Diachronic Diversity in Classical Biblical Hebrew

Aaron D. Hornkohl

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies

Cover image (clockwise from top left): Leningrad Codex (Firkovich B 19 A), f. 8r, Gen. 14.12b–15.13a, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Page_from_the_Leningrad_Codex_01.jpg; Cambridge University Library Mosseri IX.224, detail of Gen. 32.30b–32a (courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library); The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa), cols I–IV, Isa. 1.1–5.14a, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:The_Great_Isaiah_Scroll_MS_A_(1QIsa)_-_Google_Art_Project-x4-y0.jpg; 4QGeng (4Q7), Gen. 1.1–11a, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Genesis_1_Dead_Sea_Scroll_(Cropped).jpg; Aleppo Codex fol. 130r, Isa. 66.20–Jer. 1.17, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Aleppo-HighRes2-Neviim6-Jeremiah_(page_1_crop).jpg
Cover design: Jeevanjot Kaur Nagpal

The fonts used in this volume are Charis SIL, SBL Hebrew, SBL Greek, Estrangelo Edessa and Scheherazade New.

3. *QAL* VERSUS *HIFʿIL* FORMS OF יס״ף

Throughout the Hebrew Bible, two verbs that share the root יס״ף compete in the meaning 'add, do again': *qal* יָסַף and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף. Their synonymy is demonstrated by the example pairs in (1)–(8), with *qal* and *hifʿil* forms presented in odd- and even-numbered examples, respectively:

(1) וְלֹא־יָסַף שְׁמוּאֵל לִרְאוֹת אֶת־שָׁאוּל עַד־יוֹם מוֹתוֹ

'And Samuel did no more see Saul until the day of his death…' (1 Sam. 15.35)

(2) כִּי אֲשֶׁר רְאִיתֶם אֶת־מִצְרַיִם הַיּוֹם לֹא תֹסִיפוּ לִרְאֹתָם עוֹד עַד־עוֹלָם

'…For the Egyptians whom you see today—you shall no more see them again.' (Exod. 14.13)

(3) וְהִנֵּה לֹא־הֻגַּד־לִי חֲצִי מַרְבִּית חָכְמָתֶךָ יָסַפְתָּ עַל־הַשְּׁמוּעָה אֲשֶׁר שָׁמָעְתִּי

'…And behold, half the greatness of your wisdom was not told me; you have surpassed the report that I heard. (2 Chron. 9.6)

(4) וְהִנֵּה לֹא־הֻגַּד־לִי הַחֵצִי הוֹסַפְתָּ חָכְמָה הוֹסַפְתָּ חָכְמָה וָטוֹב אֶל־הַשְּׁמוּעָה אֲשֶׁר שָׁמָעְתִּי

'…And behold, the half was not told me. You have accumulated[1] wisdom and wealth beyond the report that I heard.' (1 Kgs 10.7)

(5) וַיְשַׁלַּח אֶת־הַיּוֹנָה וְלֹא־יָסְפָה שׁוּב־אֵלָיו עוֹד

'…and he sent forth the dove, and she did no more return to him again.' (Gen. 8.12)

---

[1] Or 'you have surpassed in wisdom and wealth'.

(6)　נָפְלָהֹ לֹא־**תוֹסִיף** קֹום בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל

'She has fallen. She will no more rise, the virgin of Israel.'
(Amos 5.2)

(7)　**וְיָסַפְתָּ** לְךָ עוֹד שָׁלֹשׁ עָרִים עַל הַשָּׁלֹשׁ הָאֵלֶּה

'…then you shall add three other cities to these three.'
(Deut. 19.9)

(8)　**וְיוֹסִיפוּ** לְךָ שְׁנוֹת חַיִּים

'and years of life will be added to you.' (Prov. 9.11)

As things stand in the extant combined Tiberian written-reading tradition, *hifʿil* forms outnumber *qal* forms.[2] Intriguingly, however, neither stem boasts a complete paradigm. Especially conspicuous is the apparent absence of the *qal* prefix conjugation (but cf. below), whether in *yiqṭol* or *wayyiqṭol* forms. Table 1 (facing page) summarises the paradigms.

The discussion that follows focuses on the distribution of the two stems, with particular sensitivity to diachronic trends. To avoid combining diachronically diverse layers of evidence, it is necessary to separate morphologically unambiguous written (i.e., purely consonantal) forms from ambiguous written forms, as the latter were amenable to secondary processes of morphological reinterpretation in the pronunciation tradition(s) reflected in orthographic developments (the addition of *matres lectionis*) and vocalisation and/or remain morphologically ambiguous.

---

[2] According to the Groves-Wheeler (1991–2016) electronic tagged database available with the Accordance software, the figures are *qal* 36 and *hifʿil* 173. Yet, since many forms, especially in the prefix conjugation, are morphologically ambiguous or have been wrongly classified as *hifʿil*, these figures ought to be viewed with suspicion.

Table 1: Summary paradigms of *qal* and *hifʿil* יס״ף

Form	*qal*	*hifʿil*
suffix conjugation	יָסַף	הוֹסִיף
participle	יֹסְפִים	מוֹסִיפִים
prefix conjugation	—[3]	יוֹסִיף/יוֹסֵף
wayyiqtol	—[3]	וַיּוֹסִיפוּ/וַיֹּסֶף
infinitive construct	לִסְפּוֹת/סְפוֹת[4]	לְהוֹסִיף
imperative	סְפוּ	—
external passive	נוֹסַף	—[5]

1.0. Unambiguous Written Evidence

1.1. The Tiberian Masoretic Tradition

Table 2 (overleaf) presents the statistics relevant to those forms with unequivocal consonantal shapes in *qal* and *hifʿil*, i.e., suffix conjugation, participle, infinitive, and imperative. According to purely consonantal evidence—i.e., excluding evidence for stem differentiation based on *matres lectionis* and vocalisation—the picture is relatively clear. *Qal* forms—such as suffix conjugation יסף, participle יספים, and imperative ספו—dominate in CBH,[6] whereas LBH shows preference for consonantally unambiguous

---

[3] According to the standard I-*y/w qal* pattern, the expected Tiberian prefix conjugation form would be יֵסֵף*, *wayyiqtol* וַיֵּסֶף*; but see below.

[4] Cf. Moabite לספת (Meshaʿ [*KAI* 181] l. 21); see below, fn. 6.

[5] Cf. BA *hofʿal* הוּסְפַת 'was added (FS)' (Dan. 4.33).

[6] These figures include the *qal* infinitival forms לִסְפּוֹת (Num. 32.14) and סְפוֹת (Isa. 30.1), despite the III-*y* (rather than I-*y*) morphology, on the grounds that their stem morphology is transparent. By contrast, the *qal qere* יָסֵף (1 Sam. 27.4; *ketiv* יוסף) is excluded, since it is not part of the consonantal tradition, whereas the stem of the *ketiv* is ambiguous.

hifʿil morphology—such as suffix conjugation הוֹסִיף, participle מוֹסִיפִים, and infinitive construct לְהוֹסִיף. The overall CBH *qal* to *hifʿil* ratio is 33:5 (Pentateuch 16:1, Prophets 16:3, non-LBH+ Writings 0:1), whereas LBH shows a reverse trend of 1:6.

Table 2: MT distribution of unequivocal forms of *qal* יָסַף and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף (see §4.1 for citations)

Book	qal	hifʿil	Book/Corpus	qal	hifʿil
Genesis	2	0	Ezra	0	1
Leviticus	7	1	Nehemiah	0	1
Numbers	3	0	Chronicles	1	1
Deuteronomy	4	0	**Pentateuch**	**16**	**1**
Judges	2	0	**Prophets**	**16**	**3**
Samuel	4	0	Former	8	3
Kings	2	3	Latter	8	0
Isaiah	5	0	**Writings**	**1**	**7**
Jeremiah	2	0	Non-LBH+	0	1
Psalms	0	1	LBH+	1	6
Qohelet	0	3	**TOTALS**	**33**	**24**

1.2. Extrabiblical, Non-Tiberian, and Cognate Sources

Maintaining the focus on unambiguous *qal* and *hifʿil* consonantal forms (suffix conjugation, participle, infinitive construct, imperative), we find that the same diachronic pattern seen above in the case of the Tiberian consonantal evidence is discernible in extrabiblical and non-Tiberian biblical consonantal material. The incidence of unambiguous *qal* and *hifʿil* forms in classical and post-classical corpora is summarised in Table 3 (facing page).

