Cambridge Semitic Languages and Cultures

The Verb in Classical Hebrew
The Linguistic Reality behind the Consecutive Tenses

Bo Isaksson

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies

https://www.openbookpublishers.com

Semitic Languages and Cultures 27

ISSN (print): 2632-6906
ISSN (digital): 2632-6914

ISBN Paperback: 978-1-80511-350-8
ISBN Hardback: 978-1-80511-351-5
ISBN Digital (PDF): 978-1-80511-352-2

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0414

Cover image: Fragments of Hebrew Bible manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah. Left: Cambridge University Library, T-S A20.16 (Ruth 1.18–2.9). Right: Cambridge University Library, T-S A18.4 (Ezra 3.2–4.2). Courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library. Cover design: Jeevanjot Kaur Nagpal

The main fonts used in this volume are Charis SIL and SBL Hebrew.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Aim

The traditional system of consecutive tenses in Biblical Hebrew has three hallmarks:[1]

1. The syntactic distributional opposition between clause-initial *waw*-consecutive forms and the corresponding non-initial *waw*-less forms. *Wayyiqṭol* and *wə-qaṭal* are clause-initial, while long *yiqṭol* forms and *qaṭal* forms must be non-initial.
2. The explicit opposition in temporal, aspectual, and modal semantics between two pairs of constructions: *wayyiqṭol / qaṭal* and *wə-qaṭal /* long *yiqṭol*. In short terms: *wayyiqṭol* 'equals' *qaṭal* (past meaning), and *wə-qaṭal* 'equals' long *yiqṭol* (present/future meaning).
3. Certain semantic, pragmatic, or discourse-conditioned notions associated with the '*waw*-consecutive' constructions *wayyiqṭol* and *wə-qaṭal*, in contrast to their '*waw*-less' counterparts *qaṭal* and long *yiqṭol*. Usually, the difference between the pairs is described as one of (temporal or logical) sequentiality (or foregrounding) for the *waw*-consecutive clauses in contrast to the non-consecutive verb forms.

At the heart of the matter stands the role of word order, with a conspicuous alternation of clauses with initial verb (type *wa-VX*) and clauses with non-initial verb (Isaksson 2015d; 2021a, 204).

 https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0414.01

Grammars of Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH) describe an alternation of 'forms' in double pairs: *wayyiqṭol* alternates with its 'equivalent' *qaṭal*, and *wə-qaṭal* alternates with its 'equivalent' long *yiqṭol*.[2] "This standard treatment is problematic and unsatisfactory" because it places "too much semantic weight on the *waw* conjunction" (Cook 2012a, 313f.). Especially problematic is the nature of the *waw* conjunction in the *wayyiqṭol* type of clauses.

It is commonly held in comparative Semitic linguistics that the short *yiqṭol* in Biblical Hebrew has an historical background in an old short prefixed conjugation *yaqtul* with perfective meaning (Isaksson 2021, 197).[3] This short *yiqṭol* is attested in freestanding form in the Archaic Hebrew poetry and with two basic meanings, indicative (past) and jussive (Notarius 2013, 307, 313). In classical prose, the indicative meanings of short *yiqṭol* are found only with word order restriction, in *wayyiqṭol* (Smith 1991, 6; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416; Blau 2010, 150). In comparison with the relatively free usage of short *yaqtul* in Amarna Canaanite, the indicative short *yiqṭol* in Classical Hebrew has been replaced by *qaṭal* in most positions and functions; the only exception is the *wayyiqṭol* syntagm (Rainey 1986, 5; Baranowski 2016a, §4.2).[4] By contrast, the jussive short *yiqṭol* is retained in freestanding form (Isaksson 2021a, 198). It is "fairly frequent that perfective categories may have non-past reference in non-indicative moods or (which is the same thing) certain non-assertive contexts" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 84; also Tropper 1998, 168; Palmer 2001, ch. 8; Isaksson 2021a, 198).

Table 1: Short *yiqṭol* for past and jussive meanings (Tiberian vocalisation)

	Indicative (past)	**Jussive**
Archaic Hebrew poetry[5]	*Ø-yiqṭol*, *wayyiqṭol*	*Ø-yiqṭol*, *wə-yiqṭol*
Classical prose	*wayyiqṭol*	*Ø-yiqṭol*, *wə-yiqṭol*

A problem with the theory of consecutive tenses is that it contains assumptions about verbal morphology ('tenses' with *waw*) that belong to the realm of macro-syntax (continuity and discontinuity in a text). There is certainly a 'truth' contained in the theory, but this 'truth' is macro-syntactic, not morphological.[6]

It is a thesis of this book that the basic suppositions of Tropper (1996; 1998), Van de Sande (2008, 206–39) and Cook (2012a, 315) accord with the linguistic reality in the CBH texts: there was only one single conjunction -ו *wa* 'and' in Biblical Hebrew (Isaksson 2021a, 205f.). It is a principle of economy—"a proposed development that accounts for the most data with the least effort is usually to be preferred" (Huehnergard 2006, 3).

To prove this thesis, Classical Hebrew linguistics must be able to account for the following issues in CBH (Isaksson 2021a, 206f.):

1. why *wa* has two formal variants (*wə-* and *way-*) in the Masoretic text;
2. the status of the short *yiqṭol* (with both past and jussive meanings) as a separate verbal morpheme distinct from long *yiqṭol*;
3. how long *yiqṭol* was distinguished from short *yiqṭol*;
4. why *qaṭal* came to alternate with the inherited *wayyiqṭol*;

5. why *wə-qaṭal* acquired imperfective meanings and came to alternate with the inherited long *yiqṭol* (< **yaqtulu*);
6. the linguistic reality behind *wa* in the 'consecutive tenses'.

The first point, about the Tiberian variants of the conjunction *wa*, will be treated already in this introductory chapter (§1.2.5). The second, about the status of short *yiqṭol* in CBH, is treated in §3. The third, on how long *yiqṭol* was distinguished from short *yiqṭol*, is discussed in §3.4 and §4. The fourth point is treated in §5, which discusses the emerging *qaṭal* morpheme in relation to the indicative short *yiqṭol* (in the *way-yiqṭol* clause-type). The fifth, about the much-discussed origin of the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type, is treated in §6. Finally, the sixth point is treated in §2 and §7.

These are the questions to be treated in the book. The answers will constitute an account of the linguistic reality behind the 'consecutive tenses'. Since it is these that are in focus, less attention will be paid to the jussive meaning of the short *yiqṭol*.

1.2. Method and Terminology

The description of CBH will be both descriptive and reconstructive. In recent linguistic research, it has become obvious that a purely synchronic description of an ancient language is not sufficiently illuminating. An understanding of the diachronic processes is necessary in order to fully grasp a verbal category in the extant texts (Givón 1979, 271; Cook 2012a). For this reason, I will use the methods of historical linguistics: internal reconstruction and comparative Semitic reconstruction.[7] They will be sup-

plemented by other approaches: diachronic typology and grammaticalisation. On this point, the work on comparative Semitic linguistics by Kouwenberg (2010a; cf. Kogan 2012) has been an inspiration. It is truly philological, based on knowledge of the texts, and at the same time linguistically sound. Another source of inspiration has been the standard work on grammaticalisation by Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994).[8] It is data-driven, not theory-driven, and based on empirical data from languages representative of all the major genetic groups in the world. A third inspiration has been the sharp evaluation of previous research found in Cook (2012a).

1.2.1. Diachronic Typology and Grammaticalisation in a Comparative Semitic Setting

"Historically, the study of the BHVS has suffered from idiosyncratic analyses that find no support among the recent typological classifications (e.g., the *waw hahippuk* theory of the *waw*-prefixed verbal forms)" (Cook 2012a, 185). Diachronic typology starts from the assumption that language variation and language change are subject to universal restrictions. Typology investigates "what is a more probable, as opposed to less probable, human language" (Song 2001, 3). "[D]iachronic developments tend to follow rather narrowly circumscribed paths that recur again and again with different lexical means" (Kouwenberg 2010a, 3). What I like most in diachronic typology is that it "intertwines the cross-linguistic with the diachronic… grammaticization paths are similar across languages" (Bybee et al. 1994, 23).

Diachronic analysis increases the explanatory power of linguistic descriptions (Cook 2012a, 178, 185).[9] It is a great achievement to be able to demonstrate how a grammatical category came to have a certain function. Establishing the forces behind a grammatical change reveals "the cognitive and communicative factors which underlie grammatical meaning" (Bybee et al. 1994, 3). Studying only a synchronic stage (if such a thing is possible at all) does not allow us to explain the meanings of specific grammatical morphemes.[10] "Viewing the synchronic slice as simply one stage in a long series of developments helps us explain the nature of grammar at any particular moment" (Bybee et al. 1994, 4). Finally, similarities between languages, not least those in the Semitic family, "are more easily seen from a diachronic perspective" (Bybee et al. 1994, 4).

Grammaticalisation is defined as (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 18):

> a term referring to the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions.[11]

Grams, or verbal morphemes, are a closed class of morphemes. There are usually only a handful of them, and they are determined by a restricted grammatical behaviour, unique for each morpheme. The TAM terminology is used for the semantic description of such morphemes. Some such morphemes are commonly called perfect, imperfect, or progressive, and often they consist of only one word with stem and affixes.[12]

Grammaticalisation theory observes how "grammatical morphemes develop gradually out of lexical morphemes or combinations of lexical morphemes with lexical or grammatical morphemes" (Bybee et al. 1994, 4).[13] An important type of grammaticalisation is semantic generalisation, whereby the meaning of a morpheme undergoes a process of bleaching (or generalisation), which is a parallel to the phonological reduction that the grammaticalised element undergoes (Bybee 1985, 17; Bybee and Dahl 1989, 56, 63). Such phonological reduction usually involves loss of independent stress, and loss of lexical status, which results in "reduction or loss of segmental material and the reduction in the length" (Bybee et al. 1994, 6) of the grammatical morpheme.[14] Such a reduction renders the resulting grammaticalised morpheme unsegmentable, and this reduction also means that the morpheme becomes more and "more dependent on surrounding material and begins to fuse with other grammatical or lexical morphemes in its environment" (Bybee et al. 1994, 6). As a parallel to the semantic and phonological reduction comes an increasing fixation of the syntactic position of the morpheme, and this fixing of the syntactic position causes the gram to gradually "fuse with other elements in its environment" (Bybee et al. 1994, 7).[15]

The source concepts that are grammaticalised are basic to human experience and "tend to be conceived of in a similar way across linguistic and ethnic boundaries" (Heine et al. 1991, 33), which "partially account[s] for the great similarities in grammaticization paths across genetically and areally unrelated languages" (Bybee et al. 1994, 10). An example is the use of the word for 'face' in a construction that means 'in front of' in a large

number of unrelated languages. The substantive retains its concrete meaning ‘face’, but at the same time develops a generalised meaning ‘front’, which becomes the basis for a construction with the meaning ‘in front of, before’, which is grammaticalised to a preposition, such as CBH *lifnē* (preposition *lə-* + *pānɛ̄* ‘face’).

If structuralism in linguistics can be viewed as constituting “dramatic shifts from an essentialist to a relationalist conception of reality” (Korchin 2006, 14), the grammaticalisation theory represents a return to essentialism (Cook 2012a, 176f.). The typical concern of grammaticalisation studies is verbal morphemes, and such morphemes may possess meanings of their own, while at the same time influencing the functions and meanings of other morphemes. New verb forms develop and gradually take over the functions of older forms (Cook 2012a, 177).[16]

An important result of the investigation of grammaticalisations is that the source of the grammaticalisation, the original construction of lexical elements that undergoes a bleaching and semantic reduction, “uniquely determines the grammaticalisation path” (Bybee et al. 1994, 12).[17] This means, for example, that a construction that gives rise to a present tense morpheme cannot also give rise to a past tense. The paths for developing verbal morphemes tend to be similar around the world.[18] The grammatical morpheme develops in several steps, and the meanings it acquires during this process can be regarded as different stages on a specific cross-linguistic path. For example, resultative constructions generalise to anteriors with a strong shade of personal involvement of the subject. Anteriors evolve into perfectives or pasts with a diminished personal involvement and greater distance

distance from the subject in space and time (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 57). But past tenses do not develop into resultatives. Grammaticalisations are unidirectional.[19] It has turned out that "many languages have a general past, perfective, present, imperfective, or future whose functions are very similar," and the paths to them are similar cross-linguistically (Bybee et al. 1994, 12, 15; Hopper and Traugott 2003, 7, 17).

Certain original meanings of the source construction may be retained for a long time in the grammaticalisation process ('expansion'; Croft 2003, 262).[20] Remnants of earlier meanings "are detectable in certain contexts" (Bybee et al. 1994, 16). The grammatical meaning(s) of a morpheme can thus be considered "links on a chain, one having given rise to another" (Bybee et al. 1994, 17). Multiple meanings of a grammatical morpheme constitute the diachronically ordered links of a chain, the first link of which is the most ancient and the last link the youngest. For example, perfective grammatical morphemes may be used to indicate past events that have relevance to the current situation (anterior meaning). Such categories may have evolved from resultatives, which means that, in one specific context, a perfective morpheme exhibits perfective/past meaning; in another context, a past with personal involvement and relevance in the present situation; and in yet another context, a resultative. If a past-tense conjugation shows in some contexts a resultative meaning, then we can with confidence conclude that its grammaticalisation has been built on a stative verb as the source construction (Bybee et al. 1994, 18).

Cross-linguistic data show that a language may have more than one grammatical morpheme representing the same type of

verbal category. Earlier forms (grammatical morphemes) usually coexist with later ones (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 16). In English, there are three regular futures, all used in their particular contexts: *will*, *shall*, and *be going to*. This is a typical situation. The rise of a future marker does not necessitate the loss of its predecessors, and this is a common phenomenon, not least for expressions of future and modality (Bybee et al. 1994, 21). In addition, earlier meanings may interact with and constrain later meanings (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 16). In Classical Hebrew, we encounter two new intruding verbal forms: an anterior/perfective gram (*qaṭal*), which competes with the older *wayyiqṭol*, and a present/progressive gram (*qoṭel*), which competes with the older imperfective long *yiqṭol*. It is fruitful in this instance to use the term 'renewal': the renewal of the durative meaning of the imperfective category, and the renewal of the (personal) involvement in the past perfective category (Rundgren 1963). "Where a long historical record is available, the process of renewal can be seen to occur repeatedly" (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 9). A classic formulation of the renewal of the anterior/perfective is found in Kuryłowicz (1964, 22):[21]

> As regards the so-called *perfect* the normal evolution seems to be: *derived form* (or verbal noun + auxiliary) > *perfect* > *indetermined past* ('passé indéfini') > *narrative* tense. The derivative is adopted as a regular member of the conjugation in order to replace the old form of the perfect, which, having been additionally charged with the narrative function, has lost its expressiveness.

The renewal of the durative aspect, which can also be called cursive, is formulated in this way (Kuryłowicz 1964, 20):

> The most important phenomenon which has repeated itself over and over again and has left numerous traces in the old I.E. languages, is the renewal of the *durative* character of the verbal forms denoting the moment of speaking (present-imperfect system). The durative form may easily invade other semantic spheres: general ('timeless') present, futurity, modality ('capability', 'eventuality'), etc. This expansion, involving the loss of expressiveness (i.e., of concentration on durativity), is the cause of drawing upon derived forms designed to renew the durative function. A formal split is likely to ensue: durative present (new form) and general or indetermined present (old form), present (new form) and future (old form), indicative (new form) and subjunctive (old form).

