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1.0. Introduction

The final vowel of the masculine singular (ms) imperative of strong verbs in the qal and derived stems alternates between a zero morpheme and -ā, e.g., זכרו ‘remember!’ (Exod. 32.13) vs. זכרה (Neh. 13.29), פלצו ‘deliver!’ (Ps. 32.7) vs. פלצה (Ps. 17.13), תחתו ‘station yourself!’ (2 Sam. 18.30) vs. תחתה (Job 33.5). Most weak verbal classes also show this alternation, e.g., שיב ‘sit!’ (Gen. 20.15) vs. שיב (Gen. 27.19), קוּם ‘arise!’ (Gen. 13.7) vs. קוֹם (Judg. 18.9), הָבְי ‘look!’ (Lam. 3.63) vs. הָבִי (1 Kgs 18.43). III-y verbs in the derived stems, however, show a different alternation in the final vowel of the ms imperative, namely, a zero morpheme and -ē.

Some III-y verbal roots appear in the derived stems with short forms, some appear with long forms, and yet others show up with both short and long, e.g., צו ‘command!’ (Lev. 6.2) vs. צוה (Josh. 4.16), or רחץ ‘stretch forth!’ (Ps. 17.6) vs. רָחֵץ (Ps. 71.2). Are there conditioning factors responsible for the choice of the III-y forms or are short and long merely stylistic variants? In the light of the conditioning factors that have been argued for the employment of short and long imperative forms in the strong and weak verbs, further investigation into the conditioning factors responsible for the III-y imperative forms is necessary.
weak (non-III-y) verbs (see below §3), I propose to re-examine the distribution of the short and long imperative forms in III-y verbs in Biblical Hebrew and the other ancient Hebrew corpora in order to see what factors, if any, regulate their use.

2.0. History of Scholarship

Medieval and modern grammarians have noted the existence of two forms of the III-y ms imperative, but, with few exceptions, have not attempted (e.g., GKC, 214) to explain the difference in use and distribution. Ibn Janah (Bacher 1896, 465) explained the lengthened form רְבֵּה ‘multiply!’ (Judg. 9.29) as a singular imperative that indicates generosity and grace’. Elijah Levita wrote in his commentary to Moses Qimhi’s מהלך שבלי הדעת (1563, 74) on the inflection of III-y verbs:

משריים נלה כמי קוה אל יי והמטבח הלמה לא אמר ובדרךו היא כל כך

the imperative גלה ‘reveal’ like הקה ‘hope in the Lord’ and I wonder why it is not defective without a he like the verse גלعينי ואביטי ‘open my eyes that I may behold!’ [Ps. 119.18]]

The Karaite grammarians, who considered the imperative to be the base of most verbal and some nominal forms (Khan 2000, 39), also noted that some verbs had two forms, of which the shorter one was apocopated from the longer (Skoss 1936–1945, II:503; Khan 2000, 188, 278, 352, 370; Vidro 2013, 276). They did not, however, address the question of whether there
was a difference in meaning or in use between the III-י ms imperatives.

In the modern period Ewald (1870, 588) thought that the vocalisation with ṣere was more poetic and Aramaic. Brockelmann (GvG, I:628) viewed the short forms as older inherited imperatives and those with final -ē as new formations on the analogy of the imperfect. Bauer and Leander (1922, 414) attributed the existence of long and short forms of רברב/רברב and יִתְנֵה/יתנヘ to the merging of the III-י and III-ו classes and considered the final ṣere (for expected hireq) in the derived conjugations to be the result of analogy to the qal imperative. Lambert (1931–1938, 371–72, 374) was of the opinion that there was no clear distinction in use between רברב and יִתְנֵה, but wondered if the long forms רברב, מִשָּה, and רברב (Judg. 9.29) were for marking entreaty, as he believed was the case with the lengthened imperative צְאַה ‘go out!’, which followed רברב in the verse. Lipiński (2001, 357) commented that צְאַה as well as יִתְנֵה represent graphic and dialectal differences, but did not offer an explanation. According to Qimron (2018, 173, 235 n. 234, 252) the short forms found in Ben-Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls reflect spoken speech during the Second Temple Period. In the most recent treatment of the subject, Suchard (2020, 135–36) concurs with Brockelmann and the consensus that the short imperatives are the historically inherited forms. Suchard views the long forms in the derived verbal stems as the result of analogy with qal forms.¹