Table 3: Distribution of unequivocal forms of *qal* יָסַף and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף in the MT, Extrabiblical Sources, and Non-Tiberian Biblical Material (see §4.2 for citations)

Corpus	*qal*	*hifʿil*	Corpus	*qal*	*hifʿil*
Meshaʿ (*KAI* 181)	2	0	NBDSS	2	16
Zakkur (*KAI* 202)	0	1	Ben Sira	0	3
BDSS	16	4	Mishna	1	75
SP	18	0			

Reflecting early patterns of stem usage outside Masoretic BH, the mid-9th-century Moabite of the Meshaʿ Stele, the BDSS, and the SP, show dominant use of *qal* forms. The BDSS and the SP, however, paint a mixed picture. As biblical traditions rooted in antiquity, they unsurprisingly exhibit persistence of early *qal* dominance. At the same time, as Second Temple manifestations of BH, they also show the effects of the influence of late linguistic conventions in stem distribution of יס״ף verbs. In the case of the BDSS, the fragmentary nature of the evidence permits only tentative observations. Even so, if the few relevant cases can be taken as more broadly representative, it is worth highlighting a noticeable trend of opting for *hifʿil* rather than *qal*, which occurs in at least three (and possibly four) of six cases (all involving the participial form at Deut. 5.25):

אׅם מׅוּ[סׄ]פׅים (4Q37 3.7 || MT אׅם־יֹסְפִים Deut. 5.25); וְהוֹסַפְתִּי (4Q83 f9ii.13 || MT כִּי מׅ[וֹסִיפִים] Ps. 71.14); אׅם יֹ[וֹסִפּׅים] (4Q41 5.7 || MT אׅם־יֹסְפִים Deut. 5.25); [וֹׅסׄ]פׅים אׅם מׅוּ (4Q135 f1.4 || MT אׅם־ (4Q129 f1R.13 || MT אׅם־יֹסְפִים Deut. 5.25); אׄם יֹסׅפׅים (4Q137 f1.31 || MT אׅם־יֹסְפִים Deut. 5.25); יֹסְפִים Deut. 5.25); אׄם מ/יסֹפׅים (XQ2 1.6 || MT אׅם־יֹסְפִים Deut. 5.25).[7]

---

[7] Several instances of the participle corresponding to MT Deut. 5.25 may have been influenced by the presence of *mem* in the preceding word, but this obviously does not apply to כִּי מׅ[וֹסִיפִים] (4Q129 f1R.13).

As for the SP—despite superficial similarity between it and the MT concerning the preservation of *qal* יֵסֵף, there are significant differences, all pointing to SH's relative typological lateness. First, in the case of I-*y* verbs, the Samaritan tradition routinely replaces *wayyiqṭol* with non-converted *we-qaṭal* forms: not only is ויסף read as *qal wyā̊səf* (cf. the unequivocally *hifʿil* ויוסיפו *wyūsīfu* Deut. 20.8), but so, too, is feminine ותסף *wtā̊səf* (Gen. 4.2; cf. תוסף *tūsəf* Gen. 4.12; תוסיפון *tūsīfon* Gen. 44.23). Second, against MT *qal*, the SP sometimes has *piʿʿel*, e.g., MT וְיָסַפְתִּי᾿ || SP ויספתי *wyassafti* 'and I will continue' (Lev. 26.18; see also Lev. 26.21; Deut. 19.9).[8] Third, as demonstrated below, in three of the eight instances in which old *qal yaqṭel*[9] prefix conjugation forms are arguably preserved in the MT Pentateuch, the SP written and/or reading tradition evinces an unambiguous *hifʿil*; see תֹסֵף || SP תוסף *tūsəf* (Gen. 4.12); תֹסֵף || SP תוסיפו *tūsīfu* (Deut. 13.1); אֹסֵף || SP אוסיף *ūsəf* (Deut. 18.16).

Likewise, unequivocal *hifʿil* usage is frequent in late extrabiblical sources, e.g., the NBDSS, the Mishna, and Ben Sira. *Qal* usage, by contrast, is exceptional and conditioned, limited to

---

Though some apparently *qal* 3rd-person *weqaṭal* forms in the DSS are given to analysis as instances of *hifʿil* (or *qal*) *wayyiqṭol* or *we-yiqṭol*, e.g., ויספו (1QIsaᵃ 23.29 || וְיָסְפוּ MT Isa. 29.19; cf. the following paragraph on the SP), the prevalence of *mater waw* in I-*w/y hifʿil yiqṭol* forms in the DSS (26 of 28 cases) makes it likely that the forms identified above as *weqaṭal* are indeed instances of the *qal* suffix conjugation.

[8] On pielisation as a feature of Second Temple Hebrew, see Hornkohl (2023, 253–88) and the references mentioned there.

[9] Alternatively, a form like Samaritan *tūsəf* can be analysed as an original *yaqtul*, whereby **tawsup* > **tōsup* > **tōsip* (due to dissimilation).

biblical citation and allusion. No unambiguous *qal* forms appear
in Ben Sira. Notably, the two *qal* cases in QH come in the 'rewrit-
ten Bible' or 'reworked Pentateuch' material of 4QCommentary
Genesis A (4Q252 1.18, 20), where the language was undoubt-
edly influenced by its CBH source (MT Gen. 8.12). In other cases,
tellingly, QH has transparent *hifʿil* morphology against a more
ambiguous MT form, e.g., לוא **תוסיף** עליהמה ולוא תגרע מהמה 'you will
not add to them and you will not subtract from them' (11QTᵃ
[11Q19] 54.6–7) || (MT Deut. 13.1), לא־**תֹסֵף** עָלָיו וְלֹא תִגְרַע מִמֶּנּוּ לוא
תוסיף לשוב בדרך הזואת עוד 'You shall no more again return that way'
(11QTᵃ [11Q19] 56.17–18) || and לֹא תֹסִפוּן לָשׁוּב בַּדֶּרֶךְ הַזֶּה עוֹד (MT
Deut. 17.16), and ולוא **יוסיפו** עוד לעשות כדבר הזה בקרבכה 'and they
will no more do that sort of thing among you again' (11QTᵃ
[11Q19] 61.11) || וְלֹא־**יֹסִפוּ** לַעֲשׂוֹת עוֹד כַּדָּבָר הָרָע הַזֶּה בְּקִרְבֶּךָ (MT Deut.
19.20). Likewise, the sole case of *qal* morphology in the Mishna
(Soṭa 9.5) was inherited from the Bible (MT Deut. 20.8).[10]

With specific reference to the incidence of indisputable
hifʿil consonantal forms in non-Tiberian biblical material: the
late-9th–early-8th-century Old Aramaic instance of הוספ]ת 'I
added' (Zakkur [*KAI* 202] B.4–5) is solid evidence of early *hifʿil*
usage. It may be seen as supporting evidence for the authenticity
of the lone instance of unambiguous *hifʿil* in the Tiberian Torah,
לְהוֹסִיף (Lev. 19.25), though textual and interpretive questions
leave some doubt (see below).

---

[10] Note also the Mishna's combined written-reading testimony of בַּל
תּוֹסֵ(י)ף 'Thou shalt not add' (Zevaḥ. 8.10, 10, 10), where the vocalisation
in Codex Kaufmann conforms to that of the Tiberian tradition לֹא־תֹסֵף
(MT Deut. 13.1). Cf. בַּל תּוֹסִיף in printed editions.

2.0. Ambiguous Consonantal Evidence, Orthography, and Vocalisation

Conspicuously absent from the foregoing account are the prefix conjugation forms *yiqṭol* and *wayyiqṭol*. Exempting such forms from the initial survey is necessary, because purely consonantal prefix conjugation forms are morphologically ambiguous, disposed to both *qal* and *hifʿil* interpretations. The morphology is often clarified thanks to the inclusion of *mater yod* and via unequivocal vocalisation, but these might involve the imposition of secondary morphological interpretations. Moreover, even some vocalised forms are morphologically equivocal.

2.1. The Morphology of *(way)yiqṭol* יס״ף Forms

2.1.1. Wholesale *(way)yiqṭol* Hifilisation?

Given the unequivocal *qal* shapes of most of the suffix conjugation, imperatival, infinitival, and participial forms cited above, it would be reasonable to expect, with Ginsberg (1934, 223), that the corresponding *qal* prefix conjugation form would be of the typical I-*y/w* pattern, i.e., *yiqṭol* יֵסֵף* and *wayyiqṭol* וַיִּסֵף*. From this perspective, a vocalised form such as תֹסֵף 'there will (not) be again' (Exod. 11.6) should be identified as an original *qal* form, which might be expected to yield Tiberian תֵּסֵף*, that was secondarily realised with *hifʿil* pronunciation in line with Second Temple tendencies. Thus, in *plene* spellings such as יוסף, יסיף, and יוסיף, the *waw* and/or *yod matres* might reasonably be considered secondary. Even the apparently early consonantally unambiguous *hifʿil* infinitive לְהוֹסִיף (Lev. 19.25) arouses scepticism, the context more

suited, in Ginsberg's opinion, to the Samaritan להאסיף, presuma-
bly 'to gather'.[11] On Ginsberg's view, then, the expected Tiberian
CBH paradigm is *qal* (לְ)סְפֶת-סַף-*יֵסֵף-יֹסֵף-יָסַף**, with the *hifʿil* para-
digm (לְ)הוֹסִיף-*הוֹסֵף-יוֹסִיף-מוֹסִיף-הוֹסִיף** late and secondary. If so, all
apparently CBH *hifʿil* realisations, whether indicated by *matres
lectionis*, by Tiberian vocalisation signs, or by a combination of
the two, are anachronistic. To sum up: Ginsberg's view is that the
mixed CBH paradigm is the result of the artificial extension of
the post-exilic *hifʿil* paradigm to pre-exilic *qal* spellings amenable
to *hifʿil* realisation.

