 32.19; 34.14; 35.6, 19, 20, 22, 27; 37.32; 38.1, 14, 16, 21, 25; 43.32; 47.6, 17, 18; 48.7; Exod. 3.8; 8.15; 12.15, 19; 22.26, 26; 31.13, 14, 14, 17; Lev. 2.6, 15; 5.12; 6.2, 10, 18, 22; 7.20, 21, 27; 10.12, 13, 17; 11.6, 6, 26; 13.4, 8, 11, 20, 22, 23, 25, 25, 26, 28, 28, 28, 42, 52, 55, 57; 14.44; 15.3, 23, 25; 17.11, 14; 18.7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22; 19.8, 20; 20.6, 14, 21; 22.3, 12; 23.3, 30, 36; 25.10, 11, 12, 33; 27.4; Num. 5.6, 13, 14, 18, 28, 31; 8.4; 9.13; 13.18, 19, 20, 27, 32; 14.8, 41; 15.25, 30, 31; 18.19; 19.9, 13, 20; 21.16, 26; 22.4; 32.4; 33.36; Deut. 1.9, 16, 18; 2.20, 34; 3.4, 8, 11, 12, 18, 21, 23; 4.6, 14; 5.5; 9.19, 20; 10.1, 8, 10; 11.10; 14.28; 17.5; 20.20; 21.3, 4, 6; 22.18, 24; 24.4; 29.21, 26; 30.11, 11, 12, 13; Isa. 39.1. 3FS התו: Gen. 14.2; 19.20; 20.5; 26.7; 38.25; 40.10; Exod. 1.16; Lev. 5.11; 11.39; 13.6, 10, 21; 16.31; 20.17, 18; 21.9; Num. 5.13, 14.

 ning with h may well have arisen due to lenition of more archaic ś, as in east Semitic.
5.2. Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

\[3FS וָּאָיָה: 1Q3 f3–4.2 || Lev. 20.11; 1Q13 f23–25.5 || Deut. 11.10; 2Q12 f1.5 || Deut. 10.10; 4Q1 f5.3 || Gen. 35.19; 4Q6 f1.13 || Gen. 48.7; 4Q22 25.7 (2x) || Exod. 22.26 (2x); 4Q22 37.7 || Exod. 31.14; 4Q23 f4.5 || Lev. 14.44; 4Q23 f34ii + 44–50.22 || Num. 5.6; 4Q24 f9i + 10–17.20 || Lev. 22.12; 4Q24 f9ii + 11i + 18–20i.2 || Lev. 23.3; 4Q25 f5.2 || Lev. 5.12; 4Q26b f1.2 || Lev. 7.20; 4Q26b f1.4 || Lev. 7.21; 4Q27 f3ii + 5.7 || Num. 13.18; 4Q29 f1–2i + 3.16 || Deut. 30.11; 4Q29 f1–2i + 3.17 || Deut. 30.13; 4Q30 f12–15.3 || Deut. 11.10; 4Q31 1.15 || Deut. 2.34; 4Q31 2.12 || Deut. 3.23; 4Q33 f17–19.1 || Deut. 21.4; 4Q35 f1.8 || Deut. 1.9; 4Q37 1.6 || Deut. 5.5; 4Q38 f2.9 || Deut. 11.10; 4Q40 f1–3.5 || Deut. 3.21; 4Q41 2.10 || Deut. 5.5; 4Q134 f1.11 || Deut. 5.5; 4Q138 f1.26 || Deut. 11.10; 8Q4 f1.28 || Deut. 11.10; 11Q1 4.7 || Lev. 25.33; XQ3 1.12 || Deut. 5.5. 3FS וָּאָיָה: Mas1b 3.21 (addition) || Lev. 10.17; Mas1b 4.9 || Lev. 11.6; 4Q26 f4.16 || Lev. 17.11; 8Q3 f26–29.19 (2x) || Deut. 11.10.\]
9. THE 2/3FPL EN indiangs

Ancient Hebrew sources exhibit diversity in 2/3FPL morphology, specifically in the endings of 2/3FPL prefix conjugation forms and of FPL imperatives.¹

1.0. The Combined Tiberian Biblical Tradition

In the majority of cases of 2/3FPL prefix conjugation (way)yiqtol forms and of FPL imperative forms, the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition agree on a vowel-final ending written and vocalised נָה. In far fewer cases, they agree on consonant-final endings, such as וָ or וֹ. In the remaining cases, the orthography and vocalisation diverge, resulting in the graphic representation נ (Andersen and Forbes 1986, 180; Barr 1989b, 127–31).² See Table 1.

¹ Excluded from this discussion are forms of the infinitive construct with 2/3FPL affermatives. While these vary between vowel- and consonant-final endings, there are no cases of dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition: וָ: Gen. 30.38; 2 Sam. 20.3; Ezek. 1.9, 12, 17; 42.12; נו-: Jer. 8.7; Job 39.2; Ruth 1.19, 19.

² For a succinct discussion of the relevant ancient Hebrew FPL endings in a broader Semitic context, as well as bibliography, see Blau (2010, 203–4, §4.3.3.1.2n).
Table 1: 2/3FPL endings according to the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition (see §5.1 for references)

|               | נָ | נָ | נָ/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prefix conjugation</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the prefix conjugation, written-reading divergence resulting in the graphic representation נ occurs in 37 of 333 cases. When it comes to the imperative, נ occurs in 3 of 22 cases.

The incidence of mismatch between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition is not evenly distributed throughout the biblical text. For the 2/3FPL prefix conjugation, see Table 2.

Table 2: Distribution of 2/3FPL prefix conjugation forms in Tiberian BH

|         | נָ | נָ | נָ/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the table, instances of Tiberian written and reading dissonance reflected in the consonant-vowel combina-
tion י- congregate appreciably in the Pentateuch, where, indeed, they account for more than a third of the cases (especially in Genesis and Exodus). In Samuel, one-sixth of the 18 cases show י—, while Ezekiel, with far more 2/3FPL prefix conjugation forms than any other book, has an incidence of just over one in ten.

Turning to FPL imperative forms, consult Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of FPL imperative forms in Tiberian BH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>י-</th>
<th>י- י-</th>
<th>י-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though a dearth of data precludes certainty, a few tentative observations may be ventured. First, the variety of forms in Genesis and Exodus is consistent with what was seen above in conjunction with the prefix conjugation. The lack of any consonant-vowel mismatch may be due to the rarity of the forms. Second, the dominance of vowel-final orthography and realisation throughout the rest of the Bible also tallies with the distribution of the prefix conjugation. The outlier is Ruth, where, similar to the case of Ezekiel noted above with regard to the prefix conjugation, a relatively high concentration is characterised by a degree of diversity.

Focusing on the Torah, the variation does not appear to be a function of putative source. On the basis of the division into sources found in Friedman (1997, 246–55), the principal reconstructed documents, i.e., J, E, and P, are all characterised by the use of both י- and י-. Indeed, in four places in the Tiberian tradition, twice in the Pentateuch, a verse contains at least one in-
stance of each alternant: Gen. 30.38; 37.7; 1 Sam. 18.7; Ezek. 16.55. Also, no phonological or prosodic factor governing the preference for one or the other alternants is apparent.

Andersen and Forbes (1986, 180–81) and Barr (1989, 130–31) agree that the difference between יָ and יְ is not to be regarded as merely orthographic, but as reflecting diverse pronunciations, the one vowel-final and the other consonant-final. If so, then the consonant-vowel combination יְ represents mismatch in the combined written-reading tradition. Since orthographic יָ cases and -nā realisations are the norm, it is reasonable to consider the apparent dissonance in cases of יָ a result of the secondary extension of the majority realisation that resulted in the levelling of several non-conforming cases, though their orthography was left unchanged. Admittedly, this is not the only logical explanation. It may simply be that the written and reading components differed in this regard from a very early date, each with a slightly different constellation of forms. The choice between these two approaches is informed via examination of non-biblical and non-Tiberian material.

2.0. Beyond the Tiberian Biblical Tradition

2.1. Non-Tiberian Biblical Material

In non-Tiberian biblical material, dedicated FPL morphology is common. Vowel-final endings dominate to the near exclusion of consonant-final forms, which are, however, occasionally attested.

The Samaritan tradition exhibits its own internal diversity. First, parallel to the 26 cases of Tiberian 2/3FPL prefix conjugation forms ending in יְ, and against the one case with יָ (Gen.
49.26), the SP generally has נ-ו. Two of the exceptions, along with seven other forms, end in נ-ו.\(^3\) Thus, according to the Samaritan written tradition, vowel-final forms outnumber consonant-final forms by a margin of 64 to nine (see §5.2.1 for citations; this compares to the ratio of 44 to 27 in the Tiberian written tradition). Vowel-final forms are even more dominant in the Samaritan reading tradition, where the endings are either -na or, more commonly, -inna (see §5.2.2 for citations).\(^4\)

Samaritan FPL imperatives present written and oral forms consistent with those found in the Tiberian written tradition—שמען šēmān and האזינה ḥāzīna (Gen. 4.23); קראן qērān (Exod. 2.20)—i.e., with no mismatch between the two components of the Samaritan tradition (see §§5.1–2).

Turning to material from the Judaean Desert, and focusing on the 2/3FPL prefix conjugation, BDSS material preserves forms ending in both נ-ו and ס-ו, with the former far more common than the latter. Indeed, of the 73 BDSS cases of prefix conjugation forms with a dedicated 2/3FPL ending, just two have ס-ו, one of which parallels ס-ו in the MT. Overall, where the BDSS preserve forms parallel to those in the MT, agreement between the two on the 2/3FPL ending is the norm; see Table 4.

\(^3\) SP Exod. 1.10 has תקרנה תקרנה against Tiberian תקרנה.

\(^4\) On SH -inna Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 105) explains as follows:

Since the 2nd and 3rd fem. pl. were generally expressed in post-BH by means of 2nd and 3rd masc. pl. forms, the feminine endings may have become somewhat obscure, the doubling of the nun resulted in this case from analogy to forms with object suffixes.
Table 4: 2/3FPL prefix conjugation endings in the BDSS and the MT (see §5.3.1 for citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT וַ-</th>
<th>MT ת-</th>
<th>MT Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDSS וַ-</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDSS ת-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDSS Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BDSS preserve just five FPL imperative forms, all orthographic matches for the וַ- forms in the relevant Tiberian parallels.

Jerome’s Latin transcriptions of BH include a single case of a 3FPL wayyiqtol form. The Tiberian יָֽמְנָה ‘and they mated’ (MT 30.38) is transcribed iaamena (Kantor 2020, 118–19).

2.2. Extra-biblical Hebrew Material

In the nature of things, no relevant 2/3FPL forms appear in the fragmentary corpus of Iron Age epigraphy. Later extra-biblical material is characterised by replacement of dedicated verbal 2/3FPL morphology with 2/3CPL < 2/3MPL morphology (Qimron 2018, 159–60). Thus, for example, the Hebrew of BS lacks any dedicated 2/3FPL morphology. Where the relevant dedicated verbal 2/3FPL morphology is preserved in late extra-biblical Hebrew material, often in citation of the Bible or allusion thereto, it nearly always has vowel-final morphology.

---

5 See Kantor (2020, 118–22) on the omission of any representation of the waw at the beginning of the transcription of this wayyiqtol.

6 See, by way of example, ‘the eyes of God will see his deeds’ (SirA 6r.29 [Sir. 15.19]); ‘על כל על בנות וְהָרֶנָּהוּ שֶׁבֶרֶבַּהוּ’ (SirB 16v.11 [Sir. 47.6]).
When it comes to non-biblical material from the Judaean Desert (including that categorised as rewritten Bible), FPL ḫnah-dominates to the total exclusion of ḫ. This is true of both the 2/3FPL prefix conjugation and the FPL imperative (see §5.3.2 for citations).

Given the shift in RH from dedicated 2/3FPL morphology to 2/3CPL morphology, the Mishna (as represented by Codex Kaufmann) exhibits very few relevant cases. Of the mere nine, eight come in biblical citations, all with ḫnah in both sources (see §5.4 for citations). In another case, the (unvocalised) phrase דע שתכהין עיניו ‘before his eyes darken’ (m. Pe’a 8.9) is part of an interlinear addition. The three FPL forms that end in ḫ in m. Ketubbot 4.11 are in Aramaic. The Mishna also includes five FPL imperative forms, all ending with ḫnah, four of which are direct biblical quotations, with the fifth (m. Nedarim 9.10a) an explicit allusion (see §5.4 for citations).

2.3. Aramaic Material

Though it is of questionable relevance, FPL prefix conjugation morphology in BA, DSSA, TA, and Syriac is consistently consonant-final. The FPL imperative is unattested in BA and DSSA, is consonant-final in Syriac, and varies in TA, e.g., שמעה ‘listen!’ (Gen 4.23); קרא ‘call!’ (Exod. 2.20); איולנה ו הבא ‘go, return!’ (Ruth 1.8).

3.0. Diachronic Considerations

Based on the non-Tiberian and extra-biblical data surveyed above, it is reasonable to hypothesise that the diversity seen in
ancient Hebrew sources, especially in the orthography of the Tiberian written tradition in the Pentateuch, is representative of early diversity, whereby FPL morphology in both the prefix conjugation and the imperative was alternatively vowel- or consonant-final. Even the Tiberian reading tradition preserves a degree of diversity in the form of rare consonant-final FPL imperatives, which are, again, limited to the Pentateuch. Be that as it may, it is difficult to ignore the fact that, by and large, the Tiberian pronunciation tradition patterns like Second Temple Hebrew sources when it comes to FPL verbal morphology, standardising the vowel-final alternant reflected in the majority נ- spelling, even where the orthography י- most likely reflects an original consonant-final ending.

Whether differentiation between Hebrew and Aramaic FPL morphology played any role in the late standardisation of vowel-final FPL verbal morphology is unclear.

While the Tiberian reading tradition both diverges from the apparently early diversity preserved in the written tradition and shows close affinity to Second Temple sources in its levelling of FPL verbal morphology, it is worth emphasising that the specific form that became the standard is not itself an exclusively late feature, but is already common, if not dominant, in the earliest Hebrew evidence. This scenario is in line with the view that the recitation component of the Tiberian biblical tradition crystallised in the Second Temple Period, extending certain late conventions, but at the same time preserves minority Iron Age features.
4.0. Conclusion

The reading component of the Tiberian biblical tradition shows not infrequent dissonance in comparison to the corresponding written component in the case of 2/3FPL verbal endings. In accord with the supposition that the reading component’s development was largely complete by the Second Temple Period, it should come as no surprise that it exhibits both affinity with the corresponding written component, via use of a feature well attested therein, and simultaneously diverges therefrom in agreement with Second Temple material in the standardisation of vowel-final 2/3FPL verbal morphology.

5.0. Citations

5.1. Tiberian Biblical Tradition

Prefix conjugation—נָה: Gen. 3.7; 24.61, 61; 30.38; 31.14; 37.7; 41.2, 3, 4, 7, 18, 20, 21, 53, 54; Exod. 1.10; 2.16, 16, 16, 18; 8.5, 7; Lev. 4.2, 13, 22, 27; 5.17; 7.30; 10.19; 23.15, 17, 17; Num. 27.1, 2; 35.11, 13, 14, 15; 36.3, 4, 6, 6, 11; Deut. 1.44; Josh 17.4; 21.42; 24.7; Judg. 5.26, 29; 7.11; 11.40; 15.14; 1 Sam 3.11; 4.20; 6.12; 7.14; 9.3, 12, 12; 12.10; 14.27; 18.6, 7; 2 Sam. 1.20, 20; 2.7; 20.3; 1 Kgs 3.16, 16, 22; 10.7; 2 Kgs 2.24, 24; 21.12; 22.20; Isa. 3.16, 16, 16; 5.15; 11.7; 13.7, 16, 18; 16.2; 17.2, 7; 27.11; 28.3; 29.18; 30.21; 32.3, 3, 10; 33.17, 17, 20; 35.5, 5; 41.22; 42.9; 44.7, 26; 47.9; 48.3; 49.15, 22; 54.10; 60.4, 8; 65.17, 17; 66.14; Jer. 4.7; 9.16, 16, 17, 17; 14.17, 17; 18.21; 19.3; 24.2, 3, 8; 29.6, 17; 31.29, 30; 32.4; 33.13; 34.3; 44.6, 25, 25, 25; 48.6, 9; 49.2, 13; 50.20; Ezek. 1.24, 25; 6.6, 6; 7.17, 17, 27; 12.20; 13.11, 18, 18, 19, 19, 19, 23, 23; 16.50, 50, 52, 55; 17.23; 18.2, 24; 21.12; 22.14; 23.3, 4, 4, 40, 48, 49; 26.6, 10; 30.7, 17, 18, 25; 31.5, 5, 12; 32.16, 16; 33.13, 16; 34.5, 5, 5, 8, 14, 14, 19, 19, 22; 35.9, 10; 36.10, 38; 37.3; Hos. 4.13, 13, 14, 14; Joel 4.18; Amos 4.3; 8.13; 9.13; Obad. 1.13; Mic. 2.12; 6.1; 7.10, 16; Zech. 1.17; 4.9; 5.9; 6.7; 8.9, 13; 11.9; 14.2, 12; Mal. 1.5; Ps. 17.2; 31.19; 35.10; 37.15, 17; 45.16, 16; 48.12; 51.10; 65.13; 66.7; 69.24; 71.23; 75.11; 78.64; 81.7; 92.12; 97.8; 119.171; 130.2; Job 5.12, 18; 11.20; 17.5, 16; 20.10; 27.4, 15; 39.2, 3, 3, 3; Prov. 5.3; 6.27, 28; 10.27; 23.16, 26; 24.2; 27.20, 20; 30.15; Ruth 1.7; 9, 9, 10, 11, 13, 13, 14, 14, 19, 19, 20, 21; 4.14, 17, 17; Song 4.11; Lam 2.20; 4.1, 17;
5.2. Samaritan Tradition

5.2.1. Samaritan Written Tradition

Prefix conjugation—nu: Gen. 3.7; 19.33, 35, 36; 24.61, 61; 26.35; 27.1; 30.38, 39*, 39; 31.14; 33.6; 37.7, 7; 41.2, 3, 4, 7, 18, 20, 24, 36, 53, 54; 49.26; Exod. 1.17, 17, 18, 19; 2.16, 16, 16, 18, 19; 8.5, 7; 15.20; 25.27; 26.3, 3*; 27.2; 28.21, 21; Lev. 7.30; 10.19; 23.15, 17, 17; Num. 14.45; 25.2; 27.1, 2; 35.11, 13, 14, 15; 36.3, 4, 6, 6, 11; Deut. 21.15; 31.21. n: Gen. 30.38; 33.6; 41.21; Lev. 4.2, 13, 22, 27; 5.17; Deut. 1.44. Imperative—nih: Gen. 4.23; Exod. 2.20, n: Gen. 4.23.

5.2.2. Samaritan Reading Tradition

Prefix conjugation—na: Gen. 3.7; Num. 25.2; Deut. 31.21. -inna: Gen. 19.33, 35, 36; 24.61, 61; 26.35; 27.1; 30.38, 38, 39*, 39; 31.14; 33.6; 37.7, 7; 41.2, 3, 4, 7, 18, 20, 24, 36, 53, 54; 49.26; Exod. 1.17, 17, 18, 19; 2.16, 16, 16, 18, 19; 8.5, 7; 15.20; 25.27; 26.3, 3*; 27.2; 28.21, 21; Lev. 7.30; 10.19; 23.15, 17, 17; Num. 14.45; 25.2; 27.1, 2; 35.11, 13, 14, 15; 36.3, 4, 6, 6, 11; Deut. 1.44; 21.15. Imperative—ān: Gen. 4.23; -na: Gen. 4.23; -in: Exod. 2.20.

5.3. Dead Sea Scrolls

5.3.1. Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Prefix conjugation—DSS nh— | MT nih: 1QIsa 3.22 | MT Isa. 3.16; 1QIsa 3.23 | MT Isa. 3.16; 1QIsa 3.24 | MT Isa. 3.16; 1QIsa 5.2 | MT Isa. 5.15; 1QIsa 10.25 | MT Isa. 11.7; 1QIsa 11.16 | MT Isa. 13.7; 1QIsa 11.24 | MT Isa. 13.16; 1QIsa 11.26 | MT Isa. 13.18; 1QIsa 13.18 | MT Isa. 16.2; 1QIsa 14.4 | MT Isa. 17.2; 1QIsa 14.12 | MT Isa. 17.7; 1QIsa 20.17 | MT Isa. 26.6; 1QIsa 21.22 | MT Isa. 27.11; 1QIsa 22.1 | MT Isa. 28.3; 1QIsa 23.29 | MT Isa. 29.18; 1QIsa 25.2 | MT Isa. 30.21; 1QIsa 26.11 | MT Isa. 32.3; 1QIsa 26.12 | MT Isa. 32.3; 1QIsa 26.20 | MT Isa. 32.10; 1QIsa 27.19b | MT Isa.
33.17b; 1QIsa² 27.23 | MT Isa. 33.20; 1QIsa² 28.21 | MT Isa. 35.5; 1QIsa² 28.22 | MT Isa. 35.5; 1QIsa² 35.19 | MT Isa. 42.9; 1QIsa² 37.13 | MT Isa. 44.7; 1QIsa² 38.4 | MT Isa. 44.26; 1QIsa² 39.28 | MT Isa. 47.9; 1QIsa² 40.9 | MT Isa. 48.3; 1QIsa² 41.15 | MT Isa. 49.15; 1QIsa² 41.23 | MT Isa. 49.22; 1QIsa² 45.8 | MT Isa. 54.10; 1QIsa² 49.8 | MT Isa. 60.4; 1QIsa² 49.11 | MT Isa. 60.8; 1QIsa² 52.27 (2x) | MT Isa. 65.17 (2x); 1QIsa² 54.1 | MT Isa. 66.14; 1QIsa² 55.27 (2x) | MT Isa. 66.17; 1QIsa² 56.19 | MT Isa. 68.9; 1QIsa² 56.20 | MT Isa. 68.9.

5.3.2. Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Prefix conjugation: CD 19.8; 1QM 8.1; 1Q⁰ 15.14; 4Q171 f1–2ii.16 | MT Ps. 37.15; 4Q176 f8–11.12 | MT Isa. 54.10; 4Q268 f1.1; 4Q364 f8ii.2 | MT Gen. 37.8; 4Q364 f8ii.6 | MT Exod. 15.21; 4Q378 f3ii + 4.11; 4Q433a f2.4, 4; 4Q437 f2i.3 | MT Ps. 37.15; 4Q481 f2.2; 11Q19 21.13. **Imperative:** 1QM 12.13, 15, 15, 15; 19.5, 7, 7, 7; 4Q365 f6aii + 6c.6; 4Q492 f1.7, 7.

5.4. Mishna

Prefix conjugation: Nedarim 3.11 (2x) | MT 1 Sam. 1.20 (2x); Soṭa 1.6 | MT Ezek. 23.48; Soṭa 9.9 (2x); MT Hos. 4.14 (2x); ’Arayot 1.22 (2x) | MT Num. 35.14 (2x); Makkot 2.4 | MT Num. 35.13. **Imperative:** Ta’anit 4.8 (2x) | MT Song 3.11 (2x); Mo’ed Qaṭṭan 3.9 | MT Jer. 9.19; Nedarim 9.10 (2x) | 2 Sam. 1.24.
10. NIFALISATION

A well-known example of ancient Hebrew historical development involves the realignment of verbal stems. Over time, many G-stem (*qal*) verbs were replaced by synonymous cognates in other stems (*binyanim*). The present chapter focuses specifically on the shift from G- to N-stem (*nifʿal*). This process, which is here termed *nifalisation*, was neither wholesale nor haphazard. Rather, it was limited chiefly to originally *qal* verbs with stative, medio-passive, reflexive, or more broadly intransitive semantics, including *qal* internal passive forms. The process often resulted in suppletive paradigms, sometimes with only vestigial *qal* representation.

The phenomenon of nifalisation is especially characteristic of Second Temple chronolects—such as LBH, DSS Hebrew, SH, the Hebrew of BS, and RH—though the extent and specific manifestations in each varies. Since a large portion of the Tiberian biblical reading tradition’s crystallisation took place in the Second Temple Period, it is not surprising that nifalisation is also detectable in the Tiberian vocalisation of classical biblical material, specifically in deviations of the Tiberian reading tradition from the consonantal text. Even so, it must be emphasised that Tiberian vocalisation also preserves evidence of resistance to nifalisation and that shifts from *qal* to *nifʿal* are not exclusively late, but extend back into presumably early Tiberian consonantal biblical material.
1.0. Second Temple Evidence

1.1. Tiberian Late Biblical Hebrew

The shift away from medio-passive qal and qal internal passive is seen in developments that characterise Tiberian LBH as contrasted with Tiberian CBH.

1.1.1. כָשַל ‘stumble’

Consider the example of apparent suppletion involving qal כָשַל and nifʿal כָשִל ‘stumble’. On the surface, BH seems to exhibit an indiscriminate mixture of qal and nifʿal, e.g.,

(1) ...ישרואל ואתרימא בְּכָשַל מִשָּׁמְעָם כָשַל גַּמ־יְהוּדֶָ֖ה עִמַָֽם׃

‘...Israel and Ephraim stumble in their guilt; Judah has also stumbled with them.’ (Hos. 5.5)

(2) בְּעֵת־פְּקַדְּתִֵ֥ים יִכָשְּׁלֹׁ֖וּ אָמֵ֥ר יְּהוַָֽה׃

“...at the time that I punish them, they will stumble,” says the LORD. ...“Behold, I will lay before this people stumbling blocks and they will stumble against them...”’ (Jer. 6.15, 21)

Upon closer inspection, however, a situation of suppletion emerges in CBH. Forms are vocalised as nifʿal unless the consonantal spelling is not amenable, in which case qal forms are preserved. It is only in LBH that that the written tradition ‘catches up with’ the vocalisation and one encounters a comparative proliferation of consonantally unambiguous nifʿal forms, e.g., כָּשִל ‘and they will fail’ (Dan. 11.14; see also Dan. 11.19, 33) and כָּשָּׁל ‘and when they stumble’ (Dan. 11.34). This trend continues in QH and RH (see below, §2.1.1; see further Khan 2020, I:58).
1.1.2. Qal Internal Passive > Nifʿal

Another LBH manifestation of nifalisation is replacement of qal internal passive with nifʿal.¹ A useful example involves forms of the qal internal passive יָלַד ‘be born’. These appear throughout the Bible—Torah, Prophets, Writings²—but are rare in LBH (where the sole case, in 1 Chron. 1.19, was likely imported from Gen. 10.25). Conversely, consonantally unambiguous nifʿal alter-

¹ A succinct account of the disappearance of the qal internal passive is given by Fassberg (2001, 254):

One finds in the literature two related explanations for the disappearance of the Qal internal passive. The first is phonic: at a certain stage, Hebrew phonology no longer tolerated a short vowel (in this case u in *qatal) in an open pretonic syllable. The u-vowel, which was the marker of the passive, could be maintained only in a closed syllable; the closing of the syllable was accomplished by secondarily geminating the following consonant. The resulting form with geminated second radical became identical to the Puʿʿal and hereafter was interpreted as Puʿʿal. In the case of the imperfect, forms like יָתַן and יָקַח were reanalyzed as Hofʿal forms with regressive assimilation of the first radical: *yuntan > yuttan and *yulqaḥ > *yuqqah.

The second reason is morpho-semantic: Nifʿal, which may have been originally reflexive in Hebrew, began to take on a passive meaning as well, thus rendering the Qal internal passive redundant.

See Fassberg (2001, 254) for bibliographical references.

² 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.
natives, like qatal נֶלַד and infinitival נֹלַד, preponderate conspicuously in LBH. Consider the parallels:

\[3(a)\] נָלַיָּד לְדוּד בְּחֶבְּרָוָן׃
‘These were born to David in Hebron’ (2 Sam. 3.5)

\[3(b)\] נַשְׁתַּתְיוּ לְדוּד בְּחֶבְּרָוָן׃
‘Six were born to him in Hebron’ (1 Chron. 3.4)

and

\[4(a)\] נָלַיָּד לְהָרָפַה׃
And he, too, was born to the Rapha (2 Sam. 21.20)

\[4(b)\] נָלַיָּד לְהָרָפַּא׃
And he, too, was born to the Rapha (1 Chron. 20.6)

Likewise, while unambiguous spellings of both qal internal passive יָנָה and nif'al יָנָה ‘will be given (3MS)’ come in CBH texts, LBH texts have only nif'al forms, the qal internal passive forms having fallen away. Indeed, more generally in the late corpus consisting of Qohelet, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, Hughes (1994, 76, fn. 20) counts just four cases of the qal internal passive, יֵקִימוּ ‘are snared’ (Qoh. 9.12), יִבְלֹּא ‘have been consumed’ (Neh. 2.3, 13), and the aforementioned inherited יָנָה ‘were born’ (1 Chron. 1.19 || Gen. 10.25). See further Reymond (2016, 1138); Qimron (2018, 221).
1.2. Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew

1.2.1. Late Nifalisation

DSS Hebrew shows continuity of the LBH features listed above, most notably, consonantally unambiguous forms, such as נכשלה ‘stumbled (3MP)’ (CD 2.17; 4Q266 f2ii.17) and נולדה ‘she was born’ (4Q215 f13.4; see also 11Q19 40.6). It also furnishes the earliest unequivocal consonantal evidence of the nifʿal morphology for the Tiberian suppletive verb יִגַש-נִגַש ‘approach’, in the form בהנגשו ‘when he approaches’ (4Q512 f40–41.2) (see below, §§1.3.6; 2.1.2).

1.2.2. Qal Internal Passive > Nifʿal

Additionally, לְנַסָלַת יִנַס ‘will be given (3MS)’ is employed to the exclusion of qal internal passive לְצָלַת. Indeed, the NBDSS present no clear-cut cases of the qal internal passive. Reymond (2016, 1139–40) lists many DSS Hebrew alternatives for MT qal internal passive forms. Qimron (2018, 222) observes that DSS Hebrew develops a nifʿal נָסַלְת ‘be fulfilled, completed’ (infinitival forms at 1QS 10.6; 4Q256 19.5; 4Q270 f3ii.21; 4Q385 f11i.3) corresponding to MT stative qal נָשָלָת.

---

4 According to the tagging in Abegg’s (1999–2009) QUMRAN Accordance module, עָטוּ (4Q417 f1i.23) is qal internal passive, but Qimron (2020, II:148) reads the form as עָטוּ ‘do (not) touch’.
1.3. Samaritan Hebrew

As a biblical tradition characterised by pervasive Second Temple linguistic evolution, it is no surprise that SH also documents the shift in question. Indeed, though transmitting a literary tradition likely rooted in the Iron Age, SH presents a relatively advanced stage of nifalisation compared to other ancient Hebrew traditions. Yet, the Samaritan picture is complicated by several factors. First, like the Tiberian biblical tradition, the linguistic testimony of the SP is composite. It comprises related, but partially independent written and reading components. Crucially, as regards both nifalisation and other linguistic developments, the two components of the tradition present historically distinct stages. Second, while SH both confirms and exceeds the nifalisation seen in several other Second Temple Hebrew traditions, it also evinces qal forms reminiscent of pre-Tiberian Hebrew.

Brushing aside cases of local divergence in which SH nifʿal forms differ from Tiberian qal counterparts due to textual and/or interpretive factors not representative of broader trends, more pervasive Samaritan nifalisation manifests in several ways.

1.3.1. Comprehensive Nifalisation

First, there are Tiberian qal verbs with forms amenable to nifʿal recasting that are consistently read as nifʿal in SH. These are the broadly stative, reflexive, intransitive, and weakly transitive verbs in the following list.

5 For a study focused on nifalisation in the Samaritan biblical tradition, see Hornkohl (2022).
Many such verbs are rarely attested, but a few of the more frequent have conspicuously suppletive paradigms in SH. These include the parallels to Tiberian חָזַק ‘be/become strong’, סָחַר ‘traffic, travel about, engage in trade’, and שָכַח ‘forget’. Forms amenable to reinterpretation—especially in the prefix conjugation—are realised as nifʿal, whereas other forms—in the suffix conjugation, participles, imperatives, infinitives—remain qal. In these cases, no perceptible semantic shift accompanies the morphological shift. Such realignments often tally with late Aramaic use of Dt-stem forms, as seen in the Targums and/or Syriac.

Consider the suppletive relationship of SH G-stem נָחַק āzdāq (5) and N-stem וָיִיָּחַק wiyyāzdāq (6), which occur in successive verses:
The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition

1.3.2. Partial Formal Nifalisation

In the case of the verb מָאָן ‘refuse’, SH presents a suppletive paradigm composed of nifʿal prefix conjugation and piʿel B suffix conjugation, participle, and infinitive (see below, ch. 12, §2.1).

1.3.3. Partial Nifalisation for Grammatical/Semantic Disambiguation

In other cases where the Tiberian tradition makes do with qal forms with varying valency and/or semantics, SH seems to exploit nifalisation for purposes of grammatical and/or semantic disambiguation. Consider the case of the SH counterpart to Tiberian דָבַּק ‘cling’ in examples (7)–(9) (see Hornkohl 2021a, 6–7).
The passages cited in examples (7) and (8) represent suppletion similar to that discussed above: morphologically ambiguous yiqtol forms originally in qal could be recast as nifʿal, while qatal forms preserve qal morphology, because their orthography leaves no room for nifʿal analysis.

Example (9) demonstrates that nifalisation could affect even forms ill-suited to nifʿal analysis, such as the infinitive ולְדָבְּקָה (וּלְּדָבְּקָה) whose original qal form is preserved in MT וּלְּדָבְּקָה.

---

6 The distinction in number between the verb form in the two traditions entails different subject referents. The SP’s singular verb refers across the verse boundary to the singular subject כל חלי ‘every illness’ in the previous verse.
Finally, example (10) testifies to the fact that the shift from G- to N-stem in the case of this verb is not one of mere formal suppletion, but was also evidently exploited for morphosemantic disambiguation. Here, the sole prefix conjugation form of דְּבָכִי that retains qal morphology is strongly transitive (taking an object suffix) and semantically dynamic (‘to overtake’ rather than just ‘cling to’). The rest of the SH prefix conjugation forms of this verb, i.e., those mentioned in (8) and (9), all take objects with -ב and have stative semantics.

Similar morphosemantic disambiguation obtains in the cases of the SH equivalents of Tiberian qal עָבַט ‘take collateral/lend, give collateral/borrow’, כָבַד ‘be/become heavy’, חָגַר ‘gird’, and קָצַר ‘be/become short’ (see Hornkohl 2021, 5–6).

1.3.4. Nifalisation Resulting in Nifʿal B

Alongside its standard nifʿal, SH has a second N-stem (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 117–18). The so-called nifʿal B is a hybrid that incorporates components of the N- and Dt-stems. It has both nifʿal orthography and the middle radical gemination characteristic of hitpaʿʿel, thus partially resembling RH nitpaʿʿal (see below, §1.5). The resemblance is not total, because crucial to the reinterpretation of qal forms as nifʿal B was the routine assimilation of the -t-
infix in some Second Temple Aramaic and Hebrew dialects, such as SA, Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and RH, according to which \textit{hitpa‘el/nitpa‘el} > \textit{hippa‘el/nippa‘el} (Ben-Hayyim 2000, 117–18; Bar-Asher 2016, 209–10). An original \textit{qal} form was not amenable to reinterpretation as a \textit{hitpa‘el/nitpa‘el} due to the mismatch involving the absence or presence of infix \textit{-t-}. Conversely, the \textit{nif‘al B} realisation of original \textit{qal} forms faced no such obstacle, as the \textit{-t-} infix had assimilated, resulting in a form with geminated first and second radicals. Originally \textit{qal} prefix forms and the like could easily be pronounced as \textit{Nif‘al B} forms.

The Tiberian counterparts of these SH \textit{nif‘al B} forms consistently show \textit{qal} morphology, whereas in SH their paradigms are suppletive: \textit{qal} is read where necessary, \textit{nif‘al B} where possible. Again, the Targums also sometimes resort to dedicated middle Dt morphology. Relevant Tiberian verbs with Samaritan \textit{nif‘al B} parallels include \textit{qal} גָבַ֫ר \textit{‘prevail’} and קָשָ֫ה \textit{‘be hard, severe’}, and both \textit{qal} כָלָה \textit{‘finish (intr.)’} and pu‘al כֻלָה \textit{‘be finished’}, in which all prefix conjugation forms were levelled to \textit{nif‘al B} (Hornkohl 2022, 7–9). Consider the Samaritan equivalents to \textit{qal} suffix conjugation והמים ויכסו ההרים in examples (11) and (12).

(11) \textit{ downgrade. אֲמֹתָהוֹ מִלְמַעְלָה גֶּבֶר} || \textit{gēbēru} (גָּבַ֫ר, מִשְׁלי) MT  

‘The waters \textbf{prevailed} above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep.’ (Gen. 7.20; see also Gen. 7.19; 49.26)

(12) \textit{wyiggābbāru} (וּיְ֝גִֽבֵּר, מִשְׁלי) MT  

‘And the waters \textbf{prevailed} on the earth 150 days.’ (Gen. 7.24; see also Gen. 7.18)
In contrast to the G-stem paradigmatic consistency in the Tiberian tradition, the SH verb has a suppletive paradigm. Nifʿal is read where possible, qal where consonantal form precludes nifʿal analysis. TO resorts to dedicated medio-passive Dt-stem verbs in select cases, e.g., MT יבּוּר || TO יכוס; MT יבּוּר (Gen. 49.26) || TO ממהכר; MT יבּוּר (Exod. 17.11) || TO ממהכר.

1.3.5. Qal Internal Passive > Nifʿal

A phenomenon partially related to nifalisation is the well-known replacement of the qal internal passive with alternatives, a process more pronounced in SH than in Tiberian Hebrew. Tiberian qal passive גֻנַב is twice paralleled by orthographic nifʿal alternatives, not just in the reading component of the Samaritan tradition, but in the written component, as well (Gen. 40.15; Exod. 22.6). Nifalisation, however, is not the usual SH alternative to Tiberian qal internal passive. Among the more common strategies are the qal passive participle (parallel to Tiberian paʿul), the 3mpl qal impersonal, and active interpretation.

1.3.6. Conditioned Qal Preservations

Despite the comparatively advanced stage of nifalisation it displays, SH also exhibits conditioned, and possibly secondary, qal forms parallel to Tiberian nifʿal forms. These are suggestive of pre-Tiberian Hebrew. For example, the Tiberian verb נִגַש is fa-

---

7 Interestingly, while the Samaritan written tradition has apparently nifʿal ננגבתי (Gen. 40.15) and nifʿal ננגב (Exod. 22.6) against the Tiberian qal internal passives גנבתי and גנב, respectively, the Samaritan reading tradition differentiates between nifʿal niggānâbti and nifʿal B wniggānnâb.
mously suppletive: *nifʿal* wherever the consonantal text allows, i.e., suffix conjugation (נִגַש) and participle (נִגָּשֶׁה); *qal* where consonantal form precluded *nifʿal* recasting, i.e., prefix conjugation (יִגַש), infinitive construct (גֶשֶת), imperative (גַּש), and participle (נֶגֶשֶׁה) (see below, §2.1.2). For its part, the Samaritan verb is uniformly *qal*, including suffix conjugation (*nָגָשֶׁה*) and participle (*נֶגֶשֶׁה*).

On the one hand, a unified נִגַש-יִגַש *qal* paradigm, as in SH, is precisely what has been hypothesised for pre-Tiberian Hebrew. On the other, it must be emphasised that the apparent Samaritan preservation of *qal* is conditioned, since Samaritan *I*-n consonantal forms are not amenable to *nifʿal* phonology. This is true not just of the prefix conjugation, where—as in Tiberian Hebrew—only those *I*-n forms that preserve a first radical *nun* are eligible for *nifʿal* realisation, but also of the suffix conjugation and certain forms of the participle. This is because—unlike in Tiberian Hebrew—1st-radical gemination applies throughout the Samaritan *nifʿal* paradigm, which would yield such forms as prefix conjugation *

*yinnāgāš*, suffix conjugation *

*ninnāgāš*, and verbal participle *

*ninnāğaš*, none of which suit their respective consonantal spellings, i.e., נֶגָש, יִגַש, and נָגָש. 

---

8 In SH this secondary gemination applies only to participles with verbal semantics; participles with nominal semantics preserve the inherited morphology without gemination (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 193).

9 Other weak roots for which SH regularly has *qal* against Tiberian *nifʿal* include נמ"ל/נמ"ל 'circumcise'; נמ"ט/נמ"ט 'scatter'; נמ"ב/נמ"ב 'surround'; נמ"ם/נמ"ם 'be confused'; נמ"ג/נמ"ג 'melt'; נמ"ס/נמ"ס 'melt'; נמ"ק/נמ"ק 'rot'; חת"ת/נח"ת 'be dismayed'.
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1.4. Ben Sira

Despite unmistakable indications of the late linguistic milieu that it represents, the language of BS is remarkably classical. In terms of the phenomenon of nifalisation here under discussion, however, BS shows unmistakable affinities with other late Hebrew corpora.

1.4.1. Qal > Nifʿal in the Case of Medio-passive Semantics

First, several Tiberian medio-passive qal verbs find nifʿal alternatives in BS. These include נדבק ‘cling’ (SirB 3v.14) (Dihi 2004, 162–65), נדעך ‘go out (of fire), be extinguished, uprooted’ (Mas1h 2.5; SirB 10r.7), and נחכם ‘be wise’ (SirB 7v.13; SirC 4v.3; SirD 1v.9; SirD 1v.10) (Dihi 2004, 162–65), though BS’s classical penchant is displayed in the continued use of qal נדבק and חכם.

1.4.2. Qal Internal Passive > Nifʿal

Second, despite the classical mien of BS’s Hebrew, the corpus attests to only highly equivocal cases of potential qal internal passive forms (Reymond 2016, 1142–50). Moreover, some of the more common BH qal internal passive forms go unused in BS in favour of nifʿal alternatives, such as נלקח ‘was taken (MS)’ (SirB 13v.18; 17v.13; 19r.4) and נתן ‘will be given (MS)’ (SirA 6r.28 || SirB 2v.1 [margin]; SirC 6r.3).

---

10 In Tiberian BH the verbs in question are almost exclusively qal, the lone exception being נדעו ‘they dry up, disappear’ (Job 6.17).
1.5. Rabbinic Hebrew

RH is well known for several processes subsumed in this study under the heading nifalisation.

1.5.1. Qal > Nifʿal in the Case of Stative and Medio-passive Semantics

It has already been mentioned that RH joins LBH and DSS Hebrew in the attestation of consonantly unambiguous nifʿal infinitive וֹוּבַּכָּשְלַת 'and when he stumbles' (m. ṢAvot 4.19), matching the nifʿal vocalisation of MT וֹוּבִכָּשְלַת (Prov. 24.17), in opposition to its qal consonantal orthography. Additional cases of RH nifʿal || MT qal include אבד ‘be/become lost, die’, ארך ‘be/become long’, and חסר ‘lack’ (Bendavid 1967–1971, II:483).

1.5.2. Qal > Niptaʿʿal

Especially typical of RH is replacement of medio-passive qal with niptaʿʿal (often in conjunction with movement of active qal > piʿʿel; see below, ch. 12, §1.5). This is evident in such verbs as נתחמץ ‘become leavened’ (m. Ṣevul Yom 3.4), נמתמלא ‘become full’ (e.g., m. Yoma 5.1 || MT Isa. 6.4), נתרחק ‘be distant, avoid’ (m. Sanhedrin 3.4; m. ṢAvot 2.9), and נשתתק ‘be mute’ (m. Giṭṭin 7.1). These contrast with the Tiberian consonantal tradition, which

---

11 It is worth noting that such authentic nifalisations in reliable Mishna manuscripts are often, due to a biblicising tendency, replaced in printed editions with qal forms. For example, the Eshkol (2000) version of the Mishna reads וֹוּבַּכָּשְלַת in m. ṢAvot 4.19 in agreement with MT Prov. 24.17 and against Kaufmann’s וֹוּבִכָּשְלַת. I am grateful to Geoffrey Khan for reminding me of this matter.
prefers *qal* forms for the relevant semantic values. Turning to the *qal* internal passive—aside from biblical allusions, it is generally absent from RH (Sharvit 2004, 45; Reymond 2016, 1141, fn. 37).  

### 2.0. The Tiberian Reading Tradition of Classical Biblical Hebrew Texts

Since the Tiberian reading tradition crystallised in the Second Temple Period, it is not surprising that nifalisation is also detectable in the oral realisation (vocalisation) of classical, i.e., ostensibly First Temple biblical material, specifically in secondary deviations in the Tiberian pronunciation tradition from the pronunciation implied by the written tradition.

### 2.1. Partial Nifalisation of Intransitive Verbs

**2.1.1. כָשַל ‘stumble’**

A clear case involves the aforementioned shift of *qal* כָשַל > *nifʿal* נִכְשַל ‘stumble’ (§§1.1.1; 1.2.1). As noted above, consonantly unambiguous *nifʿal* forms, especially in the suffix conjugation, have a conspicuously late distribution. Yet, *nifʿal* vocalisation is not restricted to LBH, but is routine in CBH, too. This is because, unlike their suffix conjugation counterparts, the ambiguous conso-

---

12 Biblical allusions include the phrase ‘but if water is put’ (Lev. 11.38) in m. Makhshirin (e.g., 1.1, 2 [4x], 3, etc.) and *תַנָוּר וְכִירַיִם יֻתֶּץ* ‘and oven or stove will be smashed’ (Lev. 11.35) in m. ‘Avoda Zara 3.9. Beyond such allusions, the sole possible case in MS Kaufmann is *היוּלַד* (m. Bekhorot 1.2), but the reading is doubtful (see *Ma’agarim s.v.*).
nantal prefix conjugation form, initially *qal—יִכְשַל*—was amenable to reanalysis as *nifʿal—יִכָשֵל*—in line with Second Temple linguistic trends, as manifested in the LBH written tradition, DSS Hebrew, and RH. It is noteworthy that the *nifʿal* reanalysis extended even to consonantal forms ill-suited to reanalysis, e.g., the infinitive construct *ובכשלו* ‘and when he stumbles’ (Prov. 24.17), which, despite lacking the consonantal *heh* characteristic of a *nifʿal* infinitive construct, is vocalised as *nifʿal* rather than *qal* וֹּכֶּשֶל. The *nifʿal* morphology matches not just the aforementioned LBH consonantal *nifʿal* forms, including infinitival נִכְשָל (Dan. 11.34), but also DSS Hebrew נִכְשֶל (CD 2.17; 4Q266 f2ii.17), and—pointedly—RH וֹּכֶּשֶל (m. ṬAvot 4.19), which is a citation of MT וֹּכֶּשֶל ‘and when he stumbles’ (Prov. 24.17), with orthography updated to match *nifʿal* pronunciation.

2.1.2. נג* נג* ‘approach’

Likewise, the aforementioned suppletion between *qal* prefix conjugation נִגֶש (Exod. 24.14), infinitive construct מִגֶֶ֥שֶת (Exod. 34.30), and imperative גֶש (2 Sam. 1.15; Gen. 19.9), on the one hand, and *nifʿal* suffix conjugation נִגֵ֥שֶׁה (Exod. 33.7) and participle נִגֶשׁ (Exod. 19.22), on the other, is probably due to reanalysis where allowed by the written forms (see above, §§1.2.1; 1.3.6). Significantly, the earliest unambiguous consonantal evidence matching the *nifʿal* vocalisation is found in Second Temple DSS Hebrew: ‘when he approaches’ (4Q512 f40–41.2).

2.2. *Qal* Internal Passive > *Nifʿal*

Similarly, in the Tiberian reading tradition, the replacement of *qal* internal passive with *nifʿal* nearly always occurs except where
spelling precludes it (Böttcher 1866–1868, I:98–105; Barth 1890; Lambert 1900; Blake 1901, 53–54; Ginsburg 1929; 1934; 1936 Williams 1977; Hughes 1994, 71–76; Sivan 2009, 50–51; Raymond 2016). Consider the matter of qal infinitives absolute with cognate nifʿal finite forms in the so-called tautological construction. In several cases of qal-nifʿal mismatch, the consonantly ambiguous nifʿal finite form possibly conceals a qal passive, e.g., סָקוֹל יִסָקֵל ‘he/it will surely be stoned’ (Exod. 19.13; 21.28); עָנ וֹש יֵעָנֵ֗ש (Exod. 21.22); גָנֵ֥ב יִגָנִֵ֖ב (Exod. 22.11); טָרֵ֥ף יִטָּרִֵ֖ף ‘(if) it is torn in pieces’ (Exod. 22.12).