¹ See also Suchard (2017, 213–17).
3.0. Biblical Hebrew

Qal III-y imperatives show no fluctuation: there are only long forms, all of which end in ṣere.² Attested imperatives include הָלֵּךְ ‘uncover!’ (Ezek. 12.3), הָי ‘be!’ (also הָיָה, 13x), הָלְךֻּ ‘live!’ (Gen. 20.7; Prov. 4.4; 7.2), הָיָה ‘erase!’ (Ps. 51.3, 11), הָי ‘count!’ (2 Sam. 4.21), הָיָה ‘stretch out!’ (11x), הָלֵּךְ ‘ascend!’ (39x), הָי ‘answer!’ (Mic. 6.3; Prov. 26.5), הָי ‘do!’ (62x), הָי ‘acquire!’ (20x), הָי ‘see!’ (84x), הָי ‘have dominion’ (Ps. 110.2), הָי ‘take captive!’ (Judg. 5.12), הָי ‘drink!’ (8x). Only one nifʿal verb is attested and it is also with -ē: הָי ‘show yourself!’ (1 Kgs 18.1).

The two examples of hitpaʿel imperatives are both short and without a final vowel: הָי ‘feign illness!’ (2 Sam. 13.5), הָי ‘contend with!’ (Deut. 2.24).

It is in piʿel and hifʿil verbs that one finds fluctuation. Both short and long forms are found with the following verbs:

- הַנְּח ‘stretch forth!’ (Ps. 17.6; 119.3; 144.5; Prov. 4.20; 5.1; 22.17) vs. הָנָח (2 Kgs 19.16; Isa. 37.37; Ps. 31.3; 71.2; 86.1; 88.3; 102.3; Dan. 9.18)
- הַמַּג ‘strike!’ (Exod. 8.12; 2 Kgs 6.18; 13.18; Ezek. 21.19; Amos 9.1; Zech. 13.7) vs. הָמַג (Ezek. 6.11)
- ה ‘command!’ (Lev. 6.2; 24.2; Num. 5.2; 28.2; 34.2; 35.2; Deut. 2.4; 3.28; 2 Kgs 20.1; Isa. 28.10, 13; 38.1) vs. ה (Josh. 4.16; 1 Kgs 5.20; Ps. 44.5)

²Richard Steiner (2020) has recently argued that הָלֵּךְ in the notoriously difficult הָלֵּךְ בְּשֹׁם הָיָה (Num 21.14) is a short ms imperative ‘come!’ from the root א-טכ.
The hif'il ms imperative of הֶרֶּב ‘increase!’ (Judg. 20.38; Ps. 51.4 qere) vs. הֶרֶּף (Ezek. 24.10; Ps. 51.4 ketiv)

רָכָח ‘let go’, refrain!’ (Deut. 9.14; 1 Sam. 11.3; 15.16; 2 Sam. 24.16; Ps. 37.8; 1 Chron. 21.15) vs. רָכַּף (Judg. 11.37; 2 Kgs 4.27)

The hif'il ms imperative of הֵרֵם is attested with a short form three times: הֵרֵמ ‘bring up!’ (Exod. 8.1; 33.12; Num. 20.25). There is one possible example of the long form: הֵרֵּפֵה ‘Bring up a mob against them and make them an object of horror and plunder!’ (Ezek. 23.46), though some prefer to take the verb as an infinitive absolute (e.g., BDB, 749a).³

