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.

2. THE CONJUNCTION *WA* IN CBH

2.1. PS **Wa* and the Concept of Natural Language Connective

Chaining was a central feature of Early Semitic syntax, and in this syntax the conjunction *wa* played a fundamental role (Cohen 2014, 234; Baranowski 2016a, 190). *Wa* was monosyllabic and proclitic (Huehnergard 2008, 241f.; Kogan 2014, 42, 53). This proclitic *wa* is used in all Semitic languages as a connective element between clauses (and thus as a conjunction).

It is a thesis of this book that the PS **wa* was a natural language connective in the sense described by Van Dijk (1977, 58).[1] As a natural language connective, *wa* should *not* be expected to fulfil de Morgan's law:[2]

$$\sim(P \,\&\, Q) = \sim P \vee \sim Q$$

Instead, the meaning of *wa* was ambiguous and pragmatically determined (Brongers 1978, 273; Posner 1980, 186). As clause-linking connective, this *wa* could express readings such as '(and) at the same time', '(and) there', '(and) therefore', '(and) then', '(and) so', '[if]… then'. A comparison with the English connective *and*, the basic meaning of which is rich and asymmetric, provides a good illustration (Schiffrin 1986, 45, emphasis added):[3]

(a) Annie is in the kitchen **and** (there) she is making doughnuts. [location]

(b) Annie fell into a deep sleep **and** (during this time) her facial color returned. [simultaneity]

 https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0414.02

(c) The window was open **and** (coming from it) there was a draught. [source]

(d) Peter married Annie **and** (after that) she had a baby. [temporal succession]

(e) Paul pounded on the stone **and** (thereby) he shattered it. [cause]

(f) Give me your picture **and** I'll give you mine. (If you give me your picture, I'll give you mine.) [conditionality]

(g) The number 5 is a prime number **and** (therefore) it is divisible only by 1 and itself. [conclusion]

These more specific meanings were primarily derived from the context (which includes the whole paragraph; Garr 1998, lxxii–lxxiii).[4] A terminology such as 'locative *and*', or 'sequential *and*', based on one of the examples above, would be misleading. There is only one *and*.

As a natural language conjunction, *wa* sets a clause in a certain relation to a previous clause. Pattern:

(*wa*)-Clause$_1$ *wa*-Clause$_2$

The pattern illustrates the simplest linking of two clauses (cf. §1.2.7).[5] Clause$_2$ is *linked* to Clause$_1$.[6] The conjunction *wa* puts Clause$_2$ in a *relation* to Clause$_1$. The full perceived meaning of *wa* is the semantic relation between the two clauses, and the order of the clauses is fundamental. It is Clause$_2$ that *relates to* Clause$_1$:

> If the action or state described in Clause$_2$ follows temporally after the action or state in Clause$_1$ the reader may perceive that *wa* is sequential (temporal succession), or even consequential.[7]

If the action or state described in Clause$_2$ is a consequence of the action or state in Clause$_1$ the reader may perceive that *wa* is consequential (*therefore*; *and so*).[8]

If the action or state described in Clause$_2$ explains something in Clause$_1$ the reader may perceive that *wa* is 'epexegetic' or 'explanative'.

If the action or state described in Clause$_2$ is concomitant with the action or state in Clause$_1$ the reader may perceive that *wa* is circumstantial or elaborative or summational.

The pragmatic meaning of *wa* is a relation: how Clause$_2$ relates to Clause$_1$. The nature of this relation is of primary importance for understanding a text. If a reader perceives that there are several different *wa*, this only proves that there are many different clausal relations between clauses connected by (one and the same) *wa*. It is impossible to prove that, for example, a 'consecutive *waw*' in CBH in itself has any deviating meanings: "these readings are no different from those of the conjunctive *waw* attached to any other word in Hebrew" (Garr 1998, lxxxvi).[9]