A renewal may lead to a situation when the centre (prototypical meaning) of the older gram is "invaded by the younger one, but keeps the periphery for the time being" (Dahl 2000, 10). Typical cases are progressives/imperfectives that lose their protypical progressive and imperfective meanings when a new progressive formation is introduced. Such a process may lead to "grams whose domain has been reduced by the invasion of another gram" (residual grams; Dahl 2000, 10; also Bybee and Dahl 1989, 84).[22]

Grammaticalisation always involves a moment of *reanalysis* (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 59). In reanalysis, a receiver of an utterance understands a grammatical form as having a structure and meaning that are different from those understood by the sender. The well-known example is *hamburger* 'item (of food) from Hamburg', which is heard as [*ham*] + [*burger*], a burger made of ham. "Sooner or later someone substitutes the word *cheese* or *beef* for *ham*" (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 50). When

this happens, the reanalysis (*ham* + *burger*) has already occurred. Thus reanalysis could be defined as a silent rebracketing of an expression, and such a rebracketing may occur also with syntactic sequences, as the English example *be going to* > *be gonna*, and *let us* > *let's* > *lets* shows (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 50f.).[23] Another example is the Latin *dicere habeo* 'I have to say', which in certain contexts is interpreted as obligative or future orientated, until finally the user interprets the syntagm not as two underlying clauses, but as one structure (expressing the future in Late Latin) in which *dicere* is no longer subordinate to *habeo*. The reanalysis process is gradual, and the changes may occur "in different verbs at different times" (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 54f., 57).

In reanalysis, steps are taken from more concrete and specific meanings to more grammatical, more abstract, meanings (semantic bleaching), and at the same time there is an expansion of the domain of applicability of the expression (Dahl 2000, 9; Croft 2003, 261).[24]

An important type of reanalysis concerns the typologically frequent use of past tense verbal forms to express irrealis: distance in time is expressed by a past tense form, a meaning that is utilised as a vehicle for conceptualising other kinds of distance, like distance in epistemic modality. Such is the case in the reanalysed English pluperfect for the expression of modality (Heine et al. 1991, 75f.):

(1) I had helped him.

(2) I had hoped we might get together tonight.

In (1), we can interpret the pluperfect as having a normal tense–aspect meaning. In (2), however, "The speaker, via the pluperfect,

distances himself… from the potential loss of face that a rebuff would entail" (Suzanne Fleischman, quoted from Heine et al. 1991, 75). The (pluperfect) verbal morpheme's property of marking temporal distance is employed as a vehicle to express modality, in this case an interpersonal distance (metaphorical extension; Croft 2003, 269).

When, in this and similar ways, a new grammatical meaning arises, the source expression usually retains its original form, at least for some time (Heine et al. 1991, 213):

> The result is a stage of asymmetry where one and the same linguistic form simultaneously offers two different meanings, a lexical or less grammatical meaning on the one hand and a (more) grammatical one on the other. Synchronically, this results in polysemy or in homonymy.

1.2.2. The TAM Categories

The primary verbal entities to be discussed in this book are (verbal) grammatical morphemes (or verbal forms, or grams), not tenses and not aspects.[25] Notions such as tense, aspect, and mood belong to the semantics of grams in a specific language, and "[m]any, if not most, grams combine elements from several domains in their semantics" (Dahl 2000, 7; also Bybee and Dahl 1989, 97). A verbal grammatical morpheme (gram) has a language-specific behaviour. It "belongs to the grammar of an individual language, rather than to the general theory of human languages" (Dahl 2000, 7). It is one of the findings of recent typological research that a large majority of the languages in the world have verbal grammatical morphemes that belong to one of six *types*, roughly characterised in the following way (cross-linguistic

gram types; Dahl 1985, 33; Bybee and Dahl 1989, 55; Dahl 2000, 7; Cook 2012a, 181):[26]

a. **perfective**, indicating that the situation is viewed as bounded;[27]
b. **imperfective**, indicating that the situation is viewed as not bounded;
c. **progressive** (called **continuous** in Bybee's study), indicating that the situation is in progress at reference time;[28]
d. **future**, indicating that the speaker predicts that the situation will occur subsequent to the speech event;
e. **past**, indicating that the situation occurred before the speech event;
f. **perfect** (called **anterior** in Bybee's study), indicating that the situation is being described as relevant at the moment of speech or another point of reference.

The distinction between *perfective* and *imperfective* "is the most common inflectional aspectual distinction" in the world (Bybee 1985, 141).[29] Next in frequency comes the *progressive / habitual*. It often happens that an imperfective morpheme covers both habitual and continuous meanings (Bybee 1985, 143).

Aspect and tense have a higher relevance to the verb than mood. This is shown by the fact that aspect and tense markers tend to be closer to the stem than mood markers. Highly relevant morphemes "will be tightly fused, while less relevant morphemes will have a looser association with the verb stem" (Bybee 1985, 35f.).[30]

Bybee defines the concepts of *aspect*, *tense*, and *mood* in the following way. "*Aspect* refers to the way the internal temporal

constituency of the situation is viewed" (Bybee 1985, 28). When *aspect* is an inflectional category (and not expressed lexically) it is used to (Bybee 1985, 21; see also 152):

> indicate how the action or state described by the verb should be viewed in the context of the whole discourse. Background information is expressed by imperfective verb forms, and the foregrounded information of the main narrative line appears in perfective verb form.

Regarding *tense* (Bybee 1985, 21; see also 28):

> *Tense* is a deictic category that places a situation in time with respect to the moment of speech, or occasionally with respect to some other pre-established point in time.

Regarding *mood* (Bybee 1985, 22; see also 28, 165):

> *Mood* distinctions express what the speaker wants to do with the proposition in the particular discourse. This will include expression of assertion (indicative), non-assertion (subjunctive), command (imperative), and warning (admonitive). It also includes other expressions of the speaker's attitude about the truth of the proposition.[31]

The so-called paragogic *heh* (cohortative suffix) in Biblical Hebrew, attached to the imperative and the short prefix conjugation, and the linking *-n-* between the verb and a following pronominal suffix (energic suffix), are analysed in this book as allomorphs of the ventive morpheme, expressing various shades of a reflexive-benefactive meaning (see Sjörs 2023, ch. 6). In this instance, it must be pointed out that, for verbs III*wy*, a formally long prefix verb form with the usual ending *-ε̄* must sometimes be analysed as a ventive-cohortative suffix and the verb as a short *yiqṭol* (Sjörs 2023, 105). This is illustrated in (3):

(3) *Ø-IMP + wa-IMP + [2]wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A + wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-V*

הִתְהַלֵּךְ לְפָנַי וֶהְיֵה תָמִים: וְאֶתְּנָה בְרִיתִי בֵּינִי וּבֵינֶךָּ וְאַרְבֶּה אוֹתְךָ בִּמְאֹד
מְאֹד:

‘Walk before me and be perfect, [2]and I will make my covenant between myself and you, and I will give you a multitude of descendants.’ (Gen. 17.1–2)

In (3), the second of two first-person volitive forms (אַרְבֶּה) lacks a cohortative-ventive paragogic *heh*; instead, the ventive morpheme has resulted in the long final vowel *-ē*, so that the verb is formally identical to a long *yiqṭol(u)*. But the form must be parsed as short *yiqṭol(Ø)* with ventive suffix (“le *mode cohortatif*;” Joüon 1923, 307 n. 1; Kummerow 2008, 69; cf. Sjörs 2023, 105; see further §3.4.2.3).[32]

1.2.3. The Data: My Corpus and Database

There are diachronic strata also in Classical Biblical Hebrew, even within the Pentateuch (Joosten 2016). A reader acquainted with the Hebrew texts from Genesis to Numbers who turns to Deuteronomy will perceive that there are a number of features that work in a different way, or are conspicuously more frequent in this book than in the first four books of the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy is written in a slightly different language.[33] The sentences are longer and more complicated (Polak 2017, 350), as in Deut. 1.30–31.[34] It is a language created by scribes with writing as their profession, for clarity but also complexity, with a richer use of complicated relative clauses,[35] complement clauses, and appositions; extended use of infinitives for subordinate clauses[36] and main clauses;[37] and a tendency towards new idioms (Polak

2021, 324, 332f.).[38] Complement clauses are introduced by אֲשֶׁר, not כִּי (Deut. 1.31). The normal negation for participle clauses becomes אֵין instead of לֹא,[39] and more complicated conjunctions creep in.[40] The participle, which represented a renewal of the imperfective aspect in Genesis–Numbers and thus was an invasive form for the expression of progressive aspect and present tense, is pushed a step further in Deuteronomy, with extended replacement of the long *yiqṭol* morpheme,[41] exhibition of explicit future time reference,[42] and performative function,[43] but also with past time reference in an attributive/relative position.[44] We also have in Deuteronomy occasional instances of a violation of the word order rule for the long *yiqṭol* conjugation. This word order was the first syntactic defence against the potential merger of the two prefix conjugations after the dropping of short final vowels in Proto-Hebrew (see §3.2; also Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 412; Isaksson 2015d).[45] The reader also encounters the first departure from the rule of the 'normal' *qaṭal* that it may not be placed directly after the conjunction *wa*.[46] In addition, there are early indications of a new analytic tense: היה + active participle (Deut. 9.7, 22, 24; 30.4).[47] Inherited and partly oral traditions such as the patriarchal stories have received a "subsequent textualization as the Deuteronomistic History" (Gzella 2018, 29).

In spite of the linguistic differences mentioned above, I regard the Pentateuch as a relatively solid representation of CBH.[48]

The present book is based on:

A *corpus* of CBH texts: the Pentateuch and the Book of Judges, with the exclusion of the archaic poems;

A *database* of classified syntactic samples, mostly clause linkings, from the corpus (6559 non-archaic records; the 628 records from the archaic poetry are treated separately).

The corpus is intentionally restricted to secure a reasonably consistent synchronic state of CBH.[49] The poetry in the Psalter, for example, is notoriously difficult to evaluate diachronically and cannot be used as evidence of CBH.[50] I have used no poetry in this study, except, for diachronic comparison, the poems commonly accepted as archaic (with the exception of late additions, such as Gen. 49.17: Notarius 2013, 205, §§13.1.10, 13.3.2).

The database has been developed in Microsoft Access. The principal goal of the database is to register clauses and their relations (linkings) to other (mostly preceding) clauses. A typical record in the database registers a clause and its relation to a preceding clause. The fields registered in each record are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: The fields in the database

field	explanation	sample values
Source	place in text	Gn 01:01
Data	original text (for CBH: BHS)	—
Data transl	my translation of Data	—
Connective	conjunction, if any	*wa*; *way*; *Ø*; *kī*; REL[51]
1st Constit	first constituent in clause except *wa-*	ADV; *lō*; *ʾal*; *pɛn*; *ʾim*; S.noun; O.noun; S.pron; O.pron; PrP
Other constituent	other pre-verbal constituent after the first	same as 1st Constit
Clause-type	type of predicate in clause	*qaṭal*; *yiqṭol(Ø)*; *yiqṭol(u)*; *qoṭel*; *XØ*; IMP[52]

Clitic	verbal clitic, if any	nun parag. (Npar); vent./coh. *-ā*; vent./energ. *-nn-*; *-nā'*
TAM	aspect, temporal reference	resultative; anterior; perfective; progressive; future; habitual-past; habitual present; performative[53]
Switch	type of 'switch' in the linking	*qaṭal/yiqṭol(u)*; *qaṭal/yiqṭol(Ø)*; *yiqṭol(u)/XØ*[54]
Person	the person–gender–number of the verb	3ms; 3fs; 2ms; 2fs;…
Sem Rel	the semantics of the linking in which the clause is involved	Consequence: purpose; Logical: comparative; Elaboration; Attendant circumstance; conditional[55]
Discourse type		Narrative; Report; Direct speech; Poetry; Legal discourse; Instruction
Special	Notable syntactic feature in the clause or in linking	Serial verb; Apposition; Left-dislocation; Ellipsis; Rightdis-location; Chiasm; Sub-structure (e.g. within protasis)
Other clause	type of predicate in other clause involved in the linking	same value list as Clause-type
Connective in Other clause		same value list as Connective
1st Constit in Other clause		same value list as 1st Constit
TAM in Other clause		same value list as TAM
Comment	my free-text philo-logical notations, including the struc-ture of the linking	Exod. 1.7: *wa-S.noun-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

Each field has a limited list of values. The database is searchable by multiple fields. A sample search could be: Sem Rel = 'Attendant circumstance', AND Clause-type = '*yiqṭol(u)*', AND Discourse type = NOT 'Poetry-archaic', which yields all cases of circumstantial clauses coded by a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate that are not part of an Archaic Hebrew poem. With this search capacity, it is possible to filter out all types of linkings, and examine the resulting records one-by-one, while making further notations in the Comment field.

The statistics in the book are based on this Access database. When feasible, they are transferred into Excel for further processing of the data. In relevant cases, such data are copied into tables in the book. This is done when the search has resulted in a significant number of records. When a less significant number of instances of a certain verbal morpheme (gram) or linking is found in the database, the extant samples (records) are accounted for in the text and footnotes.

When absolute numbers of attestations are supplied, they refer to the number of registered forms or constructions in the database. They of course represent a selection of all forms and constructions and linkings that exist in the Masoretic text. The numbers given in the tables are not exhaustive, but they are representative. Relevant meanings and constructions and linkings are registered.

1.2.4. The Concept of Domain and the Chaining Nature of Early Semitic

"[C]haining was one of the most important syntactic features of Early Semitic" (Baranowski 2016a, 190). A domain is a specifically Semitic device for organising chains into recognisable semantic units with roughly the same function as paragraphs. As Eran Cohen (2014) has shown, the domain is a macrosyntactic entity or unit inherited from the most archaic phase of Semitic. It is a sequence of verbal clauses signalled by macro-syntactic markers.

The domain is well documented in Old Babylonian Akkadian (OB). In OB, the connective particle *-ma* plays a central role in signalling the clauses that constitute a domain. It is significant that this connective particle is asymmetrical: the sequence of clauses connected by *-ma* is non-reversible. It is also significant that *-ma* functions as a marker of the beginning of the following clause in a domain. Thus, the syntagm between two instances of *-ma* is always a clause. The final clause in the domain, however, is not followed by *-ma*. A specific domain "is bound together by a special connective, verbal forms of a particular kind, internal order, syntactic peculiarities and overall functional unity, with well-defined boundaries" (Cohen 2014, 251). There are domains in every type of text, and, according to Cohen, there are three major domain types: indicative, subordinative, and directive.[56] In a domain, verbal grammatical morphemes constitute "the major signal of grammatical and discourse structure, as well as temporal and aspectual relations" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 51).

In the **indicative domain**, which in Cohen's corpus is always a narrative unit, the chain consists of preterite *iprus* forms, and the domain tends to end with an *iptaras*, a form that in main clauses normally fulfils the function of a perfect. The most common function of the *iptaras* form is to appear at the end of an indicative domain, which can be quite long. The *iptaras* clause marks its final boundary, as in (Cohen 2014, 239 example 5; cf. Cohen 2006, 55):

(4) Old Babylonian

ana	*PN*	*ṭupp-am*	***uš-ābil–ma***
to	PN	tablet-ACC	(1)CS-CAUS-carry-PST = CONN
meḫer		***ṭupp-i***	
answer.NUC		tablet-GEN	
uš-ābil-am–ma			**[*u*]*š-t-ābil-akkum*** #
(3)CS-CAUS-carry-PST-DAT.1CS = CONN			(1)CS-CAUS-PRF-carry-DAT.2MS

'**I sent** PN a tablet, **he sent me** a response and **I sent** (it) to you' (AbB 3, 55:30–32)

The sequence of clauses in this (reportive) narrative domain is *iprus-ma* + *iprus-ma* + *iptaras#*. The *iptaras* form in OB has two distinct functions: in domain-final position it marks the end of the domain, and in the single clause domain it has the present perfect function.