   One conspicuous upshot of the *hifʿil* reinterpretation of
original *qal* forms is that the distribution of the two stems blurs
the otherwise straightforward picture of diachronic development
presented on the basis of purely consonantal evidence above
(§1.0). Because a certain number of originally *qal yiqtol* forms
were apparently recast as *hifʿil*, the rather tidy diachronic picture
sketched above based on consonantally unambiguous forms is
distorted due to apparent secondary *qal* > *hifʿil* shifts in the

---

[11] In the passage's context of harvesting, 'gather' is at least as apposite as
'add'. Vulgate *congregantes* reflects the former; LXX πρόσθεμα, Onqelos
לְאוֹסָפָא, and the Syriac ܡܘܣܦ the latter. The Samaritan evidence is itself
varied: the Targum has למכנשה 'gather', against Arabic ليضاعف 'multiply'.
For the meaning 'gather' one expects *qal* לאסף in Samaritan as well as
Tiberian Hebrew; indeed, the *hifʿil* is otherwise unknown. Also, as noted
above, the Samaritan pronunciation *līsəf* reflects neither לאסף nor להאסיף,
but seemingly להסיף 'bring to an end'. Cf. MT תֹּאסִפֿוּן || SP תוסיפון *tūsifon*
(Exod. 5.7), where, again, the context is amenable to both 'con-tinue' and
'gather'. Similar cases of possible conflation occur within the Tiberian
tradition: אס"ף and סו"ף in Jer. 8.13 and Zeph. 1.2, אס"ף and יס"ף in 1 Sam.
18.29 and 2 Sam. 6.1 (see Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 143, 213).

realisation of ambiguous spellings. The basically diachronic sup-
pletion described above, consisting of classical *qal* and late *hifꜥil*,
is complicated by a situation of seeming synchronic suppletion
within CBH, in which only those *qal* forms impervious to *hifꜥil*
reinterpretation—*(we)qaṭal*, participle, imperative, infinitives
construct and absolute—preserved their original stem, while the
remaining *(way)yiqṭol* forms shifted to *hifꜥil*. The suppletive na-
ture of the paradigm is especially conspicuous in morphologically
divergent forms in proximity. Consider the contrasting stems in
the following examples of verses in close context:

(9a) ...וַיֹּ֣סֶף שַׁלַּ֥ח אֶת־הַיּוֹנָ֖ה מִן־הַתֵּבָֽה׃

‘...and he again sent forth the dove from the ark.’ (Gen.
8.10b)

(9b) ...וְלֹֽא־יָסְפָ֥ה שׁוּב־אֵלָ֖יו עֽוֹד׃

‘...and (the dove) did not again return.’ (Gen. 8.12b)

(10a) ...וְיָסַ֥ף חֲמִשִׁת֖וֹ עָלָ֑יו...

‘...and he must add a fifth of it thereupon...’ (Lev. 27.27b)

(10b) ...חֲמִשִׁית֖וֹ יֹסֵ֥ף עָלָֽיו׃

‘...a fifth of it he must add thereupon.’ (Lev. 27.31b)

(11a) וְלֹֽא־יָסְפ֣וּ ע֔וֹד גְּדוּדֵ֣י אֲרָ֖ם לָב֑וֹא בְּאֶ֥רֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵֽל׃

‘...and the bands of Arameans no longer came into the ter-
ritory of Israel.’ (2 Kgs 6.23b)

(11b) ...כֹּֽה־יַעֲשֶׂה־לִּ֥י אֱלֹהִ֖ים וְכֹ֣ה יוֹסִֽף...

‘...thus will God do to me and thus will he repeat...’ (2 Kgs
6.31a)

(12a) ...סְפ֥וּ שָׁנָ֖ה עַל־שָׁנָ֑ה...

‘...add year upon year...’ (Isa. 29.1)

לָכֵ֗ן הִנְנִ֥י **יוֹסִ֛ף** לְהַפְלִ֥יא אֶת־הָֽעָם־הַזֶּ֖ה... (12b)

'Therefore, behold, I will again do wonderful things with this people…' (Isa. 29.14)[12]

וְיָסְפ֧וּ עֲנָוִ֛ים בַּֽיהוָ֖ה שִׂמְחָ֑ה ... (12c)

'And the meek will increase joy in the LORD…' (Isa. 29.19)

2.1.2. An Alternative Approach

On the face of it, Ginsberg's view is straightforward and compelling, adequately explaining most of the evidence. It fails, however, to account for certain significant details. The specific constellation of spelling and vocalisation characteristic of the יס"ף prefix conjugation forms seems to reflect a situation more complex than the wholesale application of post-exilic *hifʿil* morphology and phonology wherever pre-exilic *qal* consonantal spelling made it possible.

One intriguing piece of evidence in this connection is the comparatively high incidence, especially in the Masoretic Pentateuch, of what look to be short *yiqṭol* ($<$ PS *yaqtul*), i.e., jussive, *hifʿil* forms in contexts better suited to full *yiqṭol* ($<$ PS *yaqtulu*) morphology and indicative semantics, e.g.,

כִּ֤י תַֽעֲבֹד֙ אֶת־הָ֣אֲדָמָ֔ה **לֹֽא־תֹסֵ֥ף** תֵּת־כֹּחָ֖הּ לָ֑ךְ (13)

'When you work the ground, it will no longer yield to you its strength.' (Gen. 4.12 || SP תוסף *tūsəf*)

---

[12] For more on this construction see the discussion below, §2.2, on examples (21)–(22).

(14) ...וְאֵ֣ת אֲשֶׁר֩ חָטָ֨א מִן־הַקֹּ֜דֶשׁ יְשַׁלֵּ֗ם וְאֶת־חֲמִֽישִׁתוֹ֙ יוֹסֵ֣ף עָלָ֔יו וְנָתַ֥ן אֹת֖וֹ לַכֹּהֵ֑ן

'And for what he has done amiss in the holy thing he must make restitution and a fifth of it he must add thereupon and he will give it to the priest...' (Lev. 5.16 || SP יסף *yå̄saf*; see also Lev. 5.24; 27.31; Num. 5.7)

(15) וְעַתָּ֗ה שְׁב֨וּ נָ֥א בָזֶ֛ה גַּם־אַתֶּ֖ם הַלָּ֑יְלָה וְאֵ֣דְעָ֔ה מַה־יֹּסֵ֥ף יְהוָ֖ה דַּבֵּ֥ר עִמִּֽי׃

'And now, stay here then tonight you, too, that I may know what more the Lᴏʀᴅ will say to me.' (Num. 22.19 || SP יסף *yå̄saf*)

(16) אֵ֣ת כָּל־הַדָּבָ֗ר אֲשֶׁ֤ר אָנֹכִי֙ מְצַוֶּ֣ה אֶתְכֶ֔ם אֹת֥וֹ תִשְׁמְר֖וּ לַעֲשׂ֑וֹת לֹא־תֹסֵ֣ף עָלָ֔יו וְלֹ֥א תִגְרַ֖ע מִמֶּֽנּוּ׃ פ

'Everything that I command you, it you will be careful to do. You must not add to it or take from it.' (Deut. 13.1 || SP תוסיפו *tūsīfu*)

(17) ...לֹ֣א אֹסֵ֗ף לִשְׁמֹ֙עַ֙ אֶת־קוֹל֙ יְהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהָ֔י וְאֶת־הָאֵ֥שׁ הַגְּדֹלָ֛ה הַזֹּ֖את לֹא־אֶרְאֶ֣ה ע֑וֹד וְלֹ֥א אָמֽוּת׃

'...I will not again hear the voice of the Lᴏʀᴅ my God or see this great fire any more, lest I die.' (Deut. 18.16 || SP אוסיף *ūsaf*)

(18) ...וְרָעָ֞ב אֹסֵ֤ף עֲלֵיכֶם֙ וְשָׁבַרְתִּ֥י לָכֶ֖ם מַטֵּה־לָֽחֶם׃

'...and famine I will add upon you and will break your supply of bread.' (Ezek. 5.16)

(19) ...לֹ֥א אוֹסֵ֖ף אַהֲבָתָ֑ם כָּל־שָׂרֵיהֶ֖ם סֹרְרִֽים׃

'...I will no longer love them.' (Hos. 9.15)

(20) ...עַם רַב וְעָצוּם כָּמֹהוּ לֹא נִהְיָה מִן־הָעוֹלָם וְאַחֲרָיו לֹא יוֹסֵף עַד־שְׁנֵי דּוֹר וָדוֹר:

> '…a great and powerful people; their like has never been
> before, nor will be again after them through the years of all
> generations.' (Joel 2.2)[13]

While a certain degree of overlap between jussive and indicative
patterns is known to characterise the use of *yiqṭol* forms in BH
(see, e.g., GKC §109d, k; JM §114l), the frequency of the phe-
nomenon in the case of הוֹסִיף–יָסַף arguably calls for closer inspec-
tion—lest a factor specific to this verb be (partially) responsible
for the unexpectedly high degree of apparent mismatch between
morphology and modality.