2.2. Some Reflexes of PS **Wa* in Semitic Languages

2.2.1. PS **Wa* in Akkadian

According to Kienast, the meaning of *wa* in Akkadian ($u < *wa$) was "und ausserdem" (Kienast 2001, 395, 438; Kogan 2014, 42), but, for the most ancient stages of Akkadian, this is a simplification. The connective *wa* was used in early Sargonic Akkadian and at that time could express both an additive meaning ('and also')

and a sequential meaning ('and then'). At this early stage, word order was still VSO and in the unmarked word order the (always proclitic) *wa* was attached directly to the verbal predicate (*wa*-verb), while other clausal constituents like subject, object, and adverbial expressions followed the verb.[10] In narrative or reports of historical events, the clauses were asyndetic (Ø) or connected by *wa* (*ù*). The following example in (1) is from a Sargonic inscription:

(1) URU^{ki} UNUG^{ki} SAG.GIŠ.RA ***ù*** BÀD-*śu* Ì.GUL.GUL **Ø** *in* ^{KASKAL}ŠUDUL UNUG[^{ki} *iš*$_{11}$-*ar* ***ù*** *lugal-z*]*ag-*⌜*ge*⌝*-si* [LU]GAL [UN]UG^{ki} *in* ^{KASKAL}ŠUDUL ŠU.DU$_8$.A **Ø** *in* SI.GAR-*rìm a-na* KÁ ^{d}*en-líl u-ru-uś*

'He conquered the city of Uruk **and** destroyed its walls. **Ø** [He was victorious] over Uruk in battle [**and**] captured Lugalzagesi, king of Uruk, in battle. **Ø** He led him in a neck stock to the gate of Enlil.' (Kogan 2014, 43, his emphasis)

According to Kogan (2014, 51f.), "many examples of *ù* in the inscriptions of Sargon and Rīmuš fully satisfy the idea of consecution both temporally and logically," as in (2):

(2) *in* ^{KASKAL}ŠUDUL URÍM^{ki} *iš*$_{11}$-*ar* ***ù*** URU^{ki} SAG.GIŠ.RA ***ù*** BÀD.*śu* ì.GUL.GUL

'He was victorious over Ur in battle, **and** (*then*, *as a consequence of this victory*) he conquered the city, **and** (*then*, *as a consequence of this conquest*) he destroyed its walls.' (Kogan 2014, 43, his emphasis)

When both *-ma* and *ù* are used in the same early Akkadian texts, the *ù* tends to become a minority connective marker which

introduces an additive and sometimes alternative event, as in the Narām-Su'en inscriptions:

(3) [*in kiš*^{ki}] ⌜*ip-ḫur*⌝*-kiš śar-ru*$_{14}$*-súm i-śî-*⌜*ù*⌝ ***ù*** *in* UNUG^{ki} *amar-giri*$_{16}$ *śar-ru*$_{14}$*-súm-ma i-śî-*⌜*ù*

'[In Kiš] they elevated Ipḫur-Kiš to kingship, **and** (*also*) in Uruk they elevated Amar-Giri likewise to kingship.' (Kogan 2014, 52, his emphasis)

In what seems to be a Proto-Semitic syntactic feature, an adverbial subordinate clause[11] may be followed by a *wa*-clause (syndesis) with the temporal or logical meaning 'und dann',[12] especially when the subordinate clause expresses a condition or a temporal relation. An example from early Akkadian, in a Sargonic royal inscription, is (4), where I also supply the translation by Gelb and Kienast:[13]

(4) *iś-tum* ^{KASKAL}ŠUDUL.^{KASKAL}ŠUDUL *śú-nu-ti iš*$_{11}$*-ar-ru* ***ù śar-rí-śu-nu*** 3 *i-ik-mi-ma maḫ-rí-iś* ^{d}*en-líl u-śa-rí-ib in u-mi-śu li-pi*$_5$*-it-ì-li* DUMU-śu ÉNSI *már-da*^{ki} É ^{d}*lugal-már-da*^{ki} *in már-da*^{ki} *ib-ni*

'After he was victorious in those battles, **he captured** their three kings and brought them before Enlil. At that time, Lipit-ilī, his son, governor of Marad, built the temple of Lugalmarda at Marad.' (Frayne 1993, 112; quoted by Kogan 2014, 54, my emphasis)

'Nachdem er diese Schlachten siegreich bestanden hatte, **da** hat er ihrer drei Könige gefangen genommen und vor Enlil hingeführt. Damals hat Lipitilī, sein Sohn, der Statthalter von Marda, den Tempel des Lugalmarda in Marda gebaut.' (Gelb and Kienast 1990, 102f.)