Only short forms are found with the following pi'el verbs: הָעַל ‘uncover!’ (Ps. 119.18; 22); מָעַל ‘entreat!’ (1 Kgs 13.6); מִעַל ‘appoint!’ (Ps. 61.8); מִעֲל ‘test!’ (Dan. 1.12). On the other hand, only long forms show up with the pi'el verbs מָכַּה ‘wait!’ (Hab. 2.3), מַכְּה ‘consume!’ (Ps. 59.14 [2x]; 74.11); מַקְּה ‘hope!’ (Jer. 8.15; 14.19; Hos. 12.7; Ps. 27.14 [2x]; 37.34; Prov. 20.22); מַרְבַּה ‘enlarge!’ (Judg. 9.29; with segol for expected sere). Another possible example is מַלְכַּה רָעָה נְתִית הַרְוֵי ‘Saturate its furrows, lower

³ No morphological difference between the infinitive absolute and long form of the ms imperative is expected in hif'il III-y verbs: both end in -ē. One should also bear in mind that the infinitive absolute overlaps in function with the imperative at the beginning of a clause, e.g., זָכָר אֶת־יָהֶם ‘Remember the Sabbath day!’ (Exod. 20.8). Those who prefer to analyse הֵרֵמ as an infinitive absolute do so because of parallelism to the infinitive absolute הָרַך in the continuation of the verse.
its ridges!’ (Ps. 65.11), though it is generally interpreted as an infinitive absolute ‘saturating’ (and ‘lowering’; e.g., BDB, 924a).\footnote{Like הניח, the form קבל, can be taken as a pi'el imperative or infinitive absolute. See n. 2 above.}

Are there conditioning factors at play? Different possibilities come to mind. In the case of the two forms of the ms imperative of the strong verb, קבל and קטל, I believe the longer ones are marked forms indicating that the action is directed towards the speaker or for his benefit, whereas the short forms are usually used when the action is directed towards someone else (Fassberg 1999), e.g., הניחה ‘give me!’ (Josh. 14.12) but הניחו ‘and give him!’ (Josh. 7.19). This conditioned usage is evident from the fact that the longer imperatives are more often than not followed by particles and nouns with the 1 s. and pl. suffix pronouns, e.g., הניחו ‘serve me!’ (Gen. 27.25), ‘let go of me!’ (Judg. 16.26), ‘rule over us!’ (Judg. 9.8 qere), ‘give us!’ (1 Sam. 8.5), ‘save my life!’ (Ps. 116.4). Further proof is found in the use of the long imperatives לכה, לכה, and קוומ as exhortations before verbs in first-person cohortative forms, in which the speaker includes himself in the performance of the action (Mann 1954), e.g., לכה נלבחה לכהים ‘let us make bricks!’ (Gen. 11.3), ‘let us make a covenant!’ (Gen. 31.44), ‘let us return!’ (Jer. 46.16). On the other hand, a pragmatic conditioning factor of respect and politeness on the part of inferiors when addressing superiors has been argued for the long forms by some scholars (Lambert 1931–
1938, 255–57; Kaufman 1991, 198), and others have spoken of stylistic variants (GKC, 132; Joüon 1923, 108–9; Waltke-O’Connor 1990, 571) or emphasis (Ewald 1870, 583; Meyer 1992, 221).

Do any of these interpretations fit the data of verbs III-y? As for direction towards the speaker, all eight occurrences of הבית are found involving direction to the speaker (2 Kgs 19.16; Isa. 37.17; Ps. 31.3; 71.2; 86.1; 88.3; 102.3; Dan 9.18), but הבית is also attested in a similar context in five of the six occurrences (Ps. 17.6; 119.36; Prov. 4.20; 5.1; 22.17; but not in Ps. 144.5). There does not seem to be direction towards the speaker with the other verbs.

As for being a polite form, צ ו is used when God addresses Moses (Lev. 6.2; 24.2; Num. 5.2; 28.2; 34.2; 35.2; Deut. 3.28) and when Isaiah turns to Hezekiah in the name of God (2 Kgs 20.1 = Isa. 38.1), whereas הבית is employed by God in speaking to Joshua (Josh. 4.16), Solomon to Hiram (1 Kgs 5.20), and man to God (Ps. 44.5). הבית is used when God speaks to Moses (Exod. 8.12), Ezekiel (Ezek. 21.19), Amos (Amos 9.1), and a prophet (Zech. 13.7), and it is also used when Elisha addresses Joash, king of Israel (2 Kgs 13.18); הבית is attested when God turns to Ezekiel (Ezek. 6.11). הבית is found in the speech of God when talking to Moses (Deut. 9.14), God turning to a messenger (2 Sam. 24.16 = 1 Chron. 21.15), the elders of Jabesh to Naḥash the Ammonite (1 Sam. 11.3), and Samuel to Saul (1 Sam. 15.16); הבית occurs when