 Of general relevance is an observation made by Blau (2010,
21–23). It is widely held that BH *qal yiqṭol* represents three Proto-
Semitic vocalic patterns, namely *yafʿul*, *yafʿil*, and *yifʿal*, the for-
mer two considered active and the latter stative. Dominant He-
brew *yiqṭol* is the reflex of original *yafʿul* and, due to various pho-
nological and analogical processes, many original *yafʿil* and *yifʿal*
verbs also developed *yiqṭol* forms. Only a minority of verbs pre-
serve reflexes of their original *yafʿil* or *yifʿal* patterns, especially
those with weak or guttural radicals and/or those included in the

---

[13] The form יֹסֵף in יְהוָֹה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵכֶם יֹסֵף עֲלֵיכֶם כָּכֶם אֶלֶף פְּעָמִים וִיבָרֵךְ אֶתְכֶם
כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר לָכֶם: (Deut. 1.11) is semantically ambiguous in terms of both
vocalisation and context. It is analysable as a *qal* indicative *yiqṭol* or
active participle 'the LORD will add' or as a *qal* or *hifʿil* jussive 'may the
LORD add', but cf. the ensuing undoubtedly volitional וִיבָרֵךְ 'and may he
bless'. MT Deuteronomy exhibits use of both unequivocal *qal* and *hifʿil*
forms. For purposes of the present study, the form in Deut. 1.11 is clas-
sified as a jussive of ambiguous stem.

category of 'stative' verbs. Original *yafʿil* seems to have been par-
ticularly vulnerable to analogical levelling, with genuine reflexes
preserved in *qal* I-*y* forms, e.g., יֵרֵד (< **yarid*), and in the prefix
conjugation of נָתַן, e.g., יִתֵּן (< **yantin*). Blau (2010, 222) accounts
for the rare preservation of *yafʿil* thus:

> Two factors cooperated in ousting *yafʿil*: Philippi's Law,
> shifting stressed *i* in closed syllables to *a* and transferring
> it into the pattern having *a* as the characteristic vowel;
> and, even more, *yafʿil* was reinterpreted as *hifʿil* (which be-
> fore the lengthening of the characteristic *i* also had the
> form of *yafʿil*).

As examples, consider the BH *qal* forms in *weqaṭal* וְגַנּוֹתִי 'and I
will defend' (2 Kgs 19.34; see also 20.6) and infinitive absolute
גָּנוֹן 'defending' (Isa. 31.5), along with the corresponding *yiqṭol* יָגֵן
'(he) will defend' (Isa. 38.6; see also Zech. 9.15; 12.8). Though
the *yiqṭol* forms have the appearance of short *hifʿil* jussives, a
more fitting contextual analysis is that they are old indicative *qal*
yiqṭol (specifically, *yafʿil*) forms. In RH, however, one finds une-
quivocal *hifʿil* forms, e.g., imperatival הגן 'defend!' ('Aravit,
Fourth Blessing).[14] Similarly, within the Bible and beyond there
is evidence of the secondary reinterpretation of *qal* בֶּן-בָּן-יָבִין 'un-
derstand' as *hifʿil* הֵבִין-מֵבִין-יָבִין, of *qal* שָׂם-שָׂם-יָשִׂים 'put' as *hifʿil*
הֵשִׂים-מֵשִׂים-יָשִׂים, and—most relevantly—of *qal* יָרָה-יֹרֶה-יוֹרֶה as *hifʿil*

---

[14] The same may hold true of QH. The expression מגני עוז 'strong defend-
ers' (4Q403 f1i.25; 4Q405 f3ii.17) is interpretable as an instance of the
hifʿil participle (see the analysis of the Academy of the Hebrew Lan-
guage's Historical Dictionary Project online *Maʿagarim*), but Abegg
(1999–2009) and Wise, Abegg, and Cook (2005) construe מגני here as a
noun, i.e., 'shields of'. In Second Temple Aramaic, the verb is C-stem.

הוֹרָה-מוֹרֶה-יוֹרֶה. In all cases, an ambiguous *qal yiqṭol* form seems to have been interpreted as *hifʿil,* leading to the secondary creation of unequivocal *hifʿil* suffix conjugation, participial, and other forms. Such shifts coincided with a long-term, broader move away from the *qal* pattern in favour of stems perceived as having greater semantic iconicity.[15]

2.2. Reconsidering the Evidence

Having illustrated likely cases of *qal > hifʿil* reinterpretation, including in the specific case of original *yafʿil* forms, we are well positioned to consider the specific case of forms of *qal* יָסַף versus those of *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף. As it turns out, one need not assume with Ginsberg that a prefix conjugation vocalisation such as יֹסֵף in וְאֵדְעָׂה מַה־יֹּסֵף יְהוָׂה דַּבֵּר…'…that I may know what more the Lᴏʀᴅ will say' (Num. 22.19) is necessarily a secondary, anachronistic, and artificial misapplication of Second Temple jussive *hifʿil* phonology and morphology to an indicative form with the intended *qal* realisation יֵסֵף*. Rather, as Huehnergard (2006, 466–71; see also JM §75f) has shown, though resembling a misused *hifʿil* jussive, Tiberian *yōsēf* is in reality a passable, if exceptional, reflex of a *qal* I-*w/y* verb with an original *yafʿil* pattern.[16] This means

---

[15] On hifilisation as a feature of Second Temple Hebrew, see Hornkohl (2023, 209–51) and the references cited there.

[16] Huehnergard details three routes of phonological development for original I-*w* prefix conjugation forms: (a) *w > y*, e.g., יִישַׁן < *yiyšan < *yiwšan*; (b) elision of *w*, e.g., יֵשֵׁב, whose related imperative and infinitive also lack the first radical; (c) in the case of verbs with a dental/coronal consonant in second position, assimilation of *w*, e.g., יִצֹּר < PS *yaṣṣur < PS *yawṣur*. The preservation of *w* in *yawsip > *יוֹסֵף is, thus,

that the ostensibly ill-fitting jussive-like *hifʿil* forms in indicative contexts in examples (13)–(20) above are alternatively analysable as aptly employed indicative forms with vocalisations traceable to archaic *qal* morphology.[17] The same can be said of consonant-final *wayyiqṭol* forms (i.e., forms without vowel-final suffixes), which, despite their *hifʿil*-like phonology, may also be analysed as having *qal* morphology, e.g., ...לָלֶ֔דֶת וַתֹּ֣סֶף 'And she again gave birth…' (Gen. 4.2).

Contrasting with these, however, are forms in which the spelling and/or vocalisation allow for no interpretation other than *hifʿil*, namely, (a) all vowel-final and similar prefix conjugation (*yiqṭol* and *wayyiqṭol*) forms, i.e., plural forms with an open penultimate syllable, like ...פְּנֵי לִרְאוֹת תֹסִפ֖וּן לֹ֥א... '...you will no more see my face' (Gen. 44.23) and ...אֹת֑וֹ שְׂנֹ֣א ע֖וֹד וַיּוֹסִ֣פוּ... '...and they continued still to hate him' (Gen. 37.5), where the expected reflexes of archaic *qal yafʿil* are תֹסְפוּן* and וַיּוֹסְפוּ*, respectively, and (b) consonant-final forms bearing a long *i* theme vowel (whether indicated by *mater yod, ḥireq*, or both), e.g., יֹסִ֑יף 'he must (not) exceed' (Deut. 25.3).

according to Huehnergard (2006, 466, fn. 39) "an analogical countervention of the sound rule" in (c) which would otherwise have resulted in **yissōp̄*. Huehnergard (2006, 459, 467–68) opines that *yafʿil* here ultimately developed from *yafʿul*, but this does not affect the argument here.

[17] To be sure, identically vocalised short *yiqṭol* (jussive or preterite) forms also occur, e.g., אַחֵֽר בֵּ֥ן לִ֖י יְהוָ֛ה יֹסֵ֧ף 'May the Lᴏʀᴅ add' (or 'The Lᴏʀᴅ has added for me another son!') (Gen. 30.24); בַּדָּבָ֥ר ע֖וֹד אֵלַ֛י דַּבֵּ֨ר אַל־תּ֨וֹסֶף הַזֶּֽה 'Do not speak any more to me about this matter' (Deut. 3.26). These are equally analysable as *qal* or *hifʿil*.

To summarise: it would seem that in the case of prefix conjugation forms, the Tiberian reading tradition mixes the conservation of authentic reflexes of *qal* morphology with secondary *hifʿil* vocalisations. *Qal* preservation was likely conditioned on resemblance to *hifʿil*, even if this involved the apparent use of jussive forms in indicative contexts. Phonetic recasting took place where the original *qal* phonology could not easily be reconciled with *hifʿil* realisation, e.g., וַיֹּסְפוּ* > וַיּוֹסִפוּ.