This *wa* has remained in use in all West Semitic languages.

2.2.2. PS **Wa* in Gəʿəz

In Gəʿəz, *wa* is the most general connecting particle. It can connect clauses "even in those cases in which other languages, more accurate in their expression of logical relations, make use of other uniting-words or particles" (Dillmann 1907, 522; Butts 2019, 134). An example is:

(5) *wä-ʔämmä kon-ä ʕəlät-ä täwäld-ä herodəs zäfän-ät wälätt-ä herodəyada bä-maʔkäl-omu* ***wä****-ʔäddäm-ät-o lä-herodəs* [7]***wä****-mäḥäl-ä l-ati yä-häb-a zä-säʔäl-ät-o*

'When it was the day on which Herod was born, the daughter of Herodias danced among them, **and** she pleased Herod. [7](Herod) swore to her to give her whatever she asked him.' (Butts 2019, 139–40; Mt. 14.6–7)

In (5), the first *wa*-clause (***wä****-ʔäddäm-ät-o* 'and she pleased') is simultaneous with the previous clause in the narrative. The second *wa*-clause, however, describes an action that is temporally successive ('and he swore') in relation to the previous clause ('and she pleased').

2.2.3. PS **Wa* in Modern South Arabian

Jibbali is a MSA language in Oman. Its most common conjunction is *b-*, which derives from an earlier **w-* (a reflex of PS **wa*; Rubin 2014, §12.1.1). It is often followed by an epenthetic vowel *ə*, as in (6) and (7) (both from Rubin 2014, 302, my emphasis):

(6) ***bə***-*ǯēṭ ɛrḥīt* ***bə***-*ǯīṭṣ ɛūt* ***bə***-*ḳéré xaṭṣ́ḳɛ́ṣ. **bə**-zīs xáṭṣ́ḳ mənhũm **bə**-šfṣ́ḳ bes*

‘**and** he took the pretty one, **and** he took her to the house **and** hid her clothes. **And** he gave her some (other) clothes **and** married her’

(7) *he bek śēʿak* ***bə***-*šfáḥk ðénu*

‘I am already full, **and** I have this leftover’

The Jibbali samples show the conjunction *b-* linking clauses with the meanings of temporal succession in past time narrative (first sample), and simultaneity (second sample) respectively. In the narrative sample, *b-* is prefixed to all clauses.

In the **Mehri** language of Oman, the common coordinating particle is *w(ə)*, with the free variant *u* < **əw* (Rubin 2010a, 235). As a connective it may have a variety of meanings. In the first example below, the second clause is simultaneous with the action or state described in the first clause (all Mehri examples are from Rubin 2010a, 236, my emphasis):

(8) *ṣōr* ***u*** *ġəlōk b-aġəggēn*

‘he stood **and** looked at the boy’ (simultaneity)

In another example, the linking with *wə* describes an action that is temporally successive in relation to the first clause:

(9) *yəġərəbay* ***wə***-*yabráḳa təwalyɛ*

‘he recognized me **and** ran to me’ (temporal succession)

The connective *wə* can also link a clause that describes a complementary action or state which is indifferent to the temporal relation between the clauses:

(10) *ʾagbək bīs* ***wə****-sē ʾagəbōt bay*

'I fell in love with her, **and** she fell in love with me' (complementary action)

This linking in (10) can by classified as unordered addition or temporal succession (Dixon 2009, 26).