The special affinity concerning nifalisation between the Tiberian reading tradition and Second Temple consonantal traditions is borne out in the data. In Table 1, consider the earliest consonantal evidence for each of seven qal internal passive qatəl

---

13 For the analysis of qal internal passive forms as hofʿal and puʿʿal forms as part of the processes of hifilisation and pielisation, see below, chs 11 and 12.

14 Williams includes the ketiv verb שגלה*, whose reconstructed oral realisation can only be conjecture. Rare in the Bible, the verb is even rarer in post-biblical material. On the relative antiquity of the qere, see above, ch. 3, §1.3.

Excluded from Williams’s list is nifʿal נִקְּבַר ‘be buried’. This may be due to the D-stem passive classification of קֻבֵּר ‘was (were) buried’ (Gen. 25.10). Since D-stem קֻבֵּר* ‘bury en masse’ (Num. 33.4; 1 Kgs 11.15; Jer. 14.16; Ezek. 39.14–15; Hos. 9.6) has pluraotional semantics, which are arguably lacking in the context in question, the form is more likely to be a qal internal passive (see below, ch. 12, §3.0, fn. 18). Moreover, the absence of any consonantally unambiguous biblical evidence for nifʿal נִקָּבַר ‘be buried’—for which all representative forms are in the prefix conjugation—coupled with the fact that unambiguous consonantal evidence of nifʿal נִקָּבַר ‘be buried’ is not extant until RH (m. Moʿed Qaṭan
forms with corresponding \textit{nif'al yiqtol} forms as listed by Williams (1977, 49).

Table 1: Earliest unambiguous consonantal evidence of \textit{nif'al} morphology of suppletive Tiberian verbs with \textit{qal} internal passive \textit{qatal} forms and \textit{nif'al yiqtol} forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb and Gloss</th>
<th>Second Temple Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>דָחָה `push, drive'</td>
<td>BS 13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הָרַג `kill'</td>
<td>43Q372 f3.12; Tannaitic Hebrew (Mishna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חָצַב `hew'</td>
<td>Tannaitic Hebrew (Mekhilta deRabbi Ishmael, Mekhilta Devarim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּרָף `pluck'</td>
<td>Bar Kokhva (XHev/Se30 f1R.7), Tannaitic Hebrew (Mekhilta deRabbi Ishmael, Mekhilta deRabbi Shimon ben Yokhai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָרַט `polish'</td>
<td>Tannaitic Hebrew (Mishna, Sifra, Tosefta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שָרַף `burn'</td>
<td>Tannaitic Hebrew (Mishna, Mekhilta deRabbi Ishmael, Sifra, Seder Olam Rabba, Sifre Bemidbar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שָטַף `rinse'</td>
<td>Tannaitic Hebrew (Sifra, Sifre Bemidbar, Sifre Devarim)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. \textit{Nippaʿel/Hippaʿel} (< \textit{Nitpaʿel/Hitpaʿel}) < \textit{Nifʿal}

There is one further affinity between the Tiberian and Samaritan reading traditions worthy of emphasis in this connection: the occurrence of \textit{nifʿal} \textit{B}, that is the N-stem pattern with geminated middle radical common in SH and late Aramaic dialects (see above, §1.3.4), which is not unrelated to RH’s characteristic \textit{nitpaʿal} (above, §1.5.2). Tiberian vocalisations of this sort are relatively rare. In the case of some Masoretic forms, the vocalisa-
tion reflects a *nitpa*ḥʾel/*nifʿal* B analysis (with gemination in first and middle radical), though the spelling is amenable to simple *nifʿal* interpretation, e.g., אֲנַשֶּׁה ‘and (his kingdom) will be exalted’ (Num. 24.7); מַנְשֵׁר ‘and (the blood guilt) will be atoned for’ (Deut. 21.8); נוֹשֵׁר ‘and (all women) should take warning’ (Ezek. 23.48); נָשָׁה ‘(hatred) will be covered’ (Prov. 26.26); תִּנַשֵּׂא ‘(and the sons of the violent of your people) will rise up’ (Dan. 11.14); אֶנְשֵׁה ‘so he was exalted’ (2 Chron. 32.23); several of these come in exilic or post-exilic material. In a few cases, however, suffix conjugation forms in texts from no earlier than the Exile cannot be read as *nifʿal*, and are more plausibly interpreted as *hitpa*ḥʾel forms with assimilated tav: לאֹבֵשׁ ‘they prophesied’ (Jer. 23.13); יחֵבֵשׁ ‘and I will be satisfied’ (Ezek. 5.13); יחֵבֵשׁ ‘and I prophesied’ (Ezek. 37.10). Clearly, these probable consonantal *hitpa*ḥʾel forms with assimilated tav lend credence to the vocalisation of the preceding apparently *nitpa*ḥʾel forms (see below, ch. 13, §2.1).

### 3.0. Iron Age Epigraphy and the Tiberian Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

Though many *nifʿal* readings of otherwise ambiguous consonantal forms are probably secondary, a crucial consideration is that the use of *nifʿal* and, therefore, the potential for nifalisation, were not restricted to post-exilic times. In other words, while the association between nifalisation and Second Temple Hebrew is meaningful, it is not exclusive. There are also indications of early nifalisation, specifically in classical consonantal evidence.
3.1. Early Nifʿal Usage

Especially important in this connection are early nifʿal forms that are primary derivations rather than instances of secondary nifalisation of originally qal forms. From Iron Age inscriptions, consider the nifʿal imperative הָשָׁמֵר ‘take care!’ (Lachish 3.21) and the infinitive לָהַנְּבִים [כֶת] ‘to be he[wn]’ (Siloam 1.2). While the former is analysable as semantically middle, the latter would seem to be medio-passive.

Turning to BH, in the case of many common orthographically unequivocal nifʿal verbs, qal counterparts are rare or even non-existent. Thus, נִפְרַד ‘separate (intr.)’ has consistent nifʿal spelling and vocalisation throughout BH. Likewise, though a vestige of qal שָאַר ‘remain’ (1 Sam. 16.11) is once attested in CBH, the synonymous nifʿal נִשְּאַר is unambiguously represented in all biblical chronolects.

3.2. Qal Internal Passive > Nifʿal

The same holds true for the qal internal passive’s replacement by nifʿal. There is ample early unambiguous consonantal evidence of

\[\text{N-stem נָאַא ‘groan’ occurs in the eighth-century Deir Alla inscription (see KAI 312 B.12).}\]

nifʿal semantically equivalent to qal internal passive, e.g., נִלְְקָָ֑ח ‘(the Ark of God) has been taken’ (1 Sam. 1.4, etc.; cf. נַלֵּקַח, נַתַּן).

‘(straw) will (not) be given’ (Exod. 5.18; 2 Sam. 21.6 ketiv; cf. נָתָן). In light of this evidence, the nifʿal’s eclipsing of qal internal passive should be seen as a process that was already underway in the Iron Age, only reaching its conclusion in the Second Temple Period.

Given the antiquity of nifʿal’s association with middle and medio-passive semantics, along with the gradual pace of language change, it stands to reason that cognate qal internal passive and nifʿal forms might have coexisted over an extended period of time. Hughes (1994, 74–75) has sought to discern semantic and syntactic differences in CBH, before the qal internal passive fell out of use. He argues that in some cases the nifʿal serves as an intransitive against the strictly passive force of the qal internal passive, but the pervasiveness of this distinction is questionable. As such, the possible co-occurrence of qal internal passive and passive nifʿal forms, even in close proximity, should not be dismissed. Consider examples (13).

(13) וֹ ָׂ֑וְּכִַֽי־יַכֶה֩ אִָֹ֨יש אֶת־עַבְּדֶ֜וֹ אַ֤וֹ אֶת־אֲמָתוֹ֙ בַשֵֵ֔בֶט וּמֵ֖ת תַּחַת יָד֙ נָק ֹׁ֖ם יִנָקִֵֽם׃ אֵ֥ךְ אִם־י֛וֹם אֵ֥וֹ יוֹמֶַ֖יִם יַעֲמָֹׂ֑ד לֹ אֵ֥יֵ֖ו כִֵ֥י כַּסְּפֶ֖וֹ הַֽוּא׃

‘When a man strikes his slave, male or female, with a rod and the slave dies under his hand, he shall be avenged. But if the slave survives a day or two, he is not to be avenged, for the slave is his money.’ (Exod. 21.20–21)

There seems no reason to doubt the authenticity of the stem diversity between the qal infinitive absolute and nifʿal finite cognate in the tautological construction נָקִֹ֖ם יִנְָקֵ ם ‘he should surely be
avenged’ (Exod. 21.20) or between the aforementioned nifʿal and the following verse’s qal passive שְׁאַל מָּה אֶעֱשֶה לֵךְ ‘he will (not) be avenged’ (Exod. 21.21).

A similar consideration applies to the contrasting cognate forms in bold in example (14).

When they had crossed, Elijah said to Elisha, “Ask what I shall do for you, before I am taken from you.” And Elisha said, “Please let there be a double portion of your spirit on me.” And he said, “You have asked a hard thing; yet, if you see me being taken from you, it shall be so for you, but if you do not see me, it shall not be so.”’ (2 Kgs 2.9–10)

The morphological diversity of the neighbouring nifʿal אֶלְָקַח ‘I am taken’ (2 Kgs 2.9) and qal passive participle לֻקָּח ‘being taken’ (2 Kgs 2.10) indicates the chronological coexistence of the two forms.

Similar stem diversity may also be original in cases such as qal passive נַתַּן (Num. 26.54) and nearby nifʿal נִתַּן eight verses later (Num. 26.62)—though the total absence of qatal נֻתַן* raises suspicions. While many cases of qatal נַתַּן may not involve dissonance between the consonants and vocalisation, at least some probably reflect original נֻתַן* reread as nifʿal.

Finally, consider the preservation of qal internal passive נַתִּן ‘let there be given’ in the qere of 2 Sam. 21.6 against the apparently synonymous nifʿal נִתַּן in the ketiv. Hughes (1994, 76) opines:
In this instance it seems likely that the Qere has preserved the original reading, providing an interesting contrast to the normal pattern of revocalisation. Here, the process of replacing *qal* passive forms by *niphal* forms has affected the consonantal text, but has not affected the Masoretic reading tradition.

This may be correct. Yet, it bears emphasising that the shift to *nifʿal* in the written tradition allegedly responsible for the *ketiv*-*qere* dissonance may well reflect truly ancient diversity in the combined Tiberian written and reading tradition. In other words, given evidence for the coexistence of the *qal* internal passive and *nifʿal*, this may be a genuine instance of early textual fluctuation.

### 3.3. Early Nifalisation of Participial Forms

Returning to the previously discussed *qal* > *nifʿal* shifts יֻלַד > נולַד ‘be born’ and כָשַל > נִכְשַל ‘stumble’—while unambiguous consonantal evidence of N-stem finite and infinitival verbal forms is limited chiefly to late material, the relevant N-stem participles—with consonantly unambiguous forms—are attested in CBH sources. It may be relevant that forms such as הַנוֹלָדִים ‘the ones born’ (Gen. 48.5; see also Gen. 21.3; 1 Kgs 13.2) and נִכְשָלִים ‘feeble ones’ (1 Sam. 2.4) have nominalised adjectival, rather than truly eventive semantics. Such substantival and descriptive participle functions, conveying characteristics rather than actions, perhaps proved fertile ground for the initial *nifʿal* encroachment into semantic values formerly belonging to *qal*.\(^\text{17}\) Even so, the

\(^{17}\) I am grateful to my friend and colleague Geoffrey Khan for a helpful conversation on this point. Not unrelatedly, Khan (2020, I:80) raises the possibility that the *nufʿal* < *nifʿal* shift in the realisation of Chronicles’
Iron Age epigraphic and CBH usage of unambiguous consonantal *nifʿal* forms with eventive and actional semantics (see above, earlier in this section) confirms that the transparent middle marking of intransitive, medio-passive, and passive verbs via nifalisation is not exclusively late, but can legitimately be characterised as an Iron Age process the effects of which became most perceptible in Second Temple Hebrew.

### 4.0. Conclusion

It has often been claimed that secondary developments in the reading component of the Tiberian tradition that was wedded to the CBH written component are due to anachronistic, post-biblical impositions of RH onto BH (Lambert 1900; Ginsberg 1929; 1934; 1936; see also Blau 2010, 213–14), “[b]ut the discoveries of the Qumran texts and subsequent research on Second Temple Hebrew show that many of the later features underlying the vocalisation existed already in the Second Temple period” (Joosten 2015, 30). In the specific case of nifalisation, affinities between the Tiberian reading tradition, on the one hand, and the LBH written tradition, DSS Hebrew, SH, the Hebrew of BS, and RH, on the other, demonstrate that the linguistic development in question had taken place long before the Masoretes engaged in the preservation and transmission of the tradition in the Middle Ages.

Jeremy Hughes discussed the Tiberian secondary vocalisation shift from *qal* internal passive to *nifʿal* in a study entitled
“Post-Biblical Features of Biblical Hebrew Vocalisation.” Notwithstanding the provocative title, Hughes (1994, 75–76) offers a remarkably nuanced summary on the relevant process of nifalisation:

First, it represents a continuation of a process which had begun in classical biblical Hebrew, where the niphal conjugation replaced the qal passive conjugation as the normal syntactic passive of most verbs. Secondly, this process was also continued in late biblical Hebrew, where the niphal conjugation replaced the qal passive conjugation as the normal syntactic passive of all verbs. [emphasis in the original]

The most revealing element in Hughes’s summary is the pronounced continuity between the Tiberian reading tradition and both CBH and LBH. Given the already advanced stage of the shift in LBH, there is arguably no reason to class the Tiberian reading tradition’s penchant for nifalisation a ‘post-biblical’ feature of vocalisation. Rather, this proclivity for nifʿal seems very much in line with LBH conventions, though it also preserves features lost in more representative forms of Second Temple Hebrew, like LBH, DSS Hebrew, SH, BS’s Hebrew, and RH. This all points to the plausibility of a theory whereby the Tiberian reading tradition crystallised around the time that the LBH texts were being written. If so, it may be expected to preserve a great deal of authentic First Temple detail along with evidence of secondary development rooted in Second Temple linguistic drift.
11. HIFILISATION

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

1.0. Second Temple Evidence

1.1. Tiberian Late Biblical Hebrew

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

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

qal זָנַח > hif‘il הִזְנִיחַ ‘reject’

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

qal לָעַג > hif‘il הִלְעִיג ‘mock’

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

qal בָזָה > hif‘il הִבְזָה ‘ despise’

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

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

² Excluded from this discussion is the form וּוְּהֶאֶזְּנִ יח ‘(canals) will become foul’ (Isa. 19.6) on the grounds that it represents a separate lexeme. Cf. יחוּזֶנֶה (4Q56 f10–13.11) || יחוּזֶנֶה (1QIsa 15.10).
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69.34; 73.20; 102.18; Prov. 14.2; 15.20; 19.16; Est. 3.6; Neh. 2.19; 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Chron. 36.16), whereas the apparently synonymous *hifʿil* infinitive לְהַבְזְוֹת comes in BH only in Esther (1.17).

*qal* רָעַד > *hifʿil* הִרְעִיד ‘tremble’

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

*qal* שָׂחַק > *hifʿil* הִשְׂחִיק ‘laugh’

If the *hifʿil* in 2 Chron. 30.10 has the meaning ‘laugh’, then this comes in place of the CBH *qal* form with that meaning.

1.1.2. *Qal* > *Hifʿil* Movement in the Case of Stative and Inchoative Verbs

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

---

3 The shift of transitive semantics from *qal* to *hifʿil* evidently opened the door to the innovation of middle semantics for the *qal*, as in לְהַבְזֵ֥וֹת לִשְּלַֹ֤ח יָד֙ בְּמָרְּדֳכַ יְּבַדֵ֔וֹ ‘but it was disdainful in his eyes to send his hand against Mordechai alone’ (Est. 3.6).
Table 1: Qal and hif'il of צל"ח in the MT (see §5.1 for citations)

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

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

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

qal שָמֵן > hif'il הִשְמִין ‘become fat’

The classical, semantically predictable combination of stative qal (Deut. 32.15, 15; Jer. 5.28) and transitive hif'il (Isa. 6.10) contrasts with the late stative hif'il in LBH (Neh. 9.25).
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$qal רָשַע \rightarrow hif'il מְרַשֵׁשׁ 'be wicked, commit wickedness'

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

$qal גָדַל \rightarrow hif'il הִגדִיל 'grow, become great'

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

1.1.3. Hifilisation of Qal II-y Verbs

בי"ן

A different manifestation of hifilisation particularly (though not exclusively) characteristic of Tiberian LBH has resulted from the formal identity of the prefix conjugation forms of $qal$ and $hif'il$ II-y verbs, e.g., יָבִין 'he understands, will understand'. Consider, in Table 2, the distribution of unequivocal $qal$ forms, ambiguous $qal/hif'il$, and unequivocal $hif'il$ forms.
Table 2: Qal and hif'il of י"ב in the MT (see §5.1 citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>qal ambiguous</th>
<th>hif'il ambiguous</th>
<th></th>
<th>qal ambiguous</th>
<th>hif'il ambiguous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dan.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neh.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chron.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The case of forms of the root ר"ז ‘act arrogantly’ is similar. There are unequivocally qal forms (Exod. 18.11; Jer. 50.29) and forms amenable to both qal and hif'il analysis (Exod. 21.14; Deut. 1.43;
Unambiguously hifʿil forms are also attested in the NBDSS, BS, and RH.

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

Clear qal, hifʿil, and equivocal derivations of ר"ו, ר"ט, and כ"א ל"ב, and כ"א

Excluded here on semantic grounds is the morphologically ambiguous והֲשִַֽמֹתִ֙ויּוּ ‘and (Jacob) cooked’ (Gen. 25.29).
lent) have derided me’ (Ps. 119.51), ‘and to deride’ (4Q184 f1.2), and ‘to contend’ (4Q390 f2i.6) all come in acknowledged late material.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>qal</th>
<th>ambiguous</th>
<th>hif'il</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נוהי</td>
<td>Gen. 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוהי</td>
<td>Exod. 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוהי</td>
<td>Num. 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוהי</td>
<td>Deut. 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוהי</td>
<td>Sam. 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נוהי</td>
<td>Kgs 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Another interesting case is that of qal יוסי against hif'il יוסי ‘add, repeat’. See Table 4.
Table 4: *Qal* and *hifʿil* of יִשְׂרָאֵל in the MT (see §5.1 for citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>qal</em> ambiguous</th>
<th><em>hifʿil</em></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>qal</em> ambiguous</th>
<th><em>hifʿil</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nah.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zeph.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L. PROPH.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENT.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Qoh.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lam.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. PROPH.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dan.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neh.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chron.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WRITINGS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LBH+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Related to the late extension of *hifʿil* was exploitation of C-stem morphology for disambiguating distinct nuances originally subsumed within the *qal*, for example the use of *qal* יָלַד for the procreative act associated with both mother ‘bear’ and father ‘beget,'
sire’ (Driver 1882, 209; Joüon 1920, 359; Hendel 2000, 38–42).
Consider Table 5.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Qal</th>
<th>Hif’il</th>
<th>Qal</th>
<th>Hif’il</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Qoh.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dan.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neh.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chron.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>35 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

5 Hendel (2000) focuses on this issue in a discussion of the dating of Pentateuchal sources. On the one hand, he argues that “the complementary distribution of יָלַד (Qal) for ‘beget’ in the J source and הֶלִיד (Hiphil) for ‘beget’ in the P source is attributable to a diachronic development in Classical Hebrew Biblical” (Hendel 2000, 42), i.e., not diachronic development between CBH and LBH. On the other hand, he dates P to the exilic or early Persian Period (Hendel 2000, 46). Hendel’s figures differ from those given above, because he focuses on genealogies, whereas the figures here are mechanical, including metaphorical usages. For example, one of the cases of qal יָלַד in Jeremiah should probably be considered a counterexample of the semantics ‘father, sire’ for qal יָלַד. Consider the verse שַאֲלוּ נָא וְרְאוּ אִם יָלַד זָכָּר ‘Ask now, and see, can a man bear a child?’ (Jer. 30.6). While technical genealogical usage of qal יָלַד, ‘father, sire’ is still found in LBH, the form had become especially associated with female agency prior to LBH.
יָלַד, ‘beget’ was effectively supplanted. Outside of LBH proper and Qohelet, the figures are qal 27, hif’il 66. In LBH proper and Qohelet combined, they are qal 8, hif’il 90. Moreover, six of the eight LBH qal cases come in texts borrowed from the Pentateuch (1 Chron. 1.10, 11, 13, 18, 18, 20 || Gen. 10.8, 13, 15, 24, 24, 26).

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

1.2. Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew

1.2.1. The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

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

The lone exception in this regard is the verb represented by qal יָסַף, and hif’il הוֹסִיף. In the case of this verb, there are several instances in CBH material in which an unequivocal DSS hif’il parallels a MT qal or ambiguous form:

(1) יָסַף ‘they will (not) continue’ (4Q30 f24.2) || MT יָסֵָ֧ף ‘they will (not) continue’ (Deut. 13.12)
(2) יָסַף ‘will add’ (4Q35 f1.9) || MT יֹסֵָ֧ף ‘will add, is adding’ (Deut. 1.1)
A few such cases centre on Deut. 5.25:⁶

(3) ...מַיִן `we continue’ (4Q37 3.7) || MT `if (we) continue’ (Deut. 5.25)

(4) ...מַיִם `if (we) continue’ (4Q129 f1R.13) || MT אִם־יֹסְּפִ יָם...

(5) ...מַיִם `we continue’ (4Q135 f1.4) || MT `if (we) continue’ (Deut. 5.25)

(6) ...מַיִם `if (we) continue’ (4Q137 f1.30–31) || MT אִם־יֹסְּפִ יָם...

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

1.2.2. The Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Less anchored within the biblical text, NBDSS material exhibits more pronounced effects of hifilisation than the BDSS. This is manifest in (a) the use of hifʿil verbs with biblical distribution limited to LBH ( Kb, קב, לְעַב, ר), (b) the replacement of stative/intransitive qal verbs with hifʿil cognates, as in LBH (ח, ל), (c) the employment of unambiguous hifʿil forms of originally qal verbs with ambiguous prefix conjugation forms ( Kb, קב, ל, ה, מ), and (d) exploitation of morpholog-

---

⁶ In examples (3)–(6), the potential sequences of bothsmouth in ר and would have been vulnerable to graphic and/or phonetic corruption.
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Table 6 provides a quantitative summary.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>qal ambiguous</th>
<th>hif'il</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>זנח&quot;ח</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ&quot;לע</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב&quot;וב</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רבע&quot;ד</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמח&quot;ק</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>של&quot;ז</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יש&quot;ף</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רש&quot;ע</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גד&quot;ל</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes, the NBDSS fail to exhibit clear-cut cases of the diagnostically late hif'il verbs (ד"ג, ש"ח, כ"ע) or appear to favour the more classical alternative (ב"ו, ב"ר). In other cases, the characteristically late hif'il usage is conspicuously dominant (ש"ח, כ"ע, ב"ו).

1.3. Samaritan Hebrew

A scriptural corpus embodying related but semi-independent written and reading components, the Samaritan biblical tradition has roots extending at least as far back as the Iron Age, but at the same time shows clear signs of late development. Morphological shifts from G- to C-stem in the Samaritan tradition, though noted, have not generally been discussed as part of a grammatical trend. Indeed, they go unmentioned in Ben-Hayyim’s discussion of regular stem shifts (2000, 222–24, §§2.15.4–7), relegated to a few examples in a paragraph that begins “Other alternations between
stems do not display general tendencies, but each individual verb must be explained separately, so that discussion of them belongs in a lexicon, not a grammar” (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 224, §2.15.8). As the ensuing discussion demonstrates, the applicability of this statement to hifilisation in the Samaritan tradition may be questioned, as the phenomenon is both more pervasive in SH than Ben-Ḥayyim implies and exhibits affinities to the same process in other Second Temple traditions. The relevant verbs may be divided into several categories.

1.3.1. Hifilisation of ר"ש 'sing' and שמ"נ 'hide'

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

Similarly, while Tiberian qal סֶנֶם is twice paralleled by its Samaritan qal counterparts, in the prefix conjugation (Exod. 2.12) and the passive participle (Deut. 33.19), on another occasion, MT qal הָיִם || SP יֶתְמוּ wyṭmōn ‘and he hid (tr.)’ (Gen. 35.4),
with no obvious distinction in meaning separating the qal and the hif‘il (also in the Masada BS material, RH, and the Tiberian CBH reading tradition; see below, §§1.4–5; 2.0).

1.3.2. Hifilisation of יָלַד ‘bear (a child); beget, father, sire’

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

1.3.3. Hifilisation of יָסַף ‘add, repeat, do again’

In one further case of partial hifilisation relative to the Tiberian tradition, the combined Samaritan written and reading tradition testifies to increased use of unequivocal hif‘il forms of יָסַף. There is one case in which an unambiguous MT qal || SP hif‘il and 14 cases in which an MT form of ambiguous stem || SP unambiguous plene hif‘il. The opposite situation obtains just twice (see §5.3 for citations). Indeed, the situation in SH is one of orderly, if compli-
cated, suppletion: all 3rd-person *qatal* forms and all participles are *qal*; all 1st- and 2nd-person *qatal* forms are *pi‘el*; all *yiqtol* forms and infinitives are *hif’il*.

1.3.4. Extensive Hifilisation

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

---

7 Some apparent SP *qal qatal* forms of יָדָסִף, especially those parallel to Tiberian *weqatal* forms, are arguably interpretable as secondary *hif’il yiqtol* forms.

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

9 In the remaining three cases, all consonantally unambiguous, the MT and SP agree on a *nif‘al* (Lev. 1.4), *hif’il* (Lev. 26.34), and passive *qal* participle (Deut. 33.24).

10 See Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 224, §2.15.8) on יָד. Regarding יָדַבָח: one form is unambiguously *hif’il* according to the reading component of the Samaritan tradition, while the remaining three are analysable as either *pi‘el* or *hif’il* (Ben-Ḥayyim 123, §§2.2.1.2.2–3).
1.3.5. Hifilisation and Levelling

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

(7) וַתְּשֹׁפְּנוּ שֶׁלֶשֶׁה יְרָחִים: וְלֹא יָכְלָה הַצְּפִינוֹ...

‘...and she hid him (qal) three months. And she could no longer hide him (hifʿil)...’ (Exod. 2.2–3)

(8) וְתָשִׁפְּנָה שלשה ירחים: ולא יכלה עוד הצפינהו...

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

1.3.6. Hifilisation in the Case of Rare Verbs

Finally, there are rarely occurring verbs in the Pentateuch that are qal in the MT and hifʿil in the SP, some representative of
broader hifilisation patterns: חָש "ך 'be/become dark' (Exod. 10.15; cf. RH, CBH), ע"ך 'advise' (Exod. 18.19; Num. 24.14; cf. Aramaic C-stem אמלך), ע"ך 'blow' (Gen. 2.7; cf. BH), ר"ך 'bind' (Gen. 22.9), צ"ך 'observe' (Gen. 31.49).

1.3.7. Hifilisation Resulting in Suppletion

Qal-hif'il suppletion is comparatively more common in SH than in the Tiberian Torah. The suppletive paradigm of חָנ"י characteristic of the MT (§§1.1.3; 2.1) is also found in the SP. Consider also consistently qal Tiberian חָנ"י 'show mercy'—in the SP, conversely, it is generally qal where required by consonantal spelling (Gen. 33.5, 11), but otherwise hif'il (Gen. 43.29; Exod. 33.19, 19; Num. 6.25; Deut. 7.2; 28.50), including a hif'il reading in opposition to qal spelling: וְּחַנֹתִי את אֲשֶר אָחֵֹ֔ן 'and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious' (Exod. 33.19a). Various suppletive patterns obtain in the case of שָׁב' 'stink' (qal Exod. 7.18; hif'il Exod. 7.21; 8.10; 16.20), וָיְֹוִ נְֹו 'repay, bear (fruit)' (qal Gen. 50.5, 17; hif'il Num. 17.23; Deut. 32.6), וַשָּׁב' 'thrust' (qal Num. 35.20; hif'il Num. 35.22; Deut. 6.19; 9.4), וַהֹֹו 'oppress' (qal Exod. 3.7; 5.6, 10, 13, 14; hif'il Deut. 15.2, 3), וְֹוִ 'close' (qal Gen. 19.6, 10; 14.3; hif'il Gen. 2.21; 7.16), וׁ 'arrange' (qal Exod. 40.4; Lev. 1.7, 8; 6.5; hif'il11 Gen. 22.9; Exod. 27.21; 40.23; Lev. 1.12; 24.3, 4, 8), and

11 Ben-Ḥayyim (1977, 217) analyses the SH forms wyārēku (Gen. 14.8) and יראתי 'arrīkti (Num. 23.4) as pi`el. The former is alternatively analysable as hif'il, which is indeed the analysis given in Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 375a, cf. 375b).
1.3.8. Hifilisation and Semantic Disambiguation

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

ר"ח 'distance'

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

ש"בר 'buy/sell food'

SH also uses morphology to distinguish distinct senses of ש"בר 'buy and sell food' left indistinct in Tiberian Hebrew. Whereas the MT is content with a qal verb שָבַר meaning both 'buy food' (Gen. 41.57; 42.2, 3, 5, 7, 10; 43.2, 4, 20, 22; 44.25; 47.14; Deut. 2.6) and 'sell food' (Gen. 41.56), it also has a hif'il form meaning 'sell food' (Gen. 42.6; Deut. 2.28). SH more strictly observes the morphosemantic distinction, reading Joseph’s action in וַיִשְּבֹר.
‘and he sold (grain to Egypt)’ (Gen. 41.56) as hif’il ישבור wyasbar.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{1.4. Ben Sira}

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

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

To Moreshet’s list may be added:

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

\textsuperscript{12} It is unclear why the same qal-hif’il mismatch between MT and SP occurs in MT אכל תִּשְׁבְּרוּ מֵאִתָם בכֶֶ֖סֶף ‘food you will buy from them for money’ (Deut. 2.6) || SP אכֵל תָּשִּׁברִיו מַאתָם מַכַּף אֹ כֶל תִּשְׁבִרֵ֙נִי ‘food for money sell to me’ (Deut. 2.28), which has a hif’il in both the MT and SP, or the hif’il has a nuance of ‘actively trade’.

\textsuperscript{13} He also lists הזיף ‘reprove’ (SirA 4r.25 || SirB 1v.12 || Sir. 11.7), which seems to reflect hifilisation relative to RH and Aramaic G-stem נ”י.
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- בחרות ‘act arrogantly’ (SirA 1r.8 || Sir. 3.16; see above, §§1.1.3; 1.2.2)
- הרוחה ‘reprove, stir up the wind’ (Mas1h 6.10 || Sir. 43.16)
- הלעיג ‘mock’ (SirB 4v.4 || Sir. 31.22; see above, §§1.1.1; 1.2.2)
- העיד ‘arrange’ (SirB 9r.3 || Sir. 39.17; SirB 19v.12 || Sir. 50.18; cf. above, §1.3.7)
- הצלמי ‘hide’ (SirA 1v.12 || Sir. 4.23; SirC 2a.3 || Sir. 20.31; SirC 2a.4 || Sir. 20.31; SirB 11r.7 || Sir. 41.15; SirB 11r.7 || Sir. 41.15)
- 현 ‘buy’ (SirB 7v.2 || Sir. 37.11)
- בקשיש ‘become hard’ (SirB 3r.4 || Sir. 30.12)
- просмотр ‘look’ (SirB 13v.11 || Sir. 44.8)

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

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

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

---

14 In context, העריך can be understood in its classical meaning of ‘estimate’, whereas העריך is open to a causative interpretation.
• exclusive use of *hifʿil* הַזָּלִד rather than *qal* הָלִד in the sense of ‘father, sire’ (Mas1h 3.10 || Sir. 41.9; SirA 4v.26 || Sir. 11.33; SirB 10v.18 || Sir. 41.9; SirB 10v.18 || Sir. 41.9;

• dominance of *hifʿil* הַזָּלִד to the exclusion of *qal* הָלִד (SirA 1r.16 || Sir. 3.27; SirA 1v.25 || Sir. 5.5; SirB 8r.5 || Sir. 37.31; SirB 13r.12 || Sir. 43.27 [?]; SirC 2r.7 || Sir. 5.5; SirC 1b.10 || Sir. 3.27; SirD 1v.20 || Sir. 37.31);

• comparatively frequent incidence of intransitive *hifʿil* הָלָל (Mas1h 2.25 || Sir. 41.1; SirA 3v.11 || Sir. 9.12; SirB 8v.1 || Sir. 38.13; SirB 9r.4 || Sir. 39.18; SirB 10v.8 || Sir. 41.1; though possible cases of the *qal* are also attested: SirA 3r.18 || Sir. 8.10; SirA 4v.7 || Sir. 11.17; SirB 8v.2 || Sir. 38.14; SirB 13r.11 || Sir. 43.26).

1.5. *Rabbinic Hebrew*

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

1.5.1. *RH Hifʿil* || *MT Transitive Qal*

ך"מ ‘hide’

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

ך"מש ‘draw, extend’

In *BH* the *qal* is normally transitive, with *nifʿal* serving for intransitive (Isa. 13.22; Ezek. 12.25, 28), though the *qal* can also be
intransitive (Judg. 20.37; Job 21.33; Neh. 9.30 [?]); the same is generally true in RH, but a transitive hifʿil has also appeared.

נש"א ‘raise (a signal flare)’

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

شم"ט ‘unfasten, remove, cancel (debt, oath)’

Qal in BH (on the apparent hifʿil in Deut. 15.3, see §§1.3.5); in RH the qal continues in literal senses (‘unfasten, remove’; cf. its nifʿal passive/intransitive), while the hifʿil is reserved for cancellation of debts (m. Sheviʿit 10.1–3) and oaths (m. Shevuʿot. 7.8) and for letting fields lie fallow (Sifra, BaHar, parasha 2, ch. 3 [p. 107, col. 3]).

1.5.2. RH Hifʿil || MT Intransitive Qal

חכ"ם ‘be/become wise’

In BH the qal is stative ‘be wise’ (e.g., Deut. 32.29; Prov. 23.15) and inchoative ‘become wise’ (e.g., Prov. 6.6; 9.9; 19.20), the only hifʿil being causative (Ps. 19.8); in RH, the hifʿil can be inchoative (m. Bava Batra 10.8; m. ʾAvot 2.5).
The BH qal ‘mourn’ never takes a direct object (2 Sam. 3.31; internal object in Gen. 50.10; it takes ו, e.g., Gen. 23.2, or י, e.g., 2 Sam. 11.26), though nif’al is clearly passive (Jer. 16.4; 25.33); RH also has an intransitive qal (m. Yevamot 16.5) and passive nif’al (m. Shabbat 23.4), but adds a hif’il either transitive (m. Mo’ed Qatan 1.5) or intransitive (m. Megilla 3.3).

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

1.5.3. RH Hif’il || MT Transitive and Intransitive Qal

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

BH qal forms dominate, with both transitive (e.g., Gen. 18.4) and intransitive/reflexive (e.g., Exod. 2.5) meanings of ‘wash, rinse’ (there are also rare qal passive [Ezek. 16.4; Prov. 30.12] and hitpaʿel forms [Job 9.30; Dan. 3.28]); the RH qal is typically in-
transitive/reflexive (e.g., m. Sheviʿit 8.11) or transitive/reflexive with body parts (e.g., m. Yoma 8.1), while the hifʿil functions in both of the latter senses (e.g., Sifra, Nedava, parasha 11, ch. 1 [p 10, col. 4]; ʾEmor, parasha 4, ch. 2 [p. 96, col. 4]) and more prototypically transitive senses (e.g., m. Shabbat 9.3).

1.5.4. RH Hifʿil || Rare BH Qal

"חמ"ץ ‘ferment, be/become leavened’

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

"טע"ן ‘load’

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

"כח"ש ‘become thin’

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

"פש"ע/פש"ע ‘step, march’

The BH qal hapax means ‘step, march’ (Isa. 27.4); in RH the root is normally ופין, with the qal continuing and the innovation of a synonymous hifʿil (e.g., y. Berakhot 1.1).
Assuming that the BH usage in Ps. 45.2 means ‘express’, RH exhibits persistence of the qal (e.g., y. Berakhot 2.1) and innovation of a synonymous hifʿil e.g., (y. Berakhot 4.1).

A BH hapax qal meaning ‘darken (intr.)’ (Job. 30.30); cf. RH hifʿil (e.g., m. Negaʿim 1.5, 5) and hofʿal (m. Sukkot 4.9).

1.5.5. RH Hifʿil Innovations

Moreshet also lists hifʿil RH root innovations: ‘heap, stack’, ‘form a crust, scab’, ‘return (intr.), repeat’, ‘hide (tr.)’, ‘wait’, ‘arrange’.\(^\text{15}\)

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

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

- strong preference for hifʿil בַּיָּן;
- occurrences of hifʿil שֶׁמֶּשׁ (t. Giṭṭin 7.13; Sifre Devarim 315; y. Sanhedrin 1.1; frequently in the BT);

\(^{15}\) From this list, several roots cited by Moreshet have been omitted due either to absence of the hifʿil form from the authoritative RH manuscripts cited on the Maʿagarim site of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, e.g.,矫正 ‘prune’, צַז ‘become ill’, יְדִיב ‘disturb, drive away’, פַּשׂ ‘accuse’, or to semantic remoteness relative to the BH qal, e.g., בָּשָׁם הָךְ ‘cease’.
• strong preference for hifʿil הוליד over qal ילד with masculine subjects, in the sense of ‘father, sire’;
• dominance of hifʿil הוסיף to the near exclusion of qal יסף;
• dominance of hifʿil intransitive הצלח.

2.0. The Tiberian Reading Tradition of Classical Biblical Hebrew Texts

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

2.1. נָח ’lead, guide’

The root נָח ‘lead, guide’ is represented in Tiberian BH by a paradigm that is largely suppletive. Consider Table 7.
Table 7: Qal and hif‘il forms of נָח"י according to the Tiberian reading tradition (see §5.4 for citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>qal</th>
<th>hif‘il</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suffix conjugation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive construct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefix conjugation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to the suffix conjugation and the imperative, the dominant morphology is qal. Against this background, it is telling that there are no qal prefix conjugation forms in the 17 potential cases. This is even more suspicious when one considers the fact that one of the infinitive construct forms realised according to the reading tradition as a hif‘il has the orthography of a qal, namely, לְּנָחַתּוּ ‘to guide them’ (Exod. 13.21). Lacking the expected heh of a hif‘il infinitive, it seems likely that the consonants presuppose qal לְּנָחַתּוּ*, in line with the aforementioned qal suffix conjugation and imperative forms. Interestingly, the only other infinitive construct with this root is the unambiguous hif‘il לְּנָחַתּוּ ‘to guide them’ (Neh. 9.19) in an LBH allusion to this very verse.

It is also to be noted that one of the two unequivocally hif‘il suffix conjugation forms (Neh. 9.12) comes in LBH (on the other, see below, §3.0). According to a plausible reading of the data, early stem diversity characterised verbs with the root נָח"י. This is to say, the process of hifilisation was underway well before the era of LBH. Yet it was by no means complete. If so, however, why according to the reading tradition are qal forms restricted to imperatives and qatal forms? Surely, given the apparent early incidence of qal imperatives and suffix conjugation forms, one might expect at least some incidence of qal infinitives and prefix conjugation...
gation forms, rather than consistent hifʿil vocalisation. Here, again, the reading tradition appears to have extended an ancient feature in line with Second Temple preference for the C-stem. Where hifʿil could be read without undue deviation from the consonantal orthography, i.e., in yiqtol forms, it was so read. The hifʿil analysis was extended even in opposition to the consonantal spelling of infinitival לִנְחֹתָם ‘to guide them’ (Exod. 13.21), because this was considered close enough phonetically to the expected מְנָחַתָם.

2.2. טָמַן ‘hide, bury’

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

2.3. Hofʿal of II-w/y Verbs as Evidence of Hifilisation

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

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

While the preceding paragraphs detail departures of the Tiberian reading tradition from the pronunciation tradition implied by the consonantal text in line with Second Temple linguistic developments, it is important, for the sake of balance, to highlight conservatism, even archaism, in the reading tradition. One relevant phenomenon involves qal verbs with prefix conjugation forms in the yiqtol pattern (Yalon 1971). Consider, for example, forms representative of the root גֵּן: the suffix conjugation form יָגֵן ‘and I will defend’ (2 Kgs 19.34 || Isa. 37.5; 2 Kgs 20.6 || Isa. 38.6) and the infinitive absolute גָנוֹן ‘protecting’ (Isa. 31.5b) are unambiguously qal, whereas the prefix conjugation יָגֵן ‘will protect (3MS)’ (Isa. 31.5a; Zech. 9.15; 12.8) is alternatively qal yiqtol or hif’il. Since there are no unambiguous hif’il forms in BH, and
since the qal infinitive absolute occurs alongside the equivocal prefix conjugation in the same verse (Isa. 31.5), the verb is plausibly analysed as uniformly qal in BH (Blau 2010, 222–23, §4.3.5.2.3.2). This contrasts with orthographically unequivocal RH hifʿil forms, such as הֵמֶן (e.g., ‘Aravit, fourth blessing, In. 4), מְנַע (e.g., Mekhilta deRabbi Ishma‘el, BeḤodesh [Yitro], parasha 1 [p. 204]), and הָלֲגֵן (e.g., y. Pesahim 7.12 [p. 35b]).

In a similar way Yalon (1971, 46–47) explains such forms as ‘they bend their tongue like their bow for deceit’ (Jer. 9.2; otherwise consistently qal); רַדְּבַק ‘they too pursued them in the battle’ (1 Sam. 14.22) and even רַדְּבַק ‘and the Philistines pursued Saul and his sons’ (1 Chron. 10.2), and even רַדְּבַק ‘they overtook the people of Dan’ (Judg. 18.22)—the latter on the assumption that the i so reminiscent of hifʿil results from a lengthening of the original short i vowel of the qal yaqtel pattern. It is from qal forms with yaqtel prefix conjugation forms, opines Yalon, that many unambiguous hifʿil forms developed. Basing himself partially on the likes of Barth (1889; 1891, 117, 147, 119–20, 136, 285–86, 305), Böttcher (1866–1868, II:436), and Brockelmann (1908–1913,

---

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

17 Cf. the causative hifʿil in בֶּאֶשֶר יָדַּבַּּ֣קְּׁתִי כֵּן אֶל־מָתְנֵי־אִֵ֗ישׁ הָאֵ֖זֶר יִדְּֽבַּּ֣ק ...כַּאֲשֶֽׁר אֵלַי אֶת־כָּל־בֵּֽית יִשְּרָאֵּ֖ל... ‘...as a loincloth clings to a man’s waist, so I have made the whole house of Israel... cling to me’ (Jer. 13.11; cf. Deut. 28.21; Ezek. 3.26; 29.4).
Yalon argues for the preservation of qal yaqtel and/or related infinitival or imperatival forms representing such roots as, אב”ד, אב”ל, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י, אב”ו, אב”י. Many of these have apparently suppletive qal-hif’il paradigms, on the basis of which it may be postulated that unequivocal hif’il forms secondarily arose.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>qal</th>
<th>hif’il</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffix conjugation</td>
<td>יָסַף</td>
<td>הוֹסִיף</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participle</td>
<td>יָסַף</td>
<td>הוֹסִיף</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefix conjugation</td>
<td>יָסַף (וַיָּסֵף)</td>
<td>הוֹסִיף (וַיָּוסֵף)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>*סֵף</td>
<td>*הוֹסֵף</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive construct</td>
<td>(לָ)סֶפֶת &gt; סְפוֹת/לִסְפוֹת</td>
<td>(לְ)הוֹסִיף</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

18 Yalon (1971, 43) also adduces opinions among Jewish interpreters, such as Ibn Janaḥ, Rashi, and Samuel David Luzzatto. Cf. Bergsträsser (1918–1929, II: 80, 82, 127), who for many of the forms suggested by Barth rejects a qal yaqtel explanation, adopting instead the view that the vocalisation is simply wrong.
ative alternatives are expected (e.g., Gen. 4.2; Lev. 5.16, 24; 37.31; Num. 5.7; 22.19; Deut. 13.1; 18.16) and the apparent use of the 3rd-person jussive where the participle is expected (Isa. 29.14; 38.5). It entails the assumption that the qal I-y infinitive construct נָסַף in the Mesha’ Stele (KAI 181.21) was realised as if it were a III-y form in the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition. Such a situation of parallel paradigms presumably evolved from an original qal, whose yaqtel < PS yaqtil prefix conjugation spurred the secondary formation of unambiguous hif’il forms. The diachronic character of the process is manifest in the distribution of unequivocal consonantal qal and hif’il forms as well as forms with matres or vocalisations that unambiguously identify the binyan.

Table 9: Distribution of qal and hif’il forms of יָסַף according to the various layers of the Tiberian biblical tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unequivocal consonantal</th>
<th>prefix conjugation vocalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qal</td>
<td>hif’il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophets</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Former)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Latter)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-LBH)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LBH+)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to the distribution of forms of qal יָסַף and hif’il יָסַף, the various Masoretic corpora exhibit conspicuous differences that appear to have diachronic significance. Thus, in MT LBH+, there is virtually no dissonance between the three types of evidence: hif’il morphology predominates to the near exclusion
of qal in unequivocal consonantal forms; vocalisation of yiqtol is exclusively hif'il; and hif'il prefix conjugation vocalisation is consistently matched by exclusively plene hif'il orthography.19 The morphological harmony among consonantal text, vocalisation, and matres lectionis in Persian Period material tallies with other evidence confirming a special affinity between the Tiberian vocalisation and the period in which LBH+ texts were composed.

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

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

20 In the passage’s context of harvesting, ‘gather’ is at least as apposite as ‘add’. Vulgate congregantes reflects the former; LXX πρόσθεμα, TO λῆψας, and the Syr λῆψας the latter. The Samaritan evidence is varied. The ST has לְּהוֹסִיף ‘multiply’. For the meaning ‘gather’ one expects qal לְּאסף in Samaritan as well as Tiberian Hebrew; indeed, the hif'il is otherwise unknown. Also, the Samaritan pronunciation lısāf reflects neither לֵאסף nor לְּהוֹסִיף, but seemingly לְּאסף ‘bring to an end’. Cf. MT תֹאסִפָון || SP תושפונים (Exod. 5.7), where, again, the context is amenable to both ‘continue’ and ‘gather’. Similar cases of possible conflation occur within the Tiberian tradition: אָסָף and אָסָף (Jer. 8.13; Zeph. 1.2), אָסָף and אָסָף (1 Sam. 18.29; 2 Sam. 6.1); see Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 143, 213).
mony in LBH+, striking dissonance obtains in the Pentateuch. Unambiguous qal consonantal forms and the rare incidence of plene orthography with mater yod to signal hif’il morphology contrast with rather common hif’il vocalisation. The complexity of the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition in the Pentateuch is further manifested in the preservation of archaic qal yaqṭel prefix conjugation morphology, according to which forms like non-jussive יָסֵף are to be analysed as cases of the indicative qal yaqṭel prefix conjugation, not as short jussive hif’il forms.

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

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

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

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

A reasonable hypothesis for historical development might run as follows. An early situation of dominant qal morphology gradually gave way to one of increased hifʿil usage due in part to hifʿil-like qal yaqtel forms. This second stage was characterised by the continued use of both consonantally unambiguous and ambiguous qal forms as well as by an increase in consonantally and orthographically unambiguous hifʿil forms. Depending on the realisation and spelling of ambiguous forms, various manifestations of suppletion might have obtained.
Intriguingly, the sorts of suppletion encountered in the Masoretic corpora described above show a certain diachronic progression. The clearest situations are in LBH+ and the Pentateuch: whereas LBH+ texts show virtually no suppletion—hif’il dominant according to all components of the tradition—much of the suppletion in the Pentateuch seems to be secondary—qal dominant both consonantally and orthographically, hif’il restricted chiefly—though not exclusively—to vocalisation. The nature of the suppletion in the Prophets is more difficult to interpret. It may be largely organic—there being a mix of unambiguous qal consonantal forms together with hif’il forms on which vocalisation and spelling with mater yod agree. Alternatively, of course, the greater use of mater yod for unequivocal hif’il spelling in the Prophets vis-à-vis the Pentateuch may be due to a secondary spelling revision that impacted non-Torah CBH material more than the Torah. Limited support for such a theory emerges from the fact that, in comparison to the Pentateuch, the Prophets show increased incidence of plene spelling with both yod and waw in the relevant (way)yiqtol forms of יסף and הוֹסִיף. What is clear is that, whatever its origin, there is more in the way of qal-hif’il suppletion to deal with in the Prophets than in either the Pentateuch or LBH+.