In addition to suppletive forms in close proximity, as in examples (9)–(12) above, the recasting of original *qal* morphology with *hifʿil* phonology sometimes occasioned genuinely awkward combinations, e.g.,

(21) לָכֵן הִנְנִי יוֹסֵף לְהַפְלִיא אֶת־הָעָם־הַזֶּה...
      'Therefore, behold, I am again doing wonderful things
      with this people…' (Isa. 29.14)

(22) ...הִנְנִי יוֹסֵף עַל־יָמֶיךָ חֲמֵשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה:
      '…Behold, I am adding fifteen years to your life (Isa. 38.5)

The constructions in (21)–(22) are doubly dubious. First, expressions involving the presentative הִנֵּה with a pronominal suffix and *yiqṭol* are exceedingly rare. A participle is expected. Second, 1st-person הִנְנִי does not concord with 3rd-person יוֹסֵף. Rather than positing elision of the glottal stop in a *hifʿil* prefix conjugation form, *hinnī ʾōsīf > hinnī yōsīf*,[18] it may be that the intended construction in both cases was הִנְנִי יֹסֵף*, with a *qal* participle (cf. the relevant critical notes in the BHS apparatus).

---

[18] See Khan (2013, 100; 2020, 252–53) for the historical Tiberian pronunciation of הִנְנִי as *hinnī*.

3.0. Interpreting the Data

The discussion to this point has substantiated a degree of dissonance between the Tiberian written and reading traditions revolving around forms of *qal* יָסַף and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף. It has also been noted that the dissonance is not equally characteristic of all parts of the MT. Further, in addition to the layers of evidence available in the consonantal and vocalic components of the Tiberian tradition, the related, yet semi-independent layer reflected in the use of *mater yod* for unambiguous representation of *hifʿil* may be interrogated. Though caution must be exercised with spelling practices infamous for variation (Barr 1989; cf. Andersen and Forbes 2013), the three-way relationship among the consonantal text, vocalisation, and *plene* orthography is worth exploring in connection to the hifilisation of *qal* יָסַף. Table 4 (facing page) displays the distribution of unambiguous consonantal forms of *qal* יָסַף and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף seen above (Table 2) alongside the distribution of the relevant MT *(way)yiqṭol* forms, whether *qal*, *hifʿil*, or of ambiguous stem. Table 5 (p. 76) combines the data from Table 4 on individual books, presenting them in corporate totals.

When it comes to the distribution of forms of *qal* יָסַף and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף, the various Masoretic corpora exhibit conspicuous differences of apparent diachronic significance.

Table 4: MT distribution of forms of *qal* יָסַף and *hif'il* הוֹסִיף (see §§4.1 and 4.3 for citations).

Book	unequivocal consonantal		prefix conjugation vocalisation			
			indicative	*hif'il*		ambiguous
	qal	*hif'il*	*qal*	defective	*plene*	jussive/*wayyiqṭol*
Genesis	2	0	1	5	0	6
Exodus	0	0	0	4	1	3
Leviticus	7	1	3	0	0	0
Numbers	3	0	2	0	0	3
Deuteronomy	2	0	2	4	3	1
Joshua	0	0	0	0	2	0
Judges	2	0	0	6	3	2
Samuel	5	0	0	4	9	13
Kings	2	3	0	3	4	1
Isaiah	5	0	0	2	10	2
Jeremiah	2	0	0	0	1	0
Ezekiel	0	0	1	1	0	1
Hosea	0	0	1	1	1	0
Joel	0	0	1	0	0	0
Amos	0	0	0	0	4	0
Jonah	0	0	0	0	1	0
Nahum	0	0	0	0	1	0
Zechariah	0	0	0	1	0	0
Psalms	0	1	0	0	6	1
Job	0	0	0	0	6	5
Proverbs	0	0	0	3	7	3
Ruth	0	0	0	0	1	0
Lamentations	0	0	0	0	3	0
Qohelet	0	3	0	0	2	0
Esther	0	0	0	0	0	1
Daniel	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ezra	0	1	0	0	0	0
Nehemiah	0	1	0	0	0	0
Chronicles	1	1	0	0	7	2

Table 5: MT distribution of forms of *qal* יָסַף and *hifʿil* הוֹסִיף according to corpus

| | unequivocal consonantal | | prefix conjugation vocalisation | | | |
	qal	hifʿil	qal	*hifʿil* defective	*hifʿil* plene	ambiguous jussive/*wayyiqtol*
Pentateuch	13	1	8	11	4	4
Prophets	15	3	3	11	36	1
(Former	9	3	0	6	18	1)
(Latter	6	0	3	5	18	0)
Writings	1	7	0	3	30	6
(non-LBH+	0	1	0	3	22	5)
(LBH+	1	6	0	0	8	1)
TOTAL	**29**	**11**	**11**	**25**	**70**	**11**

3.1. Harmony and Dissonance within the Combined Tiberian Consonantal, Orthographic, and Vocalic Tradition

3.1.1. Tiberian Late Biblical Hebrew +

Thus, in MT LBH +[19] the three types of evidence agree, in that there is virtually no dissonance among them: (a) *hifʿil* morphology predominates to the near exclusion of *qal* in unequivocal consonantal forms; (b) vocalisation of *yiqṭol* is exclusively *hifʿil*; and (c) *hifʿil* prefix conjugation vocalisation is consistently matched by exclusively *plene hifʿil* orthography.[20] The morphological harmony among consonantal text, vocalisation, and *matres lectionis* in Persian Period material tallies with additional evidence

---

[19] On LBH + as distinguished from LBH, see above, ch. 2, fn. 4.

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

confirming a special affinity between the Tiberian vocalisation and the period in which LBH + texts were composed.[21]

3.1.2. The Tiberian Pentateuch

The rest of the MT is characterised by more or less conflicting totals. Consider the Pentateuch: unequivocal consonantal forms are nearly all *qal*—with the problematic לְהוֹסִיף (Lev. 19.25) the single arguable exception (see above, §2.1 and fn. 11)—but *yiqṭol* vocalisation is divided—eight *qal* and fifteen *hifʿil*. Intriguingly, however, only four of the fifteen *yiqṭol* forms with indisputable *hifʿil* vocalisation have equally unambiguous *plene hifʿil* spelling. This situation obviously contrasts with the one described above for LBH + texts. Whereas there is consonantal, vocalic, and orthographic harmony in LBH +, striking dissonance obtains in the Pentateuch. Unambiguous *qal* consonantal forms and the rare incidence of *plene* orthography with *mater yod* signalling *hifʿil* morphology contrast with rather common—though by no means universal—*hifʿil* vocalisation. The complexity of the combined Tiberian written-reading tradition in the Pentateuch is further manifested in the rather frequent preservation of archaic *qal* phonology (see above, §2.1).

---

[21] Intriguingly, the lone *qal* outlier in LBH + is יָסַפְתָּ (2 Chron. 9.6 || הוֹסַפְתָּ 1 Kgs 10.7), which involves the late usage of a characteristically classical *qal* parallel to *hifʿil* in what is conventionally considered earlier material. The Chronicler's penchant for classical features, even where his ostensible sources have late alternatives, is conspicuous within LBH. It is evident in the case of several features; see Hornkohl (2014a, 35, fn. 97, 88–89, 108, 177, 187–88, 197, 208, 245, 320).

3.1.3. The Tiberian Prophets

The books of the Prophets appear to occupy a sort of intermediate position between the Pentateuch and LBH +. The Prophets exhibit significant discord between evidence for preservation of *qal* in unequivocal consonantal forms and evidence for *hifʿil yiqṭol*, but noticeably greater affinity than in the Pentateuch between *hifʿil* vocalisation and *hifʿil plene* orthography of *yiqṭol* forms. A further point of contrast with the Pentateuch is the infrequency in the Prophets of archaic *qal* vocalisations.

3.2. Diachronic Considerations

Some preliminary points are in order in reference to the historical depth of the hifilisation of *qal* יָסַף in the Tiberian reading tradition. First, though the vocalisation in the Pentateuch and the Prophets is almost certainly somewhat anachronistic—involving the *hifʿil* reinterpretation of several *qal* forms in line with Second Temple tendencies unambiguously seen in late consonantal evidence—in no part of the Hebrew Bible is the vocalisation component of the combined Tiberian biblical tradition the lone witness to the hifilisation of *qal* יָסַף. In its use of unambiguous *plene hifʿil* spellings, both the orthographic component (represented by *mater yod*) and the purely consonantal component (excluding *matres*) also evince results of hifilisation. What is more, since consonantal and orthographic evidence for the hifilisation of *qal* יָסַף substantially predates the advent of the Tiberian vocalisation signs, it would appear that the medieval Tiberian reading tradition reliably reflects a far earlier shift. To be more specific, the historical depth of the Tiberian vocalisation finds confirmation

in the unequivocal *hifʿil* evidence found in MT LBH+, the biblical and non-biblical DSS, the SP, Ben Sira, and RH, which combine to show clearly that the *qal* > *hifʿil* shift reflected in the vocalisation of the Tiberian reading tradition had already by Second Temple times profoundly impacted morphology.