But *w(ə)* is also the suitable connective in narration:

(11) *śxəwəllūt bərk alang* ***w****-aġayg ḳəfūd* ***wə****-wkūb əl-ḥōkəm* ***wə****-śītəm ləhān šəh*

'she stayed in the launch, **and** the man got out **and** went to the ruler('s house) **and** bought all that he had' (temporal succession)

The *wə* can also connect a focal clause after a temporal clause:

(12) *tɛ̄ ðār bayr,* ***wə****-hərbā moh*

'then (when they were) at the well, they drew water' (focal clause after temporal clause)

Similar narrative chains as in Jibbali and Mehri are found in **Soqotri**, a conservative MSA language. The normal form of the conjunction is a proclitic *wa*, as in (13):

(13) *báˁad-aḷ ˁəmɛ́ro ˁáže dɛ́nˁa ḷətóˁos ˁággi* ***wa****-zaˁáyo díˀyhi ḥídho* ***wa****-žirɛ́me* ***wa****-ṭahɛ́ro*

'After the woman said this, the men killed her, took their roots and their berries **and** went off.' (Naumkin et al. 2014, 102, text 4:11)

A *wa*-clause in Soqotri can also express the reason for the previous clause(s), as in (14):

(14) *wa-ʔəḳdémo ʿəy ʿággi wa-fizóʿo* ***wa****-ʔaḷ-bíto ífuḷ ľišgóʔo*

‘The two men looked at him and became scared, **for** they did not know what to do.’ (Naumkin et al. 2014, 220, text 12:12)

2.2.4. PS **Wa* in Ancient (South) Arabian

In Ancient South Arabian also, *w-* ‘*und*’ is the most frequent conjunction (Stein 2013, §9.4.1). In Middle Sabaic, the typical narrative chain is built up by an initial *qatal* clause followed by several infinitive clauses preceded by *w*, as in (15):

(15) [1]*šrḥʿṯt / yʾmn̊ / bn / ḏrnḥ / ʾbʿl / bytn / ʾḥrm / ʾqwl / šʿbn / ḏmr /* [2]*ʾrbʿw / qšmm / brʾ / **w**hwṯr / **w**hqšbn / **w**hšqrn / **w**ṯwbn / mṣnʿthmw* [3]*/ tʿrmn / kl / ʾbythw / wmḥfdthw / wgnʾhw / wkryfyhw…*

‘[1]ŠRḤ-ʿṮT YʾMN of (the family) ḏū-RNḤ, owners of the house ʾḤRM, leaders of the tribe ḎMR, [2]of a fraction of QŠMM, has built **and** founded **and** restored **and** finished **and** repaired their fortress [3]TʿRMN, all its houses and its tower and its wall and its cisterns,…’ (Stein 2012, B.2.3; my translation and emphasis)

The linking pattern in (15) is *S.noun-qatal + w-VN + w-VN + w-VN + w-VN* (Multhoff 2019, 336). In Old Sabaic, the narrative chain is typically constructed by clauses with finite verbal predicates. An example is found in the inscription RÉS 3945 from the early seventh century BC:

(16) [3]…***w***ywm / mḫḍ / sʾdm / ***w***wfṭ / nqbtm / wkl / ʾhgr / mʿfrn / ***w***hbʿl / ẓbr / wẓlmm / wʾrwy / ***w***wfṭ / kl / ʾhgrhmw / ***w***qtlhmw / šlṯt / ʾlf[m] # ʾ ʾ ʾ # ***w***sbyhmw / ṯmnyt / ʾlfm # ʾ ʾ ʾ ʾ ʾ ʾ ʾ ʾ # ***w***hṯny / ślʾhmw / ***w***bḍʿ / bʿlhmw / bʿm / ślʾhmw / bqrm / wsfrtm ḏy(h)bw bʿm [4]ślʾhmw[14]

‘[3]…**and** on the day when[15] he conquered SʾDM **and** burnt down NQBTM and all cities of MʿFRN, **and** seized (the territories of) ẒBR and ẒLMM and ʾRWY, **and** burnt down all their cities, **and** killed of them three thousand (3000), **and** captured of them eight thousand (8000), **and** doubled their tribute, **and** imposed on them as tribute, together with their (former) tribute, cattle and other amounts which they would have to give together with [4]their (former) tribute’[16] (Stein 2012, E.1.5, my emphasis)

The linking pattern in (16) is *ADV-qatal* + *w-qatal* + *w-qatal* + *w-qatal* + *w-qatal* + *w-qatal* + *w-qatal* + *w-qatal*, where ADV is a noun (*ywm*) in the construct state.