3.0. The Tiberian Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

The foregoing sections have focused mainly on the secondary and late character of hifilisation in various ancient Hebrew corpora and traditions. Such a characterisation is correct, but also poten-
tially misleading, as it is not the whole story. It must be empha-
sised that no historical phase of Hebrew—biblical or extra-
biblical—is devoid of consonantly unambiguous hif‘il forms.

Second, while many of the instances of hifilisation dis-
cussed above represent innovations restricted to Second Temple
times, in several cases hif‘il harbingers—sometimes, but not al-
ways, minority forms—predate the post-exilic period. This is true
of hif‘il forms of such roots as יִלָּד, יִנָּל, יִסָּף, יֶלְזָה, and
רְיָב, all of which, to varying degrees, show hif‘il distribution ear-
lier than LBH (see §5.1 for citations). Indeed, in some cases, like
that of הֵולֵד ‘father, sire’, hif‘il usage is dominant throughout all
historical stages of ancient Hebrew according to the consonantal
tradition. In the case of לֶזֶף and רְיָב, whose hif‘il verbal forms are
limited to demonstrably late material, it may be that hifilisation
began in participial forms with nominal or adjectival semantics,
since these are the only relevant hif‘il forms that crop up in pre-
LBH material (for a similar phenomenon in the process of nifali-
sation, see above, ch. 10, §3.0).

The case of qal יָסֶף, versus hif‘il הוֹסִיף exemplifies several im-
portant points. First, though the vocalisation in the Pentateuch
and the Prophets is probably somewhat anachronistic—involving
the hif‘il reinterpretation of a number of apparently original qal
forms in line with Second Temple tendencies unambiguously evi-
denced in late consonantal evidence—in no part of the Hebrew
Bible, including those parts considered the most ancient, is the
vocalisation tradition the lone witness to hifilisation of יָסֶף.

Second, in its use of unambiguous plene hif‘il spellings for
ַיָּסָף, specifically, and for hif‘il forms, more generally, the ortho-
graphic tradition itself evinces several chronological windows on the hifilisation process—considerably less advanced in the Torah, nearly complete in LBH, and at an intermediate stage in the Prophets. Seen from a different perspective, since orthographic evidence for the hifilisation of י"ש comes substantially earlier than the advent of the Tiberian vocalisation signs, it is clear that the hifilisation shift reflected in the medieval Tiberian reading tradition significantly predates medieval times, extending back to the Second and First Temple Periods.

4.0. Conclusions

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

5.1. The Tiberian Biblical Tradition

Table 1

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

Table 2

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

Table 3

| וּלְשָׁנָה | qal—Gen. 24.27; Exod. 13.17, 21 (כַּפַּרְתָּנָה); 15.13; 32.34; Isa. 7.2; 58.11; Ps. 5.9; 27.11; 60.11; 77.21; 108.11; 139.24; ambiguous—Num. 23.7; Deut. 32.12; 1 Sam. 22.4; 1 Kgs 10.26; 2 Kgs 18.11; Isa. 57.18; Ps. 23.3; 31.4; 43.3; 61.3; 67.5; 73.24; 78.14, 53, 72; 107.30; 139.10; 143.10; Job 12.23; 31.18; 38.32; Prov. 6.22; 11.3; 18.16; hif'il—Gen. 24.48; Neh. 9.12, 19. |
11. Hifilisation

Table 4

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

Table 5

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

5.2. NBDSS

ן"ש: ambiguous—1QH® 8.36; 4Q381 f46a+b.6 (ן"ש [?]); hifʿil—1QH® 17.7, 11; 4Q460 f9i.7. י"ש: hifʿil—1QpHab 4.2. י"ש: qal—CD 7.18; 1QpHab 4.2;
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1QH a 12.23; 13.22; 15.26; 4Q365 f6aii +6c.1; 4Q396 f1–2ii.10; 4Q397 f6 13.9; 4Q434 f1i.2; 4Q437 f1.2; 4Q508 f2i.2; ambiguous—1QpHab 4.5; 4Q285 f3.4; hifʿil—CD 9.4. p"yw: ambiguous—1QH a 11.36. p"yw: qal—4Q266 f10ii.12; 4Q269 f11i +15.1; ambiguous—1QS 7.14; 1QpHab 4.4, 6; 4Q171 f1–2ii.12; 4Q259 1.13; 4Q380 f3.2; 4Q434 f7b.3. n"by: qal—4Q416 f8.1; ambiguous—1Q27 fii.5; 4Q219 2.29; 4Q221 f1.7; 4Q299 f2.1; hifʿil—CD 13.21; 11Q19 58.21. y"yw: qal—CD 20.29; ambiguous—1QS 4.24; 1QH a 5.33; hifʿil—CD 20.26; 1Q5 1.2; 1Q34bis f3ii.4; 4Q174 f1–3ii.3 (|| Dan. 12.10); 4Q184 f1.3; 4Q266 f3ii.6; ambiguous—1QH a 11.36. y"yw: ambiguous—4Q364 f18.2 (|| Num. 14.17). y"yw: qal—CD 1.1; 4Q268 f1.9; 4Q413 f1–2.4; ambiguous—CD 1.8, 10; 13.8; 1QS 11.22; 1QH a 8.13; 9.39; 20.30, 36; 22.30; 2Q27 f1.4; 4Q169 f3–4ii.4; 4Q256 23.1; 4Q264 f1.10; 4Q266 f2i.5, 14; f9i.18; f9ii.5; 4Q268 f1.8; 4Q298 f3–4ii.9; 4Q372 f8.6; 4Q377 f2ii.2; 4Q381 f1.2; f3.15; f45a+b.1; f76–77.8; 4Q382 f15.2; 4Q390 f1.6; f2i.7; 4Q397 f14–21.10; 4Q401 f16.4; f77.3; f189.2; 4Q418a f8.2; 4Q421 f1aii–b.14; 4Q424 f3.2; hifʿil—CD 2.14; 8.12; 13.5; 19.24; 1QS 3.13; 4.22; 6.15; 1Q5a 1.5; 1QH a 4.33; 5.13, 14, 30; 10.20; 18.23; 19.31; fc3.4; 1Q34bis f3ii.3, 4; 4Q249a f1.2; 4Q267 f1.6; 4Q270 f2ii.21; 4Q298 f1–2ii.2; 4Q299 f3.4.3; 4Q302 f2ii.2; 4Q303 f1.1; 4Q372 f2.5; f3.3; f8.4; 4Q379 f22.4; 4Q381 f45a+b.1; f47.3; f49.2; f85.1; 4Q387 fa.4; 4Q398 f14–17ii.4; 4Q402 f4.14; 4Q408 f3+3a.7; 4Q415 f11.5, 6; 4Q416 f4.3; 4Q417 f1i.1, 14, 18; f1ii.10; 4Q418 f2+2a–c.7, 8; f17.2; f81 +81a.15; f102a+b.3; f221i.5; f13ii.4, 5; f158.4; f176.3; f205.2; f221.2, 3; f227.1; f237.1; 4Q418a f7.2; 4Q423 f7.7; 4Q428 f10.6; 4Q443 f2.8; 4Q504 f1–2Rii.17; 4Q509 f4.4; f12i–13.3; 4Q525 f6ii.2; f4ii.18; 5Q13 f1.9. y"yw: qal—4Q514 f1i.7; ambiguous—4Q364 f13a–b.2; 11Q19 56.11; hifʿil—4Q171 f3–10iv.15; 4Q511 f68.4. y"yw: qal—1QS a 1.13; 1Q176 f1–2i.2; 4Q299 f62.2; 4Q417 f2ii.14; ambiguous—1QS 4.23; 1QH a 17.23; 25.15; 1Q36 f2.1; f10.1; 4Q175 1.15; 4Q185 f4ii.3; 4Q251 f4–7i.2; 4Q299 f59.2, 7; 4Q418 f81 +81a.7; hifʿil—4Q390 f2i.6. y"yw: qal—4Q468i f1.1; hifʿil—1QpHab 8.6; 4Q184 f1.2. y"yw: qal—4Q408 f3 +3a.7; hifʿil—1QS 9.18; 4Q256 18.1; 4Q259 3.16. y"yw: qal—4Q252 1.19, 20; ambiguous—4Q252 1.16; 4Q416 f2ii.10; 4Q417 f2i.18, 20; 4Q418 f137.2; f199.2; PAM43685 f48.2; hifʿil—1QS 2.11; 6.14; 1QpHab 6.1; 8.12; 11.15; 1QH a 9.37; 1Q14 f8–10.7; 4Q265 f4ii.3; 4Q266 f6iv.8; 4Q286 f7i.8; 4Q298 f3–4ii.5, 6, 7, 8; 4Q299 f6ii.18; f30.5; 4Q416 f2ii.6; f1ii.7; 4Q418 f81 +81a.17; f162.3; f221.3; 4Q420 f2.3; 4Q436 f1a+b.2; 4Q502 f3.1; 4Q503 f15–16.10; 4Q525 f1.3; 11Q19 54.6; 56.18; 61.11; y"yw: hifʿil—4Q427 f7.18 (Qimron 2010, I:102, fn. 18). y"yw: hifʿil—1QS a 2.11; 4Q180 f1.5; 4Q225 f2i.8; f3ii.11; 4Q226 f7.3; 4Q338 2.1. 3.1.
5.3. Samaritan Hebrew

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

5.4. The Tiberian Reading Tradition

רי"ר: qal—Gen. 24.27; Exod. 13.17; 15.13; 32.34; Isa. 7.2; 58.11; Ps. 5.9; 27.11; 60.11; 77.21; 108.11; 139.24; hif’il—Gen. 24.48; Exod. 13.21; Num. 23.7; Deut. 32.12; 1 Sam. 22.4; 1 Kgs 10.26; 2 Kgs 18.11; Isa. 57.18; Ps 23.3; 31.4; 43.3; 61.3; 67.5; 73.24; 78.14, 53, 72; 107.30; 139.10; 143.10; Job 12.23; 31.18; 38.32; Prov. 6.22; 11.3; 18.16; Neh. 9.12, 19.
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 piʿʿel forms in all but their respective active and passive participial forms, it can be difficult to detect qal > piʿʿel 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‘ʿel verbs manifests LBH pielisation:

1.1.1. בֵּרֵר ‘purify’

In Tiberian BH, the pi‘ʿel 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 hitpaʿʿel (Ps. 18.27) occur. Significantly, probable piʿʿel forms are found in the NBDSS (1QS 1.12; 4.20; 1QHa 7.23; 4Q369 f1ii.5) with likely cases in RH (m. ʿEruvin 4.5; m. Tamid 2.5). The verb has a D-stem Aramaic cognate.

1.1.2. גֵאַל ‘defile’

Most occurrences of verbs with this root are late in Tiberian BH. Nifʿal forms come in historically questionable Zephaniah (3.1) as well as transitional or early post-exilic texts (Isa. 59.3; Lam. 4.14). The piʿʿel (Mal. 1.7), puʿʿal (Mal. 1.7, 12; Ezra 2.62; Neh. 7.64), and hitpaʿʿel (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 גֹאַל* in Neh. 13.29.

1.1.3. חִקֵר ‘investigate’

Qal חָקַר ‘search, investigate, explore’ occurs 22 times in the Hebrew Bible, while the nifʿal חָקַר אָל ‘(un)explored, (un)measured, (im)measurable’ comes five times; the piʿʿel appears only
in Qoh. 12.9. It has also been identified in the NBDSS at 4Q420 f1a–b.3 (see below, §1.2.2).

1.1.4. תִּלֵל ‘cover, overshadow’

תִּלֵל ‘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 הָעָלָה ‘become dark’ (Neh. 13.19) and hif’il הָעָל ‘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 מַעַט (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 common RH puʿʿal participle ממועט ‘small, few’ (e.g., m. Peʾa 8.4).

1.1.6. נִסֵך ‘pour out (a libation)’

Against the piʿʿel in 1 Chron. 11.18, there occur throughout Tiberian 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. ‘Avoda Zara 5.6; m. Zevahim 13.6). The Targumic cognate is also D-stem.

1.1.7. נָמַץ ‘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 piʿʿel 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 nifʿal (Jer. 4.26; Nah. 1.6) or qal internal passive/puʿʿal (Judg. 6.28). The piʿʿel 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 quṭal was facilitated by broader movement from qal to piʿʿel.

Increased Usage of Puʿʿal Participles

A not unrelated development in exilic and post-exilic Hebrew was increased usage of puʿʿal 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 מְחֻלָל 'defiled', מְטֹהָר 'purified', מְטֻמָא 'defiled', מְּקֻדָש 'sanctified', and מְרֻבַע '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:

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

- מְפֹרֵָ֔צֶת 'broken down' (Neh. 1.3; see also the ketiv, qere הֵ ם פְּרוּצִֵ֔ים 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).

- מְפֹרָָׂ֑ש 'made distinct' (Neh. 8.8) – פֹרֵַ֔ש (Num. 15.34) is analysable as a qal internal passive on the basis of לִפְּרֵֹ֥ש '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.,

- יִהלָה (= נוֹהָלָה) ‘that we may walk’ (1Q Isa 2.10) || מְעַלֵּה (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 Ma’agarim website).
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• ‘(they) mock’ (1QpHab 4.6)\(^2\) ㅋ (MT Hab. 1.10)\(^3\)
• ‘who sells, i.e., betrays’ (4Q169 f3–4ii.7) ㅋ (MT Nah. 3.4; cf. §1.3.1, below)

A Tiberian BH qal internal passive is twice replaced with puʿʿal in 1QIsa:\(^a\):

• ‘polished’ (1QIsa\(^a\) 14.25) ㅋ (MT Isa. 18.2)
• ‘polished’ (1QIsa\(^a\) 15.1) ㅋ (MT Isa. 18.7)

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

• ‘with opened ears’ (1QM 10.11); cf. ‘open the ear’ (e.g., 1 Sam. 9.15) and ‘and with opened eyes’ (Num. 24.4, 16) (see below, §3.3)

To Fassberg’s list of BDSS qal > piʿʿel shifts, the following may be added.

1.2.1. The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

‘דבָר’ ‘speak’

Though piʿʿel 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 דבָר 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.
• ‘(he) walks righteously and speaks uprightly’ (1QIsa\(^\text{a}\) 27.16) (MT Isa. 33.15)

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

ירננו 'sing'

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

• ‘they will sing; (1QIsa\(^\text{a}\) 52.20) (MT Isa. 65.14)

Local Shifts Piʿʿel > 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 piʿʿel does not always reflect the direction exemplified above, i.e., qal > piʿʿel. Select cases of the reverse are also known, e.g.,

• ‘and he destoned it’ (MT Isa. 5.2) (1QIsa\(^\text{a}\) 4.13)
• ‘destone!’ (MT Isa. 62.10) (1QIsa\(^\text{a}\) 50.23)
• לְבַצֵֶר ‘to fortify’ (MT Isa. 22.10) || לֶבַצֵּ֔ר (1QIsa 17.14)
• יְּשַבֵֶר ‘he shatters’ (MT Isa. 38.13) || יְשַבֵּר (1QIsa 32.5)
• אֲשַבֵֵ֔ר ‘I will break in pieces’ (MT Isa. 45.2) || אֲשַבֵּר (1QIsa 38.8)
• וּוַתְּחַשְּבֵַֽה ‘that you consider him’ (MT Ps. 144.3) || וַתְּחַשְּבוֹ (1Q5 23.15)
• לְלַקֵֵ֔ט ‘to glean’ (MT Ruth 2.23) || לְלַקֵַ֖ט (2Q16 f5ii–6i.2)

In these cases, it may be that the DSS text preserves an ancient qal form that secondarily shifted to pi‘el in the Tiberian reading tradition, presumably for purposes of semantic disambiguation, e.g., qal סָקַל ‘stone (to death)’ versus pi‘el ‘destone (a field, road); throw stones’, qal בָצַר ‘harvest grapes, trim vines’ versus pi‘elベース ‘fortify’, qal שָבַר ‘break’ versus pi‘elשבר ‘shatter, break into pieces’, qal חָשַב ‘think’ versus pi‘elחשב ‘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 pi‘el lectio difficilior was inadvertently replaced by the better-known form.

In the specific case of לְלַקֵֵ֔ט (MT Ruth 2.23) || לְלַקֵַ֖ט (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 לַקֵּט and pi‘el לַקֵּט, the qal with perhaps a more generic sense of ‘gathering’, the pi‘el referring specifically to ‘gathering by the less fortunate at harvest time’. As MT Ruth has both qal and pi‘el infinitive construct forms, it may be that the tradition preserved in 2Q16 reflects secondary harmonisation of the original pi‘el 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 > pi‘el 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 > piʿʿel movement in the NBDSS:

- מַרְגּוּלָת ‘attached’ (1QM 5.13); cf. RH רָגֹול ‘bound’ (m. Shabbat 5.3)

To this list it is possible to add further examples.

גַּאֲל ‘defile’

Alongside piʿʿel [גַּאֲל] ‘defiling’ (4Q513 f13.3; perhaps also 4Q274 f1i.6; 4Q284a f1.7; 11Q19 47.13) and puʿʿal גַּאֲלוֹ (‘that) are desecrated’ (CD 12.16) the hitpaʿʿel also occurs (1QM 9.8; 4Q379 f3i.5); for the Tiberian biblical distribution, see above, §1.1.2.

וֹדֵח ‘charge’

וֹדֵחַ ‘and charging’ (4Q223–224 f2iv.13) is clearly piʿʿel. 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 hifʿil (6x), while the middle (reflexive/intransitive) sense is typically encoded with nifʿal
(16x) or hitpaʿʿel (10x). A hofʿal passive is known (Isa. 42.22), as is a possible puʿʿal or qal internal passive in MT ‘are hidden’ (Job 24.4). The NBDSS have the clearcut puʿʿal participle ‘hidden (things)’ (1QHa 16.7, 19; see also, perhaps ṣəb 1QS 4.6).

חִֻ֜בְּא ‘are hidden’

The context of וּ ֵ֗חִובֵ֥א ‘are hidden’ (Job 24.4) may be a piʿʿel participle or a qal or hitpaʿʿel form, but the syntax may just as well point to a nominal form or to an Aramaic-style infinitive.

חִּוְּבֵּים ‘are committed’

Tiberian BH shows qal and hitpaʿʿel 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 nifʿal forms. Against the MT’s transitive qal, the NBDSS passive puʿʿal form ‘those who are committed’ (4Q501 f1.3) seems indicative of pielisation.

חָסֲכֵּה ‘confine’

The context of וּכְּסָכַ֖ה ‘and like a confined (woman)’ (4Q179 f2.7) arguably indicates a puʿʿal participle. In Tiberian BH, the relevant forms are qal and hifʿil (though qal yaqtel morphology may also be conjectured for some prefix conjugation forms), not piʿʿel or puʿʿal. Piʿʿel forms are common in RH, especially in the context of the sukkah (e.g., m. Sukkah 1.4).
In the MT, against 22 qal cases come just two cases of piʿʿel. In both Isa. 51.13 and Prov. 28.14, the piʿʿel occurs with the adverbial ‘always’, once with כָּל־הַיָּוֶם ‘all day’ (Isa. 51.13). It is conceivable that the biblical piʿʿel began with a more intensive (pluractional/iterative) meaning than the qal, but that the two forms eventually became virtual synonyms. 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); see also on BS (see below, §1.4.3).

פרוש ‘clarify’

Tiberian BH attests active qal (Lev. 24.12) and passive qal (or puʿʿal) (Num. 15.34) and nifʿal (Ezek. 34.12), with the only explicit puʿʿal in LBH Neh. 8.8 (see above, §1.1.8). Like LBH, the NBDSS have explicitly puʿʿal מפורשים ‘made distinct’ (4Q177 f1–4.11); cf. the piʿʿel in SH (see below, §1.3.1) and the piʿʿel and puʿʿal 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-פוחד/).

5 In several of the potential NBDSS examples, the consonantal form is ambiguous, i.e., is analysable as qal or piʿʿel, and some take the meaning of the piʿʿel to be causative (as in early Paytanic Hebrew, on which see Rand 2006, 190).
In the Hebrew of the NBDSS, one encounters מפרשים רשת 'net-spreaders' (1QH* 21.24 || 4Q427 f11.2 || 4Q428 f13.7–8 [?]). In Tiberian BH, cases of qal מפרש 'spread' outnumber cases of the synonymous pi’‘el מפרש 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 מפרש רשת 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.

In contrast, מרחץ ‘wash, bathe’

Against the single NBDSS case of pu‘‘al מרחץ ‘washing, rinsing (tr.)’ (11Q19 34.10), in Tiberian BH the verb is consistently qal, whether reflexive, e.g., לרחץ על הים 'to bathe by the Nile’ (Exod. 2.5), weakly transitive, e.g., ורחצו רגליכם 'so you (MPL) may wash your (MPL) feet’ (Gen. 18.4), or strongly transitive, e.g., ורחצתם את אשוב '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 ורחצת קריב ואברע '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 הכרבים ואת הכרעים ‘and washing the entrails and
the legs’ (11Q19 34.10–11). The piʿʿel also occurs in Amoraic Hebrew (y. Shabbat 9.3).

"شه"נ ‘hate’

Tiberian BH forms of "شه reflect a basically qal paradigm: שָׂהָנָא-שָׂהָנָא-שָׂהָנָא, verbal passive שֶׁנֶּהֶנֶּה*. The exception is the piʿʿel participle with substantival semantics שֶׁנֶּה ‘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 שֶׁנֶּה (Gen. 29.31, 33; Deut. 21.15, 16,17; 2 Sam. 5.8; Isa. 60.15; Prov. 30.23). Against this contextual background, one may consider the NBDSS puʿʿal 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 puʿʿal participle. Cf. BS for a yiqtol form of the puʿʿal (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 piʿʿel. 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


piʿʿel/puʿʿal, with expected gemination of the middle radical (§1.3.1); wholesale or partial movement to piʿel B/puʿal 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 piʿel 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 > Piʿʿel

명כר ‘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’, ופרש ‘explain’, and קרע ‘tear’. As the most common of these, מכר ‘sell’ serves as a useful example. The dominant Tiberian active-passive qal-nifʿal arrangement is mirrored in the SP by an active-passive arrangement consisting of piʿʿel-nifʿal B (i.e., nitpaʿʿel with assimilated tav), e.g., מכרות makkertimma ‘you (MPL) sold’ (Gen. 45.4) and נפרש B וนมכר 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 מכר ‘is selling (MS)’ || מכר מכר (Lev. 25.16). For historical context, it is worth noting that a D-stem form of מכר מכר occurs in the NBDSS: מכר מכר ‘who sells, i.e., betrays’ (4Q169 f3–4ii.7) || מכר מכר (MT Nah. 3.4). It may also be relevant that the Aramaic equivalent וב ‘sell’ is also D-stem (cf. G-stem וב ‘buy’).
‘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 \( pi’el \) 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’, \( קבץ \) ‘collect, gather, glean’, and \( חبدو \) ‘gather, collect, assemble’. An alternative Tiberian arrangement is that of dominant \( pi’el \) morphology with vestigial qal forms, as in the well-known case of \( דבר \) ‘speak’. In this case, against the MT’s \( 1000+ \) \( pi’el \) forms and forty apparently synonymous qal participial (active and passive) and infinitival forms (and nif’al passives), the Samaritan paradigm is comprehensively \( pi’el \), including \( pi’el \) active participles without the characteristic prefix \(-מ\), e.g., \( הדבורהות \) ‘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

‘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 nif’al medio-passive), the SP preserves qal mor-

---

^6 In the case of MT \( hitpa’el \) מדבר \( מדבר \) ‘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 \( hitpa’el \) 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 qāṭil rather qāṭīl morphology), and infinitive construct (משחת māšaʾu Lev. 7.36). In six of seven cases of the yiqtol, conversely, a piʿʿel form obtains (e.g., משחת tēmašša Exod. 30.30). The distinction between the dominant piʿʿel yiqtol forms and the lone qal yiqtol exception yimša (Lev. 16.32) may be explicable in terms of pluractionality—all cases of the piʿʿel involve multiple objects, 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).

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 piʿʿel 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 (Maʿagarim, s.v.; CAL, s.v.). For its part, SH is characterised by a complex situation of suppletion involving qal, piʿʿel, and qal B forms (see below,

---

7 This includes Lev. 8.12, where, notwithstanding the singular grammatical 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 רבי ‘drive away, divorce’ (vestigial qal use in Tiberian), יסף ‘add, do again’ (partial qal > hifʿil shift in Tiberian), נטע ‘allow, leave, forsake’, שלח ‘send’.
The suppletion appears generally to involve both grammatical and formal factors. All infinitives construct are piʿʿel (Gen. 23.2; 43.30), and other than the infinitive at Gen. 43.30, piʿʿel 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).

דָּל ‘bear (a child); beget, father, sire’

SH, like Tiberian Hebrew, generally distinguishes between qal דָּל ‘bear (a child)’ and hifʿil דָּלַת ‘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 piʿʿel דָּל yallǝd ‘he fathered’ parallel to MT qal דָּל ‘he bore, i.e., fathered’ (Gen. 4.18, 18, 18; 10.13, 15, 24, 24, 26; 25.3) and on one occasion piʿʿel דָּל yallǝd ‘he fathered’ parallel to MT qal passive דָּל ‘was born (M)’ (Gen. 10.21). This approach achieves the formal disambiguation of distinct semantic values that would otherwise be subsumed under the same


§1.3.3).
form, but it also results in a \textit{pi’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 \textit{pi’el} more tolerable than the original association of diverse meanings with the \textit{qal}.

1.3.2. \textit{Qal} > \textit{Pi’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 \textit{pi’el} B. Though most of the relevant verbs are II-guttural, the frequency in this stem of select non-II-guttural verbs—namely, נבֵד ‘honour’, כֵּפר ‘atone’, and ספר ‘tell, recount”—confirms the heuristic validity of the \textit{binyan}.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{pi’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 כֵּפר with \textit{peh rafa}, all from the Sifra, are compelling (Yeivin 1985, 515). Of the alleged Tiberian BH examples, מְלָשְׁנִי ‘slanderer’ (Ps. 101.5 \textit{qere}) seems pertinent, but the additional examples listed by Ben-Ḥayyim, viz. מְאָסְיו וּתְרַצְּח ‘its (M) gatherers’ (Isa. 62.9) and מְאָסְיו וּתְרַצְּח ‘you (mpl) murder’ (Ps. 62.4), are variants that bear more conventional vocalisation in L and A: מְאָסְי and מְאָסְיָו, respectively.
The mixed nature of the piʿel 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., אמסאʾʿאq ‘play, joke, mock’ versus יָשָׁשׁ רַדְאʾַא ‘ask, borrow’. Indeed, on the basis of examples like the latter, a reasonable hypothesis is that some II-guttural piʿel B verbs began as qal statives with PS qattil morphology. The broader process of pielisation and the more restricted simplification of piʿel’s originally geminate middle radical seem to have converged, with the result that statives like יָשָׁשׁ רַדְאʾַא ‘ask, borrow’ and יָאָב אʾב ‘love’ could be analysed as piʿel B.11 This was facilitated by the fact that the standard Samaritan piʿel participle requires no prefix -מ. On this basis, piʿel B prefix forms in יֵאֶבְּטֵֽל 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 יֵאֶבְּטֵֽל on the basis of purely phonological shifts to the standard qal yiqtal template, i.e., יֵאֶבְּטֵֽל < *יֵאֶבְּטֵֽל < *yiqṭal (see below, §1.3.3)—which could conceivably equally apply to the piʿel B prefix conjugation, too. Alternatively—or complementarily—the broad process of pielisation may have been a significant factor in the secondary development of יֵאֶבְּטֵֽל and יֵאֶבְּטֵֽל prefix conjugation forms.

11 Cf. the remnants of stative pronunciation of these verbs in the Tiberian tradition, e.g., עָבְּטֵֽל ‘he loved’ (Gen. 27.9), יָאָבְּטֵֽל ‘I asked him’ (Judg. 13.6).
גאל ‘redeem’: Comprehensive Shift

As a comprehensive shift from qal to pi‘el B, consider the case of גאל ‘redeem’. The Tiberian biblical paradigm is qal-nif‘al. SH preserves the nif‘al (Lev. 25.30, 49, 54; 27.20, 27, 28, 33), but all MT qal forms are paralleled by pi‘el B forms in the SP (28x), e.g., MT גאל ‘and I will redeem’ || SP גאלתי (Exod. 6.6), MT יגאל ‘will redeem (3MS)’ || SP יגאל (Lev. 25.33). Significantly, this includes the participle (13x), e.g., MT יגאל ‘the redeeming (angel)’ || SP יגאל ‘the redeeming (king)’ (Gen. 48.16). The latter are clear evidence of the qal > pi‘el 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’כ has occasional D-stem derivations (see CAL, s.v.).

אחר ‘tarry, delay, stay’: Unification of a Mixed Paradigm

In other cases, consistent Samaritan pi‘el 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 pi‘el. Qal exceptions are ייחר ‘and I remained’ (Gen. 32.5) and ketiv ייחר qere ‘but he exceeded (the deadline)’ (2 Sam. 20.5). In the Samaritan tradition, all parallels to Tiberian pi‘el forms and the single qal exception are pi‘el B.

---


13 Similar cases include עזר ‘take, grasp, seize; possess’, לזר ‘lick’, צחק ‘laugh, play, per-
1.3.3. Qal > Qal B

In SH, certain verbs have prefix conjugation forms with a *yēqāṭāl* pattern, not dissimilar from the *yēqāṭel* 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, *yiqṭāl* > *yiqṭāl* > *yēqāṭāl* (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 109, §2.1.1.7)—its similarity to the *piʿel B* pattern (*yēqāṭel*) and, for that matter, to the standard *piʿʿel* pattern (*yēqaṭṭel*), 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-'). The most common verb is זָכָר ‘remember’ with prefix conjugation יֵזָכָר. Against the contention that this (along with other III-*r* forms) might be more parsimoniously classified as *piʿel B*, attributing the shift of ש > ש 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., אחרי ‘tarry, delay, stay’ and לָשׁ ‘lick’, where there is no obvious semantic or grammatical difference between the MT *qal* and *piʿʿel* alternatives.

only compare \textit{pi‘el B ויספר}, which occasions no such shift.\textsuperscript{15} Likewise, in the case of \textit{III-y} (and similar) verbs, though it may be tempting to view apparent \textit{qal B} forms, such as \textit{wyēbēki}, as mere \textit{pi‘el} allomorphs, the existence of genuine \textit{pi‘el} \textit{wyēbakki} militates against this. So, too, does the apparent morphosemantic distinction between the forms of \textit{בכה}, viz. intransitive \textit{qal/qal B ‘cry, weep’} and transitive \textit{pi‘el בכה ‘mourn’} (see above, §1.3.1).

In sum, notwithstanding the apparent validity of the classification of \textit{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 \textit{qal > pi‘el} shift in BS, both from the medieval MS B from the Cairo Geniza. One involves the substitution of \textit{puʿʿal} participle \textit{משואל} (SirB 16r.11 = Sir. 46.13) for the MT \textit{qal} passive participle \textit{שָאוּל ‘borrowed’} (1 Sam. 1.28). The other is

\textsuperscript{15} Perhaps relevant is Ben-Ḥayyim’s (2000, 113, §2.1.3.4) contention made regarding the unexpected \textit{א}, rather than \textit{א/א}, vocalisation after the second radical in certain \textit{pi‘el} prefix conjugation forms:

\begin{quote}
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 \textit{א}-vowel.
\end{quote}
Pielisation (SirB 20r.8 = Sir. 50.27), which Ben-Ḥayyim interprets as a pi‘ʿel with the meaning ‘poured forth’ (cf. the qal in Prov. 18.4).

To these may be added further examples of qal > pi‘ʿel 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 מָסַּח ‘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 בַּעֲטָף ‘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 כָּל־הַיֵּוָּם ‘always, all day’ (Isa. 51.13) and כָּלָּיָּמָה ‘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 [ ] 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 adjectival use is not dissimilar from the plurality/iterative biblical use, the lack of an explicit adverbial signalling such is conspicuous (cf. the active participle with adverbial in Prov. 28.14). This is comparable to the less restrictive use of the $pi’\nu$el in the DSS.

1.4.4. שנה ‘hate’

Tiberian BH knows the $pi’\nu$el stem for this verb, but only in the active participle form, where it has the nominal semantics of ‘enemy’. Like the NBDSS, which attest a $pu’\nu$al participle (see above, §1.2.2), BS also knows a $pu’\nu$al, but it is the prefix conjugation ישונה ‘is [3ms] hated’ (SirA 3v.18 = Sir. 9.18).

1.5. Rabbinic Hebrew


He also cites studies by Ben-Ḥayyim (1958, 235–36), Kutscher (1969, 64–65), and Elitzur (1987, 84–87) on the relevance of $qīṭṭūl$-pattern verbal nouns, such as איבול ‘mourning’, איסור ‘prohibition’, אר-
biration’, ‘growth’, ‘extra, bonus’, ‘beating’, ‘sharp edge’, ‘settlement’, ‘conquest’, ‘taught, disciple; teaching’, ‘charge, trust, account; (book of) Numbers’, ‘community, public’, and ‘bottom of’. Illustrative examples from Tannaitic Hebrew include midrashic treatments of biblical passages in which RH piʿʿel verbs (a) replace qal verbs (b), e.g.,

(1a) בַּעֲלָהּ שָׁבְטַתָּהּ אֶל-שָׁבַע (בֶּן) רֵיחֶם לְמִשְׁלָה (קְנֵה) יָמִים לַעֲבוֹד בְּבִשְׁלָהּ (בֶּן) לְעַמִּים לָכָּאִים לְעַמִּים לָכָּא

‘Rabbi Akiba says, “the father sells her, and if the master wishes to designate (espouse) her, he may do so”’
(Mekhila, Mishpatim, parasha 3, ed. Horowitz-Rabin 257.7); cf.

(1b) אֶל-שָׁבַע אֲשֶׁר-לֶמַע (בֶּן) רֵיחֶם לְמִשְׁלָה אֶל-שָׁבַע (בֶּן) לְעַמִּים לָכָּא

‘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) מַמּ שָׁבְטַתָּהּ אֶל-שָׁבַע (בֶּן) רֵיחֶם לְמִשְׁלָה אֶל-שָׁבַע (בֶּן) לְעַמִּים לָכָּא

‘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, Haʿazinu, pisqa 32, ed. Finkelstein 330.16–17); cf.

(2b) כִּי גָּאַר זוּחָה לְאַלָּן-שָׁבַע

‘For I, the LORD, I have not changed’ (Mal. 3.6a)

From Amoraic Hebrew, consider:
(3a) אני ילך אלה בمؤם שביהו דבר תורה
‘I know that this applies only when he despised the teaching of the Law’ (y. Sanhedrin 27d 10.4); cf.

(3b) יִכְּרֵיהוּ הַשַּׁבָּת
‘for the word of the LORD he despised’ (Num. 15.31a)

(4a) ישמר יעקב אבינו את השבת
‘Jacob, our father, kept the Sabbath’ (Genesis Rabba 945.4); cf.

(4b) וּוְשָׁמְר בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת
‘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 puʿʿal in all but adjectival (i.e., participial) forms (Breuer 2013, 737–38). In verbal usage, it was largely replaced especially by hitpaʿʿal/nitpaʿʿal.

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‘ʿel morphology, e.g., מֵאֵן, ‘but he refused’ (Gen. 37.35). On the five occasions when its participle occurs, however, the consonantal spelling conflicts with pi‘ʿel analysis. In four of the five, the formulation is וַיְּמָאֵן֙ ‘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 piʿʿel 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־מְּמִיתֵֽם֙ אַתֶּ֣ם אֵתִי֑וּ ‘if you put me to death’ (Jer. 26.15), the form מַמֵאֲנֵיִם ‘[this people] who refuse’ (Jer. 13.10) cannot be so explained. Since it is not until RH that one finds unequivocal piʿʿel consonantal forms, e.g., מַמֵאֲנֵיִם (m. Ye 13.1, 1, 4, 5; m. Ketubbot 11.6; m. ʿEduyot 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 piʿʿel morphology. It is also worth noting that the Aramaic translational equivalent סַרְב is commonly paʿʿel. While suffix and prefix conjugation forms such as מֵאֵן and יְּמָאֵן 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., בָּא, הָאָל, §1.3.2).

If a qal > piʿel shift did occur in the case of this verb in the Tiberian tradition, notwithstanding the fact that the earliest unambiguous piʿel 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. כֹּרֶשׁ ‘drive out/away, expel, divorce’

A similar example is כֹּרֶשׁ ‘drive out/away, expel, divorce’. All consonantal forms amenable to piʿel analysis in the MT—suffix conjugation, prefix conjugation, imperative, infinitives—are so read (≈35x), with passives in puʿal, but qal forms obtain in the case of participles, both active, כֹּרֶשׁ ‘[Behold, I am about to] drive out’ (Exod. 34.11), and passive, כֹּרֶשָּׁה ‘divorced (FS)’ (Lev. 21.7, 14; 22.13; Num. 30.10; Ezek. 44.22).17 Unambiguous consonantal evidence of D-stem כֹּרֶשׁ comes in the DSS and RH in piʿel כֹּרֶשׁ מִגְּרָשֶָ֖הּ. Likewise, in לָבַַֽז מִגְּרָשֶָ֖הּ לְּמֵַ֥עַן ‘to cast it out for a prey’ (Ezek. 36.5 KJV) the apparent Aramaic-style infinitive was not amenable to piʿel realisation. Many, however, take כֹּרֶשׁ here as a noun (cf. NIV, ESV, NET).
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‘man divorcing’ (CD 13.17; m. Yevamot 3.7; 4.8; etc.) and *puʿʿal* ‘woman being divorced’ (m. Gitṭin 7.4, 5; etc.). RH also shows pielisation of this verb in the verbal noun *גירוש* (m. Ye-

vamot 3.8; t. Yevamot 13.5). Finally, the Aramaic equivalents for biblical *גרש*, *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 Temple morphological sensibilities, though a dearth of diagnostic forms in LBH makes it difficult to determine with precision when the shift began.

**2.3. wash, launder**

Consider also the verb כִּבֵּס ‘wash, launder’. Most active and passive forms in the MT are *piʿʿel* and *puʿʿal*, respectively. The exception is the *qal* participle *nomen agentis* that occurs in the toponym שְּדֵֵ֥ה כִּבֵַֽס ‘Washer’s Field’ (2 Kgs 18.17 || Isa. 36.2; Isa 7.3). In this case, the earliest clearcut consonantal evidence for *piʿʿel* morphology is in post-exilicמקבּס ‘launderers’ (Mal. 3.2), which becomes common in RH as the verbal participle alongside nominal *qal* כִּבֵּס; cf. *puʿʿal* מקבּסוֹת (m. Miqwaʾot 10.4). Note also the post-

biblical Hebrew knows two verbal nouns, i.e., כִּבְסָה (CD 11.22; 4Q271 f5i.15; m. Zevaḥim 7.1; etc.) and כִּבְסִים (m. Miqwaʾot 8.1; t. Bava Metsiaʿ 11.2), with respective patterns typical or *piʿʿel* and *qal*. The Aramaic equivalents חֹר and צָבע 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 *piʿʿel* where possible, 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 $qal > pi'el$ shifts discussed began prior to Second Temple times, the evidence of unambiguous consonantal $pi'el$ and $pu'al$ 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 $pi'el$ 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 $pi'el$ participles and $pu'al$ 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 $pi'el/pu'al$ attestation, some have no cognates in other stems, e.g., $ḇiq'eq$ ‘seek, request’ (63x); others exhibit well-established semantic specialisation of the $pi'el$ form vis-à-vis the relevant $qal$, e.g., plurational $ḇiq'eq$* ‘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 נִקְּבַֽר* ‘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-established *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. *

Extremely common in BH, דִבֶר 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 דֹבֵר ‘speaker, speaking’ (39x), passive participle דָבֵ֥ר ‘spoken’

---

\(^{18}\) Given the proposed morphosemantic distinction, the form יִבְרָּל ‘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* נִקְּבַֽר ‘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 הָדַּבְרָה ‘when you speak’ (Ps. 51.6). Since there is no obvious semantic distinction between ostensible qal דָבַר* and piʿʿel דִבֶר, 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 piʿʿel 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 דֹבֵר (39x) is as common in the MT as the piʿʿel participle מְדַבֵר (39x), while piʿʿel 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 מְלֻל is also D-stem).
Table 1: Frequency of qal and piʿʿel participles of דָּבָר ‘speak’ in select ancient Hebrew corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosorot</th>
<th>qal</th>
<th>piʿʿel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT LBH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBDSS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Sira</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. בָּרָךُ ‘bless’

Like the verb דָּבָר, so too Tiberian בָּרָךُ ‘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 piʿʿel (Gen. 12.3; 27.29; Num. 24.9; Isa. 66.3; Prov. 27.14) and puʿʿal (Num. 22.6; Deut. 33.13; Ps. 37.22; 113.2; Job 1.21; 1 Chron. 17.27), as well as in hitpaʿʿel 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 בָּרָכָה ‘blessed’ (71x) and in nifʿal forms (Gen. 12.3; 18.18; 28.14). The dominance of the qal passive participle over the puʿʿal 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 piʿʿel participles of דָּבָר ‘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 piʿʿel dominance outside of the passive participle seems less artificial and anachronistic than does piʿʿel dominance in the case of דִּבֶּר above. Another difference between this case and that of דִּבֶּר, discussed in the foregoing section, is that the specific arrangement of a prevailing piʿʿel paradigm with qal dominance restricted to the passive participle נַעֲרָבִּים vis-à-vis נַעֲרָבֶה persists in post-exilic Hebrew, where the puʿʿal participle never gains ascendancy. 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 (piʿʿel 56x, puʿʿal 2x),\(^{21}\) as well as in Second Temple extra-biblical sources (see

\(^{20}\) Assuming the early existence of qal בָּרַךְ ‘bless’, its shift to piʿʿel may have resulted from a perceived need to distinguish it from qal בָּרַךְ ‘kneel’ (Ps. 95.6; 2 Chron. 6.13; related hifʿil בִּהְרָי at Gen. 24.11).

\(^{21}\) Piʿʿel: Lev. 18.6, 7, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 15, 16, 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. Puʿʿal: Nah. 2.8; Prov. 27.5.
above, §2.0).

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). Passive *nif'al* forms, also presupposing an active *qal* form, are even more numerous (32x).

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־גֹּלֶַ֤ה אֶת־אָזְּנִי֙ ‘there was no one to tell me’ (1 Sam. 22.8, 8) and the passive participleגָלוּי (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* גַּל, the rather broader use of the *nif'al* arouses the suspicion that certain orthographically ambiguous forms vocalised as *pi'el* might originally have been read as *qal*. Mismatches occur in the case of the nouns עַיִן (qal 2x; nif'al 3x; pi'el 2x), סוֹד ‘secret’ (qal 2x; pi'el 2x), עֵר וָה ‘nakedness’ (pi'el 24x; nif'al 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 גַּל.

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 *Nif'al*: 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 piʿʿel 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 > piʿʿel 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 piʿʿel 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.
13. HITPAELISATION

Along with the fairly common processes of nifalisation (ch. 10), hifilisation (ch. 11), and pielisation (ch. 12)—all generally involving movement away from the qal verbal stem—hitpaelisation is also a known phenomenon. It differs, however, from the three aforementioned processes, in that it rather rarely manifests in the hitpaʿʿel revocalisation of qal orthographic forms. This must be due, at least in part, to the consonantal difference between qal and hitpaʿʿel, i.e., only with difficulty would original qal orthography lend itself to hitpaʿʿel realisation. More frequently, hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿal replaces passive or reflexive nifʿal or passive puʿʿal, especially in the case of finite forms. Other stems are also occasionally affected. In these cases, too, revocalisation often required special measures, especially the assimilation of hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿal's characteristic t-infix.

1.0. Second Temple Evidence

1.1. Tiberian Late Biblical Hebrew

1.1.1. Movement to Hitpaʿʿel

Broad indication of the diachronic significance of hitpaelisation may be gleaned from Baden’s (2010, 39, fn. 18) acceptance of conclusion reached by Bean (1976, 149–53), namely, that the later books of the Hebrew Bible witness increased hitpaʿʿel usage in comparison to earlier books. But Bean’s statistics must be considered no more than impressionistic, because his methodology
has no means of ruling out the possibility that differences in content are responsible for the apparent increase, i.e., that further hitpaʿʿels might possibly have been used in CBH given the same subject matter. What is needed is a more detailed, word-by-word study that applies Hurvitz’s (2014, 9–11) three-pronged strategy for identification of diagnostically late linguistic features, namely, (1) late distribution, (2) classical opposition, and (3) extrabiblical confirmation. Such an approach is applied to a series of Tiberian LBH hitpaʿʿel forms below.

וְהָתָבָאָשַׁ הָתָבָאָשׁ ‘stink, be odious’

The root is represented by qal (Exod. 7.18, 21; 8.10; 16.20; Isa. 50.2) and nifʿal (1 Sam. 13.4; 2 Sam. 10.6; 16.21) forms. The qal consistently refer to physical smells, the nifʿal to the metaphorical ‘you have become a stench’. The hitpaʿʿel comes just once in Tiberian Hebrew, in the late parallel to the nifʿal in 2 Sam. 10.6 found in 1 Chron. 19.6; see examples (1)–(2).

1. וַיִּרְאוּ בְּנֵי יָעָם כִּי נִבְּאָשׁ בְּדָוִד...’ ‘When the Ammonites saw that they had become a stench to David...’ (2 Sam. 10.6)
2. וַיִּרְאוּ בְּנֵי יָעָם כִּי הִתְּבָאָשׁ עִם־דָוִד...’ ‘When the Ammonites saw that they had become a stench to David...’ (1 Chron. 19.6)

While hitpaʿʿel התבאש is not again documented in Hebrew sources until piyyut, the Targumic equivalent of both N-stemنبאש and Dt-stem התבאש in Tiberian BH is Aramaic Dt-stem אַחוֹרִי.
All derivations of the root גאל II ‘defile’ are late, including pi’ʿel (Mal. 1.7), puʿʿal (Mal 1.7, 12; Ezra 2.62; Neh. 7.64), nifʿal (Isa. 59.3; Zeph. 3.1; Lam. 4.14), and hitpaʿʿel (Dan. 1.8, 8). The hitpaʿʿel ‘become defiled’ is also known from NBDSS texts (1Q59.3; 4Q379 f3i.5). The classical equivalents are derivations of הגאל ‘abhorr’, for the hitpaʿʿel of גאאל II evidently nifʿal benzil ‘be defiled’ (2 Sam. 1.21).

הגדיל ‘magnify oneself’

In classical texts, the hifʿil expression המגדיל usado in the antagonistic sense ‘to raise oneself against’ (Ezek. 35.13; Zeph. 2.8, 10; Ps. 35.26; 41.10). Twice in LBH, the phrase with hitpaʿʿel מהגדיל usado comes in the same meaning (Dan. 11.36–37). Cf. also RH: ר. צדוק או אל תעשם עטרות להגדיל בהן; R. Sadoq says, “Do not make [Torah teachings] a crown with which to glorify yourself...’ (m. 3Avot 4.5). Interestingly, the Targumic equivalent of C-stem הג血יל usado is t-stem אתרורב; Syriac אתרורב is also t-stem.

היחבר ‘join, associate’

The qal has the basic sense of ‘join, associate’, and can refer to people (Gen. 14.3; Hos. 4.17; Ps. 94.20) or objects (Exod. 26.3, 3; 28.7; 39.4; Deut. 18.11 [?]; Ezek. 1.9, 11; Ps 58.6 [?]; 94.20). The hitpaʿʿel refers only to human alliances (Dan. 11.6, 23; 2 Chron. 20.35, 37). The hitpaʿʿel also occurs in reference to human

---

1 Possibly also in Isa. 10.15, but the context does not involve a ruler raising himself up.
association in BS (SirA 5r.23–25 || Sir. 13.2), NBDSS material (4Q374 f1a–b.3; 4Q416 f2iii.21); and RH (m. 'Avot 1.7). The Mishna also includes an example of non-human association (m. Ṭohorot 9.1). In reference to human association, the Targums also utilise Dt-stem forms, e.g., אתכנש and אתחבר; so, too, occasionally the Peshīṭta.