Second, unambiguous consonantal evidence of hifilisation in CBH—לְהוֹסִיף (Lev. 19.25); הוֹסַפְתָּ (1 Kgs 10.7); וְהֹסַפְתִּי (2 Kgs 20.6); הֵסִיף (2 Kgs 24.7); וְהוֹסַפְתִּי (Ps. 71.14)—and extrabiblical Iron Age epigraphy—הוספ[תֿ] (Zakkur [*KAI* 202] B.4–5)—shows that Hebrew הוֹסִיף should be considered not an exclusively late innovation, but merely one whose dominance is restricted to late compositions, in which case the degree of *hifʿil* vocalisation in the Tiberian reading tradition of CBH texts is best seen as the Second Temple extension and standardisation of a development already underway in First Temple times.

Yet, the Second Temple characterisation of the Tiberian vocalisation should also be nuanced. As has been shown, especially in the Pentateuch, the reading tradition betrays opposing tendencies: on the one hand, secondary hifilisation; on the other, phonological reflexes explicable as instances of conditioned preservation of archaic *qal* morphology. That the preservation of the latter was possibly facilitated by passable resemblance to *hifʿil* forms in no way detracts from the reliability of the testimony. Also, while the rarity of such vocalisations from Masoretic BH beyond the Pentateuch, or their complete absence therefrom, may be casual, seen together with similar cases of disparity between Pentateuchal and non-Pentateuchal CBH collected in this

volume, it is also interpretable as evidence that the Tiberian reading tradition of the Torah is especially conservative.

Focusing on the relationship between the vocalisation and the orthographic tradition regarding hifilisation of *qal* יָסַף, consider Table 6, which shows the incidence of *plene*-spelled *hifʿil (way)yiqṭol* forms with expected long *i* theme vowel out of all such forms according to MT corpus.

Table 6: *Plene hifʿil (way)yiqṭol* forms with expected long *i* theme vowel out of all *hifʿil (way)yiqṭol* forms with expected long *i* theme vowel per MT corpus

	plene/total	percentage *plene*
Pentateuch	4/15	26.7
Prophets	36/47	76.6
(Former Prophets	18/24	75)
(Latter Prophets	18/23	78.3)
Writings	30/33	90.9
(non-LBH Writings	22/25	88.5)
(LBH+	8/8	100)

The statistics constitute arguable evidence of linguistically significant orthographic development within the MT. Concentrating on *yiqṭol* forms where a long *i*-vowel might be expected, we find that explicit *hifʿil* spellings constitute a minority of the cases in the Pentateuch, come in three-quarters of the cases in the Prophets, and are the norm in the Writings, including LBH+, where *hifʿil* 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 its constituent texts were composed, the written form of the Masoretic Pentateuch seems to reflect a stage in orthographic development during which the spelling of *(way)yiqṭol* was still largely amenable to realisation according to *qal* morphology. Beyond the Pentateuch, there is a strong and increasing tendency to utilise *(way)yiqṭol* 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 yiqṭol* 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 presumably 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 yiqṭol* 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 the use of consonantally and orthographically unambiguous *hifʿil* forms. Depending on the realisation and spelling of ambiguous forms, various manifestations of suppletion might obtain, whether original or secondary.

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—*hifʿil* 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, *hifʿil* restricted chiefly, though not exclusively, to vocalisation, and even then, far from consistent.

The nature of the suppletion in the Prophets is more difficult to interpret. Is it organic, secondary, or a mixture of the two? The nature of the evidence all but precludes certainty. The greater use of *mater yod* for unequivocal *hifʿil* 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 CBH of 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)yiqṭol* forms of יָסַף and הוֹסִיף. What is clear is that, whatever its origin, there is more in the way of *qal–hifʿil* suppletion to deal with in the Prophets than in either the Pentateuch or LBH+.

Yet, the possibility that the *qal–hifʿil* suppletion in the books of the Prophets may be partially organic in nature should not be dismissed out of hand. On the assumption of an originally unified *qal* paradigm of יס"ף, it is difficult to decide how to interpret *(way)yiqṭol* forms like (ו)יוסף in the Prophets. While the secondary hifilisation of such forms is clearly connected with the expanded

use of transparently *hifʿil* suffix conjugation, participial, infiniti-val, and imperatival forms, it is logical to assume that these latter forms arose due to prior *hifʿil* reinterpretation of ambiguous *(way)yiqṭol* forms. In other words, it is entirely reasonable to posit that the *hifʿil* analysis of ambiguous *(way)yiqṭol* spellings *preceded* and, indeed, *led to* the development of unequivocal *hifʿil* consonantal *qaṭal*, participle, infinitival, and imperatival forms. If so, the Prophets exhibit precisely the constellation of forms ex-pected for a corpus that reflects a chronolect where *(way)yiqṭol* forms were already read as *hifʿil,* but other forms were still largely *qal.* By contrast, in LBH+ nearly all forms are unambiguously *hifʿil,* while the Torah, despite a few unambiguous *hifʿil* conso-nantal and orthographic forms, along with rather common *hifʿil* vocalisation of otherwise ambiguous spellings, regularly exhibits spellings entirely amenable to *qal* interpretation as well as a size-able minority of *(way)yiqṭol* vocalisations reconcilable with *qal* morphology. If so, the alleged 'imposition' of *hifʿil* morphology via the secondary insertion of *mater yod* and/or unambiguous *hifʿil* vocalisation may not be an artificial imposition, after all. It may rather be a case in which original *hifʿil* morphology was sec-ondarily disambiguated via the use of *mater yod* and/or dedicated *hifʿil* vocalisation. If the *hifʿil* orthography and vocalisation of *(way)yiqṭol* forms in the Prophets is in any way representative of their earliest chronolect, then the difference between the CBH of the Torah, with multiple *qal*-amenable orthographic and vocalic forms, and the CBH of the Prophets, where such forms are com-paratively rare, may be interpreted as diachronic in nature, an isogloss separating typologically distinct sub-chronolects. It also

goes without saying that the few clear orthographically transparent cases of *hifʿil* in the Pentateuch may be considered authentic early precursors of eventually more extensive *hifʿil* morphology.

Rounding out the discussion, it is worth reporting results of an examination of distribution of *qal* and *hifʿil* יס״ף forms according to purported Pentateuchal source (per Friedman 1989, 246–59). See Table 7.

Table 7: *qal* and *hifʿil* forms of יס״ף according to purported Pentateuchal source

	Form	J	E	P	Dtr$_1$	Dtr$_2$	Other
Consonantal	*qal*	2	1	9	2	0	2
	hifʿil	0	0	1	0	0	0
Prefix	contextual/vocalic *qal*	1	1	4	0	0	2
	plene orthographic *hifʿil*	1	0	0	0	1	2
	defective vocalic *hifʿil*	5	4	0	1	0	3
	ambiguous	5	7	0	2	0	0

Since nearly all unambiguous consonantal forms are *qal*, no single source shows a concentration of typologically late *hifʿil* consonantal forms. The one source with such a form, P, also shows the highest incidence of unambiguous *qal* consonantal forms.[22] When it comes to prefix conjugation forms, P also shows the

[22] And it should be recalled that the lone *hifʿil* case in question constitutes an interpretive, and perhaps textual, crux (see above, §2.1 and fn. 11).

highest incidence of pseudo-jussive forms, i.e., contextually in-dicative forms in which archaic *qal* vocalisation has been pre-served, though these are also found in J, E, and Friedman's Other source in Deuteronomy. Finally, again in relation to prefix con-jugation forms, in contrast to all other sources, P shows no inci-dence of *plene* orthographic *hifʿil*, defective vocalic *hifʿil*, or am-biguous forms. In sum, considering only unequivocal consonantal and orthographic evidence, there is broad preference for typolog-ically early *qal* over later *hifʿil* morphology, with no source devi-ating in favour of *hifʿil*. P, with 13 of 14 forms demanding or amenable to *qal* analysis, is particularly conservative.

4.0. Appendix

4.1. Table 2 Citations

Qal: יָסְפָה (Gen. 8.12 [J]); יָסַף (Gen. 38.26 [J]); וְיָסַף (Lev. 22.14 [P]); וְיָסַפְתִּ֫י (Lev. 26.18 [P]); וְיָסַפְתִּי (Lev. 26.21 [P]); וְיָסַף (Lev. 27.13 [P]); וְיָסַף (Lev. 27.15 [P]); וְיָסַ֫ף (Lev. 27.19 [P]); וְיָסַף (Lev. 27.27 [P]); יָסְפוּ (Num. 11.25 [E]); לִסְפּוֹת (Num. 32.14 [P]); וְיָסַף (Num. 32.15 [P]); יָסַף (Deut. 5.22 [Dtr₁]); יֹסְפִים (Deut. 5.25 [Dtr₁]); וְיָסַפְתָּ (Deut. 19.19 [Other]); וְיֹסְפוּ (Deut. 20.8 [Other]); יָסְפוּ (Judg. 8.28); יָסַף (Judg. 13.21); יָסְפוּ (1 Sam. 7.13); יָסַ֫פְנוּ (1 Sam. 12.19); יָסַף (1 Sam. 15.35); יָסְפוּ (2 Sam. 2.28); יָסְפוּ (2 Kgs 6.23); וְיָסְפָה (2 Kgs 19.30); יָסַפְתָּ (Isa. 26.15a); יָסַפְתָּ (Isa. 26.15b); וְיָסְפוּ (Isa. 29.19); סְפוֹת (Isa. 30.1); וְיָסְפָ֫ה (Isa. 37.31); סְפוּ (Jer. 7.21); יָסַף (Jer. 45.3); יָסַ֫פְתָּ (2 Chron. 9.6 || הוֹסַפְתָּ 1 Kgs 10.7); *hifʿil*: וְהוֹסַפְתִּי (Lev. 19.25 [P]); הוֹסַפְתָּ (1 Kgs 10.7 || יָסַ֫פְתָּ 2 Chron. 9.6); וְהוֹסַפְתִּי (2 Kgs 20.6); הֹסִיף (2 Kgs 24.7); וְהוֹסַפְתִּי (Ps. 71.14); וְהוֹסַפְתִּי (Qoh. 1.16); וְהוֹסַפְתִּי (Qoh. 2.9); לְהוֹסִיף (Qoh. 3.14); לְהוֹסִיף (Ezra 10.10); מוֹסִיפִים (Neh. 13.18); לְהֹסִיף (2 Chron. 28.13).