---

5 For discussions of politeness strategies in Biblical Hebrew, see, e.g., Estelle (2012) and Morrison (2013). Jenni (2002) proposes a further twist to the politeness strategy and suggests that the speaker adopts the long form when acknowledging the right of the addressee to refuse.
Jephthah’s daughter speaks with her father (Judg. 11.37), and Elisha with his servant (2 Kgs 4.27). The ט is spoken by man to God (2 Kgs 19.16; Isa. 37.17; Ps. 31.3; 71.2; 86.1; 88.3; 102.3; Dan. 9.18); ט is also uttered by man to God (Ps. 17.6; 119.36; 144.5) as well as by a father to a son (Prov. 4.20; 5.1; 22.17). In short, it does not appear that either interpretation, direction to the speaker or politeness, applies to III-y imperatives.

Is the choice of form dependent upon the collocation? ב י ש רָא ל is common to Lev. 24.2; Num. 5.2; 28.2; 34.2; 35.2. There is no such collocation with ט.土 occurs in Ps. 17.6; Prov. 4.20; 5.1; and 22.17, yet ט (אָז) can be seen in Ps. 31.3; 71.2; 88.3; 102.3; ט is found in 2 Kgs 19.16; Isa. 37.17; and Ps. 86.1; וּטְּאָז is found in Dan. 9.18. The short form is attested with another part of the body: ט (Ps. 119.36). Due to the limited number of III-y ms imperatives, it is difficult to say more about the possibility of other collocations.

Further analysis of the data, however, hints at possible chronological conditioning. In those cases where there is a short and long pair of the masculine singular, the long form is absent from the Pentateuch and is attested only in the Prophets and the Writings. This suggests that the long form became more frequent as time went by. That is not to say, however, that the short form

---

6 According to most biblical scholars, the Pentateuch was the first section of the Hebrew Bible to have crystallized. Therefore one may generally assume that its language is also older than that found in the Prophets and the Writings. This is certainly true when looking at the language of the exilic and post-exilic books. See Fassberg (2012, 173–74).
is restricted to the Pentateuch. Prosodic factors probably played a role in the choice of form, particularly in poetic contexts.

4.0. Other Ancient Hebrew Corpora

4.1. Epigraphic Hebrew

Inscriptional material from the First Temple period yields no unequivocal examples of ms III-\(y\) imperatives. Although graphically interpretable as imperatives, the following forms have been taken contextually as 3 ms perfect forms: ‘and now your servant has inclined his heart’ (Arad 40.4); ‘and now behold my lord has done’ (Arad 21.3); ‘thus did your servant. I wrote on the door/sheet’ (Lachish 4.3). Another example, ‘make your way!’, has been interpreted by Lemaire and Yardeni (2006, 197–98) and Aḥituv (2012, 201) as a defective spelling for the qal imperative \(\text{עְשֶׁה}\), but by Bloch (2014) as the pi‘el imperative \(\text{עְשֶׁה}\), which is unattested in the Hebrew Bible.