‘freely offer (cultic)’

In the cultic sense of ‘freely offer’, the relevant CBH usages involve transitive qal with היה ‘spirit’ or ילב ‘heart’ as subject, e.g., כל איש אשר יזיזו ליבו, ‘every man whose heart moves him’ (Exod. 25.2), כל איש אשר נדב לו תורה חוה, ‘and every one whose spirit moved him’ (Exod. 35.21), כל איש אשר נדב ליבו א경영, ‘every man or woman whose heart moved them’ (Exod. 35.29). In LBH, the early transitive qal expression gives way to an apparently reflexive hitpaʿʿel involving the freewill offering of sacrifices or service (Ezra 1.6; 2.68; 3.5; Neh. 11.2; 1 Chron. 29.5–6, 9, 14, 17; 2 Chron. 17.16).² The Dt-stem form is also common in Qumran writings (1QS 5.1, 6, 8, 10, 21–22; 6.13; 1Q14 f8–10.7; 1Q31 f1.1; 4Q256 9.1, 5; 4Q258 1.1, 5; 2.1–2; 4Q368 f10i.6; 4Q433a f2.5) and in RH (m. Sheqalim 4.1; 5.6; m. Zevaḥim 10.8, 8; m. Menaḥot 12.3, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5; 13.3; m. Keritot 6.3, 3; m. Meʾila 3.6, 6; m. Middot 3.8). The Targums also frequently resort

² Hitpaʿʿel forms also occur in Judg. 5.2, 9, but these are in a military, rather than cultic context. In other words, the late aspect of התנדב is not merely its Dt-stem morphology, but its cultic semantics and use in place of qal נדב.
to Dt-stem forms, whether of רעש or רעש (the latter even in the case of two of the CBH qal usages).

‘fast’

Classical cases of החתעה have the general sense of ‘humble oneself, afflict oneself, suffer affliction’ (Gen. 16.9; 1 Kgs 2.26; Ps. 107.17). It is possible that in LBH the sense narrows to ‘fast’ (Dan. 10.12; Ezra 8.21), in line with post-biblical sources (DSSH, RH; see BDB 726b; Qimron 1980, 250; Hurvitz 2014, 242). Clearly, only in the specific meaning ‘fast’ can החתעה be considered especially characteristic of post-exilic Hebrew.

‘disturb’

Nif’al forms in the sense ‘be disturbed’ occur in CBH (Gen. 41.8), LBH (Dan. 2.3), and poetic material of less certain diachronic linguistic profile (Ps. 77.5). Nif’al forms are also preserved in the BDSS (4Q3 f1ii.15 || MT Gen. 41.8) and in SH (Gen. 41.8). Against the nif’al והתשמע והרוח ‘and my spirit was troubled’ (Dan. 2.3), one nearby encounters hitpa’el והתשמע והרוח ‘and his spirit was troubled’ (Dan. 2.1). While further Hebrew examples of והתשמע go undocumented until the time of piyyut, making them non-diagnostic as far as ancient periodisation goes, TA and, to a lesser extent, Syriac resort to t-stem forms in their renderings of both Tiberian והתשמע and והתשמע.

‘forget’

Throughout the Tiberian biblical tradition, the standard passive of נשכח is nif’al נשכח ‘be forgotten’ (Gen. 41.30; Deut.
31.21; Isa. 23.15–16; 65.16; Jer. 20.11; 23.40; 50.5; Ps. 9.19; 31.13; Job 28.4; Qoh. 2.16; 9.5). Qohelet, widely considered late on the basis of its post-exilic linguistic profile (Schoors 1992–2004; Hurvitz 2007; see Hornkohl 2013b, 321, for further bibliography), includes two of the classical nifʿal cases, but also the only Tiberian biblical example of hitpaʿʿel (Qoh. 8.10), apparently with the same meaning as its more common nifʿal counterpart. The hitpaʿʿel also appears in Tannaitic sources (Mekhilta deRabbi Ishmaʿel; Sifre Devarim; Tosefta) and Amoraic Hebrew (Yerushalmi; Bavli). Finally, the Aramaic and Syriac equivalents to both Tiberian nifʿal נשקח and hitpaʿʿel הишתחח are commonly t-stem verbs.

1.1.2. Hippaʿʿel < Hitpaʿʿel

On relatively rare occasions, Tiberian Hebrew evinces forms of the type hippaʿʿel < hitpaʿʿel. In these cases, suffix conjugation forms in texts from no earlier than the Exile can be read only as hitpaʿʿel forms with assimilated tav: ‘they prophesied’ (Jer. 23.13); ‘and I will be satisfied’ (Ezek. 5.13); ‘and I prophesied’ (Ezek. 37.10). These unambiguous consonantal hitpaʿʿel forms with assimilated tav are not especially important in their own right, as the hitpaʿʿel forms of both נִבְאָה and נִבְאָהָי are well attested throughout the Tiberian biblical corpus, from CBH to LBH. Their significance in the context of the phenomenon of hitpaelisation is as evidence of the door opened via assimilation of the infix tav for the apparent secondary development in the Tiberian reading tradition of consonantal nifʿal forms into nip-
paʿʿel [\textless nitpaʿʿel] forms (see §2.0 below; the development is especially characteristic of SH, §1.3).

1.2. Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew

There is limited evidence of hitpaelisation in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in both biblical and non-biblical material.

1.2.1. The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

In the BDSS, a possible manifestation of hitpaelisation involves textual variation in which various MT forms are paralleled in Qumran texts by synonymous t-stem alternatives. Consider the following cases:

(3) הֲנֵ֥בָּא ‘prophesying’ (4Q51 9e–i.13) || MT נָבָא (1 Sam. 10.11)

(4) תִוָּסֵַֽד ‘its foundation will be laid’ (1QIsa 38.6) || MT תִוָּסֵַד ‘your foundation will be laid’ (Isa. 44.28)

(5) תְּמוּטֶָׂ֑נָה ‘(and the hills) will shake’ (1QIsa 45.8) || MT תְּמוּטֶָׂ֑נָה (Isa. 54.10)

(6) וּתְגַרְּשׁוּ ‘and (its waters) are tossed up (with mire and dirt)’ (1QIsa 47.20) || MT וּתְנָרָּב ‘and (its waters) tossed up (mire and dirt)’ (Isa. 57.20)

(7) וּתְנַחֵם ‘(and in Jerusalem) you will be comforted’ (1QIsa 53.29) || MT וּתְנַחֲּמָ־ֽ֝ע ‘(and in Jerusalem) you will be comforted’ (Isa. 66.13)

\[3\] Cf. התמוטטה ‘(the earth) shook’ (1QIsa 19.18) || MT להוטמעה (Isa. 24.19).
The frequency of hitpaelisation in 1QIsa\(^a\) in particular—representing shifts from \textit{qal} (5)–(6), \textit{nif'al} (4), and \textit{puʿʿal} (7)—seems to have diachronic significance. Despite its basis in CBH, 1QIsa\(^a\) is renowned for its degree of linguistic contemporisation (Kutscher 1974, 77–89; Abegg 2010, 25; Fassberg 2013; Muraoka 2013; cf. Young 2013). The t-stem forms \textit{נָּב} (7) and \textit{נָּחֶם} (3) are known from CBH, and that of \textit{מַזְמָר} (5) occurs elsewhere in MT Isaiah and 1QIsa\(^a\) (see fn. 4), so that it might stem more from stylistic harmonisation than linguistic convention, but the t-stem form of \textit{יס} (4) is unknown in Tiberian BH, being unique in Hebrew until it resurfaces in early medieval poetry, and the earliest documentation of t-stem \textit{שֶׁגֶר} comes in the BDSS (6) and NBDSS (1QH\(^a\) 10.14; 11.16–17), it next appearing in the meaning ‘be divorced’ in RH (m. Yevamot 14.1; m. Nedarim 9.9; m. Gitṭin 6.2) and in Amoraic sources (Yerushalmi; Bavli). The evidence as such does not confirm the late character of hitpaelisation in the BDSS, but it is in line with such a theory.\(^4\)

1.2.2. The Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

It has already been noted that the NBDSS exhibit diagnostically late \textit{hitpaʿʿel} forms known from Tiberian LBH—‘be defiled’ (2x), ‘join, associate’ (2x; also in BS, RH), and ‘freely

\(^4\) There are also a few cases of apparent BDSS shifts away from \textit{hitpaʿʿel} in comparison to the MT. Thus, \textit{וַּהֲנַחֲלְתֶּם} ‘and you will bequeath’ (4Q24 f27–28.2) || MT \textit{וְּהִתְּנַחֲלְּתֶֹ֨ם} (Lev. 25.46); \textit{הָרַגֶּצֲכֶה} ‘your raging’ (1QIsa\(^a\) 31.7) || MT \textit{ךְָּהַרְּגֶּכֶה} (Isa. 37.28); \textit{יִתְּכַּסְּוּ} ‘they will (not) cover’ (1QIsa\(^a\) 48.17) || MT \textit{יֵיתְּכַּסְּוּ} ‘they will not cover themselves’ (Isa. 59.6). Rather than reflecting a broad shift away from \textit{hitpaʿʿel}, these cases seem to stem from local exegetical differences and/or difficulties.
offer (cultic)’ (17x; also in RH)—and from the BDSS—‘storm, be tossed up (waves)’. But this does not remotely reflect the degree of hitpaelisation encountered in the NBDSS. Indeed, many hitpaʿʿel forms unknown from BH are documented in the NBDSS, sometimes also appearing other Second Temple Hebrew material. Here they are listed in order of frequency in the NBDSS with notation of additional corpora in which they occur, if relevant: התגרש ‘become fat, savour’ (10x; BS); התזמר ‘be chastised’ (8x; RH2); הת聩 ‘become defiled, unclean’ (6x; BDSS, SH, RH, Tiberian reading tradition [see below, §2.0]); התאזר ‘be delayed’ (6x; BS (cf. below, התקרע); התאמים ‘be rewarded’ (5x; RH); התאזר ‘be delayed’ (4x; RH); התאזר ‘be cleansed, considered innocent’ (?; 4x; BDSS, Tiberian reading tradition [see below, §2.0]; Amoraic Hebrew); התגרש ‘storm, be tossed up (waves)’ (4x; Amoraic Hebrew); התגרש ‘be sent’ (3x; RH); התבשל ‘be eager, pass quickly’ (3x); התקרע ‘be scattered’ (3x; RH); התקרע ‘be cheated’ (3x); התקרע ‘go/be early’ (2x; cf. above, התקרע); החסונה ‘inquire (of prophetic dreams)’ (?) (2x); החסונה if in the meaning ‘fast’ (2x; LBH, BDSS, RH); החסונה ‘be put to shame’ (2x); החסונה ‘become a widow’ (RH); החסונה ‘be fooled, deceived’ (BS); החסונה ‘be torn asunder’ (RH); החסונה ‘condemn oneself, be condemned’; החסורה ‘break (intr.), be shattered’; החסונה ‘trust’ (?); החסורה ‘sigh, groan’ (BS, Amoraic Hebrew); החסורה ‘be right’ (?); החסורה ‘be washed’ (RH); החסורה ‘be filled’ (RH—different semantics in MT Job 16.10); החסורה ‘be tested’ (?) (RH); החסורה ‘be consumed’ (?)}; החסורה ‘hesitate, be sluggish’ (RH); החסורה ‘fear, tremble’; החסורה ‘be refined’;
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Consider the following NBDSS example with ‘be/go early’ and ‘be/go late’.

(8) ויתקדם או ייתאחר ולא ישביתו את העב ועלו לימים לא יוהו: ‘let him go earlier or later so that they need not stop the whole service...’ (CD 11.23)

(9) מי יקדם ויאשלי תחת כל השמים ליציבו: ‘Who has preceded me, that I should repay him? Whatever is under the whole heaven is mine.’ (Job 41.11)

(10) ויהי אות לאפריו לאפרים לאפרי
1.3. Samaritan Hebrew

1.3.1. *Nif'al B* = *Nippaʿel (< Nitpaʿel) < Nif'al*

As has already been discussed above (ch. 10, §1.3.4), from a synchronic perspective, SH has a second N-stem alongside its standard *nif'al* (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 117–18). This so-called *nif'al B* is in reality a result of hitpaelisation, since it is a hybrid that incorporates components of the N- and Dt-stems. It consists of secondary *hitpaʿel/nitpaʿel* pronunciation imposed on originally *nif'al* orthography, with gemination of both the first and middle radicals—the former in line with assimilation of the *t*-infixed especially common in some late Aramaic dialects (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 117–18; Bar-Asher 2016, 209–10) and the latter characteristic of the Dt-stem pattern.

1.3.2. Samaritan *Nif'al B || Tiberian Qal*

Above in ch. 10, §1.3.4, the focus was on shifts *nif'al B < qal*. Relevant Tiberian *qal* verbs with SH *nif'al B* parallels include (in order of frequency) בָּרַכָּה 'inherit' (6x), שֵׁתָּה 'be holy' (5x), הָכָה 'finish (intr.)' (3x) (along with *puʿal* הָכָה 'be finished'), שֶׁבֶר 'prevail' (2x), נָחָה 'be hard, severe' (2x), with single instances of יָרְא 'fear', לָוָה 'borrow', מָכָה 'sell', נָחַה 'tremble with emotion', הָכָה 'be astonished'. In these cases, *qal* morphology is preserved in the case of suffix conjugation forms, whereas prefix conjugation forms have

---

6 Certain individual cases may represent local interpretive peculiarities, rather than broad shifts in verbal morphology.
secondary nifʿal B realisations (Hornkohl 2022, 7–9). Compare (11) and (12), repeated from ch. 10, §1.3.4.

(11) נבירה (gēbēru) the waters and the mountains thirteen...MT || gēbēru)

‘The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep.’ (Gen. 7.20; see also Gen. 7.19; 49.26)

(12) נבירה (wyiggabbāru) the days and the earth one hundred fifty

‘And the waters prevailed on the earth 150 days.’ (Gen. 7.24; see also Gen. 7.18)

The Tiberian form is qal in both (11) and (12), whereas the SH form is qal in (11), where required by the orthography, but nifʿal B in (12), where the spelling is amenable to nifʿal B realisation.

1.3.3. Samaritan Nifʿal B || Tiberian Nifʿal

The hitpaelisation inherent in the SH proliferation of nifʿal B goes beyond shifts nifʿal B < qal. Indeed, far more common is correspondence between Samaritan nifʿal B and Tiberian nifʿal, which occur in the case of the following Tiberian nifʿal forms (listed here in order of frequency of Samaritan nifʿal B forms): נמכר ‘be sold’ (10x), נטמא ‘become unclean’ (9x; BDSS, NBDSS, RH, Tiberian reading tradition), נפרד ‘separate (intr.), be separated’ (7x), נחה* ‘be comforted, regret, relent’, נמלט ‘escape’ (5x), נ办实事 ‘be sanctified’ (4x), נאום ‘consent’ (3x; ?), נברא ‘bless’ (3x), נלווה ‘join’ (3x), נכתש ‘be destroyed’ (3x), נבנת ‘be built’ (2x), נכבש ‘be subdued’ (2x), נקם* ‘be released, freed’ (2x), ניצל ‘survive, escape’ (2x), נ microsoft word - the historical depth of the tiberian reading tradition.docx
*נקרע* ‘tear (intr.)’ (2x), *נסד* ‘be founded’, *גשה* ‘fight’, *גנקש* ‘become ensnared’, *נסכר* ‘be closed’, *נסיע* ‘be punished’, *נסף* ‘be opened’, *נסיע* ‘be punished’, *נסיע* ‘be desolate’.

*Nifʿal B* passives are particularly common when the corresponding active form is in *piʿel*.

Consider the case of *נסכר* ‘be closed’. The Tiberian active-passive *qal-nifʿal* combination is paralleled by a *piʿel-nifʿal B* combination according to the Samaritan reading tradition (on the *piʿel*, see above, ch. 12, §1.3.1). Thus,

(13) אם והשם עליו דם לו שלם ישלם אם אין לו ונסכר (winnimmakkâr)

‘but if the sun has risen on him, there shall be bloodguilt for him. He shall surely pay. If he has nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft.’ (Exod. 22.2; see also Lev. 25.39, 47–48; 27.27)

(14) והארץ לא תсмер (timmakkâr) להמצאה כי הנרי כי

‘The land shall not be sold in perpetuity, for the land is mine. For you are strangers and sojourners with me.’ (Lev. 25.23, 42; 27.28; Deut. 15.12)

whereas the Samaritan written tradition and Tiberian tradition show a mixture of Dt- and N-stem forms.
The double gemination—of first and second radical—is clear evidence of the hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿel derivation of these forms, showing an advanced stage of hitpaelisation in the Samaritan reading tradition.

1.4. Ben Sira

Hitpaelisation in BS is evident in the occurrence of several hitpaʿʿel forms already mentioned as characteristic of

- LBH: ‘join, associate’ (§1.1.1, above);
- DSS Hebrew: ‘become fat, savour’; ‘delay (intr.), be delayed’ (3x); ‘be seduced’ (2x); ‘sigh, groan’ (3x; Amoraic Hebrew; §1.2.2, above)
- SH: ‘fear’ (see §1.3, above).

BS also presents the first documentation of certain hitpaʿʿel forms (presented here in order of frequency): ‘stand’ (8x); ‘become intimate, take counsel with’ (7x); ‘neglect, pass’ (5x; RH); ‘take delight’ (2x); ‘be bitter’ (2x); ‘distance oneself, move away’ (2x; RH); ‘trade’ (2x); ‘be deaf’ (?); ‘grow old’ (RH); ‘wear’ (RH); ‘mock’ (?); ‘become a fool’ (RH2); ‘brag’ (RH1); ‘go up’ (?) ; ‘exploit’ (MT Gen. 26.2, RH);
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‘become rich’ (RH2); ‘be reckless’ (RH); ‘come near, approach’ (RH); ‘break down’; ‘be looked upon’. Several of these are characteristic of RH, whether Tannaitic, Amoraic, or both.

1.5. Rabbinic Hebrew

RH, consisting of Tannaitic Hebrew and Amoraic Hebrew, has in common with other Second Temple Hebrew chronolects the use of many Dt-stem/Nt-stem forms unknown from Tiberian CBH. The following list focuses on the Mishna (no attempt is made in the following lists to distinguish between hitpaʿʿel and nitpaʿʿal, i.e., all forms are listed as hitpaʿʿel):

- LBH: התעננה ‘fast’ (19x; NBDSS; BS); התנדב ‘freely offer (cultic)’ (19x; NBDSS), התAdvisor ‘join, associate’ (2x; BS), and התנגיד ‘magnify yourself’ (LBH);
- NBDSS: התתא ‘become defiled, unclean’ (167x; SH, Tiberian reading tradition [see below, §2.0]); התתהל ‘be sent’ (14x); התתחל ‘unite (intr.)’ (10x); התתמל ‘be filled’ (4x—different semantics in MT Job 16.10); התתפר ‘be scattered’ (2x; RH); התתבש ‘be washed’; התתצל ‘hesitate, be sluggish’; התתפר ‘be refined’;
- BS: התתפש ‘exploit’ (7x; MT Gen. 26.2); התתיא ‘fear’ (2x; SH); התתלק ‘wear’; התתרכ ‘distance oneself, move away’.

RH, generally, and the Mishna, more specifically, also manifest hitpaelisation via the innovation of many hitpaʿʿel forms unattested in earlier classical or contemporary Second Temple sources. In the following list, forms are presented in order of frequency, with cognate BH and BA forms noted where relevant:
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‘to be joined’ (137x); ‘enter into levirate marriage (said of a woman)’ (35x); ‘intend’ (35x); ‘persist, continue’ (25x; cf. LBH piʿʿel); ‘become blemished’ (23x); ‘be tithed’ (20x); ‘be used’ (17x; cf. BA paʿʿel); ‘be divided, distributed’ (12x; cf. BH reflexive hitpaʿʿel with direct object in Josh. 18.5 || nifʿal; puʿʿal); ‘receive, accept’ (12x; cf. LBH piʿʿel); ‘look at’ (11x; cf. BA hitpʿʿal); ‘partner, form a partnership’ (11x); ‘be alone (with)’ (10x); ‘be liable’ (8x; cf. LBH piʿʿel); ‘be provided for, make a living’ (7x); ‘become betrothed’ (6x; || BH puʿʿal); ‘become diminished’ (6x; || BH qal); ‘be translated (5x; cf. BA puʿʿal); ‘be hosted’ (4x); ‘gather (intr.)’ (4x); ‘move, leave, avoid’ (4x; cf. TA Dt, BA qal); ‘suffer pain, distress’ (4x); ‘attend to, take care of’ (3x); ‘be shaken, torn away’ (3x; || BH qal internal passive; nifʿal); ‘have one’s hair cut’ (3x); ‘be enslaved’ (3x); ‘be measured’ (3x; cf. BH qal); ‘be ashamed’ (3x; BH qal); ‘be cooked’ (3x; || BH puʿʿal); ‘be/get divorced (in reference to the wife)’ (3x; cf. BH qal passive participle); ‘be profaned, deconsecrated’ (3x; || BH nifʿal; puʿʿal); ‘adorn oneself’ (3x); ‘make an effort, try’ (2x); ‘be removed’ (2x); ‘convert to Judaism’ (2x); ‘wallow’; ‘be freed’ (2x); ‘despair, give up hope’ (2x || BH nifʿal; transitive piʿʿel in LBH); ‘be falsified’; ‘form pairs’; ‘need’; ‘be divisible by three’ (cf. BH puʿʿal with different semantics); ‘be digested’ (≈ BH nifʿal); ‘rub up against’; ‘become stable’;
‘become white, be bleached’ (the form in MT Dan. 12.10 is often rendered as a reflexive); ‘be pressed’ (|| BH qal internal passive; qal passive participle); ‘drain, be drained’ (|| BH nifʿal); ‘be rubbed, smeared’; ‘waste away’; ‘be intercalated’; ‘be delayed’; ‘be sneezed’; ‘be kneaded’; ‘be trimmed’.

Finally, it should be noted that one of the acknowledged results of hitpaelisation in RH was the replacement of puʿʿal hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿel. Generally speaking, only puʿʿal participles persisted, whereas finite forms gave way to hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿel alternatives e.g., BH יָבֵשׁ ‘be cooked’ (Lev 6.21, 21) versus RH נִיתְּבַשֵל ‘be cooked’ (m. Terumot 10.12; m. Maʿaser Sheni 2.1; m. ‘Orla 2.7, 16–17; m. Nederim 6.6; m. Ḥullin 7.4–5; see https://hebrew-academy.org.il/2018/07/24/)

2.0. The Tiberian Reading Tradition of Classical Biblical Hebrew Texts

The Tiberian reading tradition only occasionally deviates from the morphology reflected by the corresponding written tradition in favour of secondary hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿel morphology. In so doing, it joins with the Second Temple chronicle discussed above in terms of hitpaelisation.

2.1. Nippaʿʿel (< Nitpaʿʿel) < Nifʿal

Similar to the Tiberian Hebrew written tradition of exilic texts with hippaʿʿel < hitpaʿʿel forms (see above, §1.1.2), the Tiberian reading tradition occasionally interprets apparently original nifʿal orthographic forms as cases of nippaʿʿel (< nitpaʿʿel). Tiberian vo-
calisations of this sort are relatively rare (see also ch. 10, §2.3): והנשא ‘and (his kingdom) will be exalted’ (Num. 24.7); ובפר ‘and (the blood guilt) will be atoned for’ (Deut. 21.8); ונקיפור ‘and (all women) should take warning’ (Ezek. 23.48); וובש ‘(hatred) will be covered’ (Prov. 26.26); והנשא ‘(and the sons of the violent of your people) will rise up’ (Dan. 11.14); והנשא ‘so he was exalted’ (2 Chron. 32.23); several, but not all, of these come in exilic or post-exilic material.

2.2. I-alveolar Verbs

2.2.1. קָפֵר ‘become unclean, defile oneself’

Baden’s (2010, 38–39) discusses the case of the nifʿal and hitpael of קָפֵר, both meaning ‘become unclean, defile oneself’. This appears to be a clear case of secondary suppletion, in which the originally nifʿal form was reinterpreted as hitpael where permitted by the consonantal spelling. Thus all 18 nifʿal forms are either suffix conjugation forms (16x: Lev. 11.43; 18.24; Num. 5.13–14, 14, 20, 27–29; Jer. 2.23; Ezek. 20.43; 23.7, 13, 30; Hos. 5.3; 6.10) or participles (2x: Ezek. 20.30–31). By contrast, all 15 hitpael forms are in the prefix conjugation (Lev. 11.24, 43; 18.24, 30; 21.1, 3–4, 11; Num. 6.7; Ezek. 14.11; 20.7, 18; 37.23; 44.25; Hos. 9.4). Note that the two forms often come in the same context, or even the same verse, e.g.,
You shall not make yourselves detestable with any swarm-ing thing that swarms, and you shall not defile yourselves with them, and become unclean through them.’ (Lev. 11.43; see also Lev. 18.24)

And I said to their children in the wilderness, “Do not walk in the statutes of your fathers, nor keep their rules, nor defile yourselves with their idols.”... Therefore say to the house of Israel, Thus says the Lord GOD: “Will you defile yourselves after the manner of your fathers and go whoring after their detestable things? When you present your gifts and offer up your children in fire, you defile yourselves with all your idols to this day. And shall I be inquired of by you, O house of Israel? As I live, declares the Lord GOD, I will not be inquired of by you.” (Ezek. 20.18, 30–31)

Though translations sometimes appear to reflect a semantic distinc-tion between the nifʿal and hitpaʿʿel forms, e.g., (14), any distinc-tion between the two is in reality merely formal, both capable of a range of middle semantics covering passive and reflexive force, e.g., (15). The suppletion is an example of partial hitpae-lisation made where allowed by the orthography. Note that in
SH, all forms are \textit{nif\textsuperscript{al} B} (§1.3.3). Hitpaelisation of this verb is also documented in the NBDSS (§1.2.2) and RH (§1.5).

2.2.2. לְכָּד "be cleansed, cleanse yourself"

Active verbs with this root occur in \textit{qal}, in the sense ‘acquit, be justified’ (Mic. 6.11; Ps. 51.6; Job 15.14; 25.4), and \textit{pi\textsuperscript{el}}, in the sense ‘keep/make pure’ (Ps. 73.13; 119.9; Prov. 20.9). The imperative form \textit{וֵ֔הִזַכ} (Isa. 1.16) is orthographically ambiguous, theoretically presupposing \textit{nif\textsuperscript{al} והָנָּכ} or its traditionally \textit{hitpa\textsuperscript{el}} morphology. This is the only apparently \textit{hitpa\textsuperscript{el}} form of a I-z root in BH, so it is impossible to tell whether the full assimilation of the root-initial \textit{z} is routine. By way of comparison, root-initial \textit{ṣ} does not assimilate, but undergoes metathesis. The morphological ambiguity of the NBDSS occurrences of this verb (1QS 3.4; 8.18; 4Q257 3.6; 5Q13 f4.2) make them unhelpful. Metathesis takes place in NBDSS \textit{לְהִזַדָייף} ‘to falsified’ (m. Gittin 2.4) and \textit{וּמִיזְּדְּוִין} ‘and (they) would form pairs’ (m. Sanhedrin 5.5). It seems possible that the biblical orthography \textit{הזכנו} (Isa. 1.13) reflects a \textit{nif\textsuperscript{al}} form that was secondarily read as a \textit{hitpa\textsuperscript{el}}.

2.2.3. לְכָד "be crushed"

The verb with transitive semantics is \textit{pi\textsuperscript{el}} (Isa. 3.15; 53.10; Ps. 72.4; 89.11; 94.5; 143.3; Job 4.19; 6.9; 19.2; Prov. 22.22; Lam. 3.34). The corresponding passive \textit{pu\textsuperscript{al}} comes four times (Isa. 19.10; 53.5; Jer. 44.10; Job 22.9). An unequivocal \textit{nif\textsuperscript{al}} form comes in \textit{נִדְּכָאִֽים} ‘ones being crushed’ (Isa. 57.15). Ambiguous orthographic forms vocalised as \textit{hitpa\textsuperscript{el}/nitpa\textsuperscript{al}} come in the case
of רבדות ‘and they are crushed’ (Job 5.4) and רבדות ‘and they are crushed’ (Job 34.25). On semantic grounds, Baden (2010, 38) assumes an original nifʿal secondarily read as hitpaʿʿel, but the regularity of piʿʿal and puʿʿal forms may point to the authenticity of the t-stem morphology. Baden (2010, 40–43) also notes that initial-alveolar and initial-affricate forms are disproportionately underrepresented in terms of nifʿal morphology, suggesting that such forms were disproportionately reinterpreted as hitpaʿʿel forms.8

2.2.4. דב ‘speak (divine)’

On three occasions in Tiberian BH one encounters the hitpaʿʿel active participle מדבר:

(18)

ובִּבְּבָֹ֨א מֹ֜שֶֶ֜ה אֶל־אֹ הֶלְּוַ֨עֵד לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ וַיִּשְּמַָ֨ע אֶת־הַקֶ֜וֹל מִדַּבֵּ֣ר אֵלֵָ֗יו מֵעַַ֤ל הַכַפָֹֹ֨רֶת אֲשֶּׁר עַל־אֲרֹ֝֔ן הָעֵדֵֻ֔ת מִבֵֶ֖ין שְּנֵי הָכְרֻבִָׂ֑ים וַיְּדַבֵֶ֖ר אֵלַָֽיו׃

‘And when Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with the LORD, he heard the voice speaking to him from above the mercy seat that was on the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim; and it spoke to him.’

(Num. 7.89)

(19)

וַתָָ֧בֹא בִּי רֵ֗וּחַ כַַֽאֲשֶׁר דִֶבֶ֣ר אֵלֵַ֔י וָאֶשְּמַָ֕ע אֵ֖ת מִדַּבֵּ֥ר אֵלַָֽ

‘And the Spirit entered into me as he spoke to me and [the spirit] set me on my feet, and I heard him speaking to me.’

(Ezek. 2.2)

8 Citing the likes of Yellin (1924), Bergsträsser (1918–1929, II:§16d), and Siebesma (1991, 169), Baden (2010, 39, fn. 17) also lists the roots בר, גא, and כס as mixing nifʿal and hitpaʿʿel morphology. But the suppletion in these cases is not as consistent as in those discussed above.
The apparently secondary use of hitpaʿʿel is restricted to originally piʿʿel participles, as this consonantal form is amenable to hitpaelisation due to the assimilation of the infix -t- to the following dental d. Notably, it is restricted to contexts of divine speech. This was evidently one strategy among many employed as part of a broad Second Temple effort to avoid anthropomorphism of the deity. Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 218, §2.14.18, fn. 198) notes that such techniques are especially characteristic of the Targums. Indeed, observe that in the Aramaic rendering of Targums Onqelos in (21), Dt-stem participles correspond to both the participle and a finite verbal form in the MT:

(21) וכר עלייל משה למשכן ומכ עלייל עמי והשמע תכלאה דמעלמל עמי
‘And when Moses would go into the tent of meeting to speak with the L ORD, and he would heard the voice speaking to him from above the mercy seat that was on the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim; and it would speak to him.’ (TO Num. 7.89)

For further evidence of the Targumic distinction between the D-stem for human speech and the Dt-stem for divine speech, see
And they said to Moses, “You speak to us, and we will listen; but do not let God speak to us, lest we die.”” (Exod. 20.19)

Then Samuel said to Saul, “Stop! I will tell you what which the LORD spoke to me this night.” And he said to him, “Speak.”” (1 Sam.15.16; see also TJ Ezek. 2.2)

The Targums, thus, reflect a tradition similar to that reflected in the Tiberian reading tradition. The same is true of RH (Tannaitic and Amoraic sources). Conversely, other Second Temple Hebrew sources show no sign of this distinction. In the relevant passage, the SP has the more expected—and original—pi’el form מדבר ‘[the voice] speaking’ (Num. 7.89). Likewise, the Peshitta has D-stem forms parallel to the MT hitpa’el forms. Neither the Old Greek nor the Vulgate show special forms corresponding to the MT’s hitpa’els. The use of dedicated Dt-stem verbs for divine speech is thus a feature specific to Jewish interpretive traditions. It dates to at least the Tannaitic period, prior

---

9 For Dt-stem forms of בָּאִלָּה ‘speak’ more generally in reference to divine speech, see in TO Gen 16.13; Exod. 33.9; TJ Jer. 9.11; Ezek. 1.3, 28; 13.7; 22.28; Hab. 2.1; Targum Song 1.2; 2.5.
if the reading component of the Tiberian biblical tradition had already crystallised by then.

3.0. The Tiberian Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

3.1. Northwest Semitic Inscriptions

No hitpaʿʿel forms occur in the limited corpus of Iron Age Hebrew epigraphy (Gogel 1998, 119). However, t-stem forms are found in the wider Northwest Semitic repertoire, specifically, in the Moabite of the Meshaʿ Stele, where one finds repeated occurrences of the hifteʿel form הלחם ‘fight’ (KAI 181 1.11, 15, 19, 32–33). Clearly, t-stem forms semantically parallel to BH nifʿal forms were extant in Iron Age sources.

3.2. Synonymy between Hitpaʿʿel and Other Stems

Yet, it would be misleading to suggest that synonymy between hitpaʿʿel and other stems is an exclusively late phenomenon. Consider the following examples, which may be considered more broadly representative.

3.2.1. נברך | ben raḵ ‘be blessed, bless oneself’

Whatever the exact meaning of the hitpaʿʿel (Gen. 22.18; 26.4; Deut. 29.18; Isa. 65.16; Jer. 4.2; Ps. 72.17) and nifʿal (Gen 12.3; 18.18; 28.14), their appearance in nearly parallel contexts in Genesis would seem to demonstrate early semantic overlap.
3.2.2. הִתְּח ַבֵא \(\text{hide (intr.)}\)

In both Tiberian CBH and LBH, the hitpaʿʿel (Gen. 3.8; 1 Sam. 13.6; 14.11, 22; 23.23; 2 Kgs 11.3; Job 38.30; 1 Chron. 21.20; 2 Chron. 22.9, 12) and nifʿal (Gen. 3.10; 31.27; Josh. 2.16; 10.16–17, 27; Judg. 9.5; 1 Sam. 10.22; 19.2; 2 Sam. 17.9; Amos 9.3; Job 5.21; 29.8, 10; Dan. 10.7; 2 Chron. 18.24) forms appear with identical semantics. Indeed, they occur separated by a single verse in the same story in Gen. 3.8 and 10.

3.2.3. נֶחְּבָא/הִתְּיַצֵב ‘position oneself, stand’

The connection between the hitpaʿʿel הִתְּיַצֵב and the nifʿal נִצַב is not merely one of semantic synonymy, but of partial suppletion. In Tiberian BH the hitpaʿʿel occurs primarily as a prefix conjugation form, imperative, or infinitive construct. It occurs just twice as a suffix conjugation form, specifically in LBH. The nifʿal, conversely, occurs only as a participle and suffix conjugation form, the latter outside of LBH. Given this sort of mutual exclusivity, it is not surprising that the two forms should occur with similar semantics in close proximity, e.g., וְנִצַבְתָה ‘and you will stand’ (Exod. 34.2) and וְהִתְּיַצֵב ‘and he stood’ (Exod. 34.5). Consider also the hitpaʿʿel forms in Num. 22.22; 23.3, 15 versus the nifʿal forms in Num. 22.23, 31, 34; 23.6, 17. Finally, nearly parallel uses involve the nifʿal נִצַבְתָה ‘and you will stand’ (Exod. 7.15; see also 5.20) and the hitpaʿʿel הִתְּיַצֵב ‘and stand’ (Exod. 8.20; see also 9.13). Clearly, the above is strong evidence of early hitpaʿʿel-nifʿal correspondence.
3.2.4. be established

There is arguable semantic overlap between the hitpolel and the nifʿal, but the most striking feature of the hitpolel is the consonantal evidence it provides for the hippaʿʿel < hitpaʿʿel (nippaʿʿel < nitpaʿʿel), or, more specifically, hippolel < hitpolel (nippolel < nitpolel), shift more evident in the pronunciation component of the Tiberian reading tradition and other Second Temple traditions (i.e., SH). Indeed, in three of the four hitpolel instances, the т has assimilated: הבא ‘be established, rebuilt (FS)’ (Num. 21.27); בא ‘you (FS) will be (re)established’ (Isa. 54.1); ‘and they (M) make ready’ (Ps. 59.5); cf. יתב ‘it (M) is established’ (Prov. 24.3). Note that the relevant consonantal forms are unambiguously hippolel/nippolel < hitpolel/nitpolel, as evidenced by reduplication of the n. This is strong evidence that the apparently secondary vocalisation development seen above in §2.1 is in line with developments already seen in the Tiberian written tradition.10

3.2.5. prophesy

So apparently interchangeable are the hitpaʿʿel and nifʿal of נב that they both come throughout BH, frequently appearing in close proximity, including on four occasions within a single verse:thernא ‘prophesying (MPL)’ and התרב ‘and they prophesied’ (1 Sam. 19.20); ‘prophesying (MPL)’ and מתרב ‘prophesying (MPL)’ (Jer. 14.14); ‘would prophesy (MS)’ and יתב ‘who are prophesying ‘and he prophesied’ (Jer. 26.20); יתב ‘who are prophesying

10 Consider also hippolel/nippolel ‘I will exalt myself’ (Isa 33.10) versus hitpolel/nitpolel ‘and he will exalt himself’ (Dan 11.36).
Hitpa‘elisation

In the case of these verbs, semantic correspondence between *hitpa‘el* and *nif‘al* seems to have deep historical roots.

3.2.6. **be comforted; regret, change one’s mind**

*Hitpa‘el* forms, usually in the sense ‘take comfort, be comforted’, (7x) are rarer than *nif‘al* (48x), usually ‘repent, regret’. The *hitpa‘el* occasionally has the meaning more commonly associated with the *nif‘al*, e.g., ... ‘God is not a man that he should like, nor a human that he should change his mind’ (Num. 23.19); cf. ... ‘And also the Glory of Israel does not lie and does not change his mind, for he is not a man, that he should change his mind’” (1 Sam. 15.29).

The reverse semantic shift, that of *nif‘al* bearing the sense more typically associated with *hitpa‘el*, also occurs. Consider the following verses about Judah from consecutive chapters:

(24) וַיִּקְמוּ כָּל־בָנָיו וְכָל־בְּנֹתֶיהוּ לְנַחֲמֵוֹ וַיְּמָאֵן לְּׁהִתְּׁנַּחְּם וַיְּמָאֵן כִּי־אֵרֵד אֶל־בְּנִי אָבֵ֖ל שְּאָלָ֑ה וַיֵּבְךְּ אֹתֶֽוֹ אָבִּֽיו׃

‘All his sons and daughters stood by him to console him, but he refused to be consoled. “No,” he said, “I will go to the grave mourning my son.”’ (Gen. 37.35)

(25) וַיִּרְּבוּ הַיָּמִים וַתְּמָת בַּת־שְׁוָא אֵֵֽשֶת־יְּהוּדָה וַיְּנָחֶם יְּהוּדָה וַיֶּעַל עַל־גַּזְזֵי צֹאנוֹ הֵוּא וְחִירָה רֵעֵֵ֥הוּ הָעֲדֻלָּ֖י תִּמְּנַָֽתָה׃

‘After some time Judah’s wife, the daughter of Shua, died. After Judah was consoled, he left for Timnah to visit his sheepshearers, along with his friend Hirah the Adullamite.’ (Gen. 38.12)
One further piece of evidence for morphosemantic overlap between hitpaʿʿel and nifʿal can be found in the form וְּהִנֶחָָׂ֑מְּתִי ‘and I will satisfy myself’ (Ezek. 5.13). It represents the development hippaʿʿel < hitpaʿʿel, which in SH came to be identified as nifʿal B and is related to RH niptaʿʿal.

3.2.7. נִסְּתַר ‘hide (intr.)’

There appears to be little to no semantic difference between hitpaʿʿel נִסְּתַר and nifʿal נִסְּתַר when in reference to a human subject (the nifʿal is more common overall, and with non-human subjects, but cf. Isa. 29.14). For synonymous usage, compare

וַ֤וַיַעֲלַ֣זִפִים֙ אֶל־שָאֵ֔וּל הַגִּבְעֶ֖תָה לֵאמְרֽוֹ לָ֑דֵו מִסְּתַתֵּרֽוּ בַמְצָדוֹת֙ בַחֵֹ֔רְּשָה בְּגִבְּעַת֙ הַחֲכִילֵָ֔ה אֲשֶֶ֖ר מִימִֵ֥ין הַיְשִימַֽוֹן׃

‘Then the Ziphites went up to Saul at Gibeah, saying, “Is not David hiding among us in the strongholds at Horesh, on the hill of Hachilah, which is south of Jeshimon?”’ (1 Sam. 23.19; see also 26.1)

וַ֤יְּהִ יֹֽהַֽבֵּ֣ד הַחֵֹ֔דֶשְׁוֹ בַשָּֽדֶּ֔ה וַיֵָ֧שֶב הַמֶ֛לֶךְ עַל הַלֶֶ֖חֶם לֶאֱכַֽוֹל׃

‘And David hid in the field. And when the new moon came, the king sat down to eat food.’ (1 Sam. 20.24; see also 20.5, 19)

3.2.8. נִקְּבַץ ‘gather (intr.)’

In reference to humans, the hitpaʿʿel and nifʿal are largely synonymous regarding the meaning ‘gather (intr.)’, though the nifʿal apparently has passive semantics as well. Cf. נִקְּבַצ וָּבֹ֙אוּ מִסָבִֵ֔יב ‘gather and come against it and rise for war’ (Jer. 49.14) and נִקְּבַצ וָּבֹ֙אוּ מִסָבִֵ֔יב ‘gather and come, assemble
around’ (Ezek. 39.17). Even more convincing as examples of semantic synonymy are the *nifʿal* and *hitpaʿʿel* in consecutive verses in *nifʿal* וּוַיִקָבְּצ 'and they gathered (intr.)’ (1 Sam. 7.6) followed by *hitpaʿʿel* וַהִתְּקַבְּצ (the Israelites) gathered (intr.)’ (1 Sam. 7.7).

3.3. Evidence of *Hitpaʿʿel-Nifʿal* Merger

Discussed above, in §2.1, was the reinterpretation of *nifʿal* forms as *hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿel* forms with assimilated *t*-infix. Emphasised were the secondary nature of the vocalism and its agreement with trends characteristic of late Aramaic and Hebrew sources. In a few cases, however, suffix conjugation forms can be read only as *t*-stem forms with assimilated infix -*t*-: וְתִכוֹנֵֵֶ֖֣ן ‘be established, rebuilt (FS)’ (Num. 21.27); אֵַֽרוֹמֵָ֔ם ‘I will exalt myself’ (Isa. 33.10); הָבָּנִי ‘you (FS) will be (re)established’ (Isa. 54.1); וְהִנַבְא ‘they prophesied’ (Jer. 23.13); וְהִנֶחָָ֑מְתִי ‘and I will be satisfied’ (Ezek. 5.13); וְהִנַבִֵ֖אתִי ‘and I prophesied’ (Ezek. 37.10). וְּיִכוֹנָָׂ֑נ ‘and they (M) make ready’ (Ps. 59.5). Clearly, these unambiguous consonantal *t*-stem forms with assimilated *tav* lend credence to the vocalisation of the apparently *hippaʿʿel/nippaʿʿel < hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿel* forms seen above.

4.0. Conclusion

Probably as a result of factors external (contact with Aramaic) and internal (growing use of *hitpaʿʿel* as a medio-passive, not just a reflexive), hitpaelisation is a characteristic of Second Temple Hebrew as reflected in multiple sources and traditions (§1.0). A number of apparent cases of dissonance between the reading and written components of the Tiberian biblical tradition involve sec-
ondary hitpaʿʿel/nitpaʿʿel analysis of forms originally in other stems, especially, nifʿal (§2.0). As seen in §3.0, however, the secondary vocalic deviations find precedents in several features seen in First Temple sources, including the use of t-stem forms in Iron Age Semitic epigraphy (§3.1); not infrequent synonymy between t-stem and N-stem, including cases of suppletion (§3.2); and evidence of the N- and t-stem merger in the case of nippaʿʿel/ nippetel < nitpaʿʿel/nippetel shifts.
14. **ȬTÈREM QAŢAL**

The temporal particle (בְּ/מִ)טֶרֶם ‘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 yiqtol. The focus of this chapter is the minority syntactic structure of טֶרֶם followed by the suffix conjugation, i.e., ȬTÈREM qatal.

1.0. **The Majority Syntax: ȬTÈREM YIQTOL**

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

1.1. **ȬTÈREM YIQTOL with Expected YIQTOL Semantics**

In some 27 cases of ȬTÈREM yiqtol, 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: בֶֹ֖קֶר ‘before morning’ (Isa. 17.14); בְּטֵֶ֥רֶם ‘before summer’ (Isa. 28.4); infinitive: בֵֹ֖שֶׁר לָ֑דַע ‘before a decree takes effect’ (Zeph. 2.2a); שֶׁמֶ֜ר מַטֶּֽה ‘before the placing of a stone’ (Hag. 2.15).

² The TAM semantics of some cases of ȬTÈREM yiqtol, especially in poetry, are debatable.
(1) ‘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) “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) ‘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 yiqtol form regularly encodes such semantic values even in the absence of טֶרֶם.

1.2. Terem Yiqtol with Unexpected Yiqtol Semantics

In some 21 instances of terem yiqtol, however, the yiqtol 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 terem yiqtol
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 *ṭerem 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*).
The same future-in-the-past sense of yiqṭol can occur after the particle עַד (אֲשֶר, 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 המ ‘what’.

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).
‘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 complete interpretations, but yiqtol is employed due to the relative future force in a subordinate clause. Yiqtol dominates after terem to the near exclusion of qatal, evidently because within narrative context, the standard relative future/prospective past force of the verbal form after terem 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 terem yiqtol not only explains the otherwise anomalous use of yiqtol in reference to perfective past eventualities, as in example (8), but is consistent with yiqtol 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 yiqtol in many languages, including after terem and עד, 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 תֶּרֶם 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 terem yiqtol where the prefix conjugation refers to a perfective past eventuality also justifies the explicit use of morphologically long yiqtol (< yaqtulu/a), against the claim of some (see above) that the form in question derived from archaic preterite short yiqtol (< yaqtul) the original length distinction of which was lost.

2.0. The Minority Syntax: Ṭerem Qatal

On four occasions in Masoretic BH a verb in a תֶּרֶם construction referring to a perfective past eventuality comes in the qatal rather than yiqtol 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 תֶּרֶם constructions within and beyond BH.

2.1. Diachronic Considerations

First, it is worth noting that the four exceptional examples of terem qatal 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 תֶּרֶם—with qatal or yiqtol—is to be found in LBH.
2.1.2. Rabbinic Hebrew

The particle ṭerem 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 ṭerem match their Masoretic counterparts, in the NBDSS there is no trace of ṭerem yiqtol where the verb refers to a perfective past eventuality, against seven apparent cases of perfective past ṭerem qatal. Assuming the correctness of the readings, examples (9)–(15) appear to be instances of ṭerem qatal, though several are also interpretable as ṭerem + infinitive construct.

(9) ובטרם נсосרו ידע את מעשיהם ‘before they were established, he knew their deeds’ (CD 2.7–8)

(10) ואלה אשר הכינת מקדש [&] נתהל הכתוב בלעט ב имени כל מעשים ‘And it is these which you prepared from ancient eternity to judge, all your works before you created them’ (1QHa 5.24–25)

(11) ‘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) ובעבר בראשיתידעתם {כלם} מעשהיהם ‘and before You created them You knew {all} their works’ (1QHa 9.9)
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(13) מֵתֵרֶם מְרַכֵּזָה

‘before you (MPL) were (?)’ (4Q176 f22.3)

(14) בְּמַסְרֵם בְּרָאָם מִצְמָכָה [יחית]

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

(15) בְּמַסְרֵם בְּרָאָם יַעֲשֶׂה מֵתָּחָם [יחית]

‘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 (11Q5).

(16) אני נער בְּמַסְרֵם מְעַייר בַּקְשַּׁתיה

‘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 terem qatal over terem yiqtol, 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 ‘az, terem, and ‘ad in the past frame are consistently followed by the Pf.”

6 Cf. infinitival הבְּרָאָם בְּתַסרֵם יִזְיֹתָם ‘before they were (lit. before their being)’ (1QH 9.30).

7 Cf. infinitival הבְּרָאָם בְּתַסרֵם יֵבְרָאָם ‘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 אָז, טֶרֶם, and
Whereas in past contexts the particle (ץ) is not followed by yiqtol 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 yiqtol after ṭerem. The typical Targumic equivalent of BH ṭerem yiqtol is עד דו followed by the suffix conjugation.\(^{11}\) The Syriac equivalents are ܥܕܟܝܠ ܠܐ, consistently followed by the suffix conjugation, and ܥܕܠ ܐ, 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

\(\text{ץ} \) 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 yiqtol after ָֽזֶרֶם and ָֽזֶרֶם from the past-tense use of yiqtol after ָֽז (JM, 341–42, §113i–j; Cook 2012, 262), which, despite notable attempts 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 yiqtol after ָֽז, 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. ָֽז ֶדו + prefix conjugation and ָֽז ֶדו + infinitive are also attested. In BH ָֽז ֶדו + qaṭal occurs only here in Prov. 8.25 and in Deutero-Isaiah’s Isa. 47.7, where the corresponding text in 1QIsa\(^{a}\) 39.26 reads ָֽז ֶדו rather than ָֽז ֶדו.