The **subordinative domain** consists of clauses forming an attribute, or annexation, to a previous nucleus. This nucleus can be a noun, a pronoun, or a preposition/conjunction. The forms in the subordinative domain are marked by the morpheme *-u* in Akkadian. Since the nucleus may be a conjunction, the subordinative domain does not only comprise what are commonly called

relative clauses, but also all other explicitly (by conjunction) marked subordinate clauses.

The **directive domain** is coded by directives (expressions of will), that is, in Cohen's terminology, jussives (*liprus* in the third person), imperatives, cohortatives (*liprus* in the first person), and prohibitives.

Subordinative clauses are embedded in another domain, but do not form part of this superordinate domain and do not conform to its syntactic rules. An example is found in Cohen (2014, 241 example 7):

(5) Old Babylonian

ina *ṣāb* PN_1 *u* PN_2 100 *ṣāb-um*
from army-NUC PN_1 CONN PN_2 100 troop-NOM
ittī-šu ***l-i-llik–ma***
with-GEN.3MS JUSS-3CS-go = CONN
5 *ūm-ī* {*adi* PN_1 u PN_2
5 day-OBL.PL until PN_1 CONN PN_2
ištu GN *illak-ū-nim#}*
from GN 3MP-come-NPST
in *āl-ān-ī* ***l-i-p-tar-rik-ū–ma***
in city-PL-OBL JUSS-3MP-ITER-trouble = CONN
ḫarrān-āt-im *{ša* *ī-ten-errub-ā-nim#}* [*i*]*šteat*
caravan-PL-OBL PRON.NUC 3FP-ITER-come_in one
ū *šittā* ***l-i-dūk-ū–ma*** ***l-ī-dur-ā*** *#*
or two JUSS-3MP-strike = CONN JUSS-3FP-fear

> ‘Let one hundred troops from the troops of PN_1 and PN_2 go with him, and let them cause continuous difficulties in the cities for five days {until PN_1 and PN_2 come from GN}, and let them strike at one or two caravans {that come in regularly} so that they be afraid’ (AbB 11, 193:13–23)

The sequence of clauses in this directive domain is *liprus-ma* + *ADV {*until *S.noun PrP iparras#}* + *liprus-ma* + *O.noun {REL iparras#} liprus-ma* + *liprus#*. The example shows a directive domain in which two subordinative clauses are embedded, one temporal clause (‘until PN_1 and PN_2 come from GN’) and one relative (‘that come in regularly’). In a directive domain, the last clause often expresses a purpose or result (in the example above, *liprus l-ī-dur-ā #* ‘so that they be afraid’). In the example, the two subordinative domains digress from the syntax of the main directive domain. Both the temporal clause and the relative clause are coded by *iparras* forms (imperfective, realised respectively as future and past iterative). Cohen’s example illustrates that the directive domain may express the will of the speaker, and purpose. Clauses in the directive domain may also express an indirect command that reports the content of a command, and concessive conditionality:

(6) Old Babylonian

qibī-šum–ma	***l-i-llik–ma***	*aḫ-ā-šu*
tell-IMP-2MS-DAT.3MS = CONN	JUSS-3CS-go = CONN	brother-ACC-GEN.3MS
l-i-tr-am–ma	***{l [ām] a***	*attalk-u}*
JUSS-3CS-lead_forth = CONN	before	1CS-leave-PRF-SUBORD
nikkass-ī-šunu	***l-ī-puš-ū***	
account-OBL.PL-GEN.3MP	JUSS-3MP-do	

> ‘Tell him that (lit. and) he should go and (OR: in order to) bring over his brother so they can do their accounting {b[efo]re I (will) have left}’ (AbB 12, 44:16–21)

In the sequence *IMP-ma* + *liprus-ma* + *liprus-ma* + {before *ip-taras*} + *liprus#*, the content of the command is coded by the switch from imperative (*qibī-šum–ma*) to jussive (*l-i-llik–ma*): “Tell him *to bring over* his brother.” The last jussive is a purpose clause (*l-ī-puš-ū*). Neither the content clause nor the purpose clause is explicitly marked as subordinate. They form part of the directive domain marked by the connective particle *-ma*, and their semantic functions are signalled by the switch from imperative to jussive (the latter expressing the content of the command) and by position (last jussive in the domain is usually a purpose clause). “[T]he directive domain has its own unique complement syntax, as opposed to other domains” (Cohen 2014, 242). Thus, in a command to do something, the directive domain uses a switch to a jussive clause. In a command *not to do* something, the directive domain exhibits an asymmetric pattern, as is often the case also in other domains (Sjörs 2015, 34): when a negative content clause is intended, the jussive is replaced by a negated *iparras*, as in (7), where the imperative is followed by *lā iparras* (still connected by *-ma*). The sequence pattern is in this case *IMP-ma* + *lā iparras*:

(7) Old Babylonian

qi[*b*]*ī–ma*	***ma***[***mman***	*lā*	***udabbab-šu***
tell-IMP-2MS = CONN	PRON.INDEF	NEG	(3)CS-harass-NPST-ACC.3MS

> ‘O[r]der that (lit. and) **n[o one] should harass him**’ (AbB 12, 13:17–18; Cohen 2014, 242 ex. 9)

In the directive domain, infinitives and object clauses are rare, whereas in the indicative domain, a corresponding content complement is constructed with an infinitive. The main verb in the indicative domain may be a perfect *iptaras*, as in (8):

(8) Old Babylonian

mamman	*lā*	*dubbub-šu*	[*i*]*qtabī-šunūšim*
PRON.INDEF	NEG	harass-INF-GEN.3MS	3CS-tell-PRF-DAT.3MP

'[He] ordered them that no one should (lit. anyone not to) harass him' (AbB 12, 13:12–13; Cohen 2014, 242 ex. 10)

In sum, in the directive domain, a wish or command is found at the beginning, while purpose and indirect command are found after the first clause in the domain (Cohen 2014, 247).

In **conditional structures**, the protasis and the apodosis each constitute separate domains, which may in principle contain several clauses (Cohen 2012, 85). A frequent simple conditional linking is a protasis with *iparras* and an apodosis with jussive, as in (9).[57] In a protasis domain, the *iparras* form, which is otherwise indicative, has a modal, eventual, meaning. The sequential pattern in the example is (*iparras-ma*) + *precative*:

(9) (*ūmam eleppētum* [*ša*] *ana* GN [*aṭru*]*du* ***is***[***a***]***nniqā-ma***) [*u*]*rra*[*m*] *ina* GN ***šuṣēnšīnāti***

'Should the boats that [I se]nt to GN arrive today, load them [to]morrow in GN' (Cohen 2012, 83 ex. 145)

An example of a multiclausal protasis with *iparras* forms is (10):

(10) Old Babylonian

(*u*	*midde*	*annikīam*	***iba’’-ū-ka=ma***	
CONN	perhaps	here	3MP-pass-NPST-ACC.2MS=CONN	
alp-ī	*ana*	*āl-im*	*ayy-im=ma*	***inassaḫ-ū=ma***
ox-OBL.PL	to	city-GEN	some-GEN-PTCL	3MP-move-NPST=CONN
būrt-um	***iḫalliq*** *#*)		***alkam-ma***	
cow-NOM	3CS-get_lost-NPST		come-IMP-2MS=CONN	
būrt-am	***purus-ma***		***taru***	
cow-ACC	separate-IMP-2MS=CONN		lead_away-IMP-2MS	

‘But if they pass you by here and move the oxen to some town and (as a result) the cow may perish, come here, separate the cow and lead (it) away’ (AbB 9, 83:18–24; Cohen 2012, 112)

In this example, the apodosis also is multiclausal, and the pattern is (*iparras-ma* + *iparras-ma* + *iparras-#*) + *IMP-ma* + *IMP-ma* + *IMP-#*.

Circumstantials also in principle constitute separate complex domains, though they usually consist of only one clause. As with conditionals, they too are “incorporated by the chaining clause-combining strategy” (Cohen 2014, 244). An example of a circumstantial domain coded by an indicative non-verbal clause in OB is (11):

(11) Old Babylonian

u *aššum* PN *ša* *bīs-su* *maḫrī-ka*
CONN TOP.MARK.NUC PN PRON.NUC house-GEN.3MS front-GEN.2MS
u ***šū*** ***aḫī–ma*** (indicative)
CONN NOM.3MS brother-GEN.1CS = CONN ⇓
arḫiš *aššas-su…* [*p*]*uṭram–ma* (directive)
quickly wife-GEN.3MS release.IMP = CONN

'And, as for PN whose house is in front of you, **he is my brother**, so release his wife…' (AbB 2, 170:10–15; Cohen 2014, 244)

In (11), the sequential pattern is (*u NVC-ma*) + *IMP-ma* (the *IMP* is followed by *-ma* because the main clauses continue). There is no conjunction that marks the NVC as circumstantial, and it clearly deviates from the clause chaining rules of the directive domain represented by *IMP-ma*. The circumstantial function of the clause is signalled by its own deviating domain, which does not conform to the syntactic rules of the superordinate directive domain.

The concept of domain and the chaining nature of verbal syntax are attested also in the Amarna letters from Canaan (Baranowski 2016a, 190). The indicative sequences of narration are reportive in this corpus and exhibit both perfective *yaqtul* and perfective *qatal* forms. It seems that *yaqtul* and verbal *qatal* could be used interchangeably in the Canaanite of the scribes. An example of a report sequence that comes close to a narrative chain is given by Baranowski (2016a, 203 ex. 5.4.1):

(12) ⌜*ù*⌝ ⌜*an*⌝-⌜*nu*⌝-*ú* ***i-še*$_{20}$*-me*** *a-na* [16]⌜*a*⌝-*wa-te*^{MEŠ}*-ka* *ù* ***ú-wa-ši***[***r*$_4$**]‹***-šu*› [17]*ù* ***uṣ-ṣa-am*** *ri-qú-tám* [18]***ù i-še*$_{20}$*-me-e*** *ú ia-nu-um* ⌜ÉRIN⌝.MEŠ [19]*it-ti-šu ù* ***te-né-pu-⌜uš⌝*** [20]URU *Baṭ-ru-na a-na ša-šu* [21]*ù* ÉRIN.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ *ù* GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ [22]*ša-ki-in*$_4$ *i-na* ⌜*lìb*⌝-*bi* [23]*ù la*!(AD) ***i-nam-mu-šu-ni*$_7$** [24][*i*]*š-tu pí* KÁ.GAL URU *Gub‹-la›*^{KI}

‘And behold, **I heeded** your words **and I sen[t] ‹him› but he came forth** empty handed. **And he** (ʿAbdi-Ashirta) **heard** that there were no troops with him **then** the town of Baṭrôna **went over** to him and he stationed *ʿapîru* troops and chariots within (it). **And they do not depart** from the entrance to the city gate of the city of Byb‹los›.’ (EA 87:15–24, my emphasis)

This example illustrates the chaining nature of the syntax in early Canaanite. The verb forms are connected by *u* and have the same perfective aspect and temporal reference. The pattern is *u PARTICLE yaqtul* + *u yaqtul* + *u yaqtul* + *u yaqtul* + *u yaqtul* + *u lā yaqtul*. The reportive passages in the letters are not true narrative passages (where the storyteller fades away), but many passages come close to a narrative and in any case attest to the narrative style of the Canaanite scribes (Baranowski 2016a, 203, 206f.). In comparison with the OB indicative domain, there is no connective postpositional particle *-ma*. Instead, the conjunction *u* (practically always written *ù*) joins the clauses. There is a tendency to follow this conjunction with a clause-initial indicative *yaqtul* (as in ***ù i-ši-me-e*** ‘and he heard’), but, as the example shows, a deictic particle or an adverb or the negation *lā* or a subject may be inserted before the verb form (***ù*** *a*[*n-n*]*u-ú* ***i-ši-me*** ‘and [s]o I lis-

tened'). Moreover, there is no counterpart to the OB perfect *iptaras*, which was inserted as the last clause in a narrative domain and thus marked its end point. In the Amarna letters, the end of the sequence is inferred from the context.

Subordination may be coded by a digression from the pattern in the main domain. A complement clause can be expressed by means of a non-verbal clause (NVC)[58] introduced by the usual conjunction *u* and constitutes its own (subordinate) domain, as in (Baranowski 2016a, 203):

(13) *u yaqtul* + *u NVC*

ù i-še$_{20}$*-me-e* ***ú ia-nu-um*** ⌜ÉRIN⌝.MEŠ [19]*it-ti-šu*

'And he ('Abdi-Ashirta) heard **that there were** no troops with him' (EA 87:18–19, Baranowski's emphasis)

The verbal *qatal* in the Amarna letters is the oldest secure attestation of a past anterior and perfective suffix conjugation in Semitic (Baranowski 2016a, 208). It is apparent that this newly emerged perfective intrudes into the indicative functional domain of the old *yaqtul*. The verbal *qatal* often enters into positions where a *yaqtul* is used in similar passages. There is no geographical pattern that can explain the distribution of indicative *yaqtul* and verbal *qatal*, and in some instances *yaqtul* is even glossed by *qatal* (Baranowski 2016a, 188). When the verbal *qatal* is used in main indicative clauses, it often bears anterior meaning (Baranowski 2016a, 124 ex. 4.1.6):

(14) *ia-ši ù* [1]*Pa-ḫu-ra* [32]***a-pa-aš*** *ip-ša ra-ba* [33] *a-na ia-ši* ***uš-ši-ir*** [34]LÚ.MEŠ KUR *Su-te ù* [35]***da-ku*** LÚ *Še-er-da-\ ni* [36]*ù* 3 LÚ.MEŠ [37]***šu-ri-ib*** *a-na* KUR *Mi-iṣ-ri*

> ‘And Paḫuru **perpetrated** a great misdeed against me. **He sent** Sutean men and **they killed** a Sherdanu and (they) **took** three men into the land of Egypt.’ (EA 122:31–37, Baranowski’s emphasis)[59]

The linking pattern is *u S.noun-qatal* + *Ø-qatal* + *u qatal* + *u O.noun-qatal*, and the asyndesis in this case signals a new domain (with three clauses) with the function of elaborating on the first clause: the last three *qatal* clauses specify the misdeed committed by Paḥura. It is apparent that the position of the *qatal* form does not affect its meaning: the *u qatal* has the same past perfective meaning as the clause initial *Ø-qatal* and the non-initial *u O.noun-qatal*. Within the elaboration, the conjunction *u* in this case expresses temporal succession: one action occurs after the other, as in a narrative chain. A meaning of temporal succession can also be observed in a passage with two *qatal* clauses (Baranowski 2016a, 125 ex. 4.1.12):

(15) ***ša-ma*** *a-⌜na⌝* [*ia-ši*] ^{36}***ù na-ṣa-ar*** URU.[MEŠ] ^{37}LUGAL EN-*šu*

> ‘**He listened** to [me] and **protected** the cit[ies] of the king, his lord.’ (EA 132:35–37, Baranowski’s emphasis)

The pattern in (15) is *qatal* + *u qatal*, and the temporal succession expressed by the *u qatal* clause receives in this semantic context a nuance of result.