4.2. Table 3 Citations

Qal. Mešaʿ (*KAI* 181): לספת (l. 21); יספתי (l. 29); **BDSS:** יספת (1QIsaᵃ 20.27 || יָסַפְתָּ MT Isa. 26.15); יספתה (1QIsaᵃ 20.28 || יָסַ֫פְתָּ MT Isa. 26.15); ספי (1QIsaᵃ 23.7 || סְפוּ MT Isa. 29.1); ויספו (1QIsaᵃ 23.29 || וְיָסְפוּ MT Isa. 29.19); ספות (1QIsaᵃ 24.7 || סְפוֹת MT Isa. 30.1); ויסף (4Q24 f9i+10–17.22 || וְיָסַף MT Lev. 22.14); יסף (4Q41 5.2 || יָסַף MT Deut. 5.22); יספת (4Q56 f16ii+17–20+20a.11 || יָסַ֫פְתָּ MT

Isa. 26.15); ויספ]ה (4Q56 f22–23.3 || וְיֹסְפָ֫ה MT Isa. 37.31); סופֿי (4Q64 f1–5.4 ||
סְפוּ MT Isa. 29.1); {ו}יֹסֿף (4Q135 f1.1 || יֵסֵף MT Deut. 5.22); ויספתי (11Q1 5.4 ||
וְיָסַפְתִּ֫י MT Lev. 26.21); ויסף (11Q1 6.2 || וְיָסַף MT Lev. 27.13); ויסף (11Q1 6.4 ||
וְיָסַף MT Lev. 27.15); ויספ (11Q1 6.9 || וְיָסַף MT Lev. 27.19); יסֿפֿים (XQ2 1.6 ||
יֹסְפֵ֫ים MT Deut. 5.25); **SP:** ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וַיֹּ֫סֶף (Gen. 8.10); יספה *yắsēfa* || MT
יָסְפָ֫ה (Gen. 8.12); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וַיֹּ֫סֶף (Gen. 18.29); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וַיֹּ֫סֶף (Gen.
25.1); יסף *yắsəf* || MT יָסַף (Gen. 38.26); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וַיֹּ֫סֶף (Exod. 9.34); יספם
yūsīfəm || MT — (Exod. 20.15d || Deut. 5.25); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וְיָסַף (Lev.
22.14); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וְיָסַף (Lev. 27.13); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וְיָסַף (Lev. 27.15);
ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וְיָסַף (Lev. 27.19); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וְיָסַף (Lev. 27.27); ויסף *wyắsəf*
|| MT וַיֹּ֫סֶף (Num. 22.15); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וַיֹּ֫סֶף (Num. 22.25); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT
וַיֹּ֫סֶף (Num. 22.26); ויסף *wyắsəf* || MT וְיָסַף (Num. 32.15); יסף *yắsəf* (Deut. 5.19) ||
MT יֵסֵף (Deut. 5.22); יספים *yūsīfəm* (Deut. 5.22) || MT יֹסְפֵ֫ים (Deut. 5.25); **NBDSS:**
יספה (4Q252 1.19 || Gen. 8.22); יֹסֿפ]ה (4Q252 1.20); **Mishna:** וְיֹסְפוּ (m. Soṭa 8.5
|| Deut. 20.8). *Hifʿil.* Zakkur (*KAI* 202): הוספ]ת (B.4–5) **BDSS:** אם מו]סֿיפים
(4Q37 3.7 || MT אִם־יֹסְפֵ֫ים Deut. 5.25); והוספתי (4Q83 f9ii.13 || MT וְהוֹסַפְתִּ֫י Ps.
71.14); [אם מו]סֿיפים (4Q129 f1R.13 || MT אִם־יֹסְפֵ֫ים Deut. 5.25); אם מו]סֿיפים
(4Q135 f1.4 || MT אִם־יֹסְפֵ֫ים Deut. 5.25); אֿם מ/יספים (4Q137 f1.31) (?) || MT אִם־
יֹסְפֵ֫ים Deut. 5.25); **NBDSS:** והוסיפו (1QS 2.11); להוסיף (1QS 6.14); לוסֿיף (1QpHab
8.12); לה]וסֿי]ף (1QpHab 11.15); הוסיפו (1QHᵃ 9.37); לוסף (1Q14 f8–10.7); הוסיפו
(4Q265 f4ii.3); [ו]הוסיפו (4Q286 f7i.8); הוסיפו (4Q298 f3–4ii.6); הוסיפו (4Q298
f3–4ii.7); הוסׁיף (4Q299 f30.5); להוסיף (4Q416 f2iv.7); הוסף (4Q418 f81+
81a.17); בֿהוסיפֿ]כם (4Q502 f3.1); להוֹסֿ]ף (4Q503 f15–16.10); להוסיף (4Q525
f1.3); **Ben Sira:** מוסֿיף (SirA 1r.16 = Sirach 3.27); להוסֿיף (SirA 1v.25 = Sirach
5.5); להוסיף (SirC 2r.7 = Sirach 5.5); **Mishna:** הוסֿיף (Kil 1.3); הוסֿיף (Kil. 5.6);
וְהוֹסֿיף (Kil. 7.8); מוסֿפֿין (Shev. 3.2a); מוסֿיפֿין (Shev. 3.2b); מוסֿיף (Shev. 3.3); הוסֿיף
(Ter. 4.3); הוסֿיף (Ter. 4.4a); לְהוֹסֿיף (Ter. 4.4a); לְהוֹסֿיף (Maas. 1.1); מוסֿיף (Maaser2
4.3a); מוסֿיף (Maaser2 4.3b); מוסֿיף (Maaser2 4.3c); מוסֿיף (Maaser2 5.5); הוסֿיף
(Orla 1.5); מוסֿיף (Eruv. 7.7a); מוסֿיף (Eruv. 7.7b); [שֶׁ]]מֿוֹסֿיפֿין (Pesah. 1.6a); הוסֿיף
(Pesah. 1.6b); [שֶׁ]]מֿוֹסֿיפֿין (Pesah. 1.6c); לְהוֹסֿיף (Yoma 3.7a); מוסֿיף (Yoma 3.7b);
מוסֿיף (Yoma 4.4); מוסֿיף (Yoma 7.5); מוסֿיפֿים (Sukk. 3.15); מוסֿיפֿים (Sukk. 5.5a);
מוסֿיפֿים (Sukk. 5.5b); מוסֿיפֿים (Sukk. 5.5c); ומוסֿיף (Taan. 2.2); מוסֿיפֿים (Meg. 4.1);
מוסֿיפֿים (Meg. 4.2a); מוסֿיפֿים (Meg. 4.2b); מוסֿיף (Ketub. 3.4); לְהוֹסֿיף (Ketub. 5.1);
מוסֿיפֿין (Ketub. 5.7); ומוסֿיפֿין (Ketub. 5.9); מוסֿיף (Ned. 3.1); מוסֿיפֿים (Sota 9.1);
מוסֿיפֿין (Qidd. 4.4); מוסֿיף (ʿArayot 11); מוסֿיפֿים (BabaM. 4.8a); מוסֿיף (BabaM.
4.8b); מוסֿיף (BabaM. 4.8c); מוסֿיף (BabaM. 4.8d); מוסֿיף (BabaM. 4.8e); הוסֿיף
(BabaM. 6.5); לְהוֹסֿיף (Sanh. 1.5); מוסֿיפֿין (Sanh. 1.6); מוסֿיפֿין (Sanh. 5.5); מוסֿיפֿין
(Sanh. 11.3); הוסֿיף (Mak 3.14); מוסֿיפֿין (Shevu. 2.2); מוסֿיפֿין (Ed. 2.1); הוסֿיף (Ed.
2.1); שֶׁמֿוֹסֿיפֿין (Ed. 2.1); הוסֿיף (Ed. 8.1); הוסֿיף (Zevah. 1.3); מוסֿף (Menah. 13.6);
הוסֿיף (Bek. 6.8); מוסֿיפֿין (Arak. 2.3a); מוסֿיפֿין (Arak. 2.3b); מוסֿיפֿין (Arak. 2.3c);
ומוסֿיפֿין (Arak. 2.5a); ומוסֿיפֿין (Arak. 2.5b); ומוסֿיפֿין (Arak. 2.5c); ומוסֿיפֿין (Arak.
2.6); מוסֿיף (Arak. 6.2); מוסֿיפֿין (Arak. 8.2); מוסֿיפֿו (Arak. 8.3); הוסֿיפֿו (Mid. 3.1);

מוֹסִיפִין (Tamid 5.1); הוֹסִיפוּ (Maksh. 2.4); מוֹסִיפִין (Yad. 1.1); מוֹסִיפִין (Yad. 1.1); הוֹסִיף (Yad. 4.2).