\(^{12}\) ܚܕܠ + qaṭl: Gen. 2.5, 5; 19.4; 24.15, 45; 1 Sam. 3.3, 7, 7; ܚܕܠ + qtl: Num. 11.33; Ps. 119.67; ܚܕܠ + 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. The CBH terem yiqtol structure, by contrast, has no negative component, but can be analysed with the basic semantic value of ‘before’. When followed by yiqtol, the force is prospective, i.e., relative future ‘before he would come’; when followed by qatal, the force is retrospective, i.e., absolute past ‘before he came’. It is entirely possible that the diminished relative future use of yiqtol, 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 terem yiqtol with terem qatal. 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 terem and Aramaic/Hebrew עד לא and similar negative conjunctions may be gleaned from the apparent synonymy of the three terem structures in Zeph. 2.2:

(17) בְּׁטֶּ֣רֶם ל א־יָבּ֣וֹא עֲלֵיכֵֶ֗ם יֶ֖וֹם אַף־יְּהוַָֽה׃

‘before the delivery of the decree, like chaff the day has passed, when the burning anger of the L ORD does not yet come upon you, when the day of the anger of the L ORD does not yet come upon you.’ (Zeph. 2.2)

13 CD 10.10 (with yiqtol); 4Q300 f1a–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., עד לא (Qoh. 4.3), עד לא (m. Yadayim 4.4), עד לא (y. Berakhot).
Here the initial רֶמֶש structure containing an infinitive construct has approximately the same meaning as the two subsequent רֶמֶש constructions with negated yiqtol forms. These all have absolute future, rather than past, semantics, but the crucial point is that the standard future-oriented terem yiqtol 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 רֶמֶש 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 qatal over yiqtol in reference to perfective past eventualities. Be that as it may, on the surface, the ostensible diachronic shift from terem yiqtol to terem qatal 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, יִדֵּשׁ ‘while’ versus יָדַשׁ ‘until’ in Hebrew (cf. Job 1.16–18); post-classical ancient Hebrew אַל יָד ‘not yet’ parallels Modern Hebrew יָד אַל; 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, aspect, and negation in adverbial clauses.
chronic distribution within the MT, in that LBH exhibits no cases of terem qatal (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 terem yiqtol, 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 terem qatal reading. But such reanalysis accounts for only a portion of the terem qatal exceptions; it would seem that others are genuine classical outliers.

2.2. Secondary terem qatal in the Tiberian Reading Tradition

In two cases of terem qatal in the Masoretic Hebrew Bible, a compelling argument can be made that the qatal 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 yiqtol alternatives.

2.2.1. 1 Sam. 3.7

וּשְּמוּאֵל טֶרֶם יָדַּע אֶת־יְּהוָָׂה וְּטֵֶ֛רֶם יִגָלֶ֥ה אֵלֶָ֖יו דְּבַר־יְּהוַָֽה׃

‘Now Samuel did not yet know the LORD and the word of the LORD would yet be revealed to him.’ (1 Sam. 3.7)

This well-known example helpfully presents two instances of טֶרֶם + verb: the anomalous terem qatal in the first half of the
verse and the more common terem yiqtol in its second half. The grammatical mismatch is conspicuous. The accepted—and arguably most compelling—explanation for the instance of terem qatal 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 ידָע here were originally intended to represent a yiqtol form expected to yield Tiberian ידָע, but were read—presumably in line with later grammar, like that of the NBDSS Hebrew cases cited above in (9)–(15)—as qatal ידָע. Certainly, the conjectural yiqtol ידָע is a better match than qatal ידָע for the accompanying yiqtol הִגָלֶה later in the verse, as well as for the majority of other cases of terem yiqtol 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 qatal and yiqtol consonantal forms, in this case ידָע and ידָע, 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 + qatal forms, like וַיִּרְד wyārād. So pervasive was the penetration of qatal morphology, that it was applied even to feminine I-y qal forms, e.g., MT וַתֵּלֶד ‘and she gave birth’ (Gen. 4.1) || SP וַתַּלֵּד wtālād (Khan 2021, 331; cf. Ben-Ḥayyīm 2000, 170, 173). It is reasonable to assume that the Samaritan reading of original I-y qal forms in terem yiqtol might also have been along the lines of terem yiqtol, but this must remain conjecture, as the Pentateuch presents no cases of perfective past terem yiqtol with a I-y qal verb (likewise for perfective past I-y qal yiqtol following אָז and עַד). In light of the morphological mismatch between טֶֶ֖רֶם יָדַ ע and טֶ֛רֶם יִגָלֵ֥ה in 1 Sam. 3.7, a local explanation for the anomalous use of the characteristically late terem qatal 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 terem qatal. 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-Ḥayyīm (2000, 173) accepts this explanation for 3MS and 3MPL wayyiqtol forms, but not for 2MS and 3FS wayyiqtol forms, which he sees as yiqtol forms with an ā-vowel preformative reflecting original yafʿal; cf. Khan (2021, 331), who sees SP forms like דָּרַח wtālād as secondary forms that developed on the analogy of qatal for purposes of distinguishing preterite yiqtol (e.g., wtārād) from non-preterite yiqtol (e.g., tērād).
ticity of one or more of the remaining three cases tallies with early evidence of other secondary vocalisation features that represent standardisations of early minority options. In other words, the fact that a single case of *ṭerem qatal* is compellingly explained as a late secondary vocalic deviation from the presumed recitation of the written tradition in line with Second Temple conventions does not mean that all similar structures should be so explained.

2.2.2. Ps. 90.2

Another case of *ṭerem qatal* occurs in the poetry of Ps. 90.2:

(19) בְּׁטֶרֶם׀ הָֹרִַ֤ים יֻׁלֶ֗דוּ וַתְּח וֹלֵַֽל אֶ רֶץ וְּתֵבֵָׂ֑ל וַּֽמֵעוֹלֵָ֥ם עַד־עֶ֜וֹלֵָ֗ם אַתֵ֥ה אֵַֽל׃

‘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 יֻלֵ֗דו appears to be a puʿʿal form of the suffix conjugation, internal passive of either piʿʿel 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 middle-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 piʿʿel form is used exclusively in BH as a substantive in the meaning ‘midwife’: Gen. 35.17, 28; Exod. 1.15–21.
patterns (suffix conjugation *puʿʿal* and prefix conjugation *hofʿal/ hufʿal*) was possible, but are otherwise realised as *nifʿals*. Thus,

1. ostensibly *puʿʿal* suffix conjugation הגב pairs with *nifʿal* prefix conjugation יגָּב (rather than גַּב);
2. *qal* passive participle (or ostensibly *puʿʿal* participle without the expecting preformative -ן) corresponds to *nifʿal* (i.e., *piʿʿel* internal passive) prefix conjugation יִגָּב (rather than גַּב/ יָגַב); and
3. ostensibly *hofʿal* prefix conjugation יָתַן parallels *nifʿal* suffix conjugation גָּב (rather than גַּב*).

The problem is not the authenticity of alternatives for the *qal* internal passive, since, for example, consonantally unambiguous *nifʿal* forms are sometimes documented alongside apparent *qal* passives in classically-worded texts (ch. 10, §3.0). 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., אֵין אָכָל ‘was not being consumed’ (Exod. 3.2); לֵכֵא הַיִּבְרָא ‘to the child being born’ (Judg. 13.8); אִם־תִּרְּאֶה אָמְתָּה מֵַֽאִתָךְ ‘if you see me being taken from you’ (2 Kgs 2.10).

18 BH knows know *piʿʿel* אָכַל; cf. *piʿʿel* אוכל in the Samaritan reading tradition and *piʿʿel* עֲכַל in Amoraic Hebrew, as well as *puʿʿal* אוכל in Tannaitic Hebrew.

19 Consider the *nifʿal יֶנָּקַם* (Exod. 21.20) and the *qal* passive (apparently *hofʿal*) יָקֵם (Exod. 21.21) both ‘will be avenged’ in successive verses.
The structure ḧerem qatāl in Ps. 90.2 presents opposing diachronic tendencies. On the one hand, as noted above, the ḧerem qatāl syntagm appears to have late affinities. On the other hand, qal passive ḥāl is characteristically classical. Note that in terms of unambiguous consonantal spellings, forms of qal internal passive ḥāl (qatāl) are confined chiefly to CBH, whereas forms of nifʿal נולַד (qatāl, participle, infinitive construct), though documented in CBH, appreciably accumulate in LBH.²⁰ Orthographically, the relevant yiqtol forms, e.g., ויילדה, 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)

וְיָלְדָּה לוֹדָו (וַיִּלְּדָּה לְדָוִ֛ד בָּנִֵ֖ים בְּחֶבְרָ֑ו...) ‘And sons were born to David at Hebron…’ (2 Sam. 3.2)

It is likely here that the ketiv ויילדה reflects an original qal internal passive wayyiqtol, along the lines of wayyullǝd,²¹ and that the synonymous qere ויילדה is a secondary linguistic update in line

---

²⁰ Qal internal passive ḥāl qatāl: 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 נולַד qatāl, 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 1-y qal internal passive yiqtol, the spelling with waw is expected, e.g., ויילדה, as in ויילדה יסח and ויילדה, 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 יִלֵדוּ 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 יִלֵדוּ 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 + qatal form, the terem yiqṭol structure ...绿水青山 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 יִלֵדוּ. Original terem yiqṭol was simply reinterpreted as terem qatal. The phrase וּבְַ֥רֶם׀ הָָֹ֨רִים יֻלֵָ֗ד in Ps. 90.2 thus represents both secondary development—replacing classical terem yiqṭol with terem qatal—and classical preservation—the incidental persistence of characteristically classical qal internal passive יָלַד in the face of the encroachment of nifʿal yiqṭol יִוָּלֵד or qatal נהֲלַד. To summarise: while the form יִלֵדוּ as realised according to the Tiberian recitation tradition is analysable as a qatal form in the characteristically late terem qatal syntagm, its spelling may well represent that of a yiqṭol form in the classic terem yiqṭol structure.

Regardless of the validity of the arguments laid out above, two further factors may have contributed to the terem qatal rather than terem 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 ֶּרֶמ ייִקְטֹל construction here. Second, it is important to note that the syntagm employed in Ps. 90.2 is not precisely ֶּרֶמ + verb, but ֶּרֶמ + 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 below, §2.3.1.

2.3. Original ֶּרֶמ קַתַל 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 possibility of the non-secondary use of ֶרֶמ qaṭal in BH. Indeed, despite the decidedly minority status of the two following biblical examples, and notwithstanding the fact that unambiguous extrabiblical evidence for ֶרֶמ 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

בְּּטֶרֶם הָרִים הָטְּבוּעִי לִפְּנֵי גְּבָע וֹת חוֹלַלְלִי׃

‘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 בְּּטֶרֶם and precedes a passive verb denoting their origin. As has already been suggested, it is possible that the interrupted nature of the ֶרֶמ + verb structure facilitated the use of qaṭal
rather than *yiqtol*. 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, וּהָטְּבָָׂ֑ע clearly cannot be analysed as anything other than a form of the suffix conjugation, i.e., there are no grounds for claiming that the *terem qatal* 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 שָׂרֵד לָא יוֹשֶׁב אָרִי הָוָּזָ֑ת הָעָָ֭שָָה 'be-

---

23 E.g., ‘opening’ (v. 6), ‘way’ (v. 20), ‘deed’ (v. 22), ‘way’ (v. 20), ‘deed’ (v. 22), ‘before he had made’ (v. 26), ‘craftsman’ (v. 30). The exclu-
fore he had made earth and fields’ in the immediately following v. 26, since ַָֽ֣יְּהִי־הֵ֗וּא טֶרֶם֮ כִלָּ֣ה לְּדַבֵּר֒ וְּהִנֵּ֧ה רִבְָּקָ ה יֹצֵֵ֗את...  
‘And he was—before he finished speaking, and here Rebekah... 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 explanation of the minority construction here is the near-parallel verse with the majority terem yiqtol construction in the 1st-person account later in the chapter.
‘Before I would finish speaking in my heart, and here was Rebekah coming out...’ (Gen. 24.45)

This case of ṭerem qatal shows some similarity to that in 1 Sam. 3.7 (above, §2.2.1), in that there is internal inconsistency with an instance of ṭerem yiqtol in the same context. And, indeed, it has been suggested that the qatal form כילה in Gen. 24.15 should be considered an error for יכלה (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 purported shift from yiqtol to qatal there is limited to vocalic realization. In Gen. 24.15, conversely, the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition agree on ṭerem qatal. What is more, while the evidence of the Ancient Versions is, as is generally 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 ṭerem qatal in Gen. 24.15 and ṭerem yiqtol in Gen. 24.45—this despite the Samaritan tradition’s well-known harmonistic penchant. If טֶרֶם כִלָה in Gen. 24.15 is a secondary development, it must be one of considerable 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 וַיְּהִי:

In this case, the discourse וַיְּהִי... sets the narrative deictic center in the past (C_{pos1}) and the qatal in the past context shifts the time back one step further (C_{neg}) to express a past-
in-the-past (past perfect): \([C_{RF} < C_{pos1} < S]\). The participle, expressing a progressive event, is then indicated as intersecting the past perfect action by the adverbial טֶרֶם.

Even if Cook’s rendering of \(וַיְּהִי־הוּא\) as ‘It happened’ is acceptable,\(^{24}\) the claim that temporal ordering of pluperfect קִלָּה relative to simple past \(וַיְּהִי\) is responsible for \(טֶרֶם קַתָּל\) is puzzling. The temporal ordering of \(וַיְּהִי\) קִלָּה and קַתָּל is irrelevant to the narrative; the emphasis is rather on the order of רְבֵּךְה וּזְאת and קִלָּה קַבֵּר: 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 \(qatal\). It also bears noting that no other biblical or extra-biblical cases of \(טֶרֶם qatal\) are conditioned by a preceding \(וַיְּהִי\). It thus seems that there is nothing peculiar to the syntax of Gen. 24.15 that requires \(טֶרֶם qatal\) instead of \(טֶרֶם yiqtol\).

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, linguistic usages, that Genesis 24 is a post-exilic composition. Though \(טֶרֶם qatal\) is not among the Aramaisms he lists, given the construction’s comparative frequency in late extra-biblical sources, as well as the late distribution of synonymous Hebrew and Aramaic 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 terem qatal, which could then be seen as an anachronistic deviation from the standard classicism terem yiqtol 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 טֶרֶם֮ כִלָ ה 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 terem qatal already discussed, could perhaps be considered a conditioned exception to the terem yiqtol norm—though the mismatch between vv. 15 and 45 is, admittedly, left unexplained.

While the considerations above might help to explain the appearance of terem qatal in Gen. 24.15, it is perhaps preferable here simply to accept the possibility of early grammatical diversity, in which case טֶרֶם֮ כִלָ ה is to be viewed as an early forerunner of the more prevalent use of terem qatal in the NBDSS (see further, below).
3.0. Methodological Considerations

In BH, the use of relative future *ṭerem yiqtol* is far more common than the use of absolute past *ṭerem qaṭal*. What is more, it seems that one or more cases of *ṭerem 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 *yiqtol* after *ṭerem* are more convincing in some cases than others. The purported shift from *ְּרֵם יֵדַע* to *ְּרֵם 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 *ṭerem qaṭal* for *ṭerem yiqtol* sound like special pleading. Of course, in the interests of grammatical consistency—i.e., *ṭerem* uniformly followed by *yiqtol*—some might favour wholesale textual emendation of *ṭerem qaṭal* cases. In light of the extrabiblical (NBDSS) and extra-Masoretic (Samaritan) evidence for *ṭerem 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 ֶרֶם קַּטַּל against the backdrop of standard ֶרֶם יִקְּטֹל, it is reasonable to conclude that certain cases of ֶרֶם קַּטַּל 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 ֶרֶם קַּטַּל are genuine, even if they might be contextually conditioned, these constitute precedent for potential later secondary shifts from ֶרֶם יִקְּטֹל to ֶרֶם קַּטַּל. In other words, while ֶרֶם קַּטַּל רַע לֶדוּ in 1 Sam. 3.7a is almost certainly the result of secondary reinterpretation of original ֶרֶם יִקְּטֹל רַע לֶדוּ* in line with broader Second Temple trends, the early documentation of ֶרֶם קַּטַּל 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 ֶרֶם קַּטַּל 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 ֶרֶם קַּטַּל 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 ʻterem yiqtol, encoding relative future, and minority ʻterem qatal, encoding absolute past, is reminiscent of other CBH alternations between yiqtol and qatal. Perhaps most relevant is the relative past usage of qatal for retrospective future (or future perfect, futurum exactum) versus the absolute future force of yiqtol in parallel contexts. Compare the past-within-future qatal usages with similar future yiqtol usages in the following examples.

(24a) ...בכ全域 המקומות הניתרים אשי והיתרו שם...
   ‘...in all the places where I have driven them...’ (Jer. 8.3; cf. Jer. 29.14, 18; 32.37; 46.28)

(24b) ...בכ全域 המקומות אשאר-נדרים שם:
   ‘...in all the places where I shall drive them.’ (Jer. 24.9)

(25a) ואיכל תשבש ורכבת אתיך, אתיך ואתיך ואתיך אתיך אתיך אתיך אתיך אתיך אתיך... אשר יתב לך.
   ‘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) והיה כי תבואו אלארץ אשר יתב לי הנב... המ
   ‘And when you come to the land that the LORD will give you...’ (Exod. 12.25)

(26a) איש איש אשר נשא איש חיות אשר נשא חיות שוחר אוشب שוחר אוشب שוחר אוشب שוחר אוشب שוחר אוشب שוחר אוشب שוחר אוشب אשא.
   ‘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)
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 temporal 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 *qatal*). A similar choice seems to have developed for verbs following *טֶרֶם*, though in early sources, a relative future, prospective past *yiqtol* seems to have dominated the absolute past option *qatal*, the latter becoming more common only in later sources.

4.0. Conclusion

The use the *qatal* form following *טֶרֶם* is rare in BH, but is comparatively more common in DSS Hebrew. While one or more cases in BH may stem from the secondary recasting of 1-*y qal yiqtol* forms as *qatal*, 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 *qatal* and relative future *yiqtol* forms interchange. If any biblical *טֶרֶם qatal* instances are original, this calls into question—though does not entirely invalidate—the supposedly secondary character of other cases of *טֶרֶם qatal*. In any case, on the assumption that some cases of *טֶרֶם qatal* are secondary, it is clear that such reinterpretations are in line with early minority usage.
15. **HA-QAṬAL**

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 אֲשֶר.\(^2\) Only irregularly does relativising -ֶָה occur with finite verbs, specifically the suffix conjugation. Most of the biblical cases of ha-qaṭal appear to be late, secondary, or both.

1.0. Relativising -ֶָה with qaṭal 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 אֲשֶר qualify as a relativiser, since qaṭal 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 אֲשֶר 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 רַבֶּה + (active or passive) participle.
Consider the acknowledged cases of -ה + *qātal* from TBH and LBH compositions in examples (1)–(12).³

(1) **הַלְּוָֽא** אַתְּ־הִיא הַמַּחֲרֶבֶת יָמֵם וְיֵָיָם מַעֲמַקֵי יֵָיָם דֶֶ֖רֶךְ לַעֲבֵֹ֥ר גְּאוּלִַֽים׃

‘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) **וְּאַל־יֹאמַר בֶּן־הַנֵּכֵָ֗ר** הַנִּלְּׁוָָ֤ה אֶל־יְּהוָה֙ לֵאמֵֹ֔ר הַבְּדֵָ֧ל יַבְּדִילַ֛נִי יְּהוֶ֖ה מֵעַ ל עַמָׂ֑וֹ ...

‘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) **אֵ יךְ אָבֵַ֔דְּתְּ נוֹשֶֶ֖בֶת מִיַמִָׂ֑ים הָעִ יר הַּהֻׁלֶָ֗ה אֲשֶ֥ר הָיְָתָ֨ה חֲזָָ֤קַָ֤ה בַיָם֙ ...**

‘...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) **וֵַַּֽ֣יִשְּמְּעָ֞וּ שְּלֹ שֶת רֵעֵ י אִיֵ֗וֹב אֵ ת כָּל־הָרָעָ ה הַזֹּאת֮ הַּבָּ֣אָה עָלָיו֒ ...**

‘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.
15. Ha-Qaṭal

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

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

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

(11) ‘But David brought up the ark of God from Kiriath-jearim wherein David had prepared for it...’ (2 Chron. 1.4)
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)—הַשָּׁמַּה 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)—הַנִּלְוַה and הַנִּרְּאָה—it presupposes a shift from the ms participle’s expected segol to the qatal’s qames 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 הַהֻלֵלָה, הַהֵרִימוּ, הַהֹשִיב, הַהֹשִיבוּ, הַַהִקְדִיש, הַנִמְצְאוּ, and בַַהֵכִין 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) ...אֶרְּאֵֶ֔ה הַכְּצַעֲקָתָ֛... 'I will go down to see whether they have done altogether as the outcry that has come to me…' (Gen. 18.21)

(14) ...וָֹ֧ ...וַיִקְּרָָ֨א אַבְרָהֶָ֜ם אֶַֽת־שֶם־בְּנ ... 'Abraham called the name of his son who was born to him, whom Sarah bore him, Isaac.' (Gen. 21.3)⁶

(15) ...כָּל־הַנֶָ֧פֶש לְּבֵַֽית־יַעֲקֹ֛... ‘...All the persons of the house of Jacob who came to Egypt were seventy.’ (Gen. 46.27)

---

⁵ The form לאֶנּוֹמָה אֲבָנִים אֲבָנִים נִתְנֶ֖וּ אֲבָנִּיָּ֑ים... ‘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 נַוָּלַד־ (Gen. 3.21) is arguable. Though its Tiberian vocalisation with patah is characteristic of the nifal suffix conjugation, the form is alternatively analysable as a participle, with patah rather than the expected qameš due to the closed, unstressed status of the syllable before maqef. See WO (§19.7d), who cite JM (§145e), though the latter do not list the verse in question. Cf. Bauer and Leander (1922, §32e).
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)

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)

So Naomi returned, and Ruth the Moabite her daughter-in-law with her, who returned from the country of Moab…’ (Ruth 1.22)

‘She is the young Moabite woman, who came back with Naomi from the country of Moab.’ (Ruth 2.6)

‘…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 וַתָּשֶׂב נָעֳמִי וְרָֹ֨וּת הַמִּאֲבִיַ֤ה כַלָתָהּ֙ עִַֽם־נָעֳמִֶ֖י מִשְּדֵֵ֥ה מוֹאַָֽב׃ as a case of relativising -ן 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 -ן 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 -ָ with qatał. 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 -ָ with qatał 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 -ָ with qatał in post-classical biblical material involve consonantally unambiguous qatał forms. By contrast, among the CBH cases just one of eight cases—example (16) above, והָלְכ וּא (Josh. 10.24)—has a consonantally unambiguous qatał form. Put differently, nearly all of the apparently classical cases of relativising -ָ + qatał, 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 -ָ attached to a preposition: ...וַיָּרֶם הַטַּבָח אֶת־הַשָֹוֹוָ ... והֶעָלֶָ֜יהָ ... ‘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—השֶׁבֶת, הָשֶׁפשֶׁה, and—from FS participles, the latter with ultimate stress, i.e., הָשֶׁפשֶׁה, הָשֶׁפשֶׁה, and הָשֶׁפשֶׁה. The distinction between qatal and participle is perceptible in contrasting examples, e.g., (21) versus (22).

(21) וֵַַּֽ֣יִשְּמְּעָ֞וּ שְּלֹ שֶתּ רֵעֵ י אִיֵ֗וֹב אֵ ת כָּל־הָרָעָ ה הַזֹאת֮
 ...’ And Job’s three friends heard about all this calamity that had come upon him...’ (Job 2.11)
(22) ...יִתֵן֩ יְּהוָ֙ה אֶַֽת־הָאִשֶָ֜ה הַּבָּ֣אָה עָלָיו֒
 ...’ 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 nifʿal qatal forms—הנִלְּוָה, הַנִרְּאָה, הַנִוָּל—differentiation from the corresponding MS participial forms lies in the final vowel alone, the respective participles being הַנִלְּוֶה, הַנִרְּאה, הַנְוָל. For contrastive examples, see (23) and (24).

(23) בִשְּנַ ת שָלֵ֔וֹש לְּמַלְּכֶ֖וּת בֵלְּאשַ ר הַמֶָׂ֑לֶךְ חָזָ֞וֹן נִרְּאַ֤ה אֵלַי֙ אֲנִ י דָנִיֵֵ֔א לָאֵל֙ אֲנִי דָנִיֵֵא אָחָרַי
 ...’ 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) ...ק֛וּם עֲלֵֵ֥ה בֵַֽית־אֵ֖ל וְּשֶב־שָָׂ֑ם וַעֲשֵה־שָֽם מִזְּבֵֵ֔חַ לָאֵל֙ הַּנִרְּׁאֶּה אֵלֵֶ֔יךָ בְּבָרְּחֲךֵָ֔ם מִפְּנֵ֖י עֵשֵ֥ו אָחִַֽיךְ׃
 ...’...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 -ָּ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 -ג with ָqôle 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 -ג + ָqôle cases have consonantal forms amenable to interpretation as the far more common relativising -ג + 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 -ג with ָqôle 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 -ַ + qatāl: in post-classical material there is widespread agreement between the written and reading traditions involving consonantly unambiguous forms, while in CBH the dearth of consonantly unambiguous forms regularly leaves the reading tradition’s testimony regarding -ַ + qatāl 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 qatāl 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, -ַ + qatāl appears in contexts where the more frequent -ַ + 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 -ַ + qatāl in the BDSS, the SP, the Peshīṭṭa, the principal traditional relevant Targums, the Greek, and the Vulgate.
Table 1: Versional equivalents of MT -ה + qatal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>DSS*</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Peshitta</th>
<th>Targums</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Vulgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 18.21</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>יִרְכְּבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui venit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 21.3</td>
<td>דְֹלֲלֲלֳלֲ</td>
<td>דְֹלֲלֲלֲ</td>
<td>annan ba'</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 46.27</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>quae ingressa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh. 10.24</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui... erant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 11.9</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui apparuerat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 51.10</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui posuisti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa. 56.3</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui adheret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek. 26.17</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>inclita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 2.11</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>accidisset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 1.22</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>ac reversa est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 2.6</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>quae venit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 4.3</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>quae reversa est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan. 8.1</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>quod videram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 8.25</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>quae obulerat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 10.14</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui duxerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra 10.16</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui duxerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron. 26.28</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>haec... sanctificavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron. 29.17</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>qui... repertus est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chron. 1.4</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>in locum quem paraverat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chron. 29.36</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>בהא</td>
<td>ab'āh</td>
<td>הָּ֥א</td>
<td>רָכִיבְּבְּסֵ</td>
<td>quod ministerium (Domini) esset expletum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Q1sa 42.25); (Q1sa 46.13); (Q8 24.18).
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 Peshīṭa—little to no textual doubt attaches to any of the cases. In other words, based on versinal evidence, there is no widespread lack of equivalence interpretable as evidence for the frequent late insertion of relativising -נ + qātal 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 -נ + verb syntagm was necessarily interpreted as -נ + qātal. In order to attempt to gain some clarity on this, it is useful to compare versinal treatment of the -נ + qātal syntagm with treatment of the far more common -נ + 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).
The name of the third river was Tigris—this is the one that flows east of Assyria…” (Gen. 2.14)

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.

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

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.
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.

In (28) the MT’s nif’al 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 -ה+ 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 -ה+ qatal 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 Peshitta, 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 qatal forms. The problem is that, as already mentioned, the common -ה+ 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 qatal forms in LBH material, there is near-unanimous past-tense translation. By contrast, cases of ostensible divergence between qatal and participle analysis nearly always involve a consonantally ambiguous form. Thus, the fact that the Tiberian reading tradition’s ויהי הנשבתת הובא אלהי ‘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 הבאה.\(^9\)

Or not. Consider the apparently unequivocal qatal form in אֶל־קְּצִינֵי אַנְּשֵׁי הַמִּלְּחָמָה, 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 Peshiṣṭa 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 + qatal cases must be considered rather shaky evidence for the reconstruction of translator analysis of the forms in question.

2.0. Relativising -ה with qatal beyond the Tiberian Biblical Tradition

The relativising -ה + qatal 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 qatal הבאה and fs participle הבאה, 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 qatal and the fs participle, except when the latter is used adjectivally, e.g., הבאה הבאה ‘next year’. It may be that some ancient exegetes recognised a single underdifferentiated II-w/y qal 3fs qatal/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) רồngי דוֹסְּטִי בִרְּ׳ יַנַּיִי אוֹמֵ׳ מִשֵּם ר׳ מֵאִיר כָּל הַשָכַּח דָבָּר אֶחָד מִשַנָתו... 'R. Dosti son of R. Yannai in the name of R. Meir says, “Whoever forgets a single thing from what he has learned...”' (Avot 3.8)

(30) מי שֶנָזַר וְּהוּא בֵי קְבָּרוֹת אֶפְּלֵיוֹ היא שֶם שֶלָּשָׁם יְחַיַּֽיָל וְלֵי מִן הממִני וְאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה {וְאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה} וְּאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה {וְּאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה} וְּאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה {וְּאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה} וְּאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה {וְּאֵינוּ מֵבִיא קָוּרְבָּן טוּמְאָה}

‘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. Moreover, the ap-
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 שֶׁנְזַר וְּهوּ ‘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 -ה + 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. הַבָא and הַנִּמְצָא, 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 והלְדֹגָה כִּשְׁלָ֥שֶׁת אָלֶפֶת אֲלָפִים וְאִישָׁוּ וְאִשֵּׁ֖ה הָרֹאִ֑ים בִּשְׁחֵ֥וֹק שִמְּשַׁוֹן 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 -ה + qatal. Two further explanations JM (§145d, fn. 5) raises also occurs (see m. Miqva’ot 4.1, 1, 1), whereas the ms participle יוֹצֵא is consistently (over 200 times) spelled plene.
fn. 5)—probably rightly—reject. Andersen (2000, 53), proposed that qaṭal with relativising -تاح 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 -تاح + 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 -تاح 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‘el versus hif‘il, and locative-directional -יִשׁ versus פֹּל. The hypothesis does not enjoy wide support.

### 3.2. Historical Depth, Anachronism, and Preservation

While the mechanism for the emergence of relativising -تاح + 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 -تاح + qaṭal forms in TBH and LBH are consonantally unambiguous. While ambiguous structures in contemporary sources vocalised and/or accented as cases of -تاح + qaṭal may be analysed as secondary reinterpretations of -تاح + 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’.
ticiple, 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 as 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 -ה + qat\(\text{a}l\) 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 -ה + qat\(\text{a}l\). Indeed, one scholarly approach views all relativising -ה + verb syntagms as cases of -ה + participle, unless the consonantal form unambiguously reflects -ה + qat\(\text{a}l\), 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 -ח- + qatāl cases as genuine, but doubt the authenticity of the vocalisation in apparent CBH cases.

While most of the apparently early cases of qatāl with relativising -ח involve consonantally ambiguous forms, הָלְכ וּא '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 qatāl form. Possibly the only consonantally unequivocal classical case of qatāl with relativising -ח, 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 מַלְכּוּת ‘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 Ehrensvärd 2008, II:84–85); words sharing the root של"ט ‘rule’ (classical attestation of שִלָּח ‘ruler’ in Gen. 42.6; Hurvitz 2014, 228–36; cf. Joosten 2019, 33–35); and נְכָסִים ‘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 qatal with relativising ה- 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 consonantally ambiguous forms construed in the reading tradition as qatal 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 ה- + qatal, there is evidence of nuance within the vocalisation of those CBH forms amenable to analysis as instances of ה- + qatal. In other words, not every case interpretable as ה- + qatal
was so read. Consider the contrast between examples (31) and (32), which consist of successive verses:

(31) כל הנפשות 햐ַּ֖נֶפֶשׁ לְיַעֲקֹב מִצְּרַֽיְּמָה יֹצְאֵ י יְּרֵכֵ֔וֹ מִלְּבֶַ֖ד נְּשֵ י בְּנֵי־יַעֲקָֹׂ֑ב כָּל־נֶֶ֖פֶש שִשִֵ֥ים וָשֵַֽש׃

‘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) וּבְֵ֥י יוֹסֵ֛ף אֲשֶּ֣ר־יֻלַ֑ד־לֵ֥וֹ בְּמִצְּרֶַ֖יִם נֶ פֶש שְּנֵָָּׂ֑֣יִם כָּל־הַנֶָ֧פֶש לְֵֽבֵית־יַעֲקֹ֛ב מִצְּרֶַ֖יְּמָה שִֽבְעַ֛ים׃

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

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

(33) וַיֹּֽבְן שָ֖ם מִזְבֵּּ֣חַ לַיהוָ֧ה הנֶפֶשׁ אֵלַָֽיו׃

‘...So he built there an altar to the LORD, who had appeared to him.’ (Gen. 12.7)
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 consonantally unambiguous qatal forms with relativising -ḥ should be accorded due weight.

There is one further perspective that merits consideration. Though, as mentioned, relativising -ḥ + qatal 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, piʿel, and nifʿal all have MS participles identical to the respective 3MS qatal forms (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, §§2.12.2, 6, 9–10). This not infrequently results in cases of relativising -ḥ prefixed to forms identical to the Samaritan suffix conjugation, and this not just in places where the MT has relativising -ḥ with a form pointed as qatal. Perhaps the most striking come in D-stem, e.g.,
15. Ha-Qatal

(36) MT: ... וַתִּקְרַָ֤א שֵם־יְּהוָה֙ הַדֹּ֔בַר אֵלֵֶ֔יהָ אַתֶָ֖ה אֵ ל רֳאִָׂ֑י ... SP ... (addabbǝr) ‘So she called the name of the LORD who spoke to her, “You are a God of seeing”...’ (Gen. 46.27)

(37) MT: ... וְּׁהִָֽא כֵלֵֶ֔נָּה מִנִבְּלָתֵָ֔הּ יְכַבֵֵ֥ס בְּגָדֶָ֖יו וְּטָמֵ א עַד־הָעָָׂ֑רֶב ... SP ... (wākkǝl) ‘and whoever eats of its carcass shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening...’ (Lev. 11.40)

Similar congruence between participle and qatal forms is noticeable in the case of, e.g., qal השמע (MT Gen. 21.6) || qal aššama (SP Gen. 21.6); nifʿal הנראיה (MT Gen. 12.7) || nifʿal hanirrāʾı (SP Gen. 12.7); qal הדבר (MT Gen 16.13) || piʿʿel addabbǝr (SP Gen 16.13). It is not clear whether or how the broader Samaritan tendency to discard the distinction between participial and qatal forms might be related to the extension in the Tiberian tradition of relativising -ַ to the qatal form, but whether these were related or separate processes, the result was similar: late traditions in which relativising -ַ could be prefixed to forms indistinguishable from qatal.

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 -ַ + qatal syntagm. Most of the
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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 -׃א + qatal. 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 -׃א + qatal, 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.
16. **WAYYIQṬOL**

One of the defining characteristics of Masoretic BH is the wayyiqṭol verbal form. Especially common in narrative, it typically encodes perfective past semantics. The Tiberian biblical tradition distinguishes it from the consonantally homographic volitive weyiqṭol by means of gemination of the verbal preformative (or a compensatory vowel shift in the 1cs form). However, converging lines of evidence relevant to the development of wayyiqṭol have recently led to the hypothesis that Iron Age waw-yiqṭol was a polysemous syntagm and that its differentiation into mainly preterite wayyiqṭol and chiefly jussive/purpose we-yiqṭol was secondary and relatively late. If so, Masoretic wayyiqṭol may well represent an extremely pervasive instance of dissonance between the consonantal tradition of early biblical material and the recitation tradition embodied in the accompanying vocalisation.

The present chapter deals with wayyiqṭol in general, especially evidence for (a) the early underdifferentiation of narrative (preterite) and modal waw-yiqṭol, (b) the late secondary differentiation into geminated wayyiqṭol and non-geminated we-yiqṭol, and (c) the historical depth of the semantic distinction between the two. In order to lay the groundwork for reviewing a recent
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1 Notwithstanding the modern convention of transcribing shewa as e/a, in the Tiberian pronunciation the chief distinction between wayyiqṭol and we-yiqṭol was one of gemination, not vowel quality. This is clear from evidence showing that the default realisation of shewa in Tiberian BH was as short a, identical to the realisation of pataḥ (Kantor 2020, 59, 66–91; Khan 2020, I:305; 2021, 332).
proposal by Khan (2021), the discussion first centres on three strands of evidence on which Khan builds, namely: secondary developments in proto-Masoretic Hebrew, transcriptional evidence for the phonetic realisation of preterite and modal waw- yiqtol forms in antiquity, and non-preterite wayyiqtol semantics.

The subsequent chapter (ch. 17) focuses specifically on 1st-person forms. Striking diachronic patterns involving 1st-person wayyiqtol morphological alternatives—manifest in both the consonantal and vocalisation traditions—not only come as arguable confirmation of the general correctness of (a), (b), and (c) above, but allow for greater precision in the relative periodisation of the Masoretic written and reading traditions with respect to the wayyiqtol form.

1.0. Supporting Evidence

The following subsections summarise research into three lines of evidence fundamental to the view that the Iron Age situation of semantically undifferentiated waw-yiqtol gave way in the Second Temple Period to one in which perfective past wayyiqtol and volitive/purpose we-yiqtol were secondarily differentiated.

---

1.1. Semantic Gemination, i.e., Semantic Dagesh

‘Semantic *dagesh*’ refers to secondary gemination in one of the ancient Hebrew recitation traditions for purposes of disambiguating perceived homophones, i.e., to divide a word considered polysemous into morphologically distinct lexemes. Khan (2018, 341–47; 2020, I:524–30) collects numerous examples of ‘semantic *dagesh*’ from biblical (Tiberian, Babylonian, Samaritan) and non-biblical (rabbinic) traditions. Examples from Tiberian Hebrew include אֲבִיר ‘powerful (divine)’ versus אַבִיר ‘powerful (human)’, עֲצָבִים ‘idols’ versus עֲצַבִים ‘toils’, and, probably, הִרְּעִים ‘make thunder (divine)’ versus הִרְּעִים ‘vex, irritate (human)’. “The gemination in these pairs of forms most likely originates in existing variant morphological patterns that have been exploited to avoid homophony” (Khan 2020, I:525). While his 2021 article represents Khan’s first attempt at a comprehensive account of wayyiqtol’s development incorporating the notion of semantic gemination, he first raised the possibility in 1991 (Khan 1991, 241; 2013, 43; 2021, 330; Kantor 2020, I:104, fn. 23).

1.2. Transcriptional Evidence

In a detailed survey of Greek and Latin transcriptional evidence relevant to the development of wayyiqtol, Kantor adduces compelling evidence of historical evolution in the form’s phonetic realisation. In the late Second Temple Period, writes Kantor (2020, 99–100),

The conjunction *waw* was *usually pronounced identically* before a preterite *yiqtol* and non-preterite *yiqtol* form, namely, with no full vowel or following gemination. Nev-
ertheless, the conjunction waw was also frequently pronounced distinctly before a preterite yiqtol form, being vocalised with a full vowel and (probably) gemination....

Subsequently, in the early Byzantine Period, “The conjunction waw was always pronounced distinctly before a preterite yiqtol form (as opposed to before a non-preterite yiqtol), being vocalised with a full vowel and (probably) gemination....” Extrapolating back from the diachronic trajectory, Kantor argues that in Iron Age BH “the conjunction waw was pronounced identically before a preterite yiqtol and non-preterite yiqtol form, probably with the original etymological */a/ vowel,” meaning “that up to some point in the Second Temple Period, yiqtol in the sequence *w-yiqtol was a polysemous form, indicating either past or non-past (usually jussive) semantics according to context.”

Significantly, Kantor (2020, 104–5) follows Khan (1991, 241; 2013, 43) in positing secondary semantic disambiguation of previously undifferentiated waw-yiqtol into preterite wayyiqtol and non-preterite we-yiqtol as the most plausible explanation for gemination in Masoretic wayyiqtol (see above, §1.1).

Admittedly, one cannot totally exclude the possibility that the Tiberian reading tradition reflects an Iron Age realisation that already distinguished past waw-yiqtol (> wayyiqtol) from non-past waw-yiqtol (> we-yiqtol) by gemination. But several lines of argumentation combine to suggest otherwise: (a) the absence of any such distinction in the Samaritan reading tradition,3 (b) the

---

3 For an alternative means of distinguishing preterite waw-yiqtol in the Samaritan reading tradition, i.e., the replacement of waw-yiqtol with
partial but increasing use of the distinction in the period of the Greek and Latin transcriptions, (c) a degree of disagreement between the Tiberian and Babylonian vocalisation traditions, and (d) the broad reality in the Masoretic biblical tradition of multiple cases of dissonance involving early consonantal orthography vocalised according to a characteristically later reading tradition. Such considerations are arguable evidence that the disambiguation in question took place after the Samaritan and Jewish traditions had diverged, was in the process of taking hold at the time the transcriptions were made, and had become solidly established before the division of the Masoretic Tiberian, Babylonian, and Palestinian branches.

1.3. Non-preterite *Wayyiqtol*

Robar (2013; 2015, 78–112) builds a multi-pronged argument against *wayyiqtol*’s consensus preterite classification. She sees *wayyiqtol* as a narrative present of unspecified time reference that takes its TAM semantics from the context. While Khan’s (2021) theory differs from Robar’s at important points, he cites her work favourably and agrees that certain *wayyiqtol* semantic values are incompatible with core preterite semantics. He proposes a broader realis value that allows for greater semantic flexibility, which, crucially, he explains as a result of the form’s fused preterite-modal parentage.

*waw-qatal* in the case of *l-y qal* verbs, see Khan (2021, 331). See also below, ch. 18, esp. §1.3.
2.0. The Development of Wayyiqtol

Synthesising the aforementioned studies and additional research, Khan’s (2021, 319–40) discussion appears in a paradigm-shifting study that employs Construction Grammar to explain the development of wayyiqtol by means of the recognised mechanisms of reanalysis and schematisation. Khan seeks to improve upon existing accounts of wayyiqtol’s development in line with its semantic range, pragmatics, and status as the sole standard remnant of archaic preterite short yiqtol (< PS yaqtul).

Khan argues that preterite yiqtol’s preservation almost exclusively after waw is due to syntactic and semantic similarity to a “discourse dependent” (Khan 2021, 320ff.) modal short yiqtol in a (normally) purpose/result waw-yiqtol construction, which made preterite waw-yiqtol ripe for reanalysis. In this way, the short yiqtol’s originally distinct preterite and modal purpose/result semantics became fused in a semantically undifferentiated waw-yiqtol construction. The core semantics of the resulting waw-yiqtol had effectively been reduced to a “common denominator” of temporal posteriority relative to preceding context (Khan 2021, 326), which was further schematised to one of broader “topical cognitive relevance” (Khan 2021, 340).

Later, in some Second Temple traditions, the realis (preterite) and irrealis (volitive, often purpose/result) senses of waw-yiqtol were disambiguated via gemination of the preformative in

---

4 Khan (2021, 319, fn. 13) explicitly sidesteps the question of whether the ancient Hebrew preterite and volitional short yiqtol values are themselves reflexes of a single (Huehnergard 1988) or distinct PS yaqtul forms (Hetzron 1969; Rainey 1986).
realis (mostly preterite) *way-yiqtol*, resulting in a new distinction between realis (mainly preterite) *wayyiqtol* and irrealis (volitional, often purpose/result) *we-yiqtol*. Khan sees the frequent LBH conflation of 1st-person realis and irrealis *way-yiqtol* strings, i.e., both represented by וָאֶקְּטְּלָה/וָאֶקְּטְּלָה, along with sporadic CBH conflation, as confirmation that the relevant realis–irrealis fusion “had already taken place in CBH” (Khan 2021, 321–22, 327; for detailed discussion of 1st-person forms, see ch. 17, below).

Khan thus conceives of a convergence of the *wayyiqtol* and directive-volitive paradigms earlier and more pervasive than what is usually envisioned. It was not merely due to late analogy with cohortative אקטלה that classical וָאֶקְּטְּלָה shifted to וָאֶקְּטְּלָה; rather, the antecedents of *wayyiqtol* and cohortative אקטלה, though originally conveying distinct preterite and modal senses, respectively, fused in pre-Tiberian CBH in a semantically undifferentiated *way-yiqtol* structure broadly associated with temporal consecution—only to be disambiguated anew via Second Temple gemination of realis (mostly preterite) *way-yiqtol* > *wayyiqtol*.

Beyond elegantly explaining the nearly exclusive clause-initial preservation of preterite *yiqtol* after *waw*, Khan’s proposed Iron Age preterite-volitive/purpose *way-yiqtol* fusion helps to illuminate *wayyiqtol*’s semantic range: by acknowledging its mixed preterite-modal parentage, the form is revealed to have genetics consistent with non-past and/or non-perfective semantics, such meanings reflecting the archaic tenseless, aspect-free character of *wayyiqtol*’s volitive/purpose *waw-yiqtol* ancestor. The earlier preterite and volitive semantics, however, gave way in pre-Tiberian BH to a broader sense of temporal consecution and discourse de-
pendency. According to this analysis, the old preterite and non-preterite values did not persist, but had to be inferred from context.

3.0. Pre-Tiberian Waw-Yiqtol

There remains the not trivial matter of how the pre-Tiberian BH verb system ‘worked’ given a semantically undifferentiated waw-yiqtol form, i.e., whether and how users disambiguated preterite and volitive/purpose senses of a waw-yiqtol emptied of all but the barest of semantic values (temporal posteriority > discourse dependency).

The first thing to acknowledge is the “pathway of purpose > result clause > discourse dependent” (Khan 2021, 324). Next, Khan (2021, 326) observes an important correlation: “In the attested corpus of Biblical Hebrew... purpose and result clauses with jussives have future main clauses, whereas past wayyiqtol is generally preceded by a past clause.” In other words, preceding context must commonly have sufficed to disambiguate the past versus volitive/purpose/result semantics of waw-yiqtol forms. However, Khan (2021, 328) also notes the ambiguity of a way-yiqtol given to result interpretation, e.g.,

(1) ...לָמַָ֤ה אָמַ֙רְּתָ֙ אֲחֹ תִּי הִֵ֔וא וָאֶקַּ֥ח אֹתָ֛֥הּ לִֶ֖֥י לְאִשָָׂ֑ה...

‘Why did you say “She is my sister,” so that I took her for my wife?...’ (Gen. 12.19)

Despite following preterite אָמַ֙רְּתָ֙ (you (MS) said’, interpretation of אֶקַּ֥ח ‘so that I took’ as heading a pseudo-subordinate result clause is contextually defensible. Indeed, the bare semantic value of temporal consecution combined with the universally attested
grammaticalisation pathway of purpose > result arguably make a dependent reading more attractive than one of merely sequential preterites—though both are stops along the same trajectory, i.e., it is a series of straightforward cognitive steps from ‘he went to the store that he might buy cereal’ through ‘he went… with the result that he bought cereal’ to ‘he went… and he bought cereal’. The question then arises as to why in this (or any) cases a bare וּאֶקַח should have been interpreted one way or the other, i.e., as irrealis purpose/result we-yiqtol ḥqên or as realis preterite way-yiqtol ḥqên. In this case, the preceding perfective past qatāl seems to have influenced the realisation of the following waw-yiqtol as a realis preterite form notwithstanding the appropriateness in context of a volitive-result reading. It is also possible that the wayyiqtol realisation was influenced by the appearance of short (ואַקָּח), rather than lengthened (ואָקָח) 1st-person morphology. In the case of 1st-person forms in the Hebrew of the Masoretic Torah, only four wayyiqtol forms have lengthened pseudo-cohortative morphology (Gen. 24.48; Deut. 1.16, 18); likewise, in the same corpus, just two we-yiqtol forms eligible for cohortative marking lack the characteristic suffixed heh (Exod. 24.7; Deut. 10.2). The mismatch between the Tiberian realis interpretation and the probable volitional-purpose pre-Tiberian sense suggests that the synchronic semantic range of Tiberian wayyiqtol must extend beyond that of consecutive perfective past eventualities, though by dint of the regularity of such a semantic value, it can certainly be considered synchronically prototypical.