The modal (directive) domain in the Amarna letters exhibits some striking similarities to that found in Old Babylonian. A frequent sequential pattern is *IMP* + *u yaqtul*, as in (16):

(16) ***uš-ši-ra*** ÉRIN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti* [39]*ra-ba ù* ***tu-da-bi-ir*** [40]*a-ia-bi* LUGAL *iš-tu* [41]*lìb-bi* KUR-*šu ù* [42]***ti-né-ep-šu*** *ka-li* [43]KUR.KUR.MEŠ *a-na šàr-ri*

‘**Send** a large regular army and **you can drive out** the enemies of the king from within his land and all the lands **will be joined** to the king.’ (EA 76:38–43, Baranowski’s emphasis)[60]

As in OB, the last, usually syndetic, *yaqtul* expresses a purpose, which in the example is coded by two clauses: *u yaqtul u yaqtul*. When the verb is lexically stative, a *u qatal* in a similar sequence may express a result or purpose (Baranowski 2016a, 162; also Rainey 1996, II:126):

(17) *du-ku-mi* [26]⌜*eṭ*⌝*-la-ku-nu ù i-ba-ša-tu-nu ki-ma ia-ti-nu* [27]⌜*ù*⌝ *pa-aš-ḫa-tu-nu ù ti-né-ep-šu ki-ma* [28][*a*-]⌜*wa*⌝*-te*[MEŠ]*-šu ù i-ba-aš-šu ki-ma* [29]⌜ÉRIN⌝.MEŠ GAZ

“‘Kill your ‘lad’ and become like us, and you will be at rest.” And they have been won over in accordance with his [wo]rds and they are like the *ʿapîru* troops.’ (EA 74:25–29)

The modal sequence is a quotation, and has the pattern *Ø-IMP + u qatal + u qatal*. The *u qatal* in this sequence expresses ‘in that case you will be like us and you will be at peace’. The action of the *u qatal* clauses depends on the action in the imperative, and can be described as a result, though it is often hard to distinguish a result from a purpose. As Baranowski (2016a, 162) points out, the clauses that follow the quotation are indicative, and do not belong to the modal domain. The last verb, *ù i-ba-aš-šu* ‘and they are (like ʿApiru)’ is an indicative *u qatal* of the same stative verb in the modal sequence.

When a *yaqtula* is used in modal sequence, it usually follows directly after the initial directive form (IMP or jussive) and is part of the same wish or command, while a *yaqtul* usually follows and expresses a result or purpose (Baranowski 2016a, 164, 167):

(18) […] ***ši-mé*** *i⌜a⌝-⌜ši⌝* [10]***qí-ba-mi*** *a-na šàr-ri* [11]*ù* ***yi-di-na*** *a-na ⌜ka⌝-ta*$_5$ [12]3 *me* LÚ.MEŠ *ù* ***ni***-[***d***]***a-gal*** [13]⌜URU⌝ ⌜*ù*⌝ ***ni-pu-uš***

‘**Listen** to me, **speak** to the king **that he give** you three hundred men **so that we can look after** the city and **we may restore** (it).’ (EA 93:9–13, emphasis by Baranowski)[61]

The modal sequence in (18) has the pattern *Ø-IMP. Ø-IMP + u yaqtula + u yaqtul + u yaqtul.* The first imperative stands alone as its own domain, but the next domain contains four clauses, of which the *u yaqtula* is part of the command and codes the content of the command: *IMP + u yaqtula* with the meaning ‘Tell the king to give’. The two *u yaqtul* express the purpose of the command, ‘so that we can look after the city and we may restore it’.

The concept of discourse type (discourse mode) does not coincide exactly with that of domain, but is complementary. They are closely related, though, and perhaps we can say that discourse type is a literary term that depends on language use situations (Notarius 2008, 58), while a domain is syntactically delimited. Many discourse types are coded by the same syntactical devices (instruction/procedure). Though few scholars deny the significance of some basic discourse types for Biblical Hebrew, such as narrative and instruction, the classification of *all* discourse modes according to text-types is illusory, since it “depends on situations of language use, the number of which is unlimited”

(Notarius 2008, 57–59). It is not surprising that "there is no uniformity in classifying discourse types in the scholarly literature" (Notarius 2013, §1.1.1.2).[62]

1.2.5. The Pronunciation of the Conjunction *Wa* in CBH and the Tiberian Masoretic Text

The sources for the Tiberian reading tradition and its codification in the sign system of *Biblia Hebraica* show that *shewa mobile* was read as a short vowel with the same quality as *pataḥ* (Khan 2013a, 98; 2013b; Isaksson 2021a, 208–10). The two variants *wə-* (written with *shewa mobile*) and *way-* (written with *pataḥ* and *dagesh forte*) were read with the same vowel quality (Kantor 2020, 59, 95).[63]

וְיִקְטֹל was read *wa-yiqṭōl* 'and let him kill'
וַיִּקְטֹל was read *way-yiqṭōl* 'and he killed'

The difference in the reading of the two types of clauses is just a gemination, because the vowel quality of the conjunction was the same for both variants (Khan 1991, 241 n. 17; 2013a, 98; 2013b).

Gemination (written *dagesh forte*) was sometimes utilised in the Tiberian reading tradition to create a secondary distinction between words that were originally homophonous. This phenomenon was a strategy for avoiding unclarity that probably originated in the Second Temple period ('orthoepy').[64] In the Babylonian vocalisation (Khan 2013a, 43) and the Samaritan oral tradition, it is even more widespread.[65]

In the Archaic Hebrew poetry, a free-standing past perfective short *yiqṭol* is never preceded by another distinct morpheme in order to mark it as past (Kantor 2020, 63 n. 7). *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* was

enough, which means that *wa + yiqṭol(Ø)*, with a normal *wa*, was able to express a past perfective meaning. No intervening particle was needed.[66]

Khan (1991, 241 n. 17; 2020, 534) argues that *dagesh forte* in Tiberian וַיִּקְטֹל is a case of orthoepy, introduced in the Second Temple period,[67] thus well after the classical period. But in CBH there persisted a homophony between jussive short *yiqṭol* and indicative short *yiqṭol*, including when used after the conjunction *wa* (in the latter case forming a very frequent clause-type).[68] The differentiation is fairly old, indeed as old as the Second Temple period, but it was not a feature of CBH (Isaksson 2021a, 210).[69] For CBH, it is reasonable to suppose an inherited homophony between a jussive *wa-yiqṭol* and an indicative *wa-yiqṭol*, both signalling discourse continuity (but in different domains):[70]

ויקטל [wa-yiqṭōl] ‘and let him kill’
ויקטל [wa-yiqṭōl] ‘and he killed’

In order to avoid confusion and achieve clarity, the Tiberian reading tradition introduced a gemination of the first prefix consonant in the reading of the text.[71]

Tiberian reading:

ויקטל [wa-yiqṭōl] ‘and let him kill’
ויקטל [way-yiqṭōl] ‘and he killed’

The speakers and writers of CBH made no distinction between two different *wa*. Such a distinction was introduced in the reading tradition after the classical period, probably as early as the Second Temple period.[72]

Obviously, the distinction created in the reading tradition also involves a semantic interpretation of the verbal forms (Notarius 2011, 261). An example of the distinction is found already in the first chapter of the Bible. In verse six, there is a *wa* with jussive *yiqṭol(Ø)*, and verse seven includes a *wa* with gemination and a realis *yiqṭol(Ø)*, with past time reference:[73]

(19) יְהִי רָקִיעַ בְּתוֹךְ הַמָּיִם **וִיהִי** מַבְדִּיל בֵּין מַיִם לָמָיִם׃ **וַיַּעַשׂ** אֱלֹהִים֙ אֶת־הָרָקִיעַ֔

‘Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters **and let it separate** water from water. [7]**So God made** the expanse…’ (Gen. 1.6–7)

The meaning of the conjunction *wa* is the same in both cases. It signals discourse continuity, but in two separate domains. The *raison d’être* of the gemination is not to change the function of the *wa*, but to achieve clarity as to the meaning of two homophonous *yiqṭol(Ø)*: the short *wa-yiqṭol* with jussive meaning is distinguished in the reading from the short *way-yiqṭol* with past perfective meaning.[74] This past perfective *way-yiqṭol* is the “**yaqtul* preterite and simple *waw*” that Muraoka and Rogland (1998, 101) see in the Tel Dan and Zakkūr inscriptions,[75] but fail to recognise in the Biblical Hebrew *way-yiqṭol* (Renz 2016, 632; Isaksson 2021a, 199–201).

In consequence of this, and from now on, I will make use of a more pertinent terminology, *wa(y)-yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal*, for the traditional ‘consecutive’ clause-types.[76] The ‘*(y)*’ in *wa(y)-yiqṭol* is meant to indicate that the gemination was pronounced in the Tiberian reading (and thus written in our Hebrew Bibles), but that it was not a feature of CBH. In free-standing form, the short *yiqṭol* will be designated *yiqṭol(Ø)* (see §3), and the long

yiqṭol written *yiqṭol(u)*, recalling its origin from Central Semitic *yaqtulu* (see §4).

1.2.6. The Concept of Discourse Continuity in CBH

It is one of the cornerstones of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics that two of the principal verb forms in the central verbal system are 'consecutive'.[77] One of them is assumed to be *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, the other *wa-qaṭal*. The consecutive verbal forms tend to build series of main-line consecutive clauses (see §1.2.8). Clauses that break the main-line pattern are 'non-consecutive'. Hebrew text-linguistics is concerned with the nature of the consecution, and the function of the non-consecutive clauses. This can be summarised in a table displaying *the essence of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics*; see Table 3.

Table 3: The essence of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics (affirmative clauses)

	Consecutive clauses	**Non-consecutive clauses**
Narrative, report	***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*	(*wa*)-*X*-*qaṭal*
Instruction, forecasting	***wa**-qaṭal*	(*wa*)-*X*-*yiqṭol*

Characteristic features of consecutive clauses are:

1. The initial 'consecutive *waw*' (bold type in Table 3);
2. The initial position of the (finite) verb.

A non-consecutive clause is characterised by having a clausal constituent (*X*) before the verb. The alternation between the two clause-types[78] can be summarised as a central Tenet 1* of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics, where '*' indicates a preliminary formulation:

Tenet 1*. A series of discourse-continuity ***wa****-VX* clauses is interrupted by a clause with (*wa*)-*XV* pattern (Isaksson 2021, 212).[79]

This formula subsumes the labour of generations of Biblical Hebrew scholars, since it is the legacy of the system of 'consecutive tenses'. It contains the germ of a clause linking approach to the verbal system.[80] Tenet 1* is a confirmation that CBH has retained the old "unmarked declarative V(S)(O) word order" of Semitic syntax (Pat-El 2019, 86).

The term *discourse continuity* is borrowed from Givón. He uses the phrase "a break in the discourse continuity" (Givón 1977, 201), where a break means a syntactic interruption of the main line of continuity clauses. The notion of interruption is found also in Van der Merwe et al. (1999, 167). Discourse continuity is a broader concept than the idea of temporal or logical consecution. The semantic breadth of the concept of discourse continuity based on Givón (1977) and Buth (1995) will be of paramount importance for the following investigations in this book (see especially §2 and §7).

The '*XV*' pattern in the Tenet 1* formula represents the "practically universal strategy for realizing focus" by word order (Hopper 1979, 220); the '*X*' can be the subject, an instrumental adverb, or the direct object. "In this strategy, it is the position of the verb which is crucial" (Hopper 1979, 240).

A clause linking approach will be the central methodological procedure in this book, in order to uncover the linguistic reality behind the 'consecutive tenses' in CBH.

1.2.7. Clause Linking

"Traditional and modern grammarians alike have restricted what they call 'syntax' to the study of what goes on within the boundaries of the prosodic sentence" (Haiman and Thompson 1988, ix). As for Biblical Hebrew grammars, this approach came to an end with the introduction of text-linguistics, which forever changed the perspective of syntactic analysis from the sentence to that of the text.[81]

Clause linking is a general linguistic approach to examine how different kinds of clauses combine in a specific language.[82] It can be regarded as "a grammaticalization of a very general property of the hierarchical structure of the discourse itself" (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988, 290). The pattern of clause linking used in a text reflects the rhetorical intentions of the author or narrator (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988, 275, 299). In the present book, it is assumed that this holds also for Biblical Hebrew. The 'proof' of this assumption will be that the texts communicate meaning with this approach. The textual structure will become more understandable and more transparent (cf. Isaksson 2015a, 173).

The following example is a simple but illustrative linking of two clauses (Verstraete 2005, 619 ex. 15):

(20) Pattern: Clause_1 *and* Clause_2

Macy's advertised a sale yesterday and the whole town went crazy.

Two clauses are combined, and on the surface two actions are described that stand in a relation of temporal succession: the

event in Clause$_2$ is temporally sequential to that of Clause$_1$. This (possibly unconscious) interpretation requires a certain amount of cultural knowledge. If the phenomenon of advertising were unknown to the reader, the temporal succession would possibly escape him/her. For the knowledgeable reader, however, the temporal succession is evident, and also receives a notion of a result. Macy's' advertisement *caused* the whole town to go crazy. But an even more delicate cultural understanding, on the level of a native speaker, might result in an understanding of this bi-clausal linking as having a specific illocutionary force: that of surprise or indignation or excitement. This is perhaps more apparent when the verb forms are changed to present tense (Verstraete 2005, 619, ex. 14b):

(21) Pattern: Clause$_1$ *and* Clause$_2$

Macy's advertises a sale yesterday and the whole town goes crazy.

In a linking of clauses, the clause is any syntagm containing one predication. Clause linking can be defined as "a relation of dependency or sociation obtaining between clauses in this sense" (Lehmann 1988, 182). In this definition, dependency involves the embedding of one clause X in another clause Y ("X occupies a grammatical slot of Y"); this means that the Y-clause "determines the grammatical category of the complex and thus its external relations." Embedded clauses (such as complement clauses) are relatively trivial in Biblical Hebrew. Of greater interest are non-dependency relations, which Lehmann calls "relations of *sociation*." Among them are coordination, which is "a relation of sociation combining two syntagms of the same type and forming a

syntagm which is again of the same type" (quotations from Lehmann 1988, 181f.; see also Haspelmath 2007, 1). Parataxis means the coordination of clauses, which may be syndetic or asyndetic. The concept of syndesis has nothing to do with parataxis or hypotaxis; it is exclusively a question of the "presence or absence of a connective device," that is, a linking connective (Lehmann 1988, 210f.):

(22) Pattern: Clause_1 *but* Clause_2

You are very kind, **but** I must contradict you.

(23) Pattern: Clause_1 *and* Clause_2

This is right, **and** that is wrong.

This is a type of clause linking which is extremely frequent also in CBH. It is a linking structure with inferred interclausal relation (Bril 2010, 16), which can be given the pattern (Isaksson 2021a, 215f.):

Clause_1 *wa*-Clause_2

In this biclausal linking, Clause_2 is said to *be linked to* Clause_1. The proclitic conjunction *wa* puts Clause_2 *in a relation* to Clause_1 (see further §2). The order of the clauses is fundamental. Clause_2 *relates to* Clause_1.

To determine the 'main line' in a text "one must appeal to the discourse context" (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988, 275). It is a discourse-related concept. A "[*b*]*ackground* relation holds for a text span which provides for the comprehensibility of an item mentioned in another text span" (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988, 293). It "is used to provide the reader/listener with

information that will enable him/her to comprehend an item" (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988, 298).

1.2.8. The Foreground-Background Distinction

The concept of a foreground-background distinction plays a major role in CBH text-linguistics and is recognised by almost all linguists as a language universal (Hopper and Thompson 1980, 280, 283; Isaksson 2021a, 220 n. 50). Foregrounding and backgrounding are psycholinguistic entities; the distinction is related to the processing of discourse (Cook 2012a, 283–88). They cannot be defined by specific clause-types (Shirtz and Payne 2015, 1f.). For example, *qaṭal* and *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses can be either backgrounded or foregrounded.[83] A *qaṭal* clause may, as a discontinuity clause, begin a new literary unit, and as such it can be either foregrounded or backgrounded (Tenets 2a and 2b; see §§7.7–8).