The *w-* may also connect two modal propositions, which is shown in a wooden stick with a Sabaic letter from the third century C.E. (Stein 2015, 198f.):

(17) ***w***-l-ʿbd-k / slymm / bn / ġṯyfm / l-thḫywnn / ***w***-ʿṯtr / w-ʾlmqh / l-yhṣbḥnn / l-kmw / nʿmtm / ***w***-[2]l-yšmnn / wfy-kmw / w-bḏt / wfym / ʿbr-n-kmw / f-hʿsm / ʿbd-k / ḥmd / w-ʿbr-n-hw / wfym

‘Von Deinem Diener Sulaymum aus (der Sippe) Ġuṭayfum seid gegrüßt! (Die Götter) ʿAṯtar und ʾAlmaqah mögen Euch Glück leuchten lassen, **und** sie mögen Euer Wohlergehen aufrichten. Dafür, daß Wohlergehen von Euch (berichtet wurde), hat Dein Diener (d.h. Sulaymum) vielfach gedankt.

Von ihm (wurde ebenfalls) Wohlergehen (berichtet).' (Stein 2015, L4/1f.; my emphasis)

In (17), three jussive clauses with the proclitic precative particle *l* (*li*) are connected by the conjunction *w*. The linking pattern is ***w***-*PrP-l-yaqtul* + ***w***-*S.noun-l-yaqtul* + ***w***-*l-yaqtul*. The clauses have seemingly equal status. As can be seen, it is possible to place a clausal constituent before the jussive for focusing.

2.2.5. PS **Wa* in Classical Arabic

Classical Arabic has *wa*, but also the conjunction *fa*, which has a more specific sequential (temporal or logical) meaning.[17] As a result, *wa* in Arabic is more confined to non-sequential meanings, for example elaboration. After both conjunctions, Classical Arabic could use the new West Semitic perfective *qatala* in affirmative clauses in narration (cf. Isaksson 2009, 67):

(18) *fa-faʿala ḏālika* ***wa****-qatala Ǧuzihr-a* ***wa****-ʾaḫaḏa tāǧ-a-hu* ***wa****-kataba ʾilā ʾArdawān-a l-Bahlawiyy-i…*

'And this he did. He killed Ǧuzihr, seized his crown, **and** wrote to Ardawān the Pahlawī…' (Ṭab. I, 816:1)

The *wa* in Classical Arabic can also introduce a clause that is circumstantial in relation to the preceding clause, as in (25):

(19) *halaka ʾAbū ʾUmāmata* ***wa****-l-masǧidu yubnā*

'Abū Umama died **while** the mosque was being built' (Isḥ. 346, 6, quoted from Reckendorf 1921, §221.2)

The Classical Arabic *wa* may also function as a discourse marker (without being a clausal connective), signalling a certain connection to the preceding clauses. In the following example,

wa introduces direct speech that is a reply to a previous question within the meta-context of the textual tradition, but this *wa* does not signal a linking between clauses in the text (cf. Miller 1999, 168):[18]

(20) *qāla yā Qaysu mā yaqūlu hāḏā qāla **wa**-mā yaqūlu*

'He said: "O Qays, what does he say!" Then he said: "**And** what does he say then?"' (Ṭab., 1857, 2, quoted from Reckendorf 1895–98, §156; my transcription, translation and emphasis)

A *wa* in Classical Arabic may also link a clause that is the result of the action or state in the preceding clause. An example is (21):

(21) *qad wallāhi rābanī ʾamru hāḏā l-ġulāmi **wa**-lā ʾāminuhu*

'The behaviour of this youngster has seemed to me confused, **and** I do not trust him' (Ḥam. 40, 11, quoted from Reckendorf 1895–98, 449; my translation and emphasis)