4.3. Table 4 Citations

For unambiguous consonantal forms, see above, §4.1. **Prefix conjugation—** *qal:* לֹא־תֹסֵף (Gen. 4.12 [J]); יֹסֵף (Lev. 5.16 [P], 24 [P]; 27.31 [P]; Num. 5.7 [P]); מַה־יֹּסֵף (Num. 22.19 [E]); לֹא־תֹסֵף (Deut. 13.1 [Other]); לֹא אֹסֵף (Deut. 18.16 [Other]); אֹסֵף (Ezek. 5.16); לֹא אוֹסֵף (Hos. 9.15); לֹא יוֹסֵף (Joel 2.2); **defective *(way)yiqṭol* pointed as *hifʿil:* אֹסִף** (Gen. 8.21a [J]); אֹסֵף (Gen. 8.21b [J]); וַיּוֹסִפוּ (Gen. 37.5 [J]); וַיּוֹסִפוּ (Gen. 37.8 [J]); תֹסִפוּן (Gen. 44.23 [J]); תֹאסִפוּן (Exod. 5.7 [E]); תֹסִפוּן (Exod. 9.28 [E]); אֹסֵף (Exod. 10.29 [E]); תֹסֵף (Exod. 11.6 [E]); יֹסִפוּ (Deut. 4.2 [Dtr₁]); יֹסִפוּ (Deut. 13.12 [Other]); תֹסִפוּן (Deut. 17.16 [Other]); יֹסִפוּ (Deut. 19.20 [Other]); וַיֹּסֶף (Judg. 3.12); וַיֹּסִפוּ (Judg. 4.1); וַיֹּסִפוּ (Judg. 10.6); וַיֹּסִפוּ (Judg. 13.1); וַיֹּסִפוּ (Judg. 20.22); הָאוֹסִף (Judg. 20.28); יֹסֵף (1 Sam. 14.44); וַיֹּסִפוּ (2 Sam. 3.34); וַיֹּסִפוּ (2 Sam. 5.22); וְאֹסְפָה (2 Sam. 12.8); יוֹסִפוּן (1 Kgs 19.2); יוֹסִפוּ (1 Kgs 20.10); יֹסֵף (2 Kgs 6.31); יֹסֵף (Isa. 29.14); יוֹסֵף (Isa. 38.5); תֹסֵף (Ezek. 36.12); יוֹסִפוּ (Hos. 13.2); תֹסְפִי (Zeph. 3.11); יֹסֵף (Prov. 10.22); תּוֹסֵף (Prov. 19.19); תּוֹסֵף (Prov. 23.28); **plene *(way)yiqṭol* pointed as *hifʿil:* תֹסִפוּ** (Exod. 14.13 [J]); יֹסִיף (Deut. 25.3a [Other]); יֹסִיף (Deut. 25.3b [Other]); תֹסִיף (Deut. 28.68 [Dtr₂]); אוֹסִיף (Josh. 7.12); יוֹסִיף (Josh. 23.13); אוֹסִיף (Judg. 2.21); אוֹסִיף (Judg. 10.13); הָאוֹסִיף (Judg. 20.23); יֹסִיף (1 Sam. 3.17); יֹסִיף (1 Sam. 20.13); יֹסִיף (1 Sam. 25.22); יֹסִיף (2 Sam. 3.9); יֹסִיף (2 Sam. 3.35); יֹסִפוּ (2 Sam. 7.10); יוֹסִיף (2 Sam. 7.20); יֹסִיף (2 Sam. 14.10); יוֹסִיף (2 Sam. 19.14); יוֹסִיף (1 Kgs 2.23); אוֹסִיף (1 Kgs 12.11); אֹסִיף (1 Kgs 12.14); אֹסִיף (2 Kgs 21.8); תּוֹסִיפוּ (Isa. 1.5); תֹסִיף (Isa. 1.13); יוֹסִיף (Isa. 10.20); יוֹסִיף (Isa. 11.11); תוֹסִיפִי (Isa. 23.12); תוֹסִיפוּ (Isa. 24.20); תוֹסִיפִי (Isa. 47.1); תוֹסִיפִי (Isa. 47.5); תוֹסִיפִי (Isa. 51.22); יוֹסִיף (Isa. 52.1); יוֹסִפוּ (Jer. 31.12); אוֹסִיף (Hos. 1.6); תוֹסִיף (Amos 5.2); אוֹסִיף (Amos 7.8); תוֹסִיף (Amos 7.13); אוֹסִיף (Amos 8.2); אוֹסִיף (Jon. 2.5); יוֹסִיף (Nah. 2.1); יֹסִיף (Ps. 10.18); יוֹסִיף (Ps. 41.9); תּוֹסֵף (Ps. 61.7); יֹסִיף (Ps. 77.8); וַיּוֹסִיפוּ (Ps. 78.17); יֹסִיף (Ps. 120.3); יֹסִיף (Job 17.9); תוֹסִיף (Job 20.9); אֹסִיף (Job 34.32); יֹסִיף (Job 34.37); תֹסִיף (Job 38.11); אוֹסִיף (Job 40.5); יוֹסִפוּ (Prov. 3.2); וְיוֹסִיפוּ (Prov. 9.11); תוֹסִיף (Prov. 10.27); יֹסִיף (Prov. 16.21); יֹסִיף (Prov. 16.23); יֹסִיף (Prov. 19.4); אוֹסִיף (Prov. 23.35); יֹסִיף (Ruth 1.17); יוֹסִפוּ (Lam. 4.15); יוֹסִיף (Lam. 4.16); יוֹסִיף (Lam. 4.22); וְיוֹסֵף (Qoh. 1.18a); יוֹסִיף (Qoh. 1.18b); וַיֹּסִיפוּ (1 Chron. 14.13); יוֹסִיף (1 Chron. 17.9); יוֹסִיף (1 Chron. 17.18); תּוֹסֵף (1 Chron. 22.14); אֹסִיף (2 Chron. 10.11); אֹסִיף (2 Chron. 10.14); אוֹסִיף (2 Chron. 33.8); **jussive/*wayyiqṭol* forms of ambiguous stem:** וַתֹּסֶף (Gen. 4.2 [J]); וַיֹּסֶף (Gen. 8.10 [J]); וַיֹּסֶף (Gen. 18.29 [J]); וַיֹּסֶף (Gen. 25.1 [E]); יֹסֵף (Gen. 30.24 [J]); וַתֹּסֶף (Gen. 38.5 [J]); אַל־יֹסֵף (Exod. 8.25 [E]); וַיֹּסֶף (Exod. 9.34 [E]); אַל־תֹּסֶף (Exod. 10.28 [E]); וַיֹּסֶף (Num. 22.15 [E]); וַיֹּסֶף (Num. 22.25 [E]); וַיֹּסֶף (Num. 22.26 [E]); יֹסֵף (Deut. 1.11 [Dtr₁]); אַל־תּוֹסֶף (Deut. 3.26 [Dtr₁]); וַיֹּסֶף (Judg. 9.37); וַיֹּסֶף (Judg. 11.14); וַיֹּסֶף (1 Sam. 3.6); וַיֹּסֶף (1 Sam. 3.8); וַיֹּסֶף (1 Sam. 3.21); וַיֹּסֶף (1 Sam. 9.8); וַיֹּאסֶף (1 Sam.

18.29); וַתִּוֹסֶף (1 Sam. 19.8); וַיֹּסֶף (1 Sam. 19.21); וַיְוֹסֶף (1 Sam. 20.17); וַ (1 Sam. 23.4); וַיֹּסֶף (2 Sam. 2.22); וַיֹּסֶף (2 Sam. 18.22); וַיֹּסֶךְ (2 Sam. 24.1); וְיֹוסֶף (2 Sam. 24.3); וַיֹּוסֶף (1 Kgs 16.33); וַיְוֹסֶף (Isa. 7.10); וַיֹּסֶף (Isa. 8.5); וַתִּוֹסֶף (Ezek. 23.14); יֹסֵף (Ps. 115.14); וַיֹּסֶף (Job 27.1); וַיֹּסֶף (Job 29.1); וַיֹּסֶף (Job 36.1); אַל־תֹּוסֶף (Job 42.10); אַל־תֹּוסַף (Job 40.32); וְיֹוסֶף (Prov. 1.5); וְיֹוסֶף (Prov. 9.9); אַל־תֹּוסֶף (Prov. 30.6); וַתִּוֹסֶף (Est. 8.3); וַיֹּסֶף (Dan. 10.18); יֹוסֶךְ (1 Chron. 21.3); וַיְוֹסֶף (2 Chr 28.22).