Material that supplies the main points of the discourse is foreground; the "part of a discourse which does not immediately and crucially contribute to the speaker's goal, but which merely assists, amplifies, or comments on it" is background (Hopper and Thompson 1980, 280).

In English, there is no specific marker of foregrounding; "the audience infers grounding not from a single morphosyntactic feature, but from a cluster of properties, no single one of which is exclusively characteristic of foregrounding" (Hopper and Thompson 1980, 283f.). Foregrounding is expressed by a continuum of saliency features, "along which various points cluster and tend strongly to co-occur" (Hopper and Thompson 1980, 294):[84]

Table 4: A continuum of saliency features

More salient	Less salient
temporal succession	temporal overlap
perfective aspect	imperfective aspect
dynamic	nondynamic (descriptive)
telic	durative
volitional (involvement)	nonvolitional
affirmative	negative (negated)
indicative (finite reality of the state or event described by the clause)	non-assertive (subjunctive, hypothetical, imaginary, conditional)
nonanaphoric	anaphoric
identity of subject maintained and it tends to be presupposed	frequent change of subject
human topics	nonhuman topics
total affectedness	partial affectedness
high individuation	low individuation
unmarked distribution of focus in clause, with presupposition of subject	marked distribution of focus, e.g. subject focus, instrument focus, focus on sentence adverbial

In narrative, *foreground* is "the default (or unmarked) mode of recounting events, often, but not always, marked by means of a dominant narrative verb; *background* is marked by departures from the default mode of narration" (Cook 2012a, 295).[85]

1.2.9. Bybee's Construction Theory

Bybee's construction theory (2010; 2015) has proved fruitful for the explanation of the enigmatic 'consecutive tense' *wa-qaṭal*. Khan (2021a) has shed light upon *wa-qaṭal*, with its future and habitual meanings, as a construction in Bybee's sense. This puts

Bybee's construction theory at the centre of interest for the Hebrew verbal system (Isaksson forthcoming; and §6 in this book).

A central concept for Bybee is chunking: "When two or more words are often used together, they also develop a sequential relation" (Bybee 2010, 25, 33). Constructions are sequential chunks "that sometimes have special meanings and other properties" (Bybee 2010, 36). High frequency is determinative. The more a sequence of morphemes or words is used together, the more strongly the sequence will be perceived as a unit and the less it will be associated with its component parts. This process leads to increasing autonomy of the construction (Bybee 2010, 36, 48).

Example: the English phrase *be going to* is a chunk, which because of its frequency was extended in usage and developed into a general future morpheme *gonna*.

Be going to is a construction, with many extensional steps that widen its applicability. It is a construction, since the futural/intentional meaning cannot be deduced from the parts of the construction, *be* + *going* + *to*. The original construction was: SUBJECT + BE + *going to* + VERB, where the capitalised items are schematic. This construction is still in living usage (Bybee 2010, 96; 2015, 124). In *gonna*, a construction has adopted grammatical meaning and phonetically reduced form as a future auxiliary (Bybee 2010, 106; 2015, 268). The separate parts of the construction have lost their individual functions.

Grammaticalisation represents the extreme end of the development of a construction, but it is not necessary that a construction develop into an independent morpheme. The construction may remain a construction (as *be going to*).

Khan's (2021a) idea is that Biblical Hebrew *wa-qaṭal* in apodosis position was a chunk with high frequency that became a construction (see further §1.3). This will be the basic idea behind the investigation of *wa-qaṭal* in §6.

1.3. Previous Research

The concept of 'conversive *waw*' emerged among the medieval Jewish grammarians.[86] This idea permitted the grammarians to explain why the present/future *yiqṭol* had past tense meaning when preceded by this *waw*, and it also explained why the past tense *qaṭal* with initial *waw* had present/future meaning. That the *waw ha-hippūḵ* had two different shapes, one before indicative *yiqṭol* (with gemination of the prefix vowel) and another before *qaṭal* (sometimes with change of accent), was generally ignored in this instance. It was also passed over in silence that past tense *wayyiqṭol* and jussive *yiqṭol* both had a morphologically shorter form in several instances (Cook 2012a, 80).

The idea of a 'conversive *waw*', together with a temporal view of verbal forms, was taken over by the early western scholarship,[87] and it is still alive and well in some leading grammars of the twenty-first century (Joüon 1923; Joüon and Muraoka 2006).[88] The 'conversive *waw*' was a rule of thumb intended as a remedy for an enigma—that of the strange Biblical Hebrew ver-

bal system. But it became itself part of the enigma and an obstacle to its solution. Since it could explain only some of the usages of the verbal forms, the enigma would occupy Hebrew scholarship for centuries to come (McFall 1982).

Out of the idea of a conversive *waw* emerged the conception of a 'system' of four basic verb forms ('tenses') in Biblical Hebrew grammar, of which two were intrinsically combined with the 'conversive *waw*': *qaṭal*, *yiqṭol*, *weqaṭal*, and *wayyiqṭol*. This is a conception from which Hebrew scholarship has never entirely recovered, although the terms used for the special *waw* vary considerably in the literature: inductive, inversive, energic, strong, conservative, or consecutive (Van de Sande 2008, 198f.; Cook 2012a, 80, 83, 93).

The scholarly literature on the subject comprises an immense flood of works. For an overview of the literature up to Thacker (1954), it is necessary to refer to McFall (1982), although McFall himself uncritically presupposes the terminology that is the root of the enigma: the 'consecutive tenses', the 'consecutive *waw*'.[89] He takes for granted what he should have kept a critical distance from: the conceptual world of four basic verb forms of which two have a 'consecutive *waw*' and the other two are '*waw*-less'. If terminology contains false assumptions, raw data and statistics will only support the suppositions and block the introduction of fruitful new ideas.[90] What also characterises so many new (and old) attempts to solve the enigma is the plain belief that a fresh 'synchronic' approach to the Biblical Hebrew verbal system must be enough. This has resulted in "idiosyncratic

analyses that find no support among the recent typological classifications" (Cook 2012a, 185).

Among the first attempts to resolve the enigma was the explanation of the conversive *waw* as 'relative': it was not conversive, but gave the verb form a temporal meaning in relation to the preceding verb: *wa(y)-yiqṭol* was (past) future (a true *yiqṭol*) in relation to a preceding *qaṭal* or *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, and *wa-qaṭal* was a past used for future (Schroeder 1766; see McFall 1982, 22). A similar idea is the 'inductive *waw*', which transfers the temporal or modal force of the governing verb to the verb after the *waw* (J. Bellamy; P. Gell; see McFall 1982, 24–26). The idea of a 'relative *waw*' was a little step forward, because it recognised the semantic dependence of continuity clauses (the relative 'tenses') on preceding clauses. But still there were two different *waw* in Biblical Hebrew.

It was a step forward when Hebrew and Semitic scholars introduced the concept of verbal aspect in descriptions of the Hebrew verbal system (G. H. A. Ewald 1891; S. R. Driver 1892; Brockelmann 1951; see Cook 2012a, 86–93). The *qaṭal* verb form was regarded as expressing perfective, finished action and the *yiqṭol* as expressing unfinished action ('imperfective'). This way of analysing the verbal usage in Biblical Hebrew found good parallels in Indo-European languages and supplied an explanation as to why the *yiqṭol* could in historical contexts express a past repetitive or habitual action. Verbal aspects could certainly explain many obscure verbal usages, but no aspectual theory was able to explain the conversive or consecutive 'tenses' (with initial *waw*!) and the strange phenomenon of a conversive *waw*.

Research on the Hebrew verbal system advanced considerably with the introduction of a historical-comparative perspective in the nineteenth century. It was the recovery of the Akkadian language and later also Ugaritic that gave rise to valuable comparative studies of the Classical Hebrew language. Until then, the Semitic languages available for comparison offered only texts that were considerably later than the Bible: Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic. From then on, Hebrew could be compared with languages of a much earlier provenance, and *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (with a short *yiqṭol*) was recognised as a cognate of *iprus* in Akkadian as well as *lam yaqtul* in Arabic. The same evidence identified the Hebrew jussive short *yiqṭol* as a reflex of Akkadian *l-iprus* and Arabic jussive *yaqtul*. The Hebrew verb form *qaṭal* was analysed in the light of the Akkadian verbal adjective, the stative.[91] In the early twentieth century, the application of comparative Semitic studies to the understanding of the Hebrew verbal system was summarised and pushed forward by Hans Bauer (1910; see Finley 1981, 243). But no consensus was attained regarding the Hebrew *wa-qaṭal*, since a comparative perspective proved incapable of explaining the semantic difference between an anterior/perfective *qaṭal* in discontinuity clauses and the discourse-continuity *wa-qaṭal* clauses with imperfective/future/habitual meanings. The discovery of some very early Northwest Semitic epigraphs in the second half of the twentieth century has provided a further broadening of the comparative evidence.[92]

The majority view in comparative Semitics research has come to the conclusion that Proto-Semitic had three verbal forms (none with a preceding *waw*-conjunction): *qatal(a)* expressing

states, *yaqtul* with both past perfective and jussive meanings, and an imperfective *yaqattal* (Cook 2012a, 96f.). According to this view, the Central Semitic languages share an important innovation: the imperfective *yaqtul-u/-ūna* (Huehnergard 2005; Cook 2012a, 97).[93] The morphological and semantic distinction between a short *yiqṭol* (< *yaqtul*) and a long *yiqṭol* (< *yaqtulu*) was finally confirmed by the investigation of the Amarna tablets, which displayed data from a stage of Canaanite several centuries earlier than Biblical Hebrew (Moran 1950; Rainey 1996; Cook 2012a, 114, 118).

Among the relatively recent attempts to understand the Biblical Hebrew verbal system from a comparative Semitic perspective, the book by Mark S. Smith (1991) must be mentioned for its quality and modern linguistic terminology. Smith recognises the fruitful linguistic terminology introduced by Givón (1977; 1983) and pays proper attention to the role of the two 'consecutive' verbal 'forms' in signalling discourse continuity (the flow of the text) and the role of other clause-types in signalling discontinuity. He does not study the conjunction *wa* in itself, only the '*waw* consecutive', but recognises that "the BH converted imperfect represents a survival of NWS **yaqtul* preterite" (Smith 1991, xi). The primary emphasis in the work is "the comparative evidence from the Amarna letters, the Ugaritic texts, first millennium NWS inscriptions and the Hebrew texts from Qumran" (Smith 1991, xi). It is a mistake, though, that he throughout the book uses the terms 'converted imperfect' and 'converted perfect', though he is well aware that "'converted' and 'unconverted' are improper designations for the verbal forms with and without

prefix *waw*" (Smith 1991, xi). His justification is: "this study frequently uses the first set of terms for the sake of convenience… given the common acceptance of the terms 'converted' and 'unconverted'" (Smith 1991, xii). This is a methodological mistake, because without proper terminology he proves unable to arrive at a proper description of the conjunction, and all his conclusions are confined to the uses of *wa* in the clause-types *wa(y)-yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal*, though some of his observations, with the help of Givón's cross-linguistic research, are valid for the use of *wa* in CBH in general.[94] Smith's focus is on clauses of the type *wa-V(X)*, and his conclusions are ahead of his time: such clauses express "continued topicality" and, in narrative, the clause-type *wa(y)-yiqṭol* "controls the *flow* of the story: The opposition between *unmarked* or *sequential* narration as against *counter-sequential* narration" (Givón 1977, 188, quoted from Smith 1991, 14). Smith's study lacks a theory of grammaticalisation, but it is hard to blame him. The main works by Joan Bybee and Östen Dahl were still to be written at the time of writing of his book.[95]

A further step was taken at the turn of the new century with the introduction of a theory of grammaticalisation which enabled scholars to understand the evolution of the verbal forms ('grams') in Biblical Hebrew (thus Andersen 2000). The importance of cross-linguistic grammaticalisation studies was emphasised by John Cook (2012a, 104, 114). According to him, all new theories should be tested against a typologically reliable perspective: "a theory of the BHVS should be judged by whether it presents a 'typologically credible' model of the verbal system in light of the

abundance of data on verbal systems in the world's languages" (Cook 2012a, 149).[96]

If previous research on the Biblical Hebrew verbal system has often been hampered by a lack of linguistic clarity and comparative perspective, it is a relief to turn to the critically conducted survey of research by Cook (2012a, 77–175). It partly overlaps the time period covered by McFall, and treats modern works until about 2010. Cook is sharp and linguistically up-to-date and evaluates recent research according to three principles that are fundamental for research on the Biblical Hebrew verbal system: (1) a comparative and diachronic Semitic perspective on the Hebrew verbal system (Cook 2012a, §2.3); (2) a discussion of diachronic layers within the Hebrew Bible (at least: archaic, classical, and late);[97] (3) a recognition of processes of grammaticalisation with a cross-linguistic conception of the history of verbal forms (bearing in mind that each language reveals unique paths of development).[98] In addition, Cook treats with critical distance the attempts to present the different 'grammars' of the discourse types in Biblical Hebrew, and concludes that semantics must take precedence over discourse analysis: "so also discourse-prominent analysis of the BHVS seems to serve for some as an escape from the morass of traditional semantic and (predominantly) diachronic approaches" (Cook 2012a, 150, 268, §4.1). In text *en clair*: in the various discourse types (probably unlimited in number), we encounter the same grammar and the same verbal forms, but context and text-type influence the meaning of a verb form. Discourse analysis has been valuable in many respects, including its emphasis on the text at the expense of single sentences, but as

a method for understanding the verbal system it is disappointing, as Cook states about the contribution of F. J. del Barco: "the BH verbal forms do not align with discourse functions as uniformly as he expects" (Cook 2012a, 161; also Notarius 2008, 57–59; 2013, 10–11, 51–53).

The strengths of Cook's work are the methodological chapters and his critical assessment of current research. His discussion of the foreground/background concept is valuable. His own explanation of the verbal system (Cook 2012a, §4.4) is, however, hampered by a methodological mistake. He assumes that word order is signalled by the position of the subject in the clause, and that this word order is the basic signal for distinguishing realis and irrealis clauses in a text. Cook supports this conclusion by referring to generative linguistic considerations raised by Holmstedt, and proposes that a SV word order basically signals realis meaning in the clause, whereas VS word order signals irrealis. This thesis works tolerably well with *wa-qaṭal* clauses in CBH,[99] but the theory becomes less consistent when faced with the copious amount of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses which by (nearly) all scholars are considered verb-initial and realis. Though *wa(y)-yiqṭol* is a clause-type[100] that is gradually declining in favour of the intruding *qaṭal*, it cannot be considered a minor verbal usage. Cook's mistakes are fourfold:

(1) He supposes that the basic word order distinction is SV // VS, instead of recognising the basic observation of Hebrew text-linguistics that the fundamental distinction of word order concerns the position of the verb. According to Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics, the fundamental word

order opposition is not VS // SV but VX // XV, where X may be not only subject, but direct object, adverbial expression, etc. In Cook's definition of word order, the subject is given too much weight in comparison with other clausal constituents.