4.2. Ben Sira

The book of Ben Sira contains a number of III-\(y\) imperatives. All qal imperatives, as expected, are long: ‘be like!’ (38.5 MS B), ‘be!’ (4.10 MS A + 9x), ‘yearn for!’ (38.16 MS B), ‘answer!’ (5.12 MSS A and C; 9.14 MS A), ‘do!’ (14.16 MS A; 51.30 MS C), ‘see!’ (6.36 MS A + 3x), ‘graze!’ (34.15 MS B; 38.16 MSS B and D), ‘repeat!’ (33.6 MS B). There is one nif‘al, which is long: ‘seek counsel!’ (4.28; <"עֵשֶׁה"\>). Three short forms of pi‘el verbs are attested: ‘finish!’ (35.8 MS B; as opposed to MT \(כָּלָה\) Ps. 74.11),
‘test!’ (37.27 [2x], cf. MT יִסָּמֶה Dan. 1.12) and ‘entice!’ (30.23 MS B; there are no biblical occurrences of the ms). There are also two long forms: שָׁנָה ‘hope!’ (6.19 MSS A and C + 2x) and ‘change!’ (33.6 MS B). As for hif‘il verbs, the short form of נְס is attested three times, all in collocations containing parts of the body: (4.8 MS A), ‘bend your shoulder and carry her’ (6.25 MS A), and ‘and if you incline your ear, you will be disciplined’ (6.33 MS A). Qimron (2018, 173 n. 52) believes there is an additional example in increase!’ (30.38 MS E), though the reading is not certain. There might be one short hitpa‘el imperative, if the proposed reading and reconstruction by Ben-Ḥayyim are correct: נְשָׁהְיִתְואֱא הַר עַזְּךְ ‘make friends!’ (11.1 MS A; Ben-Ḥayyim 1973, 281; so, too, Qimron 2018, 173 n. 52).

4.3. Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran

One finds in the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran both short and long forms. In the biblical scrolls the imperatives correspond almost always to those attested in the Masoretic Text (Qimron, 2018, 173 n. 51). In the non-biblical manuscripts, the forms usually echo those found in biblical collocations. Here are the Qumran attestations:

(4QPs[4Q90] 1–2, 18 = Ps. 119.18; 11QPs[11Q5] VII, 4 = Ps. 119.18)
(1QIsa XXX, 22 = Isa. 37.17; 4QPs[4Q83] 9 II, 6 = Ps. 71.2; 11QPs[11Q5] XXIV, 4 = Ps. 144.3; 11QPs[11Q5] XXIII, 15–16 = Ps. 144.5)
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(4QSama [4Q51] 102 I, 12 = 2 Sam. 13.5)

(4QXII 65–68, 6 = Amos 9.1; PAM 43.682.1.2 = 2 Kgs 13.18)

(4QTPob [4Q200] 4, 7; cf. Hab. 2.3)

(4QExod 1–2, 4 = Exod. 8.1)

(4QJubf [4Q221] 4, 3; [4QRPc [4Q365] 23, 4 = Lev. 24.2; 4QLev–Numa [4Q23] 34 II, 47 = Num. 5.2; 1QIsaα XXXI, 21 = Isa. 38.1)

(4QPs [4Q85] 15 II–16, 32 = Ps. 51.4 and 4QPs 15 II–16, 32 = Ps. 51.4 ketiv; )

(4QPs [4Q91] f8, 4–5 = Ps. 51.4)

(4QpPs [4Q171] 1–2 II, 1 = Ps. 37.8)

Possible additional examples that occur in poorly preserved contexts include

(4QPapRit Pur B [4Q512] 106, 1; 4QPs [4Q85] 15 II–16, 32 = Ps. 51.4)

(4QMystα [4Q299] 8, 6; perfect?; 4QBSarkhi Nafshiα [4Q434] 1 I, 7; adverb הרבח?)

4.4. Other Sites in the Judean Desert

In the Judean Desert material from between the First and Second Jewish Revolts, there are two poorly preserved examples from biblical texts: [5/6Hév 1b 13 II, 5 = Ps. 31.3] and [Mur 88 VIII, 7 = Amos 9.1]. Other instances are
attested in the Bar Kosiba letters and only with the qal verb: יהו" be well!' (Mur 44.8); יהו שלום (Mur 46.11); יהו שלום (Mur 42.7; the 'alef is apparently an error); יהו שלום (Mur 48.6); יהו שלום (Yadin 49.14). This imperative form is taken by many to be Aramaic and not Hebrew, as are the instances of יהו" in Biblical Hebrew, Samaritan Hebrew, and Tannaitic Hebrew (Mor 2016, 158 nn. 855–57).