With focusing of two different subjects, a *wa*-clause can describe a contrast to the action or state in the preceding clause, as in (22):

(22) *allāhu yaʿlamu **wa**-ʾantum lā taʿlamūna*

'Allah knows, **but** you do not know.' (Qur. 2:212, quoted from Reckendorf 1895–98, 450; my transcription, translation, and emphasis)

The conjunction *wa* can also introduce a clause that expresses an elaboration or interpretation of the preceding clause, as in (23):

(23) *qālū wallāhi mā ʿarafnāhu* ***wa****-ṣadaqū*

‘They said: By God, we did not recognize him, **and** (by that) they told the truth.’ (Isḥ. 577, 17, quoted from Reckendorf 1895–98, 454; my transcription, translation, and emphasis)

2.2.6. PS **Wa* in Ugaritic

In Ugaritic, the conjunction *w /wa/* is the most prominent linking connective. It connects “Wörtern, Wortgruppen, Sätzen und ganzen Textteilen” (Tropper 2012, §§83.11, 96.1). As in the Hebrew poetry, there are many examples of a so-called ‘synonymous parallelism’ in the Ugaritic poetry:[19]

(24) *mġy . ḫrn . l bth .* ***w*** */ yštql . l ḫẓrh .*

‘Ḫôrānu ging zu seinem Haus, er begab sich zu seinem Hof’ (KTU^3 1.100:67–68, my emphasis; Tropper 2012, §83.113b)

The *wa* may also introduce a clause that describes the reason for the action or state in the preceding clause:

(25) *b ḫrn . pnm . trġn* {*w*} *.* ***w*** *tṯkl / bnwth*

‘Hôrānus Gesicht wurde verstört/traurig, denn sie war daran, ihre Nachkommenschaft zu verlieren’ (KTU^3 1.100:61–62, my emphasis; Tropper 2012, §83.113f.)

A purpose clause may be introduced by *wa*, as in (26):

(26) *ḥ*m [. iṯ . b btk . l]*ḥm . w tn /* ***w*** *nlḥ*m *. ḥm . iṯ*[. b btk . yn . w]tn *.* ***w*** *nšt /*

‘Falls [es in deinem Haus Br]ot [gibt], dann gib (es uns), **daß** wir essen können; falls es [in deinem Haus Wein] gibt, [dann] gib (ihn uns), **daß** wir trinken können!’ (KTU^3 1.23:71–72, my emphasis; Tropper 2012, §83.113h)

2.2.7. PS **Wa* in Amarna Canaanite

In Amarna Canaanite, sequences of clauses are typically linked by the conjunction *ù* (*wa*) (Baranowski 2016a, 206). According to Baranowski (2016a, 190):

> The logical relationship between two coordinated clauses in a sequence may often require the use of subordination in the translation because other languages require explicit marking of the logical relationship between the message of the two clauses in cases where the Amarna interlanguage leaves such a relationship open to the interpretive logic of the discourse instead of marking it explicitly.

(27) […] *ma-ni* [45]UD. KAM[v].MEŠ-*ti yi-šal-la-l*[*u*]-⌜*ši*⌝ [46]***ù*** *in*$_4$*-né-ep-ša-a*[*t ki-ma*] [47]⌜*ri*⌝*-qí ḫu-bu-l*[*i*] [48]⌜*a*⌝*-na ša-šu* […]

‘How long has he been plundering it **so that** it has become like a damaged pot because of him.’ (EA 292:44–48, emphasis by Baranowski)

The typical narrative syntax in Amarna Canaanite is (Baranowski 2016a, 205f.):

> the clause-initial (usually preverbal) conjunction ‘and’ (*u//wa*), the short conjugation (*yaqtul//*historically short *yiqtol*), and their typical use in narrating successive events to advance a story. These features must reflect Canaanite syntax and semantics.