(2) Cook supposes that "irrealis clauses exhibit verb-subject word order" (Cook 2012a, 234), which makes him incapable of explaining the subject + long *yiqṭol* clauses in instruction, which often alternate with *wa-qaṭal* clauses with the same type of irrealis meaning (obligation). He maintains that the word order opposition SV // VS signals an alternation between realis and irrealis clauses in a text, but this is obviously not the case. The fundamental word order opposition is one between discourse-continuity and -discontinuity clauses (not between realis and irrealis): *XV* expresses discourse discontinuity, and *wa-VX* is the typical pattern of macro-syntactic continuity, for example in a narrative main line (*wa(y)-yiqṭol*) or the successive steps in an instruction (*wa-qaṭal*). The inevitable conclusion is that a *VX* word order can be either realis (e.g. narrative) or irrealis (e.g. instruction/obligation), and the same holds for an *XV* word order.[101]

(3) Cook's word order supposition lacks typological evidence. He is unable to explain the linguistic forces behind such a development in Biblical Hebrew. His treatment of the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause-type is hard to understand, since such clauses have VS word order, which according to Cook should be analysed as irrealis, but an assumption of

this type is fundamental for Cook, because otherwise his irrealis/realis word order hypothesis would collapse.[102]

(4) Cook does not recognise the distinction between discourse-continuity (*wa-VX*) and discourse-discontinuity clauses. The reason why *wa-qaṭal* clauses are preferred for "procedural instruction" (in Exod. 25.10–14) in contradistinction to *X-yiqṭol* clauses is that *wa-qaṭal* clauses signal continuity. Cook fails to recognise the fundamental role of the conjunction *wa* in *wa-VX* clauses.[103]

Jan Joosten (2012) strives to retain a certain amount of traditional terminology and to "keep theory and technical terminology to a minimum," for the benefit of "exegetes of the biblical texts" (Joosten 2012, 7). A definite strength of Joosten's monograph is that his description of the CBH verbal system is independent of a semantic distinction between two different *wa*. Joosten is relatively consistent in calling the conjunction 'copula', irrespective of its being a traditional 'consecutive *waw*' or a traditional 'copulative *waw*'. The *waC-* (with following gemination in *wayyiqṭol*) is regarded as having retentive function (an ancient Semitic preterite *yaqtul* is preserved in *wa(y)-yiqṭol*). But at the same time, and without further explanation, two of the basic 'tenses' in Classical Hebrew are presented as verbal forms with a proclitic *wa*: *wayyiqṭol* and *weqaṭal*. This *wa* is designated by Joosten as both a 'copula' and as an intrinsic part of the 'tense' itself. In this way, Joosten has got rid of the terminology of two different *waw*, but has retained the typologically unparalleled idea of two verbal forms with an intrinsic initial 'copula'. As a consequence of this, there are two kinds of *wa* anyway: such that

are constituents in a 'tense',[104] and such that are not. I presume that Joosten's defence would be that this is how a synchronic state of Biblical Hebrew works (namely the Classical Hebrew prose language), and we have to accept it as is, strange or not.[105]

The ambition to keep theory and technical terminology at a minimum comes at a price, though, because old terminology can be misleading and an obstacle to a deeper understanding (thus Cook 2014, 380). An example is Joosten's terminology "YIQTOL and the jussive," which invites the impression that there is only one *yiqṭol* in Classical Hebrew (Joosten 2012, 11). Even in Joosten's view, there are at least two *yiqṭol*, because the jussive is also a *yiqṭol*, though with a 'short' morphology, so that the most logical terminology should be long *yiqṭol* and short *yiqṭol*. The latter term invites a discussion of the nature of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* as being an indicative (short) *yiqṭol*, a terminology that was relevant at least for the state of Biblical Hebrew when poetry used the short *yiqṭol* without the conjunction *wa* as a past perfective verb form (thus also Joosten 2012, 417f.). So Joosten recognises that there are two *yiqṭol*s in Biblical Hebrew, while his terminology makes the reader think there is only one.

Joosten's terminology concerning the verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew is traditional.[106] *Wa-qaṭal* and *qaṭal* are "two distinct verbal forms" and the *wa* in *wa-qaṭal* is called "the copula" (Joosten 2012, 16). This is old-fashioned and inappropriate terminology, because 'copula' in linguistics means a word used to link subject and predicate, not to link clauses. In a similar way, Joosten calls *wa(y)-yiqṭol* a verbal form, which means that Biblical Hebrew has two verbal forms with the proclitic conjunction

wa ('copula') regarded as an intrinsic part of the verbal form. I suspect that Joosten regards this as a linguistic fact that has somehow occurred in a specific synchronic state (= Classical Hebrew). Since it is a typological anomaly, one would expect Joosten to discuss this phenomenon, but he has no comments to offer (Joosten 2012, 16, 41).[107] In all other Semitic languages, such expressions are regarded as *clauses* with an initial conjunction *wa*, not as verbal forms.

The final break-down of this unconsidered terminology occurs in chapter X ('Verbal forms in textual perspective'). In this chapter, Joosten (2012, 350) introduces the concept of a clause: "The building blocks of texts are not individual verbal forms, but clauses." Knowing from Joosten's book that both '*weqaṭal*' and '*wayyiqṭol*' are 'verbal forms' (as well as 'tenses'), it is certainly surprising to read the following in the same chapter:

> Finally, the verbal clause as a whole can be linked to the context by one or more conjunctions or sentence adverbs such as ו, או, עתה, לכן, אבל, אבן, כי. These conjunctions come at the head of the clause and do not seem to have any direct effect on its inner structure. (Joosten 2012, 351)

Since '*weqaṭal*' and '*wayyiqṭol*' according to Joosten are 'verbal forms', they should be expected to conform to the property formulated above. But there are no examples of Classical Hebrew clauses of the types וַיִּקְטֹל or וְקָטַל, nor וַיִּקְטֹל או or וְקָטַל או, nor וַיִּקְטֹל עתה or וְקָטַל עתה, nor וַיִּקְטֹל לכן or וְקָטַל לכן, nor וַיִּקְטֹל אבל or וְקָטַל אבל, nor וַיִּקְטֹל אבן or וְקָטַל אבן, nor וַיִּקְטֹל כי or וְקָטַל כי. How then can Joosten call the syntagms '*weqaṭal*' and '*wayyiqṭol*' verbal forms and tenses? Joosten (2012, 350) says that verbal forms "need to be incorporated in a clause or sentence." Yes, but

Joosten's *weqaṭal* and *wayyiqṭol* cannot be incorporated, because they are not verbal forms. They are in themselves clauses with a conjunction, and they are not 'tenses' (Isaksson 2021a, 221). Very often, *wa-qaṭal* and *wa(y)-yiqṭol* also constitute main clauses. The whole scheme of "the Hebrew verbal sentence in main clauses" that Joosten presents on page 352 inevitably leaves out the most frequent main-line verbal clauses in Classical Hebrew prose, the clause-types *wa-qaṭal* and *wa(y)-yiqṭol*. Such clauses are not even mentioned in his overview of Hebrew verbal sentences.

Unlike many of his predecessors, Joosten (2012, 308) recognises a comparative Semitic perspective and admits that *wa(y)-yiqṭol* has a history as a Proto-Semitic 'preterite', that *qaṭal* is a cognate of the Akkadian stative, and that *yiqṭol* (that is, the long *yiqṭol*) was originally an imperfective formation. In fact, long *yiqṭol* was even used as a present progressive in Archaic Hebrew (Notarius 2012, 194f.). But Joosten maintains that the comparative perspective is an issue of interest to the *experts*: what matters to the student and exegete of Biblical Hebrew is the synchronic state of Classical Hebrew, and this synchronic state exhibits the four traditional basic 'tenses'. To them he adds a present tense: the active predicative participle. The *yiqṭol* has a "basic modal, *irrealis* function" (Joosten 2012, 29, 32). *Wa-qaṭal* is also irrealis. The synchronic state Joosten studies remains a mystery, inexplicable in the comparative Semitic perspective.[108] It is apparent that comparative Semitic typology has little bearing on his book. Joosten makes comparisons and considers cognate verbal forms in Ugaritic and Amarna Canaanite to be relevant for *earlier* stages

of Hebrew, even for the archaic biblical poetry, but such comparisons seem stunningly irrelevant for his synchronic understanding of CBH. "One of the foremost challenges to Joosten's model of the BHVS is that it is typologically unparalleled" (Cook 2012a, 141).

In spite of the research accounted for above, until recently, the verbal system of Biblical Hebrew has deserved to be called "this most mystifying domain" (Greenstein 1988, 7). This predicament has come to an end with the latest research by Geoffrey Khan, who has contributed significantly to the solution of the most mystifying facet of the consecutive 'tenses', the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type. In a recent publication, Khan (2021a) has shown that *wa-qaṭal* is a construction in Bybee's (2010; 2015) sense (see further §1.2.9 and §6 in this book). Khan's explanation of *wa-qaṭal* as a construction in Bybee's sense represents a great step forward to a linguistic understanding of the 'consecutive tenses' (Isaksson forthcoming). The basic idea behind his arguments is that the 'consecutive' *wa-qaṭal* began its specific development in the position of apodosis, which many scholars have already suggested. With this usage as a starting-point, *wa-qaṭal* was schematised by step-by-step extensions of its meanings, in accordance with the construction theory of Joan Bybee. This development took place in a stage after the archaic language (Notarius 2013, 288f., 304). Khan applies Bybee's general linguistic terminology, and argues that CBH *wa-qaṭal* was a chunk with high frequency that became a construction. "Constructions often contain explicit lexical material" (Bybee 2010, 76), and in this case the lexical material is the conjunction *wa* in *wa-qaṭal*. Constructions also "have a special

form, meaning and pragmatic effect that cannot be captured by more general principles of grammar" (Bybee 2010, 76f.). This explains why the meanings of *wa-qaṭal* cannot be deduced from the separate elements *wa* + *qaṭal*. This is the reason Biblical Hebrew scholarship has failed concerning *wa-qaṭal*. In the construction, *wa* is the invariant part and *qaṭal* is schematic with multiple forms: *wa-QAṬAL*.[109] An inevitable conclusion is that *wa-qaṭal* as a construction is a clause-type with the conjunction *wa* preserved in the construction. Specifically, *wa-qaṭal* is not a 'tense' (cf. Isaksson 2021a, 218f.; forthcoming).[110] The retention of the connective *wa-* is probably the reason why *wa-qaṭal* did not grammaticalise into a verbal morpheme (Khan 2021a, 342).

Khan's argumentation is an excellent application of modern linguistic theory to an enigma in Biblical Hebrew.[111] On this, see further §6.

---

[1] See further Isaksson (2021, 201–3). On this point I follow Notarius (2013, 22); Renz (2016, 437). Cook (2012a, 313): "There is a high degree of uniformity among all these discussions, despite the long gap of time between some of them with respect to the roles they assign to the *waw* conjunction."

[2] For CBH, see Lam and Pardee (2016).

[3] See also Huehnergard (2005; 2019, 62); Kouwenberg (2010a, 126ff.); Hackett (2012); Hasselbach (2013b, 329); Baranowski (2016b, 1); Kossmann and Suchard (2018, 47, 52).

[4] Gzella (2018, 27) takes the strange position that *way-yiqṭol* "completely replaced the perfect" in a "literary usage that extended into the vernacular." In this view, the older replaced the newer.

[5] For the concept of Archaic Biblical Hebrew, see Pat-El and Wilson-Wright (2013); Gianto (2016). The initial position of the verb in the

archaic language is a tendency for which there are exceptions (Isaksson 2021, 198 n. 5).

[6] On the debate about this *waw* in relation to the Aramaic Tel Dan inscription, see Isaksson (2021, 199–205).

[7] For the classification of the Semitic languages, I follow Huehnergard and Pat-El (2019); Pat-El (2019).

[8] Here must be mentioned also the works by Östen Dahl (1985; 2000) and Bybee and Dahl (1989).

[9] "[D]iachronics (and particularly diachronic typology) remains the only truly viable external 'control' on the analysis of BH grammar" (Cook 2012a, 178).

[10] There is some bewilderment as to which term to use for a (verbal) grammatical morpheme. Hopper and Traugott use (verbal) 'form', while Bybee and Dahl have introduced the neologism 'gram' to cover also periphrastic expressions. 'Inflectional category' is too narrow and 'grammatical category' too wide. For a discussion, see Bybee and Dahl (1989, 51). In the present book I will use (grammatical) form, (grammatical) morpheme, and gram interchangeably. For a wider term, cf. 'construction', introduced by Bybee (2010; 2015); see §1.2.9; §6.1.

[11] Concerning grammaticalisation and inferring diachrony from synchrony, see Croft (2003, 253–79). A history of research on grammaticalisation is found in Hopper and Traugott (2003, 19–38).

[12] Hopper and Traugott (2003, 4) prefer the term (verbal) 'grammatical form'.

[13] Dahl (2000, 8) maintains that this definition may in some cases be too narrow, and should include also, for example, the emergence of fixed word order, and Croft (2003, 271) emphasises "that grammaticalization applies to whole constructions, not just lexemes and morphemes." On this point, cf. Bybee's concept of 'construction'; see §1.2.9; §6.0.

[14] An example is the reduction of *going to* > *gonna* in English, with its bleached grammaticalised meaning and reduction of segmental length.

[15] Grammaticalisation involves both phonological and morphosyntactic processes. Croft (2003, 257) states that the first of two major grammaticalisation processes is rigidification of word order, "the fixing of the position of an element which formerly was free" (cf. construction, §1.2.9).

[16] An influential group of Semitists has remained structuralists and rejects the grammaticalisation approach (for example Huehnergard, Pat-El). The structuralist approach, with its concept of 'markedness', leads to explanations of verb forms that are conspicuously deficient in explanatory power, as in the following quotation from Korchin (2008, 324): "As predicted by markedness theory, the paradigmatically marked forms (*yqtl-u-* and *yqtl-a-*) each evidence a functional range that is both more restricted than, and yet also encompassed by the unmarked form (*yqtl-Ø*)."

[17] Hopper and Traugott (2003, 6) use the term 'cline': "forms do not shift abruptly from one category to another, but go through a series of small transitions, transitions that tend to be similar in type across languages." Heine et al. (1991) use the term 'grammaticalisation channels'.

[18] Bybee and Dahl (1989, 52) speak of "a small set of cross-linguistic **gram-types**." Certain meanings, such as perfective/past and present/future "are commonly expressed by grams in the languages of the world" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 53).

[19] This is a claim that Dahl (2000, 11) regards as "fairly uninteresting" and "probably untrue."

[20] This means also a refutation of a common theoretical assumption "that all uses of a word, morpheme or construction can be characterized by a single, general meaning. In fact, that is not generally the case" (Croft 2003, 262).

[21] The article is reprinted in Kuryłowicz (1975, 93–120). A similar formulation is in Kuryłowicz (1949, 49ff.).

[22] Subjunctives are often residual morphemes ('doughnut grams' with a lost centre), with originally indicative meaning (Dahl 2000, 10). Croft (2003, 260) calls such a process 'fossilisation': "Certain morphemes or phonological alternations cease to be the standard means of forming a grammatical category or construction. Instead, they become restricted chiefly to a limited specified class of words or constructions.… An extreme case of fossilization is the random retention of a former morpheme on lexical items."

[23] For the analysis of *be going to* as a construction, but *gonna* as a grammaticalised morpheme, see §1.2.9.

[24] Another aspect of the same process is a "rapid increase in token frequency which accompanies grammaticization" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 64; Bybee 1985, 17).

[25] The idea of exclusively binary (or even privative) oppositions in TAM systems is borrowed from universal phonology and probably misguided (Dahl 2000, 13). Languages vary essentially in two respects: "(i) which categories they choose out of the set of cross-linguistic categories, (ii) how they reduce the impreciseness that these categories have in choosing among the possible secondary or non-focal uses they have" (Dahl 1985, 33).