Notwithstanding the import of the preceding example, it would be misleading to say that the Tiberian realisation of waw-
yiqtol forms mechanically follows the TAM of the foregoing verbal form. Consider example (2), in which a future-oriented purpose we-yiqtol follows perfective past forms:

(2) יָשִיבָהוּ אֲשֶׁר הָפְּנוּ בָּעֵי רִמּוּנִי כֹּהֲנֵי וּזְּקֵנֵי בָעֶּי לְמָאַהֲבַיּוּ הוֹקִּ֥ית לַַֽמְּאַהֲבַי֙ הֵ מָה רִמֵ֔וּנִי כֹּהֲנֵַ֥י וּזְּקֵנֶַ֖י בָעִ יר גָוָָׂ֑עוּ כִַֽי־בִקְּשֵוּ אָֹ֨כֶל לֵָ֔מ֙ וְּׁיָשִֹׁ֖יבוּ אֶת־נַפְּשַָֽם׃ ס
‘I called for my lovers, but they deceived me: my priests and my elders perished in the city, while they sought for themselves food that they might revive their souls.’ (Lam. 1.19)

Here, though the broader context shows that יָשִיבָהוּ refers to an unrealised purpose rather than a realised achievement, the immediately preceding verbs all reference perfective past eventualities. Again, given the notional proximity of purpose, result, and simple sequential readings, it is easy to imagine the form יָשִיבָהוּ being realised as wayyiqtol ‘and they revived’. This, however, would have contradicted the force of the indictment, since the search for revival was unsuccessful. To summarise: a major factor in inferring a pre-Tiberian waw-yiqtol’s TAM reference was the narrow context of TAM values in the closely preceding clause(s). Yet, examples like (2) (cf. also Lev. 9.6 (?); Num. 23.9; 1 Sam. 12.3; 1 Kgs 13.33 (?); 2 Kgs 19.25; see JM, §116e; Joosten 2012, 154–55) demonstrate that the tradition was also sensitive to the text’s internal logic.

4.0. Wayyiqtol’s Secondary Status and Historical Depth

The lack of a geminated wayyiqtol in the Samaritan reading tradition and the only partial evidence for gemination in the Greek
and Latin transcriptional material reflect a Second Temple linguistic milieu in which disambiguation of preterite and modal \textit{waw-yiqtol} via gemination in the former had not yet become entrenched. If so, then Masoretic \textit{wayyiqtol} conceivably represents a secondary and relatively late development in line with the reading tradition’s known adoption of certain linguistic features especially characteristic of Second Temple Hebrew.

However, the innovation of ‘semantic \textit{dagesh}’ also tallies with what Khan (2021, 330–31) describes as “a general Second Temple development in the proto-Masoretic reading tradition involving the introduction of strategies to increase care in pronunciation and clarity of interpretation” (see also Khan 2020, I:73–85). Despite the secondary and late character of the Masoretic differentiation of \textit{wayyiqtol} and \textit{we-yiqtol}, there is in general no reason to doubt the historical depth of the interpretive tradition that the distinction reflects. In other words, while the distinction in phonetic realisation between preterite and modal \textit{waw-yiqtol} forms appears to be a relatively late proto-Masoretic innovation, it bears witness to earlier consciousness of \textit{waw-yiqtol} polysemy as well as, presumably, an incipient interpretive tradition (or traditions) on the basis of which gemination was added to forms construed as realis. While in most cases of preterite and purpose \textit{waw-yiqtol} there would have been no danger of misunderstanding, instances such (1) and (2) above are exceptions where, for purposes of interpretation, morphological disambiguation representative of semantic distinction proves semantically determinative. Whatever the antiquity of the phonological disambiguation, it seems clear that it reflects a gradually increasing discomfort
with the perceived semantic ambiguity between preterite \textit{wayyiq\textbar t\textbar ol} and modal \textit{weyiq\textbar t\textbar ol} that eventually developed into the fully crystalised Tiberian tradition of semantic gemination to distinguish \textit{wayyiq\textbar t\textbar ol} from \textit{weyiq\textbar t\textbar ol}. The phonological distinction goes back to the period of the transcriptions, at the latest. The discomfort with underdifferentiation between preterite and modal forms may have begun earlier. Certainly, the early and frequent morphological distinction between 1st-person preterite \textit{wayyiq\textbar t\textbar ol} forms and cohortative \textit{weyiq\textbar t\textbar ol} forms (see below, ch. 17) suggests recognition of a semantic distinction within CBH.
The morphology of the 1st-person wayyiqtol within the combined Masoretic written-reading tradition is characterised by complex diversity.\(^1\) It also represents an area of dissonance between the tradition’s written and reading components. Thankfully, evidence from alternative biblical traditions (the BDSS and the SP) and extra-biblical sources (Iron Age epigraphy, the NBDSS, and BS) sheds light on matters.

Not surprisingly, 1st-person forms comprise a small minority of the total number of occurrences of what is BH’s main narrative TAM form, accounting for just under 700 of the more than 15,000 instances, or less than 5 percent. While in the vast majority of cases across all traditions and sources, eligible 2nd- and 3rd-person wayyiqtol forms preserve short yiqtol (\(<\) PS yaqtul; cf. Akkadian iprus) morphology,\(^2\) the 1st-person wayyiqtol presents in all three of the relevant morphological templates, which, for convenience, are referred to throughout the present chapter with both descriptives and prototypical forms:

---

\(^1\) Among the relevant studies, see S. R. Driver ([1892] 1998, §72); Ungnad (1907, 58 fn. 1); Bergsträsser (1918–1927, II:§5f); Kutscher (1974, 326–27); Rainey (1986, 13–14); Talshir (1986; 1987); Revell (1988, 423); Qimron (1997, 177; 2008, 153–54); Bloch (2007); Hornkohl (2013a, 159–71); Gzella (2018, 29–35); Khan (2021, 319–40); Sjörs (2021).

\(^2\) For various scholarly approaches to exceptions among 2nd- and 3rd-person wayyiqtol forms and further bibliography, see Bloch (2007), Hornkohl (2013a, 171–80), and Gzella (2018).
1. **short** jussive-like $\text{וָאָשְׁלָח}$/$\text{וָאֶשְׁלָח}$ < PS yaqtul;
2. **long** yiqtol-like $\text{וָאָעֲשֶה}$/$\text{וָאַעֲשֶׁה}$ < PS yaqtulu or yaqtula;
3. lengthened **pseudo-cohortative** $\text{וָאָקָם}$/$\text{וָאָעִיד}$/$\text{וָאֶקְּטְּלָה}$ < PS yaqtula or yaqtulan(na).³

Table 1: Short, long, and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in the Tiberian tradition⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>III-y</th>
<th>hif'il</th>
<th>qal II-w/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>נָשַל, נָשָלָה</td>
<td>נָשַל, נָשָלָה, נָשֶׁלָה</td>
<td>נָשַל, נָשָלָה, נָשֶׁלָה</td>
<td>נָשַל, נָשָלָה, נָשֶׁלָה, נָשֶׁלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>נַשָלָה</td>
<td>נַשָלָה, נַשֶלָה</td>
<td>נַשָלָה, נַשֶלָה</td>
<td>נַשָלָה, נַשֶלָה, נַשֶלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cpl</td>
<td>נַשָלָה</td>
<td>נַשָלָה, נַשֶלָה</td>
<td>נַשָלָה, נַשֶלָה</td>
<td>נַשָלָה, נַשֶלָה, נַשֶלָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The orthographic distinction between the short (וָאָשְׁלָח, וָאֶשְׁלָח) and long (וָאָעֲשֶה, וָאַעֲשֶׁה) templates is possible only with certain hif'il and weak verb forms (especially III-y and II-w/y) qal forms. The pseudo-cohortative template is possible in all but III-y verbs.⁵ The variation between short and longer forms also ap-

---
³ The reconstructed forms are based on the analogy of documented forms; see below. For various opinions on the derivation of the pseudo-cohortative morphology see, among others, Rainey (1986, 4, 8–10); JM (§§114a–f, 116a–c); Bloch (2007, 143); Blau (2010, §4.3.3.3.4 and the note there); Dallaire (2014, 108–11); Khan (2021, 322–23); Sjörs (2021).
⁴ For the sake of convenient comparison, the table includes both documented and reconstructed forms. Of the latter, some are less contentious than others. For example, 1CPL נָשַלָה* is based on qere נָשַלָה כֻּלָּנוּ 'and we all returned’ (Neh. 4.9). For the grounds for other reconstructed forms, e.g., 1cs נָשַלָה* 'and I arose’, see below, §2.0.
⁵ This is the case in the Masoretic reading tradition. Some scholars hold that this is not necessarily characteristic of other traditions of ancient Hebrew, including, theoretically, the Masoretic written tradition (Bergsträsser 1918, II:§5f; Revell 1988, 423; Bloch 2007, 150, fn. 35, 155). See below, §1.4.2, fn. 11.
plies to other weak verb types, e.g., contextual 3MS רמאני versus 1CS רמאני (but consistently 1CPL רמאני), contextual 3MS תמאני versus 1CS תמאני (but consistently 1CPL תמאני), where the distinction is one of stress and vocalisation (see below, §2.0).

While the evidence has been variously interpreted (Talshir 1986; 1987; Bloch 2007; Hornkohl 2013a; Gzella 2018), the respective distributions of the short, long, and pseudo-cohortative alternants in ancient Hebrew sources seems to indicate that an early situation characterised by the dominance of short forms in all persons gave way to situations in which short morphology continued to reign in 2nd- and 3rd-person forms, but was commonly replaced by long and/or pseudo-cohortative morphology in the 1st-person.

While short, long, and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol forms seem to have coexisted throughout the history of ancient Hebrew, specific usage patterns involving the prevalence of one or more forms are especially characteristic of certain compositions and corpora. Surveying the data across the various biblical traditions and extra-biblical sources, a perceptible, if somewhat fuzzy, diachronic pattern emerges. Even so, though historical change proves to be the main factor, diachrony does not explain all. Sporadic outliers to the general typological trends suggest the relevance of additional factors.6 Even the significance of certain distribution patterns apparently governed by diachrony merit

scrutiny, as they may be deceptive. Be that as it may, as shown below (§1.0), the general statistical picture is sufficiently clear to warrant starting from a diachronic comparison of distribution between corpora and then moving to a more granular analysis of individual compositions and or forms together with consideration of complementary or contradictory conditioning factors.

1.0. The Masoretic Written (Consonantal) Tradition

1.1. Short III-y (ואעש) and Pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה) Forms

The clearest point of departure is a comparison focusing on the respective distributions of short versus long III-y (ואעש versus ואעשה) forms and pseudo-cohortative versus non-pseudo-cohortative forms (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה versus ואקטל, ואע(י)ד, ואק(ו)ם) in the combined Masoretic written-reading biblical tradition and in relevant non-Masoretic biblical and extra-biblical material. Significantly, in the case of such forms the Tiberian written and reading traditions are in near total harmony (with the exception of a few instances of ketiv-qere; see below, §2.2.2). Tables 2 and 3 give the raw numbers and percentages across representative corpora in various biblical traditions and extra-biblical sources.

Table 2: Incidence of short 1st-person III-y wayyiqtol (ואעש) forms across representative ancient Hebrew corpora (see §4.0 for citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Torah</th>
<th>Proph.</th>
<th>Non-LBH + Writings</th>
<th>LBH +</th>
<th>BDSS</th>
<th>NBDSS</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>BS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>28/66</td>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>1/22</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>(85.7%)</td>
<td>(42.4%)</td>
<td>(46.2%)</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Incidence of pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואכ(ו)מה) forms across representative ancient Hebrew corpora (see §4.0 for citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MT Torah</th>
<th>MT Proph.</th>
<th>MT Non-LBH + Writings</th>
<th>MT LBH + Writings</th>
<th>BDSS</th>
<th>NBDSS</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>BS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/105</td>
<td>19/254</td>
<td>8/26</td>
<td>69/127</td>
<td>21/55</td>
<td>23/31</td>
<td>34/106</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.8%)</td>
<td>(7.5%)</td>
<td>(30.8)</td>
<td>(53.9%)</td>
<td>(38.2%)</td>
<td>(73.3%)</td>
<td>(32.4%)</td>
<td>(57.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1 visually displays the incidence of short 1st-person III-y (ואעש) and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואכ(ו)מה) forms in representative ancient Hebrew biblical traditions and extra-biblical sources as percentages of potential cases.

Chart 1: Percentages of short 1st-person III-y (e.g., ואעש) and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואכ(ו)מה) forms across representative ancient Hebrew traditions as percentage of potential cases

Short (ואעשה) forms dominate in the Tiberian Torah, where pseudo-cohortative forms are rare. Conversely, in the BDSS, NBDSS, the SP, and BS, short III-y forms are relatively infrequent. In the MT pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה) forms appear to be somewhat more characteristic of poetic than of prose texts outside of
LBH+ (occurring in about a third of the potential cases in non-LBH+ parts of the Writings), but gain ascendancy only in LBH. They are also variously typical of other late corpora, e.g., the BDSS, NBDSS, the SP, and BS, in which, proportionally, they are between eight and eighteen times as common as in the written tradition of the Tiberian Torah. See below, §1.4, for discussion of the situation in Masoretic CBH outside the Torah, i.e., in the Prophets and Writings.

The apparent diachronic significance of the variations in use of the short and pseudo-cohortative patterns discussed above finds support in Iron Age epigraphy. Though the limited corpus of Hebrew inscriptions is devoid of 1st-person wayyiqtol forms, the Meshaʿ Stele, written in the related Canaanite dialect of Moab, contains several. Here III- yı 1st-person wayyiqtol forms are consistently short, e.g., וָאָשֹׁע and ‘and I made’ (lns 3, 9), וָאָבָז and ‘and I saw’ (ln. 7), וָאֶבֶן and ‘and I built’ (ln. 9), וָאָשָׁב and ‘and I captured’ (ln. 12). At the same time, forms eligible for pseudo-cohortative morphology show no indication thereof, e.g., וָאָבֹא and ‘and I killed’ (lns 11, 16), וָאֶנָּחַל and ‘and I went’ (lns 14–15), וָאָקָח and ‘and I took’ (lns 17, 19–20), וָאָסָח and ‘and I dragged’ (ln. 18), וָאֶמֶר and ‘and I said’ (ln. 24), וָאֶשֶׂב and ‘and I carried’ (ln. 30), and וָאֶרֶד and ‘and I descended’ (ln. 31). And to forestall the suggestion that a final a might be realised, but not orthographically represented (i.e., spelled defectively), it is critical to note the apparent marking of final a in such forms as בָּלֶלֶת ‘at night’ (ln. 15) and בֵּנֵה ‘he built’ (ln. 18). Such spellings lead one to expect that similar orthography would have been employed in the case of pseudo-cohortative wayyiqtol morphology, had it been in use.

To summarise: evidence from several biblical traditions (MT, the BDSS, SP) and extra-biblical sources (the Meshaʿ Stele,
the NBDSS, BS) converges to depict two diachronic trends involving 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms, namely, (a) a decline over time in the short III-y pattern in favour of the long pattern, e.g., ואעש > ואעש, and (b) increased usage in the later period of the pseudo-cohortative pattern in the case of other *wayyiqtol* forms, e.g., ואקש > ואקש, ואקש > ואקש.

1.2. Long III-y (וָאַעְּשֶׁה), *Hif’il* (וָאָעִיד) and *Qal* II-w/y (וָאַקָם) Forms

Because the respective alternants of III-y and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms involve vowel-final versus consonant-final realisations, the distinctions are orthographically transparent, e.g., ואעש, ואעש versus ואעש, ואעש, and ואעש versus ואקש, ואקש. More complex is the situation of the long alternatives to short forms in a number of weak verbal patterns, especially, *qal* II-w/y *qal*, and in *hif’il*. See Table 4.

Table 4: Short and long 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms in the Tiberian tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>III-y</th>
<th>hif’il</th>
<th>II-w/y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1CS</td>
<td>וָאַעְּשֶׁה, ואעש</td>
<td>וָאָעִיד, והעידו</td>
<td>וָאָקָם, והקם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MS</td>
<td>לְאַעְּשֶׁה, לְאַעש</td>
<td>לְהַעֲד, והעדו</td>
<td>לַקָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CPL</td>
<td>וָאַעֲשֶה, וָאַעש</td>
<td>וָאָעִיד, והעדו</td>
<td>וָאָקָם, והקם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1. Short versus Long III-y Morphology: ואעש versus ואעש

Thanks to their orthographic transparency, the most straight-forward evidence again involves III-y verbs, where long and short forms are distinguished by the presence and absence, respectively, of word-final *mater heh*. Table 5, an inverse of Table 2
above, gives the relevant statistics, while Chart 2 presents a visual comparison of long and pseudo-cohortative forms.

Table 5: Incidence of long 1st-person III-\(\nu\) forms (e.g., \(ואעשה\)) across representative ancient Hebrew traditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Torah</th>
<th>Proph.</th>
<th>Non-LBH + LBH + Writings</th>
<th>BDSS</th>
<th>NBDSS</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>BS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/21</td>
<td>38/66</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>18/25</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(57.6%)</td>
<td>(53.8%)</td>
<td>(72%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(90.9%)</td>
<td>(95.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2: Percentages of long 1st-person III-\(\nu\) (e.g., \(ואעשה\)) and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person forms across representative ancient Hebrew traditions as percentage of potential cases

As noted above, short forms (ואעשה) dominate long forms (ואעשה) in the Tiberian Torah. Conversely, in a phenomenon crucially limited to 1st-person forms, the long III-\(\nu\) pattern (ואעשה) substantially outnumbers the short pattern (ואעשה) in late material: Tiberian LBH +, the BDSS and NBDSS, the SP, and BS—the same corpora that witness regular usage of pseudo-cohortative morphology. Notably, long forms also occur in the majority of cases in the MT Prophets and the non-LBH + Writings (see below,
§1.4). In the former there is no corresponding high frequency of tokens of the pseudo-cohortative pattern, while in the latter the increase is significant, but less than in LBH+ proper; these facts are discussed in detail below, §1.4.

1.2.2. Short versus Long Hifʿil and Qal II-w/y Morphology: וָאָקֻם versus וָאָעִד and וָאָעִיד versus וָאָקֻמָה

Turning to additional verb classes in which a distinction between short and long wayyiqtol forms obtains, namely hifʿil and II-w/y qal, one confronts a degree of orthographic ambiguity. While *plene* spellings such as וָאָעִיד and וָאָקֻמָה likely reflect long morphology, the corresponding spellings וָאָעִד and וָאָקֻמָה are ambiguous. Theoretically, the latter spellings might have been intended to reflect short morphology, but could conceivably be defective representations of long morphology (but see below, §1.3.1). Nor does treatment of such forms in the reading tradition resolve the matter. Many forms written like וָאָעִיד and וָאָקֻמָה are realised with long morphology—וָאָקֻמָה and וָאָעִיד—but there are significant exceptions (see below, §2.0). One must proceed with caution.

Even so, it is difficult to ignore the striking distribution patterns. Significantly, a trend similar to that witnessed in the case of 1st-person III-y wayyiqtol forms (וָאָעִיד versus וָאָעש) also obtains in the case of 1st-person hifʿil (וָאָעִיד versus וָאָעש) and II-w/y qal (וָאָקֻמָה versus וָאָקֻמָה) wayyiqtol forms. Table 6 lists the relevant data for the written (consonantal) component of the Tiberian biblical tradition and for several other representative ancient Hebrew corpora.
Table 6: Incidence of long 1st-person III-ו (ואעשה), ḫifʿ (ואמע), and II-ו/y (ואקום) wayyiqtol forms: number of long forms out of number of combined short, long, and pseudo-cohortative forms (percentage long; for citations, see §4.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Class</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Non-LBH +</th>
<th>BDSS</th>
<th>NBDSS</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>BS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III-ו</td>
<td></td>
<td>Torah</td>
<td>Proph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/21 (14.3%)</td>
<td>38/66 (57.6%)</td>
<td>7/13 (53.8%)</td>
<td>18/25 (72%)</td>
<td>7/10 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/12 (8.3%)</td>
<td>14/33 (42.4%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9/21 (42.9%)</td>
<td>0/2 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫifʿ</td>
<td>ps-cohor</td>
<td>0/12 (0%)</td>
<td>3/33 (9.1%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10/21 (47.6%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long + ps-cohor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/12 (8.3%)</td>
<td>17/33 (51.5%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19/21 (90.4%)</td>
<td>2/2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-w/y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Torah</td>
<td>Proph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0/6 (0%)</td>
<td>9/15 (60%)</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>14/21 (66.7%)</td>
<td>0/3 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/6 (0%)</td>
<td>1/15 (6.7%)</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>7/21 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1/3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-w/y</td>
<td>ps-cohor</td>
<td>0/6 (0%)</td>
<td>10/15 (66.7%)</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>21/21 (100%)</td>
<td>1/3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-w/y</td>
<td>long + ps-cohor</td>
<td>0/6 (0%)</td>
<td>61/114 (53.5%)</td>
<td>8/16</td>
<td>41/67 (61.2%)</td>
<td>7/15 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/39 (10.3%)</td>
<td>65/114 (57%)</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>58/67 (86.6%)</td>
<td>10/15 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visual comparisons of the incidence of long and pseudo-cohortative wayyiqtol morphology in the representative corpora are presented, respectively, in charts 3 and 4.
Though limited sample sizes and/or the fragmentary nature of some corpora leave conspicuous gaps in the data, trends in the use of long III-\(y\), hif\'il, qal II-\(w/y\) and in long plus pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol forms are broadly discernible. The Tiberian Torah reflects classical infrequency of long and pseudo-cohortative forms and the representative Second Temple corpora exhibit noticeable concentrations of both. Also, it is important to point out that where long morphology does not obtain in Second Temple corpora, more often than not the text resorts to pseudo-cohortative, rather than short morphology. In this way, between them, long and pseudo-cohortative morphology largely crowd out short morphology in late material.
Perhaps surprising is the status of the Tiberian Prophets and non-LBH+ Writings, both broadly classified as CBH. Different from the situation of the pseudo-cohortative discussed above, where such forms are conspicuously lacking from the Masoretic Pentateuch, Prophets, and, to a lesser extent, the non-LBH+ Writings, when it comes to long forms, the Prophets and non-LBH+ Writings show concentrations similar to those of acknowledged Second Temple material. This matter is discussed in detail below, §1.4.

1.3. Anticipating Potential Objections

Before proceeding, however, it is worth considering some potential objections.
1.3.1. Spelling Variation versus Linguistic Variation

First, focusing on hif’il and II-w/y qal 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology, and excluding III-y forms, it is reasonable to question the linguistic significance of the distinction between apparently short and long spellings. This doubt applies to all representative ancient Hebrew traditions. Beginning with the MT, do the Torah’s typical short spellings, like ושאנו, and long spellings, like ושאנו, elsewhere in the Bible reflect a genuine morphological difference, or are they merely divergent orthographic representations of the same form? After all, though a spelling like ושאנו with mater waw almost certainly represents a form along the lines of the Tiberian long-pattern $\text{wā-}\text{āqūm}$, the Masoretic Torah’s spelling without waw, ושאנו, is ambiguous: conceivably defective for the same long $\text{wā-}\text{āqūm}$ realisation or representing something more akin to *$\text{wā-}\text{āqūm}$, as in the corresponding Tiberian 3MS, 3FS, and 2MS forms. Given the notoriously variable character of spelling in the Tiberian written tradition (Barr 1989; cf. Andersen and Forbes 2013), is it reasonable to interpret this spelling discrepancy in linguistic terms?

The view espoused here is that 1st-person wayyiqtol spelling practices that distinguish the Tiberian Torah from the rest of the Bible have linguistic, not just orthographic, import. Three lines of argumentation may be cited in support of this view. First, plene wayyiqtol spelling in the consonantal components of the Tiberian tradition outside the Torah and in the SP is limited to 1st-person forms, while the relevant 2nd- and 3rd-person wayyiqtol forms preserve short orthography.
Second, the dominant *plene* spelling of relevant standard *yiqtol* (< PS *yaqtulu/a*) forms in all persons throughout the Tiberian and Samaritan written traditions makes it clear that long orthography was an option. If the prominent distinction in spelling between 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms in the Torah (אֲבֵד, אֲכֹמ) and in the rest of the Bible (אֲכֹמ) were merely a function of divergent orthographic policies, one might reasonably expect the regular incidence of defective standard *yiqtol* (< PS *yaqtulu/a*) forms in the Torah and/or long 2nd- and 3rd-person *wayyiqtol* spellings beyond the Torah. The fact that 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms in the Torah pattern orthographically like their 2nd- and 3rd-person counterparts and not like 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-person *yiqtol* forms, while in the rest of the Bible 1st-person forms depart from the short morphology typical of 2nd- and 3rd-person *wayyiqtol* forms in favour of the *plene* spelling characteristic of standard *yiqtol* (< PS *yaqtulu/a*) forms suggests a morphological change in 1st-person forms, specifically a shift from the short template (אֲבֵד, אֲכֹמ) in the Torah to the standard long template (אֲכֹמ, אֲכֹמ) in the rest of the Bible.

Finally, the distribution of short and long III-*y* forms in the Torah—predominantly short (אֲכֹמ)—and beyond—mixed, but predominantly long (אֲכֹמ)—supports the linguistic significance of analogous distribution patterns in the case of *hif’il* and II-*w/y qal* forms.

The foregoing arguments apply to 1st-person *wayyiqtol* morphology outside the MT as well. In the BDSS, the NBDSS, the SP, and BS there is a marked spelling difference between III-*y*, *hif’il*, and *qal* II-*w/y wayyiqtol* forms in the 1st person (אֲכֹמ, אֲכֹמ, אֲכֹמ), on the one hand, and 2nd and 3rd person (אֲכֹמ, אֲכֹמ, אֲכֹמ).
17. 1st-person Wayyiqtol

In the interests of clarity and convenience, the presentation of data to this point has been according to corpus, rather than individual composition. Yet, it is fair to ask whether the corporate statistical profiles are representative of the individual constituent works.

MT Torah

All books in the Masoretic Torah show strong preferences for short 1st-person wayyiqtol forms, to the near total exclusion of long and pseudo-cohortative morphology, which justifies their combined treatment in this study. See Table 7.
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Table 7: Long (ואעש, ואעי, ואקום) and pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in the Tiberian Torah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long III-y</th>
<th>long hif'il</th>
<th>long qal II-w/y</th>
<th>total long</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>3/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>2/13</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>2/19</td>
<td>0/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah</td>
<td>3/21</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>4/38</td>
<td>4/105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MT Prophets

It was noted above that the books of the Former and Latter Prophets resemble those of the Pentateuch in terms of relatively low incidence of pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms, but show comparatively high incidence of long (ואעשה, ואעי, ואקום) forms. There is, however, variation within the distribution. Samuel and Judges are outliers of a sort. Though pseudo-cohortative forms represent minorities in the two books, between them they account for a disproportionately high number of the cases in the Prophets as a whole (12 of 13).

When it comes to long forms, Kings favours long III-y (ואעשה) forms, but not long hif'il (ואעי) and II-w/y qal (ואקום) forms, whereas Samuel shows strong preference for ואעשה, ואעי, and ואקום forms. Indeed, the counts of long morphology in Samuel alone are largely responsible for the difference in incidence of long forms between the Former and Latter Prophets. Excluding the outlier Samuel, the books of the Prophets, Former and Latter alike, are broadly similar in terms of incidence of long forms, making up from about one-third to one-half of the potential cases—far higher than in the books of the Masoretic Torah, sim-
ilar to the non-LBH+ Writings, but lower than in LBH+. See Table 8.

Table 8: Long (ואעשה, ואעיד, ואקום) and pseudo-cohortative (ואקטולה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in the Tiberian Prophets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long III-y</th>
<th>long hifil</th>
<th>long qal II-w/y</th>
<th>total long</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>7/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>0/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah7</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>0/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>6/11</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>2/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>11/22</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>17/32</td>
<td>3/68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The XII</td>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>11/22</td>
<td>1/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Proph.</td>
<td>13/15</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td>13/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Proph.</td>
<td>24/49</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>39/76</td>
<td>6/178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophets</td>
<td>37/64</td>
<td>14/30</td>
<td>9/14</td>
<td>60/108</td>
<td>19/254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MT Writings

Because the Writings include LBH material together with compositions of likely classical or unknown provenance, it seems judicious to segregate LBH+ and non-LBH+ material. And, indeed, when one filters out the LBH+ figures from those of the rest of the Writings, two distinctive patterns emerge. In terms of long (ואעשה, ואעייד, ואקום) forms, the non-LBH+ material shows an incidence broadly comparable to that of the Former and Latter

7 Given the relatively small numbers of relevant forms in Isaiah, it is perhaps not surprising that no component of the book presents a distinctive concentration of long or pseudo-cohortative forms. Long forms come in 1/1 and 2/2 potential cases in Isa. 1–39 and 40–55, respectively, but not in Isa. 56–66 (in one potential case). MT Isaiah contains no pseudo-cohortative forms.
Prophets. The relatively high incidence of pseudo-cohortative forms in the non-LBH+ Writings, mainly Psalms (6/14 cases outside of Ps. 119), but also Job’s poetry (2/11 cases), is possibly genre-driven, as poetic style may have favoured the relatively early use of forms not (yet) characteristic of contemporary non-poetic style. See Table 9.

Table 9: Long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in the Tiberian Writings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long III-</th>
<th>long hif'il</th>
<th>long qal II-</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>w/y</td>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>12/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ps 119)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>6/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Job narrative)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qohelet</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>17/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>5/11</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>23/29</td>
<td>31/69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>0/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writings</td>
<td>24/37</td>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>48/63</td>
<td>77/153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LBH+</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>8/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH+</td>
<td>17/24</td>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>40/49</td>
<td>69/128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For their part, the LBH+ works present 1st-person wayyiqtol usage profiles unlike those of any other books or corpora in the MT. They consistently display clear preferences for long morphology and in all but one case have marked accumulations of pseudo-cohortative morphology. Long forms comprise the majority in every LBH+ composition—Qohelet (2/2), Daniel (7/8), Ezra (2/3), Nehemiah (23/29), and Chronicles (6/7). Pseudo-cohortative forms
make up sizeable proportions of the relevant cases in Ps. 119 (6/7), Job 1–2 and 42.7–17 (4/4), Qohelet (1/1), Daniel (10/18), Ezra (17/22), and Nehemiah (31/69). Chronicles is an outlier when it comes to pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology, completely eschewing forms of this type (in seven potential cases). While long forms are common in both the Prophets and the Writings, pseudo-cohortative forms dominate only in LBH+ material.

In summary: the non-LBH+ Writings join the books of the Prophets in rather common use of long 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology, but show a stronger inclination to pseudo-cohortative morphology, possibly due to poetic style. The LBH+ material shows strong preference for long morphology throughout and, excluding Chronicles, far higher incidence of pseudo-cohortative forms than any non-LBH+ Masoretic book except for Psalms. Chronicles resembles LBH+ material in its preference for long

---

8 This may be a result of Chronicles’ preference for long morphology, which is similar to that of MT Samuel, but perhaps more self-consciously systematic. Despite one clear-cut short form—‘and I have said’ (MT 1 Chron. 17.10) || ‘and (the Lord) says’ (MT 2 Sam. 7.11)—the Chronicler’s predilection for long morphology is such that he leaves unchanged long forms in his sources—‘and I was’ (MT 1 Chron. 17.5 = MT 2 Sam. 7.6; MT 1 Chron. 17.8 = MT 2 Sam. 7.9); ‘and I built’ (MT 2 Chron. 6.10 = MT 1 Kgs 8.20)—but, in the interest of consistency, levels divergent morphology, whether pseudo-cohortative, ‘and I cut off’ (MT 1 Chron. 17.8) || ‘and I cut’ (MT 2 Sam. 7.9), or short, ‘and I arose’ (MT 2 Chron. 6.10) || ‘and I arose’ (MT 1 Kgs 8.20); ‘and I placed’ (MT 2 Chron. 6.11) || ‘and I placed’ (MT 1 Kgs 8.21).
forms, but, perhaps due to this preference, includes no pseudo-cohortative forms.

The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Several upshots of the fragmentary character of the BDSS mean that care must be taken in interpreting the distribution of 1st-person *wayyiqtol* variants. Considerations include the infrequency or total non-preservation of certain forms, the potential skewing of the broader picture due to the idiosyncrasies of better-preserved manuscripts, and the arbitrary nature of the specific forms preserved. Thus, while pseudo-cohortative morphology is fairly well represented in the BDSS, relatively few cases that might showcase a distinction between short and long morphology are extant, especially with regard to *hif'il* and II-*w/y* *qal* forms. See Table 10.

**Table 10:** Long (*וָאָפָה*, *ואֶעַיָּד*, *ואֹקֵם*) and pseudo-cohortative (*וָאַקַּטָּל*, *וָאָע(י)דה*, *וָאָק(ו)מה*) 1st-person *wayyiqtol* in the BDSS: Select scrolls and totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>long III-<em>y</em></th>
<th>long <em>hif'il</em></th>
<th>long <em>qal</em> II-<em>w/y</em></th>
<th>total long</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QIṣa⁴</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>6/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q51</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q70</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q80</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Q5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDSS</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>21/55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beginning with pseudo-cohortative forms, it must be asked whether their apparently high incidence is due largely to the fact that they are especially frequent in the largest scroll, 1QIṣa⁴, which accounts for over 25 percent of BDSS material (Abegg
2010, 25), but whose linguistic profile is rather exceptional within the broader corpus (Tov 2012, 100–10; Young 2013; Raymond 2014, 11; Rezetko and Young 2014, 138–39; Hornkohl 2016a, 1020). Likewise, the prevalence of pseudo-cohortative forms in the biblical component of 11QPsalms (11Q5) is at least partially due to the chance preservation there of relevant sections of Ps. 119, which also in the MT exhibits an accumulation of pseudo-cohortative forms. Similarly, two of the three pseudo-cohortative forms (as well as the single long III-y form) in 4QSamuel (4Q51) are also found in MT Samuel. In light of these considerations, it is worth entertaining the possibility that the concentration of pseudo-cohortative forms in the BDSS, rather than being broadly representative, is to some extent an accident born of their fragmentary state and the capricious nature of their preservation.

Even so, a strong argument that long and pseudo-cohortative forms are more characteristic of the BDSS than of the Tiberian written tradition can be sustained if, upon examination of parallel cases, one perceives a consistent pattern of difference. As things stand, in most instances (49 out of some 67 unambiguous cases), the MT and the BDSS textual versions agree on form. The remaining 18 may be sorted as in Table 11.

Table 11: Instances of variation in 1st-person wayyiqtol: MT versus BDSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total excluding 1QIsa⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT short</td>
<td></td>
<td>BDSS long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT long</td>
<td></td>
<td>BDSS short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT non-ps-cohort.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BDSS ps-cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT ps.-cohort.</td>
<td></td>
<td>BDSS non-ps-cohort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the MT and the BDSS differ with regard to 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology, it is more common for the MT to exhibit short (ואעש, ואעד, ואקטל) or non-pseudo-cohortative (ואקטל, ואקם) morphology than for the BDSS to do so. The relative incidence of BDSS pseudo-cohortative (ואקטילה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) morphology is especially striking. And, crucially, this remains true even if one corrects for such skewing factors as 1QIsa’s disproportionate size and atypical linguistic profile and if one excludes LBH + 1st-person wayyiqtol forms (which are pseudo-cohortative in both the MT and the BDSS). Though the vagaries of fragmentation preclude certainty, the comparative accumulation of pseudo-cohortative forms in the BDSS is arguable evidence of a direction of change from the shorter forms preserved in the MT to longer forms in the BDSS. This is consistent with BDSS treatment of other linguistic features, which more closely conforms to Second Temple conventions than does the MT (Hornkohl 2016a).

The Non-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Large gaps in the evidence rule out a complete picture. However, among the extant cases of the 1st-person wayyiqtol, short (ואעש, ואקטל, ואקטילה) forms are extremely rare and long (ואקם, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) and pseudo-cohortative (ואקטילה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms are far more common, though not necessarily in the same texts. See Table 12. The Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHא), which offers the greatest number of examples by far, uses pseudo-cohortative forms wherever possible and long morphology in III-י forms. The Apocryphon of Jeremiah Cא (4Q385a) and Cד (4Q389) also exhibit concentrations of pseudo-cohortative morphology, but are too
broken to sustain more extensive conclusions. The highly fragmentary 4QReworked Pentateuch\(^b\) (4Q364) appears to prefer long forms—two of three candidates, all short in the MT\(^g\)—but shows low incidence of pseudo-cohortative forms (just one of six). A similar pattern of long, but not pseudo-cohortative, morphology might also characterise 4QPseudo-Ezekiel\(^e\) (4Q391), but cases are too few to draw firm conclusions, a situation typical of other scrolls as well. In sum, though severely obscured by fragmentation, the apparently high incidence of long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology in the NBDSS is consistent with broader Second Temple trends.

Table 12: Long (ואעש, ואעידי, ואעשיה) and pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) 1st-person wayyiqtol in the NBDSS: Select scrolls and totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>long III-y</th>
<th>long hif'il</th>
<th>long qal II-w/y</th>
<th>total long</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QH(^a)</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q364</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q385a</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q389</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q391</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBDSS</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>23/31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samaritan Pentateuch

The Samaritan written tradition displays strong proclivity for long 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology. In contrast to the rarity of forms such as ואעש, ואעשיה, and in the MT (3/21 III-y, 1/12 hif'il,

\(^a\) ‘and we ascended’ (4Q364 f24a–c.15) || | תָּנַע (MT Deut. 3.1); \(^e\) ‘and I cast’ (4Q364 f26bii + e.1) || | אַשְׁלִ (MT Deut. 9.21); but \(^g\) ‘and I saw’ (4Q364 f26bi.6) = | ואֶא (MT Deut. 9.16).
0/5 II-w/y qal, 4/38 total), they are the rule in the SP (21/22 III-
y, 10/10 hifʿil, 4/5 II-w/y qal, 35/37 total). See Table 13.

Table 13: Long (ואעשה, ואעביר, ואקום) and pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) 1st-person wayyiqtol in the SP (figures of long out of total short and long forms; figures in brackets represent the total of long and pseudo-cohortative forms out of total short, long, and pseudo-cohortative forms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>long III-y</th>
<th>long hifʿil</th>
<th>long qal II-w/y</th>
<th>total long</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP Gen.</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>1/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Exod.</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Lev.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Num.</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Deut.</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>16/16</td>
<td>28/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4/4)</td>
<td>(3/3)</td>
<td>(20/20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>35/37</td>
<td>34/106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13/13)</td>
<td>(5/6)</td>
<td>(39/41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) morphology, however, the Samaritan situation is more complex. Overall, the proportion of 34 of 106 cases is far higher than MT Torah’s of 4 of 105. However, in the books of the Tetratetuch (Genesis–Numbers) the totals in the two traditions are comparable—Samaritan 6 of 64 versus Tiberian 4 of 64—with little in the way of disharmony between the two.¹⁰ In Deuteronomy, conversely, the SP has pseudo-cohortative forms in 28/42 cases, against a total absence of pseudo-cohortative forms in the 41 MT cases. The uniqueness of SP Deuteronomy

¹⁰ SP pseudo-cohortative || MT non-pseudo-cohortative: Exod. 3.8, 17; 6.5; Lev. 26.13. SP non-pseudo-cohortative || MT pseudo-cohortative: Gen. 41.11; 43.21.
is particularly striking when its 1st-person way-yiqtol profile is compared to that of SP Genesis, which has a comparable number 1st-person wayyiqtol cases, but a far lower incidence of pseudo-cohortative morphology (1/42).

While it may be tempting to hypothesise sweeping linguistic, compositional, and/or text-critical explanations for the inner-Samaritan diversity between the SP Tetrateuch and SP Deuteronomy, their differential treatment of 1st-person wayyiqtol forms turns out to be casual. When the specific verbs that obtain as non-pseudo-cohortative and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol forms are analysed, there emerges striking consistency in treatment throughout the SP. With just two exceptions, individual verbs take one pattern or the other, not both. See Table 14 (p. 420).

Table 14 lists the 49 verbs that account for the 106 potential cases of pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology in the SP. The 72 tokens of non-pseudo-cohortative morphology (ואקטל, ואע(י)ד, ואק(ו)ם) in the SP represent 32 different verbs, while the 34 tokens of pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, וד, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) morphology represent 19 different verbs. Crucially, only two verbs present both non-pseudo-cohortative and pseudo-cohortative alternants—אמר (18 non-pseudo-cohortative cases in Genesis [11], Exodus [2], Leviticus [2], and Deuteronomy [3]; two pseudo-cohortative cases, in Exodus and Deuteronomy) and יש (one non-pseudo-cohortative case in Genesis, one pseudo-cohortative case in Deuteronomy). Thus, despite the surface-level statistical profiles, there is virtually no basis for claiming a distinction in 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology between SP Deuter-
onomy and the rest of the SP. SP Deuteronomy’s apparently exceptional character vis-à-vis the SP Tetrateuch results merely from Deuteronomy’s use of a number of verbs unused elsewhere in the Torah. Those that appear in Deuteronomy and elsewhere either share the preservation of non-pseudo-cohortative morphology or, more rarely, present with pseudo-cohortative morphology in both the Samaritan Tetrateuch and Deuteronomy. Only among verbs exclusive to Deuteronomy is there a noticeable concentration of pseudo-cohortative morphology. Presumably, were these to appear in SP Genesis–Numbers, an analogous percentage would also have pseudo-cohortative morphology. See Table 14 (following page).

Sjörs (2021a, 20–25) notes that pseudo-cohortative lengthening in the SP is used with a limited number of semantic classes of verbal lexemes, including motion verbs and verbs of appropriation. Crucially, Sjörs (2021b) observes no such semantic correlation in LBH, where the extent of lengthened 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology demands a more comprehensive explanation.

Stepping back for a broader perspective on Samaritan 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology in comparison with other sources and traditions, the SP joins LBH+ and the DSS in displaying an overwhelming preference for long (ואעשה, ואעידי, ואקום) forms and shows incidence of pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms between that characteristic of Tiberian CBH (Torah, Prophets, non-LBH+ Writings) and what obtains in Tiberian LBH+ and the NBDSS. The diachronically advanced stage of Samaritan 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology relative to that
in the Tiberian Torah is consistent with the broad linguistic profiles of the two traditions (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 3–4).

Table 14: Alphabetical list of non-pseudo-cohortative and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqṭol verbs in the SP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non-pseudo-cohortative</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
<th>non-pseudo-cohortative</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>1CS</td>
<td>1CPL</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>אחר</td>
<td>אחר</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>אכל</td>
<td>אכיל</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ואמר</td>
<td>ואמר</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>בוא</td>
<td>בוא</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>הבר</td>
<td>הבר</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>הבדיל</td>
<td>הבדיל</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>הביא</td>
<td>הביא</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>הנד</td>
<td>הנד</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>לולו</td>
<td>לולו</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>הפקד</td>
<td>הפקד</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>הקור</td>
<td>הקור</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>נש</td>
<td>נש</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>השל</td>
<td>השל</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>הב</td>
<td>הב</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>תלב</td>
<td>תלב</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>תשכ</td>
<td>תשכ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>קぷ/קיט</td>
<td>קープ/קיט</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ben Sira

Of the relatively few relevant forms preserved in manuscripts of BS, all potentially long cases are long (ואבא, וארב; ואצפ, ואפר), while four of seven potentially pseudo-cohortative cases are
pseudo-cohortative (ואتناول, ואברכה, ואاهلלא). Two of the three non-pseudo-cohortative are long (ואולא, ואברכה). Only one strong form is left unlengthened (ואתплל). Thus, the extant BS 1st-person wayyiqtol forms pattern like those of other Second Temple sources, with strong inclination for long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person morphology. See Table 15.

Table 15: Long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol in Ben Sira

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>long III-y</th>
<th>long hif'il</th>
<th>long II-w/y qal</th>
<th>total long</th>
<th>pseudo-cohortative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SirB</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Q5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Drilling down beneath the surface-level statistical profiles of 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology across ancient Hebrew sources and traditions, one finds broad support for the hypotheses suggested by the corporate surveys in §§1.1–2 above. Indeed, far from contradicting the postulated diachronic contours, the details of a granular analysis of individual compositions validates distinguishing among the CBH of the Torah, the CBH of the Prophets and non-LBH+ Writings, and the late chronolects reflected in MT LBH+, the BDSS and NBDSS, SH, and BS.
1.4. 1st-person Wayyiqtol Morphology and Historical Depth in the Masoretic Written Tradition

1.4.1. Short III-י (ואעש) and Pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה) Forms

The Meshaʿ Stele’s exclusive use of short III-י 1st-person wayyiqtol (ואעש) forms and lack of pseudo-cohortative wayyiqtol (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה) forms (see above, §1.1) tally with the Masoretic Torah’s preference for short 1st-person morphology. Likewise, the striking affinity for long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol forms among late non-Tiberian biblical traditions—the BDSS, the SP—and extra-biblical sources—the NBDSS, BS—is strong evidence of the historical authenticity of the Masoretic LBH+ preference for long and pseudo-cohortative wayyiqtol morphology.

Since the morphological shifts away from short forms seen thus far are not confined to the Tiberian reading and/or written tradition, but—even after probing beneath the surface-level statistical profiles—prove to be characteristic of late biblical and extra-biblical corpora more generally, there are no grounds for attributing the expanded use of long and pseudo-cohortative morphology to medieval or even Byzantine scribal intervention, much less to anachronistic medieval vocalisation (but see below, §2.0). Despite the Tiberian consonantal tradition’s status as a product of scribal transmission, necessarily entailing the possibility of textual fluidity, the shift from short 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in the Tiberian Torah to long and pseudo-cohortative alternatives in Masoretic LBH+ is broadly consistent with patterns
seen in early and late non-Masoretic sources. The crystallisation of Masoretic 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology plausibly dates to Second Temple times, though, relative to contemporary sources, it must be considered conservative by dint of its comparative preservation of short morphology.

1.4.2. Long III-י (אעשיה), Hif’il (אעידי) and Qal II-w/y (אכדום) Forms

The argument advanced to this point is consistent with, but does not exhaust the evidence. The data sustain more far-reaching conclusions. Not only are long 1st-person wayyiqtol forms—ואעשה, ואעיד, ואקום—the norm in Tiberian LBH+ and other late written traditions; they are also common in what is generally considered CBH material outside the Pentateuch, e.g., the MT Prophets and non-LBH+ Writings, where their incidence is closer to that seen in MT LBH+ than to that in the MT Torah. For the sake of convenience, Chart 3 is reproduced below as Chart 5.

Against the background of the associations already established—i.e., classical short, on the one hand, and late long and pseudo-cohortative, on the other—how are the specific profiles of the MT Prophets and non-LBH+ Writings—involving the apparently early distribution of long, but not pseudo-cohortative forms—to be explained?
Since long orthographic forms (ואעשה, ואעיד, ואקום) are absent from the Torah’s written tradition, but common in the rest of the MT—again, not just in LBH+, but outside the Pentateuch more generally—one might venture the hypothesis that long forms were not originally characteristic of any CBH material and pin responsibility for the difference between the CBH of the Torah (where short forms dominate) and CBH outside the Torah (where long forms are quite standard) on late scribes. These copyists—it seems reasonable to conjecture—might have preserved the ancient orthographic integrity of the venerated Torah more strictly than that of the rest of CBH, which was allowed to ‘drift’ in the direction of LBH+. In this way, 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in the MT Torah could have been kept pristinely short, while elsewhere in CBH they were updated under the influence of later morphological trends. The theory, while attractive, is contradicted by the data.
Key in this connection is the unambiguous orthographic evidence of long 1st-person III-ו (ואעשה) and pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms, the incidence of which is compared in Chart 6.

Chart 6: Incidence of long 1st-person III-ו (ואעשה) and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms across representative ancient Hebrew traditions as percentage of potential cases

Generally speaking, frequency of long (ואעשה) forms positively correlates with frequency of pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms. Thus, both largely lack in the MT Torah, but are common in MT LBH+ and in other late corpora, biblical and extra-biblical alike. The glaring exception is the MT Prophets, where long forms are frequent (57.6 percent), whereas pseudo-cohortative forms are rare (7.5 percent). Returning to the speculative hypothesis proffered above, i.e., that 1st-person wayyiqtol forms may have been more or less uniformly short throughout CBH and that only outside the Torah underwent contemporisation in line with late linguistic customs—on this assumption, it
would be reasonable to expect a marked increase in both long III-
y forms and pseudo-cohortative forms in CBH outside the Torah. For if late scribes felt free to append final heh to originally short 1st-person III-y wayyiqtol forms according to Second Temple convention, i.e., changing ואעש to ואעש, then it is reasonable to ex-
pect that they would also have felt free to do the same where necessary to expand the use of pseudo-cohortative forms, chang-
ing ואקטל and ואקטל, etc., since these were no less characteristic of Second Temple Hebrew.