4.5. Samaritan Pentateuch

There are no short imperatives in the oral tradition of the Samaritan Pentateuch. All forms in all stems end in a final -i, e.g., ēli ‘ascend!’ (Samaritan Pentateuchal written tradition עליה Gen. 35.1 = MT עליה, ēliיעתי Exod. 33.12 = MT עליי). MT צי ‘order!’ (e.g., Deut. 2.4) is realized as ṣābi (in the written tradition), and MT הכהʿ ‘strike!’ (Exod. 8.12) as wakki (written tradition; Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 186–87). The IIIʾ verbs כר ‘fill’ and קרא ‘call’ follow the inflection of III-y verbs: לֶֽמַל (麻辣 Gen. 44.1 = MT מל, לַמְלַל), מַלִיל (מליל Gen. 29.27 = MT מליל), קֵרִי (קריבו Deut. 31.14 = MT קרי), נֶֽתָֽה (נשה Exod. 7.19 = MT נשא always (11x) ends with an a-vowel, for it appears to have been treated as if from the root נשת, נשת, נשת, the Samaritan Targum equivalent of יֹשִׁיחו" (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 146).

7 Signs of the merger of verbs IIIʾ and III-y can be found already in Classical Biblical Hebrew (GKC, 206). The phenomenon increases in the Second Temple period, as seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Kutscher 1974, 343) and particularly Tannaitic Hebrew (Segal 1927, 90). The merger of IIIʾ and III-y is a salient feature of Aramaic.
arrəf (הֶרֶפְּ) is derived in the Samaritan tradition from רֵפָּנָה (Ben-Ḥayyim 2000, 186 n. 139).

4.6. Secunda

Two imperatival forms are attested in the Secunda of the Hexapla, both of which correspond to the Masoretic Text (Brønno 1943, 100): αίη (ḥayyim Ps. 30.11; 31.3); εττη (ḥayyim Ps. 31.3).

4.7. Tannaitic Hebrew

Tannaitic Hebrew evidences the long forms in all stems (Segal 1927, 92; Haneman 1980, 385–87), e.g., הרף ממני ואשמידם ‘let me alone so that I will destroy them’ (Sifre 27, citing Deut. 9.14), הרף אזנך ושמעי ‘incline your ear to hear!’ (Seder Olam Rabba, citing Prov. 22.17). An exception is הרף את הפירות האלו לירושלם לחלק ‘bring up these fruits to Jerusalem to distribute!’ (m. Ma‘aser Sheni 3.1; t. Shev. 6.23).

5.0. Conclusion

The distribution of long and short forms of the ms imperative of III-y verbs does not correspond to the conditioning factors that have been suggested for the short and long forms of the ms imperative of strong verbs and most weak verbs. The data from ancient Hebrew sources seem to indicate that the later the text, the greater the chance that one will find in it long ms III-y imperative forms in the derived conjugations. This is the case in the later books of the Hebrew Bible, in the oral tradition of the Samaritan
Pentateuch, and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In Ben Sira one finds two short forms unattested in Biblical Hebrew as well as an unattested long form.

It has been suggested by Qimron that the existence of short ms III-y imperative forms in Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls is proof that the short forms were used in speech in the Second Temple period. This interpretation of the data should be viewed in the light of Qimron’s general approach that the orthography of the Dead Sea Scrolls should often be taken at face value and may represent the *ipsissima verba* of the Qumran community. Such an explanation of the written data, I believe, underestimates the role of written classicisms in the Hebrew of the Second Temple period, a period when writers tried and, on the whole, succeeded in imitating the Hebrew of the First Temple period (Kutscher 1974, 31). Scribes knew the classical biblical system and generated new forms that were unattested in writings from the First Temple period. At times they were guilty of pseudo-classicisms (Joosten 1999). The existence of III-y short forms in Second Temple Period texts does not prove that Hebrew speakers continued to generate short forms in speech. It does prove, however, that they continued to write them.

References


Haneman, Gideon. 1980. *A Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew According to the Tradition of the Parma Manuscript (De-Rossi 138)*. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University. [Hebrew]


Qimḥi, Moses. 1563. מחלék שבלי ודות. Mantua.