[26] In the present book, I will follow this terminology, with the exception of item f, for which I will use 'anterior' (Bybee's term; see Bybee 1985, 159). Gram types should be thought of as "relatively stable points along the paths of development that grams take in the course of grammaticalization processes" (Dahl 2000, 7).

[27] The term 'bounded' should be understood in the sense that "a certain limit or end-state is attained" (Dahl 1985, 29).

[28] Cross-linguistically, the progressive has a strong tendency to be marked periphrastically (Dahl 1985, 91). For the concept of reference time, see Hatav (2004, §5).

[29] Both perfective and imperfective grams tend to have markers. "In structuralist terms, we cannot identify one of the members of the opposition as the unmarked one.… [There are] stem alternations between perfective and imperfective forms to an extent not found anywhere else in tense–aspect systems" (Dahl 2000, 16).

[30] "It seems to be generally true that the order of morphemes within a word reflects an earlier ordering of words within a sentence" (Bybee 1985, 38, 41, referring to Givón 1971, and Vennemann 1973).

[31] Dahl (1985, 26) has a more syntactic definition: moods "are a grammatical way of indicating that the proposition is embedded into a modal or non-assertive context." Mood distinctions are normally used "in well-defined types of subordinate clauses" (Dahl 1985, 53). Because of our focus on the consecutive tenses, modal forms are not a central issue in the present book. For a more elaborate discussion of modality, see Palmer (2001).

[32] Some other examples of ventive/cohortative forms of verbs III*wy* where a formally long *yiqṭol(u)* should be analysed as short *yiqṭol(Ø)* with ventive suffix, from the first half of Genesis: 1.26; 2.18; 6.7; 11.4 (Sjörs 2023, 105); 18.21; 19.32, 34; 22.5; 24.14, 48 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol-V*); 24.49; 26.3.

[33] This is a linguistic confirmation that Deuteronomy is to be read diachronically as an exposition of "both P and non-P legislative material" (Kilchör 2019, 102). P is written in a firmly CBH language (Petersson 2019). Eberhard Otto also regards D as a later text than P (Retsö 2017).

[34] One sentence often stretches over several verses, as in 4.45–46, 4.47–49, 6.10–11, 14.24–25. Extreme protases are found in Deut. 17.2–4, 19.8–9.

[35] There is a relative clause within a relative clause in Deut. 3.24 (Brockelmann 1956, §151); concatenated relative clauses in Deut. 4.46; a relative clause with extended meaning (purpose/result) in Deut. 6.3; rhetorical scribal syntax with repeated relative clauses in Deut. 11.4–6.

[36] The normal purpose clause in Classical Hebrew is *wa* + jussive short *yiqṭol*, but *lə-VN* functions as purpose clause in Deut. 4.36 (לְיַסְּרֶךָּ)—and in 4.38 (לְהוֹרִישׁ) with a more independent function—as do *bə-VN* in Deut. 5.28 (בְּדַבְּרְכֶם) and *lə* + general VN in Deut. 5.29, 10.12 (לְיִרְאָה). A more independent (close to finite) function of VN is also found in Deut. 6.19 (לְהַדְּף), 10.12 (5×). A protasis is enlarged with *lə-VN* clauses (instead of with *wa-qaṭal* clauses, as in Gen.–Num.) in Deut. 11.13, 22; 28.1, 12. Several instances of *lə-VN* function as complement clauses in Deut. 26.18–19.

[37] There is, for example, increased use of VNabs for IMP, as in Deut. 5.12, 15.2, 16.2, 24.9, 31.26.

[38] Some new idioms: a tendency to replace הִנֵּה with רְאֵה (Deut. 4.5, 11.26); the new phrase עַד־לֶב הַשָּׁמַיִם (Deut. 4.11); frequent use of a main verb with following infinitive, as in Deut. 5.25 (יִסְפֶּים׀ אֲנַחְנוּ לִשְׁמֹעַ), instead of a serial verb construction with two syntactically equal verbal clauses; a connection formed by *wa-qaṭal* of the copula verb after a frozen request particle (cf. Brockelmann 1956, §9), as in Deut. 5.29: מִי־יִתֵּן וְהָיָה. Conspicuous in Deuteronomy also is the extended use of the verb *pnh* instead of *šwb*, as in Deut. 10.5 (וָאֵפֶן וָאֵרֵד מִן־הָהָר) and 16.7.

[39] In Genesis–Numbers, אֵין expresses the non-existence of the actant in the *qoṭel*. Compare its normalisation as a means of negation before *qoṭel* in Deut. 1.32; 4.12, 22.

[40] In Deut. 3.3, the complex conjunction עַד־בְּלֹתִי occurs before a *qaṭal* clause. In Deut. 4.37, there is the complex וְתַחַת כִּי (consisting of three particles).

[41] This is seen in the protasis אִם־יֹסְפִים | אֲנַחְנוּ לִשְׁמֹעַ אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ עוֹד in Deut. 5.25, where a long *yiqṭol* would have been expected, and also in a temporal clause after כִּי in Deut. 18.9.

[42] This usage, which Joosten (2012, 241) calls *futurum instans*—a present that is used to represent imminent action—is seen in Deut. 2.4.

[43] In Deut. 11.26 (רְאֵה אָנֹכִי נֹתֵן), *qoṭel* is used as a performative instead of the expected *qaṭal*; but it can be taken as prospective.

[44] In Deut. 3.21 and 4.3, the *qoṭel* with definite article functions as a relative clause after a left-dislocated noun phrase ‘your own eyes’.

[45] According to Gzella (2013c, 859) short word-final vowels disappeared in Northwest Semitic at the beginning of the first millennium BCE. Violation of word order is attested in Deuteronomy in 19.3—thus also Joosten (2012, 217 n. 19, 266, 319 n. 19), though he suggests that תְּכִין may be read as a VNabs with imperative meaning from a root *tkn*—and possibly also in Deut. 2.4 (Joosten 2015, 33).

[46] The rule has been misunderstood to mean that *qaṭal* cannot take a clause-initial position. For this, there are many counterexamples (for example, the clause-type *Ø-qaṭal*, in §7.3.3). The word order rule for *qaṭal* means that it should not be allowed to conform to the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type, which has invaded the imperfective semantic field as a replacement for clause-initial *yiqṭol(u)* (see §6.11). An example of a *wa* + *qaṭal* clause in Deuteronomy is found in 2.30 (*kī-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*) in direct speech (Schulz 1900, 36; Joosten 2012, 225; Hornkohl 2014, 260, 289); it is the only *wa-qaṭal* with the function of a *qaṭal* in Deuteronomy (Gropp 1991, 48).

[47] The last three features—clause-initial *yiqṭol(u)*, ‘normal’ *qaṭal* preceded by *wa*, and a form of *haya* + *qoṭel* as an emerging new analytic tense—represent tendencies that forebode the gradual breakdown of the classical verbal system in LBH (Hornkohl 2016b, 1045, with references).

[48] Joosten (2016, 328) takes the same position, with the exception of the archaic poetry and some possible insertions from later layers of CBH. It is assumed that CBH represents the high literary register in a diglossic situation in the political centre of Jerusalem (Khan 2013c, 16). Of Elitzur's (2018) nine early CBH features, the first three are unconvincing, but the remaining six are probable at least. I agree with Hornkohl (2017, 55) in considering the Tiberian Masoretic tradition "sufficiently clear and authentic to permit meaningful linguistic discussion leading to sound diachronic conclusions." There are "striking patterns of historical development discernible in the case of numerous linguistic features within the MT" (Hornkohl 2017, 57).

[49] This is not to deny that some later additions can be detected; see Joosten (2019).

[50] While "linguistic verification for the alleged postexilic origins of extensive stretches of material in the Pentateuch is strikingly absent," this cannot be stated for many of the psalms (Hornkohl 2017, 75). A diachronic evaluation of the psalms on linguistic grounds is still an unfinished task, which requires a clear picture not only of LBH but also of CBH (a goal still not reached, since fundamental problems with the consecutive tenses have remained unsolved to this day).

[51] *REL* stands for a relative pronoun; *way* indicates that the Tiberian tradition reads the connective *wa-* with a following gemination (see §1.2.5); *Ø* means that the clause is asyndetic.

[52] *XØ* stands for a verbless clause, and IMP is imperative. A *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause is registered as *yiqṭol(Ø)* predicate with connective *way*, and (usually) TAM perfective-past (one of the values in field TAM).

[53] The values constitute the actual meanings found in the database.

[54] The number of switch-types in the database is 193, including cases with no switch, such as *yiqṭol(u)/yiqṭol(u)*.

[55] The values of Sem Rel are 87 in number, and are based on the semantic taxonomy presented in Dixon (2009), with some additions typically

found in CBH texts, such as 'Attendant circumstance', 'Background', and '(Editorial) Comment'. This taxonomy will be used in the present book.

[56] The domain is a more precise concept than Longacre's concept of 'discourse types' (Longacre and Bowling 2015, 4–11), which partly coincides with genre; see the criticism by Notarius (2008, 58): it "is based on language use situations, the number of which is not limited."

[57] My parentheses mark the protasis.

[58] In the résumé of Baranowski's investigation, I have retained his abbreviation NVC, instead of my own (*XØ*), which is used in the rest of this book.

[59] Baranowski 2016a, 124: 'And Paḥura [*sic*] **has committed** a great misdeed against me. **He sent** Suteans and **they killed** a šerdanu. And **he brought** 3 men into Egypt.'

[60] Baranowski 2016a, 161: '**Send** me a large archer host so that **it may drive out** the king's enemies from his land and so that all lands **be joined** to the king.'

[61] Baranowski renders the last phrase "we may restore (it)" in italics, but it should be in bold.

[62] Cook (2012a, 268) criticises what are often perceived as the exaggerated conclusions of the concept of (different) discourse types: "there is not a fundamentally different TAM system at work in speech and non-speech deictic contexts." He quotes Comrie (1986, 21): "the meaning of a tense is independent of its discourse function in any particular context" (quoted from Cook 2012a, 274). For this reason, I am at variance with Longacre's position, formulated in this way (Longacre 1992, 178): "The uses of a given tense within a given cluster may differ quite well strikingly from the uses of the same tense within another cluster (discourse type)."

[63] This [a] shifted to [i] before *yod*, an assimilation in the 3m and 3p forms, in the later Tiberian tradition, so the [a] of *wayyiqṭol* must be a preservation of an original [a] vowel of the *wa-* in *wayyiqṭol*, which later

shifted to [i] (Khan 2021a, 332 n. 30, and personal communication). The Tiberian differentiation of the reading of *wa* into two variants, *wə* and *wa* + gemination, is not found in all reading traditions. It is not found in the Samaritan oral tradition of the Pentateuch (Müller 1991, 148; Florentin 2016, 126), and it is not upheld in the second column of the Hexapla or in the Latin transcription of St. Jerome (Müller 1991, 146; Yuditsky 2016, 115). In the Palestinian reading, the ו before a perfective past *yiqṭol(Ø)* is sometimes unmarked, sometimes marked as *wa* (Müller 1991, 147f.); it is unmarked in Ezek. 16.11, 13; Ps. 37.36 (see Yahalom 2016, 167). But the Babylonian tradition reflects the distinction (Müller 1991, 147), and the Karaite Arabic transcriptions generally follow the Tiberian reading (Khan 2016, 158).

[64] Yeivin (1980, 49, 294); Khan (2018a, 341, 344; 2018b; 2020, 534); *pace* Pardee (2012, 294 n. 47), who regards the gemination as "late proto-Hebrew." Pardee's conclusion (2012, 287 n. 12) is: "[i]t appears in any case likely to me that the proto-Hebrew conjunctival element was identical, i.e. */wa/*, and that the doubling of the preformative consonant of the PC is secondary."

[65] Khan (2018a, 345): "there are numerous examples of morphophonemic restructuring to distinguish homophones" in the Samaritan oral tradition. A number of scholars, like Müller (1991, 145, 155), maintain that the gemination (creating a closed syllable) was introduced in order to retain the vowel *a* in the conjunction, but the linguistic force behind this retention remains unexplained. Other scholars explain the gemination as due to a difference in stress: perfective **yáqtub* but imperfective **yaktúbu*, which, when preceded by *wa*, led to a gemination in the perfective form (Lambdin 1971a, 325 n. 16): perfective **wa* + *yáktub* > *wayyiktōb* versus 'imperfective' (thus Lambdin) *wəyiktōb* < **wayaktúbu* (this does not generally exhibit an attested stress contrast, but Lambdin argues that the stress contrast survives intact in some root types, e.g., Iwy *wayyéšeb/wəyēšḗb*). All theories of different stress patterns are refuted by recent observations by Huehnergard (2019, 53) that word

stress was non-phonemic in Proto-Semitic. Some scholars have adduced Egyptian *ỉw* as a reflex (or loan) of Hebrew *wa* + gemination (Smith 1991, 4). Some *way-yiqṭol* forms evidently exhibit penultimate stress, but, as Revell (1984, 441) argues, "it is difficult to believe that the penultimate stress which they show is a genuine survival from an earlier stage of the language."

[66] Müller (1991, 145; also Revell 1984, 443 n. 25; Smith 1991, 4) rejects with good reason the suggestions by numerous scholars that *wə* and *wa* plus gemination represent historically distinct morphemes. *Wa* + gemination is sometimes derived from an adverbial morpheme **wan*, in which *n* is proposed to be a past tense marker borrowed from Egyptian (Young 1953, 251f.; also Sheehan 1971; Gordon 1983). Schramm (1957–58, 6) derives *wa* plus gemination from "**walyišmor*," where *l* is proposed to be the optative marker found before the jussive in Akkadian and Arabic. The position of Cook (2013, 899f.) is unacceptable and approaches linguistic mysticism: the *wa* in *wayyiqṭol* is "fused with" the verb. Cook's false assumption that *realis* and *irrealis* moods were distinguished by word order drives him to maintain that *wayyiqṭol* is a case of "triggered inversion" of the word order (which he analyses as not verb-initial) "brought about by the peculiar morphology of the enclitic conjunction with gemination (often explained as the remnants of a grammatical word)."

[67] The Tiberian Masoretes felt a need to avoid the homonymic readings of jussive ויקטל and past perfective ויקטל (Kantor 2020, 58f.). Long *yiqṭol* was not involved in this process, since it was (practically) always distinguished by its internal position in the clause. In CBH, there was no need to distinguish short *yiqṭol* from long *yiqṭol.* This does not necessarily hold for later biblical texts, and Khan (2020, 534) keeps this question open. It is quite possible that the Tiberian Masoretes, who also handled the reading of LBH texts, wanted to avoid all homonymic readings, regardless of whether they concerned the short *yiqṭol* or the (mostly homonymic) long ויקטל. "It would seem, then, that the introduction of

gemination was innovated in the reading tradition to preserve the distinct meaning of a past tense that otherwise might have been perceived as non-past/future" (Kantor 2020, 107).

[68] Blum (2008, 138) also supposes a Classical Hebrew stage when the two syntagms were homophonous: "eine formale Differenzierung zwischen sog. *Waw copulativum* und *Waw consecutivum* sprachgeschichtlich für die alttestamentliche Zeit noch gar nicht anzunehmen ist" and "[g]erade unter der Voraussetzung eines formal nicht differenzierten *wayiqṭol* bewährt sich die angenommene Systematik: ein Ausdruck wie *wyktbw* kan darin entweder „und sie schrieben" oder „und sie sollen schreiben / auf dass sie schreiben" bezeichnen;" similarly Müller (1994, 166). In CBH (in contradistinction to archaic poetry), the realis *yiqṭol(Ø)* was used only after *wa* (a phrase that represents a retention). In other positions, it had been replaced by the *qaṭal* morpheme. This means that a *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* was unambiguous as jussive in CBH. The homophony occurred only after *wa*.