Crucially, this state of affairs does not obtain. Against the norm in the MT Torah, and similar to MT LBH+ and other late corpora, the MT Prophets show an affinity for long 1st-person III-y wayyiqtol (ואעש) forms. Yet, similar to the MT Torah and against convention in MT LBH+ and other late texts, pseudo-
cohortative (ואקטל, ואקטל, ואקטל) forms are largely absent from the CBH of the Prophets. From the admittedly narrow per-
spective of 1st-person wayyiqtol forms, then, the written tradition of the MT Prophets is that of neither the MT Torah nor MT LBH+, but reflects some sort of typologically transitional phase between Pentateuchal CBH and LBH+. This leaves us with a tantalising prospect, namely, that of a tri-valent 1st-person wayyiqtol historical typology:

1. nearly uniformly short (ואקטל, ואקטל, ואקטל, ואקטל) morphology in the CBH of the Torah;
2. commonly long (ואקטל, ואקטל, ואקטל, ואקטל) but rarely pseudo-cohortative morphology in the CBH of the Proph-
ets;
3. commonly long (ואעש, ואיעיד, ואעשיה) and commonly pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) morphology in LBH +. 11

A note on the MT non-LBH + Writings: their incidence of long (ואעשה, ואעיד, ואעשיה) forms is similar to that of the MT Prophets, but Psalms especially shows a comparatively high incidence of pseudo-cohortative (ואקטל(ה), ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms. Given the uncertainty inherent in the linguistic periodisation of poetry, it is difficult to determine whether this relative frequency of pseudo-cohortative forms is a function of chronolect, poetic genre, another factor or factors, or some combination thereof.

It bears explicit acknowledgment at this point that the proposed chronological interpretation of the typology is at odds with certain views current in biblical studies, not least those that see the Torah and other CBH biblical material as products of the post-exilic period and/or that reject language as reliable diachronic indicators. The position advocated here is not that alternative evidence should be deprived of in favour of orthographic and linguistic evidence, but that the latter should receive due attention and be integrated with evidence gleaned from other approaches.

11 The specific distribution patterns seem to militate against the theory (mentioned above, fn. 5) that III-y forms could take pseudo-cohortative morphology in CBH. The general lack of pseudo-cohortative morphology in the reading tradition of the Masoretic Torah and the Prophets suggests that the final ה on III-y forms in those corpora reflects long rather than pseudo-cohortative morphology. This does not apply to LBH +, where pseudo-cohortative forms are plentiful.
To summarise provisionally, whatever the chronological significance of the typological divisions proposed above, the Tiberian consonantal text reflects a linguistic tradition of considerable historical depth. This is true in terms of both antiquity (i.e., the extent of its reach into the past) and stratification (i.e., the number of linguistic phases to which it bears witness).

1.4.3. 1st-person Wayyiqtol Morphology and the Linguistic Periodisation of Ancient Hebrew

Most discussions of ancient Hebrew diachrony distinguish LBH from CBH (Hornkohl 2013b; Hurvitz 2013). Pre-classical poetic ABH (Mandell 2013) and an intermediate category between CBH and LBH termed TBH also have proponents (Hornkohl 2013a; 2016b). Certain aspects of 1st-person wayyiqtol morphological diversity are consistent with such a paradigm, especially, the high frequency of short (ואעש, וואעד, ואקם) morphology in the written tradition of the Tiberian Torah and the Mesha Stele, on the one hand, and, on the other, the rarity of short morphology and concomitant accumulation of pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, וא(ו)קמה) morphology in Tiberian LBH + and other traditions and sources that reflect Second Temple Hebrew.

Yet the proposed typology also challenges at least one component of the regnant diachronic linguistic paradigm. In the distributions of the 1st-person wayyiqtol morphological variants in the Tiberian written tradition one confronts a situation that calls for greater nuance than that which typically characterises diachronic discussions. This is because, as noted above (§1.4.2), the three-stage diachronic division of material based on distribution
of 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology is on the surface consistent with neither the ABH-CBH-LBH paradigm nor the CBH-TBH-LBH arrangement, but calls for finer shading within what is conventionally termed CBH.

Preliminarily, two explanations suggest themselves. One option is that the Torah’s written linguistic tradition is typologically older than that of the rest of CBH, in which case there may be some justification to distinguishing between CBH\(^1\) and CBH\(^2\), both typologically prior to LBH (see Elitzur 2015; 2018a; 2018b; 2019; 2022). Alternatively, it is possible to envision a scenario in which original CBH short 1st-person wayyiqtol morphological dominance gave way to secondary diversity when material outside the Torah was contemporised—not according to LBH, but in line with norms typologically transitional between those of the MT Torah and LBH proper, that is, of a period when long (ואעש, ואקום, ואקטלה) forms were in wide use, but pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) were not. In this case, what appears to be CBH\(^2\) would be a result of the updating of CBH in line with TBH conventions. It bears repeating that the similarity between the CBH of the MT Prophets and MT LBH + involving the incidence of long III-y morphology (ואעש) combined with their difference in regard to pseudo-cohortative (ואקטלה, ואע(י)דה, ואק(ו)מה) forms militates against the view that the potentially secondary status of long 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology in the CBH of the MT Prophets is due to levelling in line with LBH + standards, since one should reasonably expect this to have resulted in relatively high incidence of both long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology.
Pending the examination of more data with these scenarios in mind, they remain conjectural. And, of course, they are not mutually exclusive. Either way, from the perspective of the MT distribution of 1st-person wayyiqtol forms, it seems necessary to reckon with the reality of some sort of multivalent division of CBH, whether it involves an organic distinction between CBH\(^1\) and CBH\(^2\) or the artificial creation of CBH\(^2\) due the secondary drift of some authentic CBH material in the direction of TBH.

Rounding out this examination of 1st-person wayyiqtol diachrony in the Tiberian written tradition, it is opportune to discuss a few sundry matters.

Non-characteristic Diachronic Usages

First, though short and pseudo-cohortative forms are characteristic, respectively, of classical and post-classical forms of ancient Hebrew, there is no reason to expect that they should be exclusively restricted to the corpora they characterise. According to more nuanced renditions of the dominant diachronic paradigm, many classical features remained available to late writers and copyists, even if the latter may often have opted for contemporary alternatives. By the same token, exceptional pseudo-cohortative forms in apparently classical texts do not necessarily indicate late composition or textual drift, since there is no logical impediment to the early development of a feature whose later expansion makes it characteristically post-classical. The plausibility of diachronically distinct concentrations of 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology does not preclude the sporadic use of atypical forms at any given stage.
The Problem of Archaic Heterogeneity

From the perspective of Hetzron’s (1976) principle of *archaic heterogeneity* the situation is somewhat complex. At first glance, the claim of early short morphological unity among 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-person *wayyiqṭol* forms may appear to contravene expectations. Would it not be more appropriate to posit early *wayyiqṭol* heterogeneity, e.g., a paradigm consisting of pseudo-cohortative 1st-person forms and short 2nd- and 3rd-person forms, which was later levelled via analogical processes to a uniformly short paradigm, with a few pseudo-cohortative leftovers?

While such an approach may seem logical from the narrow perspective of *wayyiqṭol* morphology, it is neither borne out in the data nor more theoretically attractive than an alternative view. The diachronic pattern of change for the *wayyiqṭol* paradigm cannot be described as homogenising, since the morphological distinction between 1st-person forms and 2nd- and 3rd-person forms gradually increases, rather than decreases, with time. Moreover, methodologically, early *wayyiqṭol* paradigmatic heterogeneity is *a priori* no more compelling a possibility than early heterogeneity viewed from a broader perspective, namely one that includes both the *wayyiqṭol* paradigm and that of the directive-volitive forms, i.e., the cohortative (אֵקָהָה,), imperative (קָם), and jussive (יַקֵּם). Indeed, bringing into consideration this latter paradigm, especially the presumed link between the cohortative (אֵקָהָה) and the 1st-person *wayyiqṭol* (אֵקָהָה > אֵקָהָה) (see Hornkohl 2013a, 165–70; Khan 2021, 321–27; see below), it is reasonable to argue that the archaic heterogeneity eventually homogenised was that between the 1st-person *wayyiqṭol* and coho-
tative forms. But from the perspective of the narrow confines of the wayyiqtol paradigm, this merging of 1st-person wayyiqtol and cohortative morphology had the effect of increasing, rather than decreasing, heterogeneity.

The Relevance of a Recent Proposal

Ch. 16, above, focused mainly on Khan’s (2021, 319–40) recently propounded theory of the genesis of ancient Hebrew wayyiqtol (see especially §§1.0–3.0). It is now opportune to assess his approach in light of what has been said here about the distribution of 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in ancient Hebrew sources. Crucially for the present discussion, Khan speculates on the timing of the reanalysis he proposes.

Some scholars have, indeed, already expressed the view that there was a convergence between the wayyiqtol form and the modal system during the period of Late Biblical Hebrew [e.g., Bergsträsser 1918–1929, II:§5d; Talshir 1986]. I would like to argue that this had taken place already in Classical Biblical Hebrew....

The most obvious structural manifestation [of the reanalysis of the narrative yiqtol as a schematised extension of a jussive] is the occurrence of the cohortative jussive form of first person in wayyiqtol forms. These become particularly frequent in Late Biblical Hebrew (Cohen 2013, 121–13), but are found sporadically already in the Pentateuch in Classical Biblical Hebrew. (Khan 2021, 321–22, 327)

A few brief observations are in order. First, Khan’s proposal arguably conceives of a more profound and pervasive convergence of the wayyiqtol and directive-volitive paradigms than is usually envisioned. According to Khan, it was not merely by late
analogy with cohortative אקטלה that classical אקטלה shifted to אקטלה. Rather, the antecedents of wayyiqtol אקטלה and cohortative (purpose/result) אקטלה had already fused in Iron Age Hebrew. Originally conveying distinct preterite and modal senses, they had merged into a semantically underdifferentiated w-yiqtol structure broadly associated with temporal consecution. Only later were they re-differentiated via gemination of realis (mostly preterite) waw-yiqtol > wayyiqtol in the Second Temple Period.

Second, while it is clear that the frequent use of pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology is distinctive of LBH+ and other late corpora, Khan’s theory is consistent with a distribution that is not exclusively late. In other words, at the very least, it allows for the early 1st-person wayyiqtol morphological variety acknowledged above. The dominance of short 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology especially characteristic of the MT Torah written tradition can be interpreted as a stage in the convergence of preterite waw-yiqtol and dependent volitional waw-yiqtol where a morphological distinction between the two yiqtol forms was still largely preserved in the 1st person. Even so, there is no reason to deny the authenticity of sporadic pseudo-cohortative morphology in the Torah and the Former Prophets.12

Khan (2021, 327, 337–38) notes the LBH proliferation of long and pseudo-cohortative forms, providing a theoretical

---

12 Qimron (2018, 169) also sees the CBH pseudo-cohortative forms as authentically ancient, but claims that their apparent early infrequency is the product of “an illusion created by the defective spelling of the early Biblical books,” i.e., that verbs could be realised with final -a without final mater heh.
mechanism for well-rehearsed hypotheses concerning late influence of the cohortative on the 1st-person *wayyiqtol* and the late partial merger of long and cohortative morphology in *wayyiqtol* and *yiqtol* more generally. Attempting to flesh out Khan’s argument: on the assumption of early contrast between a uniformly short preterite paradigm (*וָקַם, וָתַקֵם, וָאֲקַם*) and a mixed modal paradigm (cohortative *וָקַם, וָאֲקַם*, imperative *וָקָם*, and jussive *וָיֶּקַם*), the similarity and narrative frequency of 3rd-person forms (both short) would make them the logical starting point for reanalysis. Convergence of the respective 1st- and 2nd-person forms, which were dissimilar and far less frequent, might be expected to lag. And, at least in the case of the 1st-person, this is exactly what one encounters. Not until the Persian Period does the convergence apparently begun in CBH become common in 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms.  

When it comes to the distribution of long 1st-person *wayyiqtol* (*וָאֲקַם, וָאֲעַדַי, וָאֲעַשֶּׁה*) morphology, Khan (2021, 337–38) notes the differences between the CBH of the Torah and Former Prophets and between the written and reading traditions of CBH material (on the latter, see below, §2.0). He describes the shift as gradual, attributing it to the “merging in function of the cohortative...”

---

13 The matter of 2nd-person forms lies beyond the scope of this chapter. The BH equivalent of the 3rd-person dependent jussive (purpose/result) *וָיֶּקַם* is the imperative, e.g., *וָקָם* (JM, §116f). Narrative 2nd-person *וָיֶּקַם* never arose in Hebrew (unless this is behind the late penchant for the infinitive absolute replacing a finite verb (?)). It is not clear whether the expected alternative, 2nd-person dependent jussive (purpose/result) *וָיֶּקַם*, ever developed. Perhaps the infrequency of 2nd-person narrative forms hindered the expected effects of convergence.
tive with the long [i.e., long] yiqtol form” (Khan 2021, 337). This seems consistent with the position elaborated in Hornkohl (2013a, 165–70), where it is hypothesised that, in addition to late cohortative influence on wayyiqtol, both the preterite and volitive short yiqtol forms were subject to constant analogical pressure exerted by the standard yiqtol (< PS yaqtulu), the semantics of which also included both past (mainly habitual) and modal shades. Whatever the case may be, any proposal for explaining the expanded use of long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology must successfully account for the disparities in their respective CBH frequencies. In the Tiberian written tradition of the Pentateuch, pointedly, long III-y morphology (3 of 21 cases) is comparatively more common than pseudo-cohortative morphology (4 of 105 cases). What is more, long III-y morphology is commonplace in CBH outside the Torah, while it is not until post-exilic Hebrew that pseudo-cohortative morphology becomes frequent. From a perspective of historical depth, Khan’s theory of wayyiqtol development substantially preposes the starting point for convergence of the three yiqtol templates employed in wayyiqtol morphology.

2.0. The Masoretic Reading Tradition

We are now in position to investigate the matter of dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian biblical tradition as it manifests in 1st-person wayyiqtol forms and to evaluate its historical significance.
2.1. Dissonance and Secondary Character

At issue is whether spelling and vocalisation are in harmony as regards short and long 1st-person wayyiqṭol morphology in the case of 1cs and 1cpl hifʿil and II-w/y qal forms. Table 16 compares the Tiberian written (consonantal) and reading (vocalic) traditions in terms of short 1st-person wayyiqṭol morphology.

Table 16: Short 1st-person wayyiqṭol morphology according to written (orthographic) and reading (vocalisation) traditions: number of short forms out of total short and long (percentage) (for citations, see §4.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Torah</th>
<th>Prophets</th>
<th>Non-LBH+ Writings</th>
<th>LBH+ Writings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hifʿil</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>18/31</td>
<td>4/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(91.7%)</td>
<td>(66.7%)</td>
<td>(58.1%)</td>
<td>(12.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qal II-w/y</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(35.7%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hifʿil +</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>23/45</td>
<td>4/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(94.4%)</td>
<td>(56.3%)</td>
<td>(51.1%)</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qal II-w/y</td>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>2/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.0%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 78 cases of hifʿil and qal II-w/y 1st-person wayyiqṭol forms throughout the MT, in just 15 is the vocalisation consistent with short morphology (9 in the Torah, 4 in the Prophets, 2 in LBH +). In the MT Torah the orthography nearly always reflects short morphology—16 of 17 cases, the sole exception the questionably relevant וַנַשִּׁים (Num. 21.30). According to the Pentateuch’s vocalisation, by contrast, short morphology comes in just 8 of 15 cases. In the Prophets, too, one encounters dissonance: according to the spelling tradition, just over half of the instances (23 of

---

14 Here and throughout forms with invariable wayyiqṭol vocalic realisation regardless of their orthography, such as qal נִזר, are excluded from the counts.
45) reflect short morphology, but that proportion drops to under ten percent (4 of 41) according to the reading tradition. The non-LBH+ Writings present just one relevant example, both traditions exhibiting long morphology. Only in LBH+ does one encounter relative harmony between the orthography and vocalisation when it comes to 1st-person *wayyiqtol* morphology: short forms are rare according to both traditions.

Two related observations are in order.

2.1.1. The Diachronic Significance of Dissonance in Classical Biblical Hebrew Material

First, the most plausible explanation for the frequent mismatch between long vocalisation and short orthography in 1st-person *wayyiqtol* (וָאָעִד, וָאָקֻם) forms throughout CBH texts is that a comparatively late reading tradition characterised by long 1st-person *wayyiqtol* morphology was secondarily imposed upon a written tradition in which the spelling of many such forms reflected earlier short morphology. Since the Tiberian reading tradition coincides at salient points with post-exilic written tradition, it is reasonable to see the vocalisation as a product of Second Temple times. This means that the Tiberian reading tradition presents a stage in the development of 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms more historically advanced than that discernible in the written tradition to which it has been textually wedded.
2.1.2. The Diachronic Significance of Harmony in Late Biblical Hebrew + Material

Second, the regular written-reading agreement found in LBH + material is no accident, but rather results from historical proximity. In other words, the fact that the 1st-person wayyiqṭol morphology applied by the reading tradition throughout the MT corresponds so closely to the LBH + written tradition (e.g., דאעש, דאקום) is because, though semi-independent, they are related products of the same period.

2.2. A Need for Nuance

But while the foregoing narrative is true as far as it goes, there is more to the story. Indeed, such a broad-strokes account is something of a distortion. Nuance is required.

2.2.1. The Antiquity of Long 1st-person Wayyiqṭol Morphology

First, while the extent of the use of long (ואעשה, ואקום) forms in the reading tradition is more in line with the LBH + written tradition than with the CBH written tradition, as has already been noted regarding the written tradition, the phenomenon itself—namely, the likely orthographic representation of long (ואעש, ואקום) 1st-person wayyiqṭol morphology—predates LBH+. This is clear from the particular constellation of long III-ヴ (ואעשה) and pseudo-cohortative (ואקטילה, ואעש) 1st-person wayyiqṭol morphology in Tiberian CBH outside the Torah, where—like LBH+, but unlike the Torah—long forms diffused, but—like the Torah, but unlike LBH+—pseudo-cohortative forms did not.
A similar situation emerges from an examination of the morphological variety of hifʿil and II-w/y qal wayyiqtol forms tabulated above in Table 16 (above, p. 428). Note that though long morphology’s eclipsing of short morphology in both the LBH + written and reading traditions is especially striking (2 of 25 and 2 or 20 cases, respectively), the shift was by no means unprecedented. The extensive replacement of short with long morphology in the vocalisation of the Prophets (just 4 of 41 short) is merely the continuation of a trend already well established in the written tradition of the same material (23 of 45 short). The consistency of long vocalisation in the Prophets is probably partially secondary and anachronistic, but it is merely an extrapolation of a trend already begun, just less advanced, in the corpus’s orthography.

It is in the Torah, with orthography predominantly indicative of short 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology, that the partial deviation in favour of long morphology appears especially anachronistic (the reader is once again reminded that the linguistic significance of the long hifʿil and wayyiqtol spellings has been demonstrated above, in §1.3.1).\(^{15}\) In sum, the incidence of 1st-person wayyiqtol morphological dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition increases as

\(^{15}\) Cf. Khan (2021), who presents different explanations for long 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology in the Masoretic written and reading traditions. In the case of the former he seems to envision a gradual process of organic convergence (337), while he attributes the latter to ‘top-down’ imposition unlikely rooted in vernacular usage (339).
one moves back in time from LBH+ through the Prophets to the Torah.

2.2.2. Dissonance and Diversity within the Tiberian Reading Tradition

This leads to a second important observation. Considering the hypothesis that the Tiberian reading tradition is a Second Temple oral realisation that was applied to contemporary texts and retrojected onto earlier material, it would be reasonable to suppose that it might exhibit greater uniformity, or, at the very least, that it would deviate toward late conventions wherever the written tradition was amenable thereto. Reality, however, proves more complex. Despite its clear Second Temple affinities at certain striking points, the Tiberian pronunciation tradition, like the consonantal tradition, is multifarious, routinely preserving features especially characteristic of early material in the face of the influence of later linguistic convention. Focusing on 1st-person wayyiqṭol morphology, this is manifest in linguistic diversity within the Tiberian reading tradition.

1CS versus 1CPL Forms

Consider the differential treatment of singular and plural 1st-person wayyiqṭol forms in the Torah (see Khan 2021, 338–39). See Table 17. Whereas 1CS forms often—in 6 of 8 potential cases—combine short spelling with long phonology, in the 1CPL, spelling consistently matches phonology, so that the classical template is preserved except where long spelling obtains.
The Historical Depth of the Tiberian Reading Tradition

Table 17: 1st-person short and long hifʿil and qal II-w/y wayyiqtol morphology in the Masoretic reading tradition of the Torah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Lev. 26.13; Deut. 29.4)</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Gen. 43.7; Gen. 44.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Gen. 43.21)</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Num. 31.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Deut. 2.1)</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Deut. 2.34; 3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Gen. 24.47; Deut. 10.5)</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Num. 21.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Exod 19.4)</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Lev. 20.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Lev. 20.26)</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Deut. 9.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariable</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Gen. 24.42)</td>
<td>ךְוָאֹוֹלֵ (Deut. 1.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sporadic Preservation of Short 1cs Forms

But even in the case of 1cs wayyiqtol forms: though hifʿil and II-w/y qal forms are routinely pointed long where written (and presumably intended) short, in a minority of cases, typologically early short vocalisation is preserved. Several of these might be conditioned, but it is intriguing that all occur in the reading tradition of CBH texts. Conversely, the LBH+ reading tradition is very much in sync with the parallel written tradition, strongly preferring long and pseudo-cohortative forms at the expense of short ones. In LBH+, the spelling of 1cs forms nearly always reflects long or pseudo-cohortative morphology (in 38 of 39 cases of hifʿil

16 Four such cases involve the specific verb כְוָאֹוֹלֵ, behind whose short form there may well stand phonological factors—perhaps an original diphthong in the first syllable favoured preservation of short morphology in the second (cf. כְוָאֹוֹלֵ in the SP). The preservation of another short form may be attributed to euphony in כְוָאֹוֹל (Jer. 32.10); cf. כְוָאֹוֹל (Neh. 13.15). That leaves only כְוָאֹוֹל (Josh. 14.7), which contrasts with LBH כְוָאֹוֹל (Neh. 2.20).
and II-w/y qal combined), the sole exception being רָאָשׁ (1 Chron. 17.10). When it comes to the mere three relevant 1CPL cases, the two traditions once agree on short morphology (בָּא נָשָׁה Ezra 10.2), once agree on long morphology (נַעֲמִ יד Neh. 4.3), and once clash (וָאַרְּבֶה Neh. 4.9). These exceptional instances of mismatch between orthography and vocalisation in Tiberian LBH+ are doubly important, evincing both the continued independence of the written and reading traditions as well as their close congruence. Indeed, their potential divergence makes their consistent agreement all the more striking.

**Ketiv-Qere Mismatches**

A final note on the six relevant instances of ketiv-qere dissonance: these are cases where the disparity occasioned by merging divergent written and reading traditions could not be resolved except by explicit emendation of the written form. See Table 18.

Table 18: Ketiv-qere cases involving 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in Codex Leningrad

| ketiv   | qere    | Reference | Description: ketiv || qere |
|---------|---------|-----------|----------------------|
| ואראה  | לָאָרֵא | Josh. 7.21 | long || short          |
| וארב    | לָאַרְּבֶה | Josh. 24.3 | short || long           |
| ואבאה   | לָאָבִיא | Josh. 24.8 | pseudo-cohort. || long |
| ואבתא   | לָאָבָתָא | Ezra 8.17 | pseudo-cohort. || long  |
| ואשקולה | לָאֵשְׁקָלָה | Ezra 8.25 | pseudo-cohort. || pseudo-cohortative |
| ונשוב  | נַשָּׁב | Neh. 4.9  | long || short           |

Beyond confirming the independence of two related traditions, these do not materially alter the picture drawn to this point. Intriguingly—and contrary to what might be expected, but consistent with what was said above—there is no unambiguous correlation between the ketiv and classical short morphology or
between the *qere* and later long or pseudo-cohortative morphology. This is a further indication that, despite crystallising in the Second Temple Period, the Tiberian reading tradition—including, but not limited to, explicit *qere* instances—manifests profound historical depth and intricacy, even preserving individual Iron Age phenomena in the face of the standardisation of others.

### 3.0. Conclusion

A detailed study of 1st-person *wayyiqtol* forms in the Tiberian written and reading traditions yields typologically rich results. Having established that orthographic variation in the written tradition is as at least partially indicative of typological shifts in morphology, it can be plausibly maintained that the Tiberian written tradition testifies to three typological strata of 1st-person *wayyiqtol* development in chronologically suggestive concentrations.

Dissonance between the Tiberian CBH written and reading traditions shows that the reading tradition is typologically later, akin to other Second Temple traditions, including the LBH+ written tradition. However, the Tiberian reading tradition is itself typologically diverse: the relevant vocalisation in CBH is not identical to that in LBH+; 1CS and 1CPL forms receive different treatment in CBH; and there is no clear pattern to *ketiv-qere* divergence.

The extent of long morphology in the reading tradition of CBH material seems more characteristic of the Tiberian written tradition of LBH+ and other late material than of the written tradition of CBH texts. Yet the frequency of long forms in the
written CBH tradition outside the Torah shows that, in this respect, the reading tradition merely extended and standardised a feature that had diffused prior to LBH+ times. The regularity of the reading tradition’s use of long morphology appears to be anachronistic for the earliest parts of the Bible, but evidence of its initial appearance points to the Iron Age. Common usage of long and pseudo-cohortative morphology can be dated no earlier or later than the LBH+ compositions, and, given the incidence of long morphology in the CBH of the Prophets, its diffusion may well have begun centuries earlier. Long and pseudo-cohortative 1st-person wayyiqtol morphology joins many other features of the Tiberian reading tradition that deviate from the reading tradition reflected in the consonantal in their early minority incidence followed by later standardisation.

4.0. Citations

Table 2

| MT Torah—short: | Gen. 24.46; 31.10; 41.22; Exod. 6.3; 9.15; Num. 13.33; 23.4; Deut. 2.1, 8, 33; 3.1, 1, 18; 9.15, 16; 10.3, 3, 5; long: Gen. 24.48; Deut. 1.16, 18; MT Prophets—short: Josh. 7.21 (qere); 24.3 (ketiv); Judg. 18.4; Isa. 64.5; Jer. 3.8; 11.5; 15.6; 20.7; 35.10; Ezek. 1.4, 15, 27; 11.16; 12.7; 20.9, 22; 23.13; 24.18; 43.8; 44.4; Hos. 13.7; Zech. 2.1, 5; 4.4, 11, 12; 5.9; 6.4; long: Josh. 7.21 (ketiv); 9.24; 24.3 (qere); Judg. 12.3; 1 Sam. 10.14; 13.12; 26.21; 2 Sam. 7.6, 9; 11.23; 12.22; 22.24; 1 Kgs 8.20; 11.39; Isa. 6.1; Jer. 13.2; 25.17; 31.26; 32.9, 13; 44.17; Ezek. 1.1, 28; 2.9; 8.2, 7, 10; 10.1, 9; 11.1; 16.8; 20.14; Hos. 11.4; Amos 4.10; Zech. 5.1; 6.1; 11.7, 7; Non-LBH+—short: Ps. 18.24; 38.15; 69.12; 73.14; Job 30.9; Prov. 7.7; long: Ps. 69.11, 21; 102.8; Job 7.20; Prov. 8.30, 30; 24.32; MT LBH+—short: Dan. 10.5; Neh. 1.4; 2.11, 13, 15, 15; 4.8; long: Qoh. 4.1, 7; Dan. 8.2, 2, 3, 27; 9.4; 10.8; Ezra 8.15, 17 (qere); Neh. 1.4; 3.38; 7.2; 12.31; 13.25; 1 Chron. 17.5, 8; 2 Chron. 6.10; BDSS—short: 4Q31 2.4 (|| Deut. 3.18); Mur2 f11.3 (|| Deut. 10.3a); 5/6Hev1b f6–7.10 (|| Ps. 18.24); long: 1QIsa a 51.19 (|| Isa. 64.5 short); 4Q51 f42a.1 (|| 1 Sam. 26.21); 4Q70 f21–22i.3 (|| Jer. 13.2); 4Q73 f2.10 (|| Ezek. 11.1); 4Q80 f14–15.2 (|| Zech. 5.9 short); |
4Q112 f14.12 (|| Dan. 8.2); 4Q114 1.7 (|| Dan. 10.8); **NBDSS—short:** 4Q364 f26bi.6 (|| MT Deut. 9.16); **long:** 1QH* 10.10, 12, 16, 17; 11.8; 14.27; 16.28; 4Q364 f24a–c.15 (|| MT Deut. 3.1 short); 4Q391 f9.3 (?); f65.4 (?);**17** **SP—short:** Num. 13.33 (|| MT short); **long:** Gen. 24.46, 48 (|| MT long); 31.10; 41.22; Exod. 6.3; 9.15, 19+ (|| MT Exod. 9.15 short); Num. 23.4; Deut. 1.16 (|| MT long), 18 (|| MT long); 2.1, 8, 33; 3.1, 1, 18; 9.15, 16; 10.3, 3, 5;**18** **BS—long:** SirB 20v.2 (|| Sir. 51.7), 2 (|| Sir. 51.7).

**Table 3**

MT Torah—pseudo-cohortative: Gen. 32.4; 41.11; 43.21; Num. 8.19; MT Prophets—pseudo-cohortative: Josh. 24.8 (ketiv); Judg. 6.9, 10; 10.12; 12.3, 3; 1 Sam. 2.28; 28.15; 2 Sam. 4.10; 7.9; 12.8, 8; 22.24; Jer. 11.18; 32.9; Ezek. 3.3; 9.8; 16.11; Zech. 11.13; **MT non-LBH + Writings—pseudo-cohortative:** Ps. 3.6; 7.5; 69.12, 21; 73.16; 90.10; Job 19.20; 29.17; **MT LBH +—pseudo-cohortative:** Ps. 119.55, 59, 106, 131, 147, 158; Job 1.15, 16, 17, 19; Qoh. 1.17; Dan. 8.13, 15, 17; 9.3, 4, 4, 10.16, 16, 19; 12.8; Ezra 7.28; 8.15, 16, 17 (ketiv), 17, 23, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31; 9.3, 3, 5, 5, 6; Neh. 1.4; 2.1, 6, 9, 13; 5.7, 7, 8, 13; 6.3, 8, 11, 12; 7.5; 12.31; 13.7, 8, 9, 9, 10, 11, 11, 13, 17, 19, 19, 21, 21, 22, 30;**19** **BDSS pseudo-cohortative:** 1Qlsa* 6.2 (|| Isa. 6.8 unlengthened), 5 (|| Isa. 6.11 unlengthened); 34.12 (|| Isa. 41.9 unlengthened); 40.10 (|| Isa. 48.5 long); 42.8 (|| Isa. 50.7 unlengthened); 51.20 (|| Isa. 64.5 short); 4Q13 f3ii+5–6i.8 (|| Exod. 3.17 unlengthened); 4Q51 3a–e.25 (|| 1 Sam. 2.28 pseudo-cohortative), 9e–i.16 (|| 1 Sam. 10.14 long), f61ii+63–64a–b +65–67.3 (|| 2 Sam. 4.10 pseudo-cohortative); 4Q80 f8–13.19 (|| Zech. 4.4 unlengthened), f14–15.2 (erasure || Zech. 5.9), 2 (|| Zech. 5.9), 4 (|| Zech. 5.10 unlengthened); 4Q83 f19ii–20.31 (|| Ps. 69.12 pseudo-cohortative); 4Q113 f16–18i+19.5 (|| Dan. 8.3 unlengthened); 11Q5 9.1 (|| Ps. 119.59 pseudo-cohortative); 11.2 (|| Ps. 119.106 pseudo-cohortative); 12.4 (|| Ps. 119.131 pseudo-cohortative); 13.9 (|| Ps. 119.158 pseudo-cohortative); 20.2 (|| 139.11 unlengthened); **NBDSS pseudo-cohortative:** 1QH* 12.37; 14.9, 10; 15.23; 17.9, 10; 1Q49 f1.1; 4Q364 f26bi.8; 4Q385 f2.9; 4Q385a f1a–bii.1, 6, 7, f15i.5;

---

**17** The two final ambiguous citations were excluded from the totals in Hornkohl (2013a, 160).

**18** The slight difference between the totals here and in Hornkohl (2013a, 160) is due to the inclusion here of SP Exod. 9.19+ (|| MT Exod. 9.15), which was excluded there.

**19** Hornkohl (2013a, 162) mentions the cases in Ps. 119 and Job 1, but does not count them in the relevant table’s LBH totals.
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4Q387 f1.7; 4Q389 f2.4, 5, f6.1; 4Q390 f1.6, 6; 4Q437 f2ii.13; 4Q504 f1–2rv.17; 11Q5 28.5; 11Q19 65.8;\(^\text{20}\) **SP pseudo-cohortative**: Gen. 32.6; Exod. 3.8, 17; 6.5; Lev. 26.13; Num. 8.19 (= MT); Deut. 1.19, 19, 43; 2.1, 7+ (MT —), 8, 8, 13, 26, 34, 34; 3.4, 6, 23; 9.15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 21, 25, 26, 26; 10.3, 5, 5; 22.14;\(^\text{21}\) **BS—pseudo-cohortative**: SirB 20v.3 (|| Sir. 51.8), 20v.11 (|| Sir. 51.12), 11 (|| Sir. 51.12); 11Q5 21.15 (|| Sir. 51.18) (?); unlengthened: SirB 20v.5 (|| Sir. 51.9); 21r.12 (|| Sir. 51.14) (?); 21r.17 (Sir. 51.19) (?).\(^\text{22}\)

**Table 6**

**III-y—short and long**: see Table 2, above; **hif’il**: MT Torah—short: Gen. 43.7, 21; 44.24; Exod. 19.4; Lev. 20.26; 26.13; Num. 31.5; Deut. 2.34; 3.6; 9.21; 29.4; **long**: Num. 21.30 (?);\(^\text{23}\) **MT Prophets—short**: Josh. 14.7; 24.3, 10; Judg. 6.9; 1 Kgs 2.42; 18.13; Jer. 5.7; 32.10; 35.4; 42.21; Ezek. 28.18; 31.15; 39.23, 24; Amos 2.10; Zech. 11.8; **long**: Josh. 24.6; Judg. 2.1; 6.8; 1 Sam. 10.18; 12.1; 15.20; Isa. 48.5; Jer. 2.7; 11.8; Ezek. 16.50; 36.19; Amos 2.9, 11; Zech. 11.13; **pseudo-cohortative**: Josh. 24.8; Judg. 10.12; 2 Sam. 7.9; MT LBH +—short: Ezra 10.2; 1 Chron. 17.10; **long**: Neh. 2.18, 20; 4.3, 7, 7; 6.4; 7.1; 13.15; 1 Chron. 17.8; **pseudo-cohortative**: Ps. 119.59; Ezra 8.17, 24; Neh. 6.12; 12.31; 13.8, 9, 13, 21, 30; **BDSS—pseudo-cohortative**: 1QIsa\(^\text{a}\) 40.10 (|| long MT Isa. 48.5); 11Q5 9.1 (|| MT Ps. 119.59); **NBDSS—long**: 4Q364 f26bii+e.1 (|| short MT Deut. 9.21); 4Q389 f2.2; **pseudo-cohortative**: 1QH\(^\text{a}\) 17.9; 4Q387 f1.7; 4Q389 f6.1; **SP—long**: Gen. 43.7, 21; 44.24; Exod. 19.4; Lev. 18.25 (|| qal MT);

\(^\text{20}\) The slight difference between the totals here and in Hornkohl (2013a, 162) is due to the inclusion here of the (admittedly ambiguous) case in 11Q5 28.5.

\(^\text{21}\) Since the present citation list is identical to that in Hornkohl (2013a, 162), the difference between the respective tallies is apparently due to an arithmetic error in the latter.

\(^\text{22}\) The apparent pseudo-cohortative case in 11Q5 21.15 (|| Sir. 51.18) and the apparent unlengthened cases in SirB 21r.12 (|| Sir. 51.14) and 17 (Sir. 51.19) are ambiguous, e.g., is waw-yiqtol better analysed as way-yiqtol or we-yiqtol or should apparently pseudo-cohortative 1CS הָלַכֵת be interpreted as standard way-yiqtol with a FS object suffix?

\(^\text{23}\) On the problematic כְּשֶׁה (Num. 21.30) see Bloch (2007, 149–50); Hornkohl (2013a, 160–61, fn. 5).
Lev. 20.26; 26.13; Num. 21.30 (|| long MT; ?); 31.50; Deut. 29.4;\(^\text{24}\) pseudo-cohortative: Deut. 2.34; 3.6; 9.21; BS—long: SirB 20v.5 (|| Sir. 51.9); SirB 21r.17 (|| Sir. 51.19); **II-w/y: MT Torah—short**: Gen. 24.27, 42; Lev. 20.23; Deut. 1.19; 2.1; 10.5; **MT Prophets—short**: 1 Kgs 3.21; 8.20, 21; Jer. 13.2; Zech. 6.1; long: 1 Sam. 10.14; 28.21; Isa. 51.6; Ezek. 3.15, 23; 8.10; 16.8; Zech. 5.1; Mal. 1.3; pseudo-cohortative: Judg. 12.3; **MT non-LBH +—long**: Job 38.10; pseudo-cohortative: Ps. 69.21; 90.10; **MT LBH + —long**: Dan. 8.27; Ezra 8.32; Neh. 2.9, 11, 12, 15, 15, 15; 4.8.9 (ketiv); 13.7, 25; 2 Chron. 6.10, 11; pseudo-cohortative: Ezra 8.15, 17, 23; Neh. 5.7; 13.7, 11, 17; **BDSS—short**: 4Q56 f36.2 (|| long MT Isa. 51.16); 4Q70 f21–22i.3 (|| short MT Jer. 13.2); pseudo-cohortative: 4Q51 9e–i.16 (|| long MT 1 Sam. 10.14); **NBDDS—pseudo-cohortative**: 1QH* 12.37; 4Q504 f1–2Rv.17; 11Q5 28.5; **SP—short**: Lev. 20.23 (|| short MT); long: Gen. 24.42 (|| short MT); 47 (|| short MT); Deut. 1.19 (|| short MT); 2.1 (|| short MT); pseudo-cohortative: Deut. 10.5 (|| short MT).

**Table 16**

| Torah: hifil—written and reading short: יְהַּלִּּש (Gen. 43.7); בְּּנַּו (Gen. 43.21); יְהַּלֵל (Gen. 44.24); יְהַּלֵל (Lev. 26.13); בְּּנַּו (Num. 31.50); בְּּנַּו (Deut. 2.34); יְהַּלִּּש (Deut. 3.6); יְהַּלִּּש (Deut. 29.4); written short, reading long: יְהַּלִּּש (Exod 19.4); יְהַּלֵל (Lev 20.26); יְהַּלֵל (Deut. 9.21); written and reading long: יְהַּלֵל (Num. 21.30); qal II-w/y—written and reading short: יְהַּלֵל (Deut. 2.1); written short, reading long: יְהַּלֵל (Gen. 24.47); יְהַּלֵל (Lev 20.23); יְהַּלֵל (Duet. 10.5); invariable: יְהַּלֵל (Gen. 24.42); יְהַּלֵל (Deut. 1.19); **Prophets: hifil**—written and reading short: יְהַּלֵל (Josh. 14.7); יְהַּלֵל (Josh. 24.3); יְהַּלֵל (Jer. 32.10); יְהַּלֵל (Amos 2.10); written short, reading long: יְהַּלִּּש (Josh. 24.10); יְהַּלֵל (Judg. 6.9); יְהַּלֵל (1 Kgs 2.42); יְהַּלֵל (1 Kgs 18.13); יְהַּלֵל (Jer. 5.7); יְהַּלֵל (Jer. 35.4); יְהַּלֵל (Jer. 42.21); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 28.18); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 31.15); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 39.23); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 39.24); יְהַּלֵל (Zech. 11.8); written and reading long: יְהַּלֵל (Josh. 24.6); יְהַּלֵל (Judg. 2.1); יְהַּלֵל (Judg. 6.8); יְהַּלֵל (1 Sam. 10.18); יְהַּלֵל (1 Sam 12.1); יְהַּלֵל (1 Sam. 15.20); יְהַּלֵל (Isa. 48.5); יְהַּלֵל (Jer. 2.7); יְהַּלֵל (Jer. 11.8); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 16.50); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 36.19); יְהַּלֵל (Amos 2.9); יְהַּלֵל (Amos 2.11); יְהַּלֵל (Zech. 11.13); written pseudo-cohortative, reading long (ketiv-geré): יְהַּלֵל (Josh. 24.8); qal II-w/y—written short, reading long: יְהַּלֵל (1 Kgs 3.21); יְהַּלֵל (1 Kgs 8.20); יְהַּלֵל (1 Kgs 8.21); יְהַּלֵל (Jer. 13.2); יְהַּלֵל (Zech. 6.1); written and reading long: יְהַּלֵל (1 Sam. 28.21); יְהַּלֵל (Isa. 51.16); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 3.23); יְהַּלֵל (Zech. 5.1); יְהַּלֵל (Mal. 1.3); written long, invariable vocalisation: יְהַּלֵל (1 Sam. 10.14); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 3.15); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 8.10); יְהַּלֵל (Ezek. 16.8); **Non-LBH +**

---

\(^{24}\) The total and citation list in Hornkohl (2013a, 160, 163 fn. 17) exclude the cases in Lev. 18.25 and Num. 21.30.
Writings: **qal II-w/y**—written and reading long: וָאַשִּׁים (Job 38.10); LBH +: **hif’il**—written and reading short: וָנֹשֶב (Ezra 10.2); written short, reading long: וָאַשִּׁים (1 Chron. 17.10); written and reading long: וָאַשִּׁים (Neh. 2.18); וָאַשִּׁים (Neh. 2.20); וָאַשִּׁים (Neh. 4.3); וָאַשִּׁים (Neh. 4.7); וָאַשִּׁים (Neh. 6.4); וָאַשִּׁים (Neh. 7.1); וָאַשִּׁים (Neh. 13.15); וָאַשִּׁים (1 Chron. 17.8); **qal II-w/y**—written and reading long: וָאָקָם (Dan. 8.27); וָאָקָם (Neh. 2.12); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 2.15); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 4.3); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 4.7); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 6.4); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 7.1); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 13.15); וָאָשִׁים (2 Chron. 6.10); וָאָשִׁים (2 Chron. 6.11); written long, reading short: וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 4.9 qere); written long, invariable vocalisation: וָאָשִׁים (Ezra 8.32); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 2.9); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 2.11); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 2.15); וָאָשִׁים (Neh. 13.7).
18. I-Y WE-YIQṬOL FOR WEQAṬAL

By and large in Tiberian BH prose, there is a clearcut functional difference between *we-yiqtol* and *weqaṭal* forms. Whereas the former are used fairly exclusively in 1st- and 3rd-person for what Bybee et al. (1994, 179) call ‘speaker-oriented modality’, i.e., directives indicating the speaker’s will,¹ the latter have much broader future force, including indicative meaning and both ‘speaker-oriented’ and ‘agent-oriented modality’ (see Bybee et al. 1994, 176–81; Shulman 1996, 180; Verstraete 2007, 32–35; Cook 2012, 247–48; Dallaire 2014, 39; Hornkohl 2018, 31–32; 2021, 378–80, 383–86).

In a well-known functional subcategory of the modality signalled by *we-yiqtol*, the structure serves to encode final, e.g., purpose and result, clauses. Though real-world purposes and results (and speaker-oriented modality, more generally) can also be communicated via *weqaṭal*, the latter much less transparently expresses these meanings. In sum, then, in BH prose *we-yiqtol* normally has jussive semantics, whether subordinated to a previous (normally directive volitional) verb (1) or merely coordinate with a previous jussive (2).

---

¹ The parallel 2nd-person form is not *we-tiqtol*, but the imperative *u-qṭol* (JM §116f; cf. Lambdin 1973, 119, §107c; Muraoka 1997).
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(1) וּוַיֹ אֱמֶ֔ר אֱלֹֽהִים נַַֽעֲשֵֶ֥ה אָדָ֛ם בְּצַלְּמֵֶ֖נוּ כִדְּמוּתֵָׂ֑נ
וְּׁיִרְּדוּ בִדְּגַָ֨ת הַיֶָ֜ם וּבְּע וֹף הַשָמֵַ֗יִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל־הָאֵָ֔רץ וּבְכָל־הָרֶ֖מֶש עַל־הָאַָֽרֶץ׃

‘Then God said, “Let us make humankind in our image, after our likeness, so they may rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move on the earth.”’ (Gen. 1.26)

(2) יְּבָרֵךְ אַֹתְּךֵָ֔י וְּׁיִָָֽֽֽרְּׁאֹׁ֖וּ מִמֶַֽךָ׃

‘God Almighty bless you and make you fruitful and multiply you, that you may become a company of peoples.’ (Gen. 28.3)

By contrast, in order to express more generic futurity and/or the speaker-oriented modality of what convention says should or must happen, rather than we-yiqṭol, weqaṭal is the norm, e.g.,

(3) הָיִֶ֖יתָ לִקְּהֵַ֥ל עַמִַֽים׃

‘And all the peoples of the earth shall see that you are called by the name of the LORD, and they shall be afraid of you.’ (Deut. 28.10)

Similarly, the weqaṭal נַַֽעֲשֵֶׂה in example (2), though perhaps contextually interpretable as purposive (as in the gloss), is formally unspecified for anything more than just futurity, meaning that it can just as well be taken as ‘and you will become’.

In most forms of Second Temple Hebrew, the CBH TAM system, with its pragmatically distinct pairs of conversive and non-conversive perfective past forms (wayyiqṭol and qaṭal) and habitual/future forms (weqaṭal and yiqṭol), persists.² In all forms

² See Rabin (1958, 155; 1972, 371–73; 1976, 1015–16 fn. 2) on the rare attestation of conversive forms in Talmudic narrative.
of post-exilic Hebrew, however, the system witnesses at least some degree of erosion and, in certain cases, has been nearly or even totally eclipsed. For purposes of the present discussion, a crucial development is the use of the so-called non-conversive forms preceded by the simple conjunction ו with the semantic values they have without the preceding conjunction, i.e., we-qatāl for perfective past (just like qatāl) and we-yiqṭol for future (just like yiqṭol).

1.0. Second Temple Evidence

1.1. Late Biblical Hebrew

The LBH verbal system, in general, and the use of yiqṭol, more specifically, largely adhere to CBH norms (Cohen 2013, 151–92). Even so, a significant departure from CBH convention is the use of we-yiqṭol for temporally ‘sequential’ eventualities (Cohen 2013, 151, 171–73). Consider example (4):

(4) ...וְּאִם־אָשַלָּח דֶֶ֖֑בֶּר בְּעַמִַֽ֑֖֑י׃ וְּׁיִַֽ֖֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑֑́
verb. In CBH, these would almost certainly have been *weqatal* forms. A classic diachronic parallel may be seen in example (5):

(5) אִם־יִהְּיֶָֹ֨ה אֱלֹהִֶ֜ים עִמָדִֵ֗י וּשְּׁמָרַּ נִי... בַדֶַ֤רֶךְ הַזֶה֙ אֲשֶ ר אָנֹכִ י הוֹלֵֵ֔ךְ וְּׁנִָֽתַּן לֶ֛חֶם לֶאֱכֶֹ֖لدָּה לִלְּבַֹֽשׁ׃

21 וְּׁשַבְּׁתִ֥י בְּשָלֶ֖וֹם אֶל־בֵ ית אָבִָׂ֑י וְּׁהָיָ֧ה יְּהוָ֛ה לִֶ֖י לֵאלֹהִַֽים׃

22 הָאֶ בֶן הַזֵֹ֗את אֲשֶר־שַמְּתִי מַצֵבֵָ֔ה יִהְּיֶֶ֖ה בֵ ית אֲשֶ ר תִתֶן־לִֵ֔י עַשֵֶ֖ר אֲעַשְּרֵ֥נוּ לַָֽךְ׃

‘...If God is with me and keeps me in this way that I go, and gives me bread to eat and clothing to wear, and I return to my father’s house in peace, then the LORD will be my God, and this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, will be God’s house. And of all that you give me I will give a full tenth to you.’” (Gen. 28.20b–22)

Here, all conditions save the initial one after אִמ ‘if’ are *weqatal*, as is the first verb of the apodosis, יְּהוָה ‘then (the LORD) shall be’. These leaves just three non-*weqatal* verbs, which form is precluded due to preverbal elements preventing clause-initial position.