[69] This is confirmed by the investigation of the transcriptions of the Secunda and Jerome by Kantor (2020, 99f., 124): in the First Temple period "the conjunction *waw* was ***pronounced identically*** before a preterite *yiqṭol* and non-preterite *yiqṭol* form, probably with the original etymological */a/ vowel" (Kantor's emphasis).

[70] This is also the position of Gropp (1991, 47f.); Ben-Ḥayyim (2000, 171); Yuditsky (2017, 232); Kantor (2020, 65f., 95). For domain, see §1.2.4 and Cohen (2014). Revell (1984, 444) arrives at a similar time period for the differentiation. Thus also Tropper (1996, 636), although he is less specific concerning the age of the differentiation, which he describes as "zwischen kopulativem und 'konversivem' *Waw*."

[71] This is the conclusion also of Kantor (2020, 100, §6.2). Hornkohl (2019, 556): "The signature gemination of its verbal prefix, i.e. *way-yiqṭol*, which distinguishes it from the volitional-final *we*PC, i.e., *wey-iqṭol*, may well reflect a secondary, semantically driven development." Thus also Tropper (1998, 165 n. 41); Pardee (2012, 287 n. 12). This is

suggested by Khan (2013a, 43 n. 31), though his terminology implies that the verb form after the *wə* is an 'imperfect' (similarly Tropper 1996, 636), a clause-type (*wa-yiqṭol(u)*) that is rarely found in CBH. Khan (2013a, 43 n. 31) suggests an Aramaic influence: "One may perhaps identify this marking of *dagesh* to express a semantic distinction in its occurrence in the prefixes of imperfect consecutive verb forms to distinguish them from imperfect forms with conjunctive *waw*."

[72] Müller (1991, 146, 148, 156; 1994, 166) agrees with Khan that the gemination is a Masoretic feature, but regards it a case of atavism (restitution) of an archaic verbal usage. Revell (1984, 444) argues that the gemination after *wa* was introduced "near the end of the biblical period, when the use of the *waw* consecutive imperfect began to be abandoned." He does not, however, discuss the role of the reading tradition on this point (cf. Smith 1991, 4).

[73] Rainey (1986, 6) gives additional nice examples of the jussive/perfective distinction of the old *yiqṭol(Ø)* in CBH.

[74] Revell (1984, 444) concludes that the function of *wa* + gemination is not to distinguish short forms (< **yaqtul*) from long forms (< **yaqtulu*), but to mark the specific "*waw* consecutive use," that is, to clearly mark the past narrative use as against the jussive (which has the 'normal' form of the conjunction). Baranowski (2016b, 12f.) also discusses the retention of *wa* in *wayyiqṭol* as a device to mark off the preterite meaning of the syntagm, but he is unsure about the Masoretic origin of the doubling. Baranowski on this point quotes Loprieno (1980, 10) "that *wayyaqom* was an old morphological formation, specialized in Hebrew in a new function unknown before." Against this we must object that the function of indicative '*wayaqom*' is neither new nor unknown, but old and in continued use in Biblical Hebrew, and that the jussive *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* (Masoretic *wə-yiqṭol*) is as old as the 'preterite' *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* (Masoretic *wayyiqṭol*). They represent the same verbal grammatical morpheme.

[75] For a different view of *w-yqtl* in the Tel Dan and Zakkūr inscriptions, see Gzella (2013c, 859; 2018, 26 n. 17).

[76] In comparative Semitic discussions, a more general terminology is necessary: *yaqtul*, *wa-yaqtul* (indicative or jussive), *yaqtulu*, *qatal*, *wa-qatal*.

[77] I disregard that some scholars prefer to make use of a term other than 'consecutive', for example 'conversive', 'conservative', 'energic', etc. 'Consecutive' is, however, the term used in a majority of the Biblical Hebrew grammars.

[78] For the concept of clause-type, see Talstra (2013).

[79] This tenet was formulated with inspiration from Buth (1995) and Hornkohl (2018, 48ff.). In Tenet 1*, boldface ***wa*** indicates 'consecutive *waw*', '*V*' is a finite verb and '*X*' is any non-verbal clausal constituent except negation. The terminology with *X* used before a verb form is taken from Niccacci (1990). I have concluded from my material that *wa-lō-qaṭal* creates no break in the consecution; it takes part in the story-line (see §7.12). The '*X*' before the verb may also be a conjunction (other than *wa*), such as *kī* or *ʿal-kēn*. Givón (1977), in spite of a fundamental mistake in his identification of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* as "IMPERFECT" (and thus, in his view, *in se* an expression of discourse-pragmatic continuity), and in spite of his disregarding the role of *wa* in this continuity—but possibly because he speaks of just "the conjunction va- 'and'" (Givón 1977, 190, 199)—arrives at a conclusion not too far from the position in the present book, i.e., the role of SV syntax being a signal of topic shifting (Givón 1977, 240). Topic continuity correlates with VS syntax (Givón 1977, 210). Givón's (1977, 236, 202) statistics on Genesis show that his focus on the position of the subject (only) is unwarranted: object topicalisation is found in 10.6%, subject topicalisation in 11.6% of the cases when the continuity is broken. Givón (1977, 240) is right in his conclusion that there was a gradual word order shift to SV in LBH,

and this shift was completed with the replacement of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* by *qaṭal* as the dominant narrative past verbal morpheme.

[80] For a clause linking approach, see Isaksson (2014a; 2015a; 2015b; 2017; 2021; forthcoming).

[81] This is known as the 'bottom-up' approach. For a survey of research, see Talstra (2013); Hornkohl (2018). The epoch-making work by Alviero Niccacci (1990; Italian version 1986) must be mentioned. This book became an eye-opener for many biblical scholars in the 1990s. In spite of the achievements in all those books surveyed by Talstra (2013), including those by Niccacci, I dearly miss a comparative Semitic perspective and a notion of grammaticalisation (and with it a diachronic approach; see §1.2.1). This perspective is missing even in the relatively recent book by Longacre and Bowling (2015).

[82] "The *clause* ('sentence') is the basic information processing unit in human discourse. A word may have 'meaning', but only the proposition—grammaticalised as clause—carries information. Human discourse, further, is *multipropositional*. Within it, chains of clauses are combined into larger thematic units which one may call *thematic paragraphs*" (Givón 1983, 7). For a presentation of the concept of clause in a Biblical Hebrew context, see Isaksson (2015a, 173–75).

[83] *Wa(y)-yiqṭol* does not normally introduce background, but may take part in a background complex introduced by, e.g., a *qaṭal* clause (see §2.3.3).

[84] For Table 4, see Cook (2012a, 287f.); also Hopper (1979, 214–16, 220), and Hopper and Thompson (1980, 252f., 264, 277).

[85] I disagree with Heimerdinger (1999, 223–25), who works with an understanding of foreground that is less fruitful for CBH texts (see Cook 2012a, 295 n. 12). Heimerdinger (1999, 223) proposes that the "first foregrounding device consists in the use of norms and standards people assume will be obeyed in communication." I also disagree with the ideas about foreground (based on schema theory) presented in Cotrozzi

(2010). For Cotrozzi (2010, 6, 9, 50), a key factor in foregrounding is 'deviance from a norm': "foregrounded material, then, can be determined simply by setting the specific realization of a knowledge structure underlying a passage against its default."

[86] The idea seems to have come up as early as the tenth century C.E. (Van de Sande 2008, 27 n. 6; Cook 2012a, 83).

[87] Wilhelm Gesenius in the first 13 editions of his Hebrew grammar (1813–42).

[88] For a list of features in the medieval system of 'inversive tenses' that remained unexplained, see Van de Sande (2008, 54).

[89] See Van de Sande (2008, 55 n. 2) concerning the position of McFall himself (1982, vii). A defender of the conversive *waw* and a temporal interpretation of the verb forms is Blake (1951). Joosten's basic assumption in this instance is that *wa-qaṭal* and *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (with *waw* included in the syntagms) are regarded as 'verbal forms' (and 'tenses'); the special *wa* before the two verbal forms he calls '*waw* conservative' (Joosten 2012, 15). This term is misleading as regards *wa-qaṭal*, in which practically nothing of the *qaṭal* semantics is preserved (Isaksson forthcoming, and §6 in this book).

[90] For a principal discussion on this topic, see Isaksson (2015c).

[91] "The impact of historical-comparative investigations on the understanding of the BH *qatal* is no less dramatic" (Cook 2012a, 119). it is now crystal clear that the *qaṭal* developed from the predicative use of a verbal adjective *qatil / qatul*. And an *active* dynamic pattern *qatal* is attested at Ebla (thus Cook 2012a, 119).

[92] For example, the Tel Dan inscription (Cook 2012a, 94, 99f., 104).

[93] This is the strongest position, supported also by Kogan (2015). But it remains a mystery that the old imperfective formation *yaqattal* left seemingly no traces in Central Semitic (see Cook 2012a, 108).

[94] "[T]he consecutive *waw* links two clauses and delimits the boundary between them;" and "it is the syntax and not *waw* which 'converts'" (Smith 1991, 14).

[95] See, however, Dahl (1985) and the early article Bybee and Dahl (1989).

[96] Unfortunately, Cook forgot this methodological principle when he worked out his own word order hypothesis for Biblical Hebrew (see below).

[97] See further Garr and Fassberg (2016). It is strange that Cook (2012a) himself does not sort his own text samples according to this diachronic principle.

[98] Though I agree with Cook that Classical Hebrew is aspect-prominent, this is not a crucial question in the present book, since the concept of gram permits verb forms to show both temporal and aspectual meanings. For me, the verbal grammatical morpheme (gram) is the central concept for understanding the entities of the verbal system. Tenses and aspects are semantic descriptions of the meanings encountered in grams.

[99] The theory fails in texts close to LBH when *wa-qaṭal* is used as a narrative clause-type for past time, as in 2 Kgs 18.3–4, where *wa-qaṭal* is clearly realis; this is an example that Cook himself adduces without observing the problem with his word order theory (Cook 2012a, 282).

[100] Cook often calls *wa(y)-yiqṭol* a verb ("the narrative verb," Cook 2012a, 297).

[101] Quoting DeCaen, Cook suggests that there is an *underspecified subject* between the conjunction and the verb: "an 'underspecified' function word assimilated between the conjunction and the agreement affix (i.e., *wa-y-yiqtol*)" (Cook 2012a, 236, 258).

[102] On another page, Cook writes that "the *wa*C- prefix remains unanswered" (Cook 2012a, 120, 259) and intimates that an underspecified function word is hidden between the *wa-* and the *yiqṭol*. He tries to

prove that *wa(y)-yiqṭol* was perceived by the natives as SV word order (and thus realis). With this assumption, it is not enough just to assume a "function word" between *wa* and *yiqṭol* for his hypothesis to remain true: the function word must specifically represent the *subject* in order to create the SV word order, and this may be at the same time as an explicit subject is positioned after the verb in the same clause. Cook (2012a, 260) also discusses the archaic example 2 Sam. 22.16, with an asyndetic "archaic past form." In a case like this, Archaic Hebrew exhibits a clear Ø-VS (short *yiqṭol*) word order with explicit following subject, which according to Cook must be irrealis (at least if CBH). In the case of 2 Sam. 22.16, it is impossible to assume an "underspecified function word" before the verb.

[103] Cook's terminology concerning 'irrealis *yiqṭol*' is ambiguous and misleading: the term is used for irrealis meanings of long *yiqṭol* and in several cases also for jussive short *yiqṭol* (Exod. 9.13; Cook 2012a, 254).

[104] With Joosten's (2012, 264) wording: "WEQATAL incorporates a conjunction."

[105] The inconsistency of the synchronic state of Classical Hebrew also includes the identification of (long) *yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal* as 'allomorphs', because "one should disregard the etymology of the forms" (Joosten 2012, 261).

[106] Cook (2014, 380) describes Joosten's terminology as "a faulty, underdeveloped, or outdated theory."

[107] It is odd to encounter a formulation such as "WAYYIQTOL occurring in clause-initial position when the clause begins with the copula" (Joosten 2012, 41). Does Joosten not hold that *wayyiqṭol* always begins with "the copula"?

[108] A prototypical meaning of an imperfective formation, describing repeated actions in the past, is explained by Joosten (2012, 32) as an irrealis feature of *yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal*, though this contradicts his definition of *realis* "that a process really did come about." Joosten's (2012,

32f.) argument that such actions just "express possible actions… [not] as having come about, but as liable to happen" is simply incomprehensible. Joosten's (2012, 40) argument about the irrealis nature of *yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal* is a consequence of his assumption that the verbal forms in Hebrew must belong to either of two mutually exclusive *systems* of verb forms: an indicative and a modal system. This assumption is unfounded. Joosten (2012, 62) goes so far as to maintain that all questions are in some way modal ("There is something inherently modal about questions"), and he tries to prove that the relevance case of the progressive (long) *yiqṭol* in Gen. 37.15 must be modal anyway. A brief review of the development of imperfective grams shows that Joosten's efforts on this point are unwarranted (Bybee et al. 1994, ch. 5). Now, if Joosten (2012, 76) recognises that the progressive function was "formerly expressed by the long form of the prefix conjugation (*yaqtulu*, corresponding to biblical Hebrew YIQTOL)," why not reckon with a period of coexistence between the active participle and this long *yiqṭol*, even if this would contradict his thesis of its consistently modal nature? "The historical perspective explains the fact that YIQTOL expresses the real present in a number of well-defined syntactic environments, notably in questions" (Joosten 2012, 78). So it is not, after all, necessary to declare that questions are inherently modal. The real present meaning of long *yiqṭol* is retained in some syntactic environments of CBH, as is the case also in an Aramaic inscription (KAI[5] 312 I:4). Examples of this in CBH: Gen. 2.6 (past progressive); 32.18 (question); 32.30 (question); 37.15 (question); 42.1 (question); 48.17 (past progressive); Exod. 17.2 (question); Num. 23.9 (possibly archaic); 23.9 (relative clause); Deut. 3.28 (relative clause); Judg. 17.9 (question); 19.17 (question); and, outside the corpus, 1 Sam. 1.10 (past progressive). Joosten (2012, 78) maintains that such uses are residual functions, and that "YIQTOL has become a modal form in biblical Hebrew." The syntagm *hinnē-yiqṭol(u)* is attested in non-archaic poetry with real present meaning, but since this meaning cannot be classified as "prospective, iterative, modal" (all

meanings declared modal by Joosten), this fact is mentioned by Joosten (2012, 102) as a curiosity.

[109] Khan has not written exactly this, but as far as I can see it is an inevitable conclusion from his argumentation.

[110] *Pace* Khan (2021a), I propose that *wa(y)-yiqṭol* is not a construction (Isaksson forthcoming, n. 21). Both *wa-qaṭal* and *wa(y)-yiqṭol* are clause-types (Isaksson 2021, 218f.), but only *wa-qaṭal* is a construction. The meanings of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* can be deduced from its component parts: *wa*, which is a normal Semitic connective, and the short 'preterite' *yiqṭol*, which is inherited from Proto-Semitic (Baranowski 2016b; Isaksson 2021).

[111] A forerunner to this idea is found in Smith (1991, 8): "It would appear that the future uses of **qātal* in BH conditional sentences were extended to **qātal* in independent clauses in the form of the 'converted perfect'." For a critical evaluation of Khan (2021a), see Isaksson (forthcoming).