Such sequential uses of *we-qiqtol*, while constituting a noticeable departure from CBH norms, are relatively rare throughout most of the LBH corpus. Indeed, to the series of six such forms in 2 Chron. 7.14 in example (4) above, Cohen (2013, 172, fn. 42) adds cases in Est. 1.19; Neh. 6.13; 8.15; Dan. 12.4, 10; 2 Chron. 2.15; 14.6.3

Significantly, in his discussion of the LBH verbal system, Cohen (2013, 15) expressly omits Qohelet. While this is under-

---

3 Cohen (2013, 172 fn. 42) also lists *we-qiqtol* cases in Dan. 1.12–13; 1 Chron. 13.2; 2 Chron. 12.8, but these are better seen as having classical purposive semantics.
standable insofar as Qohelet’s verbal system differs markedly from that of the core LBH works—Esther, Daniel, Ezra–Nehemiah, and Chronicles—nevertheless, the language of Qohelet is widely regarded as reflecting a late chronolect (Delitzsch 1877, 190–99; Driver 1898, 474–75; Hurvitz 1990; 2007; Schoors 1992–2004; Seow 1996). Further, when it comes to the matter of non-conversive we-qaṭal and we-yiqṭol forms, Qohelet appears to be farther along the developmental continuum than any other biblical book. In Qohelet, perfective past we-qaṭal routinely comes where one expects wayyiqṭol in CBH, whereas future/habitual we-yiqṭol is nearly as common as future/habitual weqaṭal.5

1.2. Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew

1.2.1. The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

As should be expected, classical usage of we-yiqṭol is the norm in the BDSS. Even so, in some Qumran renditions of biblical texts a drift from future/imperfective weqaṭal to future/imperfective we-

---

4 There are only three cases of wayyiqṭol in the book—1.17; 4.1, 7—against 31 cases of perfective past we-qaṭal: 1.13, 16; 2.5, 9, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 15, 17, 18, 20; 3.22; 4.1, 4, 7; 5.13, 13, 18; 8.10, 15, 17; 9.14, 14, 14, 15, 15, 16; 12.9 (?), 9 (?).

5 Schoors (1992–2004, I:86–89) provides a corrective for extreme views, listing 15 cases of classical weqaṭal in the book, to which Qoh. 1.5, 5; 8.10; and 10.3 should be added. Future/habitual we-yiqṭol comes around 13 times: 1.18; 2.19; 6.12; 7.7; 8.10; 12.4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, 7. The occurrences in 11.8–9 are passably classical jussives. The unique genre of Qohelet may also have contributed to its rare use of conversive verbal forms.
yiqtol is evident (Muraoka 2000, 210–11; Qimron 2018, 369, fn. 2). Kutscher (1974, 357–58) lists many examples from 1QIsa, e.g., (6):

(6) כי כה אמר יהוה לסריסים אשר ישמורו את שבתות ויבחוורו...כִי־כֹ הָאָמַר יְּהוֵָה לַסַּרִיסִים אֲשֶר יִשְּמְרוּ אֶת־שַבְּתוֹתֵי... Thus says the LORD to the eunuchs who keep my sabbaths and choose...’ (1QIsa 46.14–15 || MT Isa. 56.4)

The Great Isaiah Scroll is renowned among DSS biblical material for its frequent departures from classical norms, but other examples of DSS biblical material also present cases of we-yiqtol parallel to weqatal in the MT:

וַּוְּהָי (MT Gen. 1.14) וְּהָי (MT Gen. 41.30) וַּוְּהָי (MT Exod. 13.14) וְּהָי (MT Jer. 31.8) וְּחָנֵָׂ֑נ (MT Ps. 30.11)

and they will be’ (4Q7 f2.3) ‘and there will arise’ (4Q9 f3–4.2) ‘and it will be’ (XHev/Se5 f1.5) ‘and I will gather them’ (4Q72 f44–50.7) ‘and (the heavens and the earth) will shake’ (4Q78 f18–20.9) ‘and they will be’ (4Q76 4.4) ‘and he will have mercy on me’ (4Q98a f2ii.2)

It is, of course, possible that one or more of these cases reflect an interpretive rather than a linguistic difference, i.e., purposive/result semantics instead of more broadly future force.
1.2.2. The Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Like the BDSS, the NBDSS by and large demonstrate adherence to the classical norms of the so-called conversive wayyiqtol and weqatal. Yet, it is widely acknowledged that the NBDSS deviate from classical norms much more frequently than the BDSS. This is very clear in the case of use of we-yiqtol where CBH would opt for weqatal (Smith 1991, 59; Muraoka 2000, 210–11; Qimron 2018, 369). An example of Rewritten Bible (or Reworked Scripture), The Temple Scroll (11QTa = 11Q19), with up to 60 cases showcases this usage, both where it cites biblical passages and where it presents independent material (Hornkohl 2021b, 147–49, esp. fn. 53; a lower figure is reported by Smith 1991, 59).

From Temple Scroll biblical material, consider:

(7) יָכְבֶ֖ס בּוֹמֶ֑י וּרְחַֽץ

וכָ֖בֶֽס בּוֹמֶ֑י וּרְחַֽץ

‘And he will wash his clothes and bathe in water’ (11QTa 51.3 || MT Num. 19.19b)

In (7), against the series of two weqatal forms in MT Num. 19.19b, 11QTa has an apparently synonymous combination of we-yiqtol and weqatal forms. Further examples from Rewritten Bible texts include:

יָדְבֹ֨ר ‘and he will speak’ (4Q175 1.6) || (MT Deut. 18.18)

וּסְּקַלְּנִֽי ‘and they will stone me (4Q365 7i.3) || (MT Exod. 17.4)

וְּדִבֵֶ֥ר ‘and he will speak’ (11QT 6.15) || (MT Deut. 20.2)
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‘and (the man) will die (11QT 56.11) || (MT Deut. 17.12)

Such material also furnishes cases without biblical parallels, including:

‘Then he will take the second bull, the one for the people, and he will make atonement with it [...] and he will put some of its blood with his finger on the horns of the altar’ (11QT a 16.14–16)

‘and you must act according to the law that they proclaim to you and according to the word that they say to you from the book of the Law and they shall tell to you in truth’ (11QT a 56.3–4; cf. MT Deut. 17.9)

..and God said, “My spirit shall not dwell with man forever, and their days shall be determined to be one hundred and twenty years...”’ (4Q252 1.1; cf. Gen. 6.3)

1.3. Samaritan Hebrew

Like its Tiberian counterpart, the Samaritan tradition combines a relatively early (primarily consonantal) written component with a comparatively later pronunciation component (that includes consonants and vowels). In general, the Tiberian and Samaritan traditions employ weqatal and we-yiqtol similarly. Divergences
are often explicable as interpretive differences, where one tradition or the other has a more nuanced purposive/result we-yiqtol in place of a less semantically specialised weqatal form or vice versa. Consider, by way of example:

(8) רָאָסָה לְפֶּרֶה נַעֲשֶּׁה (wyafaṭad) מְפַרְּעֵֹ֔ה (wyafaṭad) פרֶּה מְפַרְּעֵֹ֔ה וְּׁיַּפְּׁקֵ֥ד פְּקִדִֶ֖ים עַל־הָאָָׂ֑רֶץ וְּׁחִמֵש (wyamās) wyamās) את ארֶץ מֵצְּרֵַ֔יִם בְּשֶֶ֖בַע שְּנֵֵ֥י הַשָבַָֽע׃

MT יַּעֲשֶ֣ה פַרְּעֵֹ֔ה וְּׁיַּפְּׁקֵ֥ד פְּקִדִֶ֖ים עַל־הָאָָׂ֑רֶץ וְּׁחִמֵש (wyamās) wyamās) את ארֶץ מֵצְּרֵַ֔יִם בְּשֶֶ֖בַע שְּנֵֵ֥י הַשָבַָֽע׃

‘Let Pharaoh do [this] and appoint overseers over the land and take one-fifth of the land of Egypt during the seven plentiful years.’ (Gen. 41.34)

In (8), the MT, Joseph’s advice to Pharaoh is conveyed in a varied series of verb forms, consisting of a morphologically long yiqtol, a morphologically short we-yiqtol, and a weqatal, all apparently with 3rd-person directive force. The SP, conversely, uses a series of we-yiqtol forms (some morphologically short). If SH רָאָסָה wyamās for MT יַּעֲשֶּׁה wyamās) ‘and let him take one-fifth of’ is secondary, it seems to have less to do with post-classical we-yiqtol’s eclipsing of weqatal than with the perception that classical we-yiqtol better suited the context than weqatal.

There is, however, one relevant systematic change. Where the MT has a weqatal form of a I-y qal verb the SP written tradition (like its Tiberian counterpart) is frequently ambiguous, but the SP reading tradition consistently records we-yiqtol. Though some of the following could conceivably be attributed to interpretive differences, their sheer number shows the broad nature of the shift.
Another indication that the Samaritan I-y qal weqaṭal to weyiqtol shift is part of a broad linguistic change is the corresponding Samaritan shift of I-y qal wayyiqtol (Samaritan w-yiqtol) to weqaṭal, e.g., ויצר (MT Gen. 2.7) (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 173, §2.9.8), a shift that even affected וילדו (MT Gen. 31.8, 8; see also Exod. 1.19; Deut. 21.15); but see Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 139, §2.4.3) on the ambiguity of the form. Perhaps also in the case of ויסף (MT Lev. 22.14; see also Lev. 27.13, 15, 19, 27; Num. 32.15); see Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 139, §2.4.2; above, ch. 11, §§1.3; 2.4). The shift does not obtain in the case of וירד (MT Exod. 9.19; see also Exod. 11.8; Num. 16.30; 34.11, 11, 12); see Ben-Ḥayyim (MT Lev. 2.1; see also Lev. 14.15).
3rd person feminine singular forms, e.g., וַתְלָלָךְ וַתָּשָֹב ‘and she went and sat’ || וַתֵּלֶךְ וַתֵּשֶׁב (Gen. 21.16), which have developed a secondary $a-a$ realisation apparently inherited from the related qatal form (Khan 2021, 331; cf. Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 173, §2.9.8). Together, both of these departures from classical norms that focus on I-י qal verbs—in comparison not just to Tiberian Hebrew, but to most Samaritan verb classes, too—exhibit the penetration of later features into the reading tradition where the written tradition was amenable to the shift.

1.4. Ben Sira

Notwithstanding the book’s relatively late provenance, the language of BS—so far as it can be assessed given the extant textual sources—is remarkably classical. Post-classical roots and lexemes abound (Dihi 2004), but the grammar, while not devoid of post-classicisms, is an impressive imitation of CBH. The poetic nature of the material doubtless contributes to its classical mien.

Indeed, the poetic nature of BS makes it difficult to detect diagnostically post-classical instances of we-yiqtol. In an exhaustive discussion, van Peursen (2004, 166–79) surveys we-yiqtol forms throughout BS’s multiple witnesses and finds CBH parallels for nearly all of them. Arguable exceptions, perhaps indicating the adoption of post-classical conventions, occur in conditional clauses:

(9) אם יסור מאחרי אשליכנו ואסיגרנו לשדדים׃ ‘If he goes astray after this, I will cast him away and hand him over to robbers.’ (SirA 1v.8 = Sir. 4.19b)
If you do good, know to whom you are doing it, and there will be hope for the good that you do.’ (SirA 4v.28–29 = Sir. 12.1)

‘And even if he shows regard for you and walks peacefully, commit your heart to being in fear of him.’ (SirA 5r.9 = Sir. 12.11)

‘If you have any possessions, he will speak pleasant words to you, and he will make you poor and it will not grieve him (SirA 5r.27–28 = Sir. 13.5)

According to CBH syntactic norms, in place of the above we-yiqtol usages, one would expect weqatal forms, whether encoding an ancillary condition in a compound protasis or beginning a conditional apodosis (bare, clause-initial yiqtol would also be possible for the latter).

1.5. Rabbinic Hebrew

Entirely lacking weqatal (and wayyiqtol) except in biblical citation, RH has regular recourse to we-yiqtol (in addition to other alternatives) where BH has weqatal (Bendavid 1967–1971, II:559–60). Consider the following contrastive pairs of BH and (Tannaitic and Amoraic) RH examples:

(13a)... ולֹא־יִשְׁאֵ֥וּ עָוֶֹ֖ן וָמֵָ֑תוּ ...’ (Exod. 28.43)

‘...lest they bear guilt and die...’

(13b) אבל אנו לא נחטא וָנִהְמֹ֤הְרָ֣ה ... (Sifre Bemidbar 10.33)

‘but we will not sin and die...’
2.0. The Tiberian Reading Tradition of Classical Biblical Hebrew Texts

We now turn to the Tiberian reading tradition of CBH material, where a limited degree of the weqatal to we-qiṭol shift has been detected (Joosten 2017, 30–33). At issue here are a relatively small number of I-y qal verbal forms where weqatal morphology has arguably been secondarily updated with we-qiṭol vocalisation. All cases involve we-qiṭol forms of the verb הָאָרֶץ ‘fear’, most instances the repeated phraseology וּיִשְּמְּעוּ וְּיִרָא ‘they will hear and
fear’, where it is argued that the original weqatal reading was along the lines of שמעו והיוּ רואו.

(17) ... cf. 2Q11 f1.2 SP ייִרְאָה wyīrā’u

‘And all the people will hear and will fear…’ (Deut. 17.13)

(18) ... cf. SP wyīrā’u

‘And the rest will hear and will fear…’ (Deut. 19.20)

(19) ... cf. SP wyīrā’u

‘And all Israel will hear and will fear…’ (Deut. 21.21)

There is at least a modicum of subjectivity in this assessment. Could the meaning here not be something like ‘they will hear so that they fear’, rather than ‘they will hear and fear’? True, we-yiqtol with final semantics is especially common after volitional forms—short/clause initial jussive yiqtol, imperative, cohortative—and the X-yiqtol order in the cases cited make it unlikely that the וּ יִשְׁמְּע forms that precede וּוְּיִרְּא are jussive. Even so, final we-yiqtol sometimes follows non-volitional forms/clauses, e.g.,

Interrogative with agent-oriented yiqtol

(20) ... ‘And they said to him: “What shall we do to you, that the sea may quiet down for us?”…’ (Jon. 1.11)

Conditional future yiqtol

(21) ... ‘But the land shall be abandoned by them and enjoy its Sabbaths while it lies desolate without them…’ (Lev. 26.43)
Simple past qātal

(22) קָרַּ֤אתִי לַמְּאַהֲבַי֙ הֵ מָה \(\text{they} \) רִמֵ֔וּנִי כֹּהֲנֵַ֥י וּזְּקֵנֶַ֖י בָעִ ירֹוּנִי
cיְּׁמַּ֣לֵא אֶת־יָדֵ֔וֹ וִיהִֹׁ֖י כֹהֲנֵֵ֥י בָמֵ֔וֹת׃

I called to my lovers, but they deceived me; my priests and elders perished in the city, for they sought food to revive their strength.’ (Lam. 1.19)

Past habitual yiqtol

(23) אַחַר֙ הַדָבָּ֔ר הַזֵ֔ה לַֹֽא־שֵָ֥ב יָרָבְּעֶָ֖ם מִדַרְּכ וֹ

After this thing Jeroboam did not turn from his evil way, but made priests for the high places again from among all the people. Any who wished, he would ordain that they be priests of the high places.’ (1 Kgs 13.33)

Nominal clause

(24) לֹ א אִֵ֥יש אֵל֙ וִַֽיכַזֵֵ֔ב וּבֶן־אָדֶָ֖ם וְּיִתְּנֶחָָׂ֑ם...

‘God is not man, that he should lie, or a son of man, that he should change his mind.…’ (Num. 23.19)

One might also compare to Deut. 31.12–13, where the yiqtol-weqatal form of v. 12 (22) is paralleled in v. 13 (23) by a weqatal-infinitive construct sequence.

(25) ...לְּמַָ֨עַן יִשְּמְּעֶ֜וּ וּלְּׁמַּּ֣עַּן יִלְּׁמְּׁדֶ֗וּ וְּׁיִָָֽֽֽרְּׁאוּ אֶת־יְּהוָ הֻ֖א לָמֻּתָּן...

‘…that they may hear and that they may learn to fear the LORD your God…’ (Deut. 31.12)
In this pair of verses, explicit final forms—לְּמַ עַן יִלְּמְּדֵ֗ו in v. 12 and לְּיִרְּאֶה in v. 13—are paralleled by weqatal forms—וְּלָ מְּד in v. 13 and וְּיֵַָּֽ֣֔֔וָרְּאוּ in v. 12 (while יֵַָּֽ֣רְּאֹ in v. 12 (while יֵַָּֽ֣רְּאֹ is orthographically ambiguous, לְּיִרְּאֶה is an unequivocal weqatal). The point is that even in cases where a finite form can be interpreted as having final semantics, MT Deuteronomy is content with a weqatal (though, as we shall see, the Samaritan tradition has וְּיֵַָּֽ֣רְּאֹ here).

Something in the way of circumstantial evidence may be gleaned from the ancient Hebrew and foreign language textual witnesses—though, given the semantic range of weqatal and allowing for orthographic ambiguity, most of their renderings cannot be considered probative regarding the identity of the form translated. The Aramaic and Syriac yiqtol forms are opaque. The Vulgate reads one future and two subjunctives. The relevant BDSS form in 2Q11 f1.2 (=MT Deut. 17.13), written וְּיֵַָּֽ֣רְּאֹ, is equivocal. By contrast, the Samaritan forms, which are spelled with mater yod, are consistently and transparently yiqtol according to both the written and reading components of the tradition, i.e., וְּיֵרָאֹ יַיִּרְּאֹ—in line with the Tiberian reading tradition. Yet this is also the case at Deut. 31.12, example (22), against the Tiberian tradition.

The foregoing facts are subject to various interpretations. Arguably, one of the more compelling is that a form intended to be read as weqatal וְּיֵַָּֽ֣רְּאֹ was secondarily reinterpreted in the Tiberian vocalisation tradition as we-yiqtol וְּיֵַָּֽ֣רְּאֹ in line with trends.
seen to varying degrees in Second Temple Hebrew sources. This is not surprising, as various scholars have highlighted features within the Tiberian pronunciation tradition that indicate that, while preserving Iron Age features and not immune to Byzantine and medieval developments, it substantially crystallised in the Second Temple Period.

3.0. The Tiberian Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

The obvious implication of all this is that, when it comes to internal Tiberian written-reading deviations such as these, the Tiberian reading tradition should be regarded as temporally removed from the pronunciation tradition implied by the consonantal text. This is borne out in numerous pieces of evidence, as seen throughout this monograph. Yet, as has also often been emphasised, it is not the whole story. Frequently, the Tiberian consonantal tradition itself bears witness to the very secondary features adopted that have become characteristic of the reading tradition. Consider an example relevant to the issue under examination here:
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And command the people, “You are about to pass through the territory of your brothers, the people of Esau, who live in Seir; and they will be afraid of you. So be very careful.’

(Deut. 2.4 || 4Q35 f56.9 || SP)

Here the orthographically unambiguous Tiberian we-yiqtol form is arguably less felicitous than weqatal, since the meaning is not purposive ‘you are crossing into their territory… so that they fear you’, but one of mere succession, one event leading to the next. Crucially, though, given the mater yod, the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition are in harmony here; similar harmony characterises the written and reading components of the SP at this point. For purposes of contrast, one may compare the BDSS text 4Q35 f56.9, which has the more ambiguous spelling ויירא, perhaps (but not certainly) reflecting a weqatal form. If the MT form here is secondary, it shows that the yiqtol morphology has penetrated into not only that layer of the reading tradition reflected in the medieval vocalisation signs, but also into that reflected by the matres lectionis, which were presumably added earlier on, probably in the Second Temple Period.

Similarly, and of more immediate relevance, in a fourth occurrence of the ישמעו יראה formula, in Deut. 13.12, the text reads:
This case differs from the rest in that the *we-yiqtol* form ends with paragogic *nun*. While *qatal* forms with paragogic *nun* are not unknown in the MT (there are three of them: Deut. 8.3, 16; Isa. 26.16), they are more than one-hundred times less frequent than *yiqtol* forms with the same suffix. In this case, again, there is harmony between the Tiberian written and reading traditions. Either the *we-yiqtol* form here with paragogic *nun* is original or the historical depth of the secondary *we-yiqtol* analysis in the Tiberian tradition extends beyond the levels of vocalism reflected in *niqqud* and *matres* to consonantal realisation.

4.0. Conclusion

This leads us back to the three other cases of *וּיִשְּמְּעַוָּו וְּיִרְאָ֑וּן*. If the apparently problematic *we-yiqtol* readings of *וּיִרְאָו* and *וּיִרְאָֽו* are rooted in the written tradition, then perhaps cases in which *we-yiqtol* רוּאָה יִרְאָה has been seen as a secondary vocalisation are *not* deviations from the ostensible pronunciation underlying the written tradition, but reliably conserve it. There are at least three ways to interpret the evidence:

1. *We-yiqtol* in place of *weqatal* is strictly late, in which case all supposed forms—whether in the written or reading tradition—must be explained as late. This could mean anything from the late composition of the entire surrounding text, through the insertion of a late gloss, to a corruption, to the secondary...
updating of the consonantal text by means of addition of a mater or paragogic nun. This option seems extreme.

2. On the other extreme, on the basis of the consonantal evidence of we- yiqtol for weqaṭal, one might adopt the view that all cases of suspected interchange are acceptable CBH, so that no secondary process in line with late Hebrew trends need be entertained, except for the notion that such early instances are authentic forerunners in the vein of what would later become more established convention.

3. There is also a preferable middle path between these extremes. This involves allowing for both the early agreement of the Tiberian written and reading traditions on characteristically late features and the deviation of the reading component from the typologically earlier profile of its written counterpart in line with Second Temple developments. Whether this is analysed as the early original use of a characteristically late feature secondarily extended within the reading tradition or as a process of secondary development within the written tradition, the implication is the same: less remoteness between the written and reading components, which, even in the case of apparent secondary developments, should be seen as largely overlapping on the historical continuum.

Similarly, in the case of we-yiqtol for weqaṭal, it is possible that a certain number of I-y qal forms vocalised as we-yiqtol began as weqaṭal forms, so that there is a degree of dissonance on this point between the written and reading components of the Tiberian tradition. But given the consonantal testimony regarding the feature, this dissonance should not be interpreted as a chasm be-
tween the two. Obviously, linguistic continuity typifies the relationship between the written and reading traditions when it comes to the vast majority of linguistic features. But even in dissonance there is continuity. The distinction between the written and reading components is one of degree, not essence, characterised by drift along a continuum within a continually recited tradition, rather than a clean break and restart within the tradition.
CONCLUSION

This collection of research has presented twenty-five cases of dissonance between the written and reading components of the Tiberian reading tradition—seven in the Introduction and eighteen in the subsequent chapters. The argument has been twofold.

1.0. The Secondary and Late Character of Tiberian Written-reading Dissonance

First, it has been argued that the relevant cases of dissonance reflect relatively late, secondary developments of the Tiberian pronunciation tradition in line with Second Temple linguistic trends vis-à-vis its orthographic counterpart. This carries with it the implication that the pronunciation tradition, despite marked conservatism regularly safeguarding genuine Iron Age features, in large part crystallised in the Second Temple Period. It therefore occasionally manifests contemporary phenomena anachronistic for First Temple texts.

2.0. The Antiquity of Secondary Features in the Reading Tradition

Second, despite the late character of the pronunciation features involved in these cases of dissonance, it has been maintained that they do not derive from medieval or Byzantine Period developments, but are rooted in Second Temple linguistic conventions. To be sure, they often appear to continue evolutionary processes already documented in pre-exilic material, whether biblical or
epigraphic. Notwithstanding the medieval origin of the Tiberian vowel signs, the fact that the secondary features of the Tiberian pronunciation tradition reflect Second Temple linguistic developments strongly suggests that the tradition’s primary features—i.e., the ones on which there is consensus between the written and reading components of the tradition—are even older. This all points to a reading tradition which, in the main, is a remarkably ancient and conservative linguistic artefact.

It is readily admitted here that the individual arguments made in the case of the features discussed in this volume are unlikely to have equal cogency. It is, however, hoped that even if certain explanations have been rejected, the combined evidence and argumentation will have been sufficient to convince even the sceptic of the major prongs of the argument. If one accepts the reality of written-reading dissonance, the secondary nature of vocalic developments in line with Second Temple conventions, and a degree of continuity between such developments and minority Iron Age features, the resulting acknowledgement of the historical antiquity of the Tiberian reading tradition should affect its perceived value for exegetical, textual, literary, and linguistic research. Allowing for the historically composite nature of the Tiberian vocalisation tradition, there is no reason to disfavour its testimony in contrast to traditions characterised by earlier written attestation. The combined evidence points to an ancient interpretive tradition that largely coalesced in the post-exilic period. The vast majority of the tradition seems reliably to preserve Iron Age features, whereas the small minority that must be considered anachronistic reflects linguistic and interpretive
trends that need be dated no later than the Second Temple Period.

In the rest of this concluding section, an attempt is made to summarise findings with regard to the principal corpora cited as representative of First and Second Temple Hebrew and to highlight certain ancillary ramifications of the research.

3.0. Linguistic Affinity between Second Temple Chronolects and the Tiberian Reading Tradition

3.1. Tiberian Late Biblical Hebrew

Though some scholars reject the diachronic import of the CBH/LBH distinction, there is no doubt that the core LBH books exhibit linguistic profiles especially marked by features characteristic of other Second Temple sources in concentrations not found in acknowledged CBH material.

The significance of LBH in the present connection centres on features common to both LBH and the Tiberian reading tradition in which both differ from the Tiberian written tradition. Such features discussed in this volume include spelling of the toponym ירושלם reflecting diphthongisation (Introduction, §3.1); univerbalisation of the proposition ל and the infinitive construct (Introduction, §3.2); constructions of the type יום השישי вместו יום השישי instead (Introduction, §3.3); the nifalisation of originally qal כשל instead of כשל ביאל (ch. 10, §§1.1.1; 2.1.1); the shift from qal internal passive to nif'al (ch. 10, §§1.1.2; 2.2); hifilisation of the originally qal form ביאל (see ch. 11, §1.1.3; 2.1); hitpaelisation of forms with
assimilated $t$ (see ch. 13, §§1.1.2; 2.1); relativising $ha- + qatəl$ (ch. 15, §§1.1; 2.0); long $yiqtol$ ($yaqtulu$) morphology in 1st-person wayyiqtol forms, especially II-$w/y$ $qal$ and $hif'il$ forms (ch. 17, §2.1).

3.2. **The Dead Sea Scrolls**

While the designations QH or DSSH might be understood to indicate a sort of monolithic Hebrew in use in the Judaean Desert at the turn of the epoch, the diversity of Hebrew types there has long been acknowledged (Morag 1988). At the very least, it is necessary to distinguish between BDSS Hebrew and NBDSS Hebrew (see above, ch. 6, §9.0; ch. 17, §1.1), though even this dichotomy is problematic (Hornkohl 2021b, 134, fn. 19).

3.2.1. **The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls**

Among the BDSS, it is well known that the Hebrew of 1QIṣa$^a$ stands out against the Hebrew of the rest of the manuscripts that reflect material eventually canonised as Jewish Scripture (Tov 2012, 100–10; Young 2013; Reymond 2014, 11; Rezetko and Young 2014, 138–39; Hornkohl 2016a, 1020). Despite 1QIṣa$^a$’s biblical content and style, its linguistic character—which has been described as ‘contemporised’ and ‘popular’—includes many features that stray from the classical norms reflected in MT Isaiah and 1QIṣa$^b$ in favour of acknowledged Second Temple alternatives. For this reason, it might be expected that 1QIṣa$^a$ would share many features with the reading component of the Tiberian biblical tradition. And, indeed, just such a scenario obtains. Consider the following list of affinities: the spelling יוהו, like
the Tiberian *qere perpetuum* ʿǎdōnāy (ch. 1, §1.0); agreement with the Tiberian *qere perpetuum* ב"ש for ב"ש (ch. 3, §1.3); the spelling לַלּוּר | MT לַלּוּר (ch. 5, §4.1); 2MS הב- | MT הב- (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 28–54 only; ch. 6, §5.1.1); 2MS ה- | MT ה- (ch. 6, §5.2.1); pielisation (ch. 12, §1.2.1); hitpaelisation (ch. 13, §1.2.1); I-y qal we-yiqtol for wayyiqtol (ch. 18, §1.2.1).

More generally, the BDSS often show affinity with the Tiberian reading tradition in terms of agreement with *qere* over ketiv (Introduction, §1.0 and fn. 5); realisation of יששכר (ch. 4, §2.0 [?]); 2MS הב- | MT הב- (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 28–54 only; ch. 6, §§5.1.1; 9.0); 2MS ה- | MT ה- (ch. 6, §5.2.1); 2/3FPL endings written נ- | MT נ- (ch. 9, §2.1); hifilisation, specifically of י"ס (ch. 11, §1.2.1); pielisation (ch. 12, §1.2.1); hitpaelisation (ch. 13, §1.2.1); long II-w/y qal and hifʿil 1st-person wayyiqtol forms (ch. 17, §1.2.2); I-y we-yiqtol for wayyiqtol (ch. 18, §1.2.1).

Notwithstanding the foregoing lists of features in which BDSS material appears to side with the Tiberian reading tradition against the Tiberian written tradition, it should be emphasised that—with the notable exception of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>—the linguistic profile of the BDSS is largely consistent with standard BH as reflected in the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition. From this perspective, there is a marked difference between the linguistic profile of the BDSS and that of the NBDSS, which are evidently more representative—than even 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>—of contemporary Second Temple language usage.
3.2.2. The Non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls

Despite a pronounced degree of resemblance between DSSH and Tiberian BH against RH, the NBDSS exhibit far greater departure from BH than do the BDSS. This should not be surprising, since the BDSS represent copies of already traditional First Temple texts, while the NBDSS appear to be Second Temple compositions. It should come as no surprise, then, that the NBDSS share many features with the Tiberian reading tradition, including constructions of the type יוהי השישי instead of יהוה השישי (Introduction, §3.3); realisation of יששכר (ch. 4, §2.0 [?]); 2MS חֲבֵ- | MT זַ- (1QIsa* 28–54 only; ch. 6, §5.1.2); 2MS הָתָר- | MT זַ- (ch. 6, §5.2.2); nifalisation, especially replacement of qal internal passive with nifal (ch. 10, §1.2.2); hifilisation (ch. 11, §§1.1.3; 1.2.2); pielisation (ch. 12, §§1.0; 1.2.2); hitpaelisation (ch. 13, §1.2.2); past tense הָרָמ qatal for הָרָמ yiqtol (ch. 14, §2.1.3); long II-w/y qal and hifal 1st-person wayyiqtol forms (ch. 17, §1.2.2); I-y we-yiqtol for wayyiqtol (ch. 18, §1.2.2).

3.3. Samaritan Hebrew

Like the combined Tiberian biblical written-reading tradition, the Samaritan tradition is composite, comprising a written component that, in view of its orthography, appears to reflect a somewhat later crystallisation than that of the Tiberian Torah, together with a significantly later pronunciation component. The pronunciation tradition, though not lacking in classical features, is strikingly replete with late linguistic features, especially typical of Second Temple Hebrew and Aramaic, but also including even later elements. Characteristic Second Temple linguistic features
common to both SH and the Tiberian reading tradition include univerbalisation of the proposition -ל and the infinitive construct (Introduction, §3.2); syncopation of the 3MPL gentilic ending -im < -iyyim (Introduction, §3.4); consistent replacement of the tetragrammaton with an alternative form (ch. 1, §§1.0; 2.0); nif'al analysis of לֵרָאָת אֶת־פְּנֵי יְּהוָה and similar (ch. 2, §§1.0; 2.0); euphemistic מ' for מ"ש (ch. 3, §§1.3; 2.0); 2MS ה-ו- || MTareth- (ch. 6, §§4.0; 5.2.1); אֲדֹ|| Tiberian qere perpetuum וה in the Torah (ch. 8, §2.0); 2/3FPL endings written י- || MT י- (ch. 9, §2.1); nifalisation (ch. 10, §1.3); hifilisation (ch. 11, §1.3); pielisation (ch. 12, §1.3); hitpaelisation (ch. 13, §1.3); ha- + qatal (ch. 15, §§3.2); long II-w/y qal and hif'il 1st-person wayyiqtol forms (ch. 17, §§1.2.2; 1.3); I-y we-yiqtol for wayyiqtol (ch. 18, 1.3).

3.4. Ben Sira

Due partially to its wisdom genre, partially to its poetic style, and partially to the archaising predilections of its author, the linguistic profile of BS is a mixture of classical, even archaic, features, especially in terms of vocabulary. Even so, there is no mistaking the book’s inclusion of diagnostically late features, lexical as well as grammatical, in both its Second Temple and medieval manuscript evidence. Diachronically significant late features common to BS and the Tiberian reading tradition include the following: univerbalisation of the proposition -ל and the infinitive construct (Introduction, §3.2); syncopation of the 3MPL gentilic ending -im < -iyyim (Introduction, §3.4); וה || Tiberian qere perpetuum וה in the Torah (ch. 8, §2.0); nifalisation (ch. 10, §1.4); hifilisation (ch. 11, §1.4); pielisation (ch. 12, §1.4); hitpaelisation (ch. 13,
§1.4); past tense τερεμ qatal for τερεμ yiqtol (ch. 14, §2.1.4); long II-w/y qal and hif’il 1st-person wayyiqtol forms (ch. 17, §1.3.1); I-y we-yiqtol for wayyiqtol (ch. 18, §1.4).

3.5. Rabbinic Hebrew

It has been argued that in the cases of written-reading dissonance in the combined Tiberian biblical tradition, the Masoretes were influenced in secondary pronunciations by RH (see, e.g., Blau 2018, 115, §3.5.6.3.7n, 213–14, §§4.3.4.2.2–4.3.4.2.2n). While it is difficult definitively to disprove such a notion, several considerations combine to show that such an extreme view is unwarranted. First, if RH influenced the Masoretes, it did so very sparingly, since in most distinguishing features, BH and RH remain distinct. Second, as has already been indicated, since in its departures from the Tiberian written tradition, the Tiberian reading tradition resembles not just RH, but several late traditions and corpora, including the combined Tiberian LBH written-reading tradition, there is no reason to insist specifically on RH influence on the Tiberian reading component. Finally, as emphasised below, secondary features standardised in the Tiberian pronunciation tradition often find precedent in minority features in the Tiberian CBH written tradition and/or in Iron Age epigraphy. This implies that many characteristic Second Temple Hebrew features constitute standardisations of earlier features no matter the Second Temple tradition or corpus in which their extension took place, including the Tiberian reading tradition and RH.

Even so, it would be misleading to deny the reality of significant diachronic affinity between RH and the Tiberian pronun-
ciation tradition, though this should not necessarily be considered a result artificial RH influence on the Masoretes. Salient features discussed in this volume include univerbalisation of the proposition -ֵ and the infinitive construct (Introduction, §3.2); syncopation of the 3MPL gentilic ending -im < -iyyim (Introduction, §3.4); qere euphemisms (§§1.1; 1.3); the vocalisation לִקְּרָאת (ch. 5, §§1.0; 2.0); 2MS ו- | | MT ו- (ch. 6, §4.0); pielisation (ch. 12, §1.5); אים | | Tiberian qere perpetuum אימ in the Torah (ch. 8, §§1.0; 2.0); 2/3FPL endings written הב- | | MT הב- (ch. 9, §2.2); nifalisation (ch. 10, §1.5); hifilisation (ch. 11, §1.5); pielisation (ch. 12, §1.5); hitpaelisation (ch. 13, §1.5); 1-y qal we-yiqtol for wayyiqtol (ch. 18, §1.5).

4.0. Iron Age Epigraphy and the Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

4.1. Iron Age Epigraphy

It has been argued that all of the linguistic features discussed in this volume are secondary pronunciation features vis-à-vis the relevant written tradition alternative. Occasionally, however, there is evidence of the pronunciation feature as a minority Iron Age epigraphic alternative. This occurs in the case of syncopation of the 3MPL gentilic ending -im < -iyyim (Introduction, §3.4); 3MS possessive suffix on plurals וה- -ющем for polythongal וה- (Introduction, §3.6); the spelling לִקְּרָאת liqrat [?] | | MT לִקְּרָאת (ch. 5, §4.2); 2MS וה- | | MT וה- ch. 6, §7.0); 2MS וה- | | MT וה- (ch. 6, §7.0); nifalisation (ch. 10, §3.1); hitpaelisation (ch. 13, §3.1).
4.2. The Tiberian Classical Biblical Hebrew Written Tradition

The late, secondary features which the Tiberian reading tradition standardised as divergences from the corresponding written tradition also sometimes appear as minority features in the Tiberian CBH written tradition. Consider the following cases discussed in this volume: univerbalisation of the proposition ל- and the infinitive construct (Introduction, §3.2); אדני for יהוה (ch. 1, §2.0; 2MS ח- || MT ח- (ch. 6, §2.0); 2MS וה- || MT וה- (ch. 6, §2.0); nifalisation (ch. 10, §3.0); hifilisation (ch. 11, §3.0); pielisation (ch. 12, §3.0); hitpaelisation (ch. 13, §3.0); past tense terem qatal for terem yiqtol (ch. 14, §§2.3; 4.0); ha- + qatal (ch. 15, §§1.2; 3.2); long II-w/y qal and hif’il 1st-person wayyiqtol forms (ch. 17, §2.2.1); I-y qal we-yiqtol for wayyiqtol (ch. 18, §3.0).

5.0. Further Ramifications of the Study

Various combinations of data gathered in the foregoing studies support a number of hypotheses, each of which merits further investigation.

5.1. Diachronic Diversity within Classical Biblical Hebrew: The Torah versus the Rest

The data pertinent to several features discussed in this volume are interpretable as evidence of diachronic development within Tiberian CBH, especially, between the Torah and the rest of the CBH corpus. However such a linguistic disparity is most convincingly explained—whether as evidence of the actual linguistic antiquity of the Tiberian Pentateuchal traditions vis-à-vis the
traditions in other CBH material or as a result of early consolidation and careful preservation of the Torah’s linguistic profile relative to other CBH texts\(^1\)—it is clear that in terms of select features, the Pentateuch is characterised by striking linguistic conservatism. Such features include \(3\text{FS} \text{ והי},\) which, it has been argued, may well reflect an early phonetic reality standardised as \(וַהי\) in the rest of the Hebrew Bible (ch. 8, §3.0), but as \(וַהי\) in the Torah (ch. 8, §2.0); hifilisation of certain \(qal\) II-\(y\) verbs, most notably \(וָס\) ‘add, continue’ (ch. 11, §§1.1.3; 2.4), the preservation of archaic \(hifil\)-like \(qal\) forms (ch. 11, §2.4), and hifilisation in general (ch. 11, §3.0); short rather than long or pseudo-cohortative 1st-person \(wayyiqtol\) forms (ch. 17, §1.4.3).

Scholars who accept a diachronic distinction between CBH and LBH do not generally attempt finer gradations. Though Hornkohl (2013a; 2016) has argued for the heuristic value of TBH, CBH is generally considered a single broad chronolect that includes regional, social, and genre diversity. More rarely, it is suggested that CBH can usefully be divided into chronological phases, i.e., CBH\(^1\) and CBH\(^2\) (Elitzur 2015; 2018a; 2018b; 2019; 2022). A previous study lending support to such an approach is Hornkohl’s (2013a, 83–91) analysis of proper names ending in the theophoric element \(וּ(יָ)ה\). There it is observed, \textit{inter alia}, that “The books of the Torah and Joshua present no examples of names with either ending, apparently reflecting a time before the use of such names was prevalent” and “To be sure, the Pentateuch has only two names containing any form of the tetragram-

\(^1\) See above, ch. 17, §§1.4.2–3, on the need for a nuanced approach to complex data.
maton, in both cases a prefix: יְּהוֹשֻעַ ‘Joshua’ and יוֹכֶבֶד ‘Jochabed’” (Hornkohl 2013a, 86 and fn. 35). It would seem that the onomastic tradition preserved in the Pentateuch is consistent with pre-monarchical times. The linguistic conservatism that distinguishes the language of the Torah from that of the rest of CBH may similarly be construed as evidence of the preservation of genuine linguistic antiquity within the tradition. Alternatively, it may be that the classical linguistic profile of the Torah was kept especially pristine, whereas the formerly more classical profile of other CBH material was allowed to drift in the direction of LBH, though it never reached the level of concentration of late features characteristic of the acknowledged LBH books. Whatever the explanation, there is a palpable difference between the CBH of the Torah and that of the Prophets and Writings.

5.2. Suppletion and Orthographic Constraints on Linguistic Development within the Tiberian Reading Tradition

In the above treatments on movement between verbal stems (chs 10–13), suppletive paradigms are highlighted as a common result of linguistic evolution and the resultant written-reading dissonance. Again and again, some or even most of a given verb’s orthographic forms amenable to secondary interpretation shifted binyanim, whereas other instances were excluded from the shift because their written forms were unsuitable to the new stem. One of the clearest examples is the well-known case of nifʿal-qal נִגַש-יִגַש ‘approach’, whose principal Tiberian biblical forms are given below in Table 1 (see also above, ch. 10, §2.1.2).
Conclusion

Table 1: Tiberian biblical forms of the suppletive nifʿal-qal verb ‘approach’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nifʿal</th>
<th>qal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suffix conjugation</td>
<td>נגש</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>נגש</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>גֶשׁ/גֶשׁ/גֶשׁוֹ/גֶשׁו/גֶשׁוּ/גֶשׁוּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefix conjugation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>גֶשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive construct</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(לָ)גֶשֶת/גִשְּת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is assumed that the verb was originally consistently G-stem (as it remains in SH; see above, ch. 10, §1.3.6) and was refashioned as nifʿal where possible in line with its intransitive semantics, for which nifʿal morphology was considered a better fit.

The consistently suppletive biblical paradigm invites scrutiny. One question involves the extent to which the unambiguous qal spellings effectively prevented more extensive qal > nifʿal evolution. In other words, does the Tiberian biblical suppletion reflect genuine language use? Or is it an artificial arrangement relevant specifically to the Hebrew Bible’s written-reading dissonance? There is no definitive answer, but it is striking that the NBDSS attest the nifʿal infinitive construct בהנגשו ‘when he approaches’ (4Q512 f40–41.2; see above, ch. 10, §1.2.1). This may indicate that nifalisation of the verb in question was more extensive than indicated by Tiberian BH, i.e., where not anchored by unambiguous qal orthography, Second Temple Hebrew exhibited greater or even full nifalisation of this verb. Even so, as Hornkohl (2021a, 14–15) observes, “ancient Hebrew sources never present the prefix conjugation נגש*, the existence of which would confirm the verb’s wholesale niphalisation.”

In other cases, it seems clearer that suppletion in the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition reflects an artificial sit-
uation unrepresentative of any genuine chronolect. Consider the case of the suppletive πֹּּ_el-ql verb מֵאֶּן. In this instance, the entire paradigm is πֹּּ_el except for the active participle, which is qal, and the infinitive absolute, which is equally analysable as πֹּּ_el or qal.

Table 2: Tiberian biblical forms of the suppletive πֹּּ_el-ql verb מֵאֶּן ‘refuse’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>πֹּּ_el</th>
<th>qal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suffix conjugation</td>
<td>מָאֵן</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefix conjugation</td>
<td>יְּמָאֵן</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>מָאֵן/הַמֵאֲנִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive absolute</td>
<td>מָאֵן</td>
<td>קָטָן</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, all biblical spellings are interpretable as qal, while the pronunciation tradition reflects a shift to πֹּּ_el where permitted by the orthography. It should also be noted that, on the assumption of originally qal stative qātēl morphology, the extant vocalisations of the MS participle and the infinitive absolute, both מֵאֶּן, can be considered faithful preservations of ancient morphology (the vocalisation of the MPL participle מֵאֲנִים, by contrast, is appropriate for neither G- nor D-stem). Clearly, the suffix and prefix conjugation spellings might well also reflect original qal forms.

But if the forms of the written component of the Tiberian biblical tradition point to original qal morphology, SH and RH confirm the pielisation seen in the pronunciation component of the Tiberian biblical tradition (ch. 12, §2.1). Again, the question may be asked: does the Tiberian biblical suppletion reflect an authentic linguistic situation or is it an artificial combination of diachronic snapshots? While in any given case of linguistic evol-
tion there must be intermediate stages of development characterised by mixed usage, it is not clear that the Tiberian biblical suppletion should be so explained. Since there is no unequivocal orthographic evidence of piʿʿel מֵאֵן until the Mishna, it may well be that D-stem analysis of the verb is entirely foreign to the Tiberian BH written tradition. But this remains unverifiable, since Tiberian LBH lacks participial forms that might unambiguously (dis)confirm the antiquity of the process of pielisation.

Even beyond BH, biblical orthography seems partially to have anchored ancient Hebrew and prevented fuller evolution. Even in post-biblical Hebrew, where it might be expected that biblical spelling relics would no longer influence language use, the biblical linguistic tradition still exerts force. Consider the very early pielisation of דִבֶר ‘speak’, which left only a small residue of qal infinitival and active and passive participial forms (ch. 12, §3.1). While one might expect that beyond BH, such residual qal forms would be completely eclipsed, use of the active participle continues in BS, the NBDSS, Tannaitic RH, and Amoraic RH, despite the extensive pielisation of the verb in all of these traditions. Indeed, the active and passive participles continue to be used in Modern Hebrew. Evidently, the existence of clearcut archaism in the Tiberian written tradition and the prestige of the mixed Tiberian written-reading tradition resulted in the conservation of linguistic relics that would probably otherwise have been levelled in forms of post-biblical ancient Hebrew.
5.3. Diversity within the Tiberian Reading Tradition

Not unrelated to the topic of the preceding section, it might be assumed that the Tiberian reading tradition would exhibit uniformity wherever possible. That is, outside of ancient orthographic forms not amenable to secondary reclothing, it would be reasonable to expect a homogenous and level reading tradition. But such consistency does not obtain. Consider the case of 1st-person wayyiqtol forms in the Tiberian Torah (ch. 17, §2.2.2). In view of the prevalence of short spellings of 1st-person forms in the Torah, 1CS and 1CPL might be vocalised similarly. But such is not the case. 1CPL forms are vocalised with short morphology in accord with their orthography, whereas in the case of 1CS forms long vocalisation is regularly imposed upon short orthography.

Similar diversity with the Tiberian reading tradition is noticeable in the case of 2MS and 2/3FPL endings (chs 6 and 9). Against the backdrop of standard vowel-final morphology, the Tiberian pronunciation tradition also testifies to minority consonant-final realisations.

The above diversity indicates that the Tiberian pronunciation was not simply a monolithic tradition mechanically wedded to the corresponding written tradition. Rather, each component of the tradition itself reflected a complex and varied linguistic reality, each component influenced the other, and their merger resulted in a layered and multifarious combination of great variety and depth.²

---

² See Khan (2020, I:69–85) for a balanced discussion of heterogeneity within the Tiberian reading tradition, including different perspectives on diachrony.
5.4. Majority and Minority Features in Classical Biblical Hebrew

A major thrust of the present volume involves the claim that many late secondary departures of the Tiberian reading tradition find precedent in minority CBH features. In other words, rare CBH features at some point became dominant in the Tiberian tradition and were standardised at the expense of earlier dominant features. It is worth stating explicitly the corollary of this statement, namely, that by dint of including minority features among majority features, CBH was inclusive of a great deal of diversity.

As an example, consider the case of standard CBH past tense ֶָֽרֶם יִקְּרֶתֶל versus minority CBH past tense ֶָֽרֶם קָטָל (ch. 14). One, perhaps two, of the exceptional past tense ֶָֽרֶם קָטָל cases are explicable as secondary revocalisations. But the other two are evidently genuine. And their genuineness calls into question the necessity of explaining away the cases that can be attributed to secondary processes (see above, ch. 14, §3.0). It is admittedly tempting to formulate a theory capable of accounting for all non-standard features, but some allowance must be made for simple synchronic linguistic variety attributable to no factor beyond human inconsistency.
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