(28) ***ù yi-la-ak*** [I]*Ar-sà-wu-ya* [27]*a-na* URU *Qì-i*[*s-sà*] ⌜***ù***⌝ ***yi-il*$_5$*-qa*** [28]ÉRIN.MEŠ [I]A-⌜*zi*⌝-[*ri*] ⌜***ù***⌝ ***iṣ-ba-at*** [29]URU *Ša-ad-du* ***u ya-di-in*$_4$*-ši*** *a-na* [30]LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ ***u la-a ia-di-in*$_4$*-ši*** [31]*a-na* LUGAL EN-*ia* […]

> ‘**And** Arsawuya **went** to the town of Qi[ssa] (Qedesh) **and he took** the troops of Azi[ru] **and he seized** the town of Shaddu **and he handed it** over to the *ʿapîru* men **and did not hand it over** to the king, my lord.’ (EA 197:26–31, emphasis by Baranowski)

This short example illustrates the strong tendency in Amarna Canaanite to place the verb directly after the conjunction *wa*, but exceptions occur from time to time, as when the verb must be negated. The clause-type *wa-lā-yaqtul* (as in *u la-a ya-di-in*$_4$*-ši* above) is regular in Amarna Canaanite. An adverb or a subject may also be inserted between the *wa* and the verb (Baranowski 2016a, 207).

An example of the use of *wa* within a modal domain is (Baranowski 2016a, 161):

(29) *an-nu-ú* LÚ.MEŠ MÁŠKIM *šàr-ri* [31]*yu-wa-ši-ru-na š*[*à*]*r-ru* ***ù*** [32]*ia-aq-bi šàr-ru a-na ša-šu-nu* [33]***ù*** *tu-pa-ri-šu be-ri-ku-ni*

> ‘So, behold, the king is sending the king’s commissioners. **So** may he speak to them **that** they should adjudicate between you (or: us).’ (EA 116:30–33, my emphasis)

In (29), after a circumstantial or temporal clause (with *yaqtulu*), *wa* first introduces a jussive *yaqtul*; after that, a jussive *wa-yaqtul* expresses purpose or complement (‘that they should adjudicate’).

2.2.8. PS **Wa* in Phoenician

In Phoenician also, *wa* is the most common conjunction, described by Friedrich and Röllig (1999, §257) as “*u̯a-* > *u̯ə-*.” It is an “anreihende Konjunktion” (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §319),

but it can also introduce circumstantial clauses, as in (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §319a):

(30) בשנת 11 לאדן מלכם פתלמיש... (5) אש המת לעם לפש שנת 33 וכהן לאדן מלכם עבדעשתרת

‘in the 11th year of the lord king Ptolemy,… which is the 33rd year of the people of Lapethos, **while** ʿBDʿŠTRT was priest for the lord king’ (KAI[5] 43:4f., my translation and emphasis)

The *wa* in Phoenician can also open an apodosis, as in (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §319d):

(31) ומי . בל . חז . כתן . למנערי . ובימי . כסי . ב(13)ץ

‘and whoever had not seen linen from his youth, **then** in my days he was covered in Byssus’ (KAI[5] 24:12–13, my translation and emphasis)

2.2.9. PS **Wa* in Old Aramaic

Old Aramaic has a conjunction *p*, which, like its reflex *fa* in Classical Arabic, has “a consecutive sense (‘then’, or sim.)” (Fales 2009, 569).[20] Thus *wa* could be expected to have a more restricted semantic range, as it has in Classical Arabic, but this does not seem to be the case. The use of the conjunction *p* is more restricted and *wa* is used “nahezu vor jedem Satz” (Degen 1969, §89). An example of *wa* introducing a purpose/result clause is found in the inscription from Sefire (Degen 1969, §89):

(32) אחוה (29) [תחזה]ולי וליתחזה ירק חצר יפק ואל

‘May the grass not come forth **so that** no green may be seen and **so that** its vegetation is not [seen]!’ (KAI[5] 222 1A:28–29)

The Old Aramaic *wa* may also introduce a circumstantial clause, or a clause that is concomitant with the preceding clause, as in Sefire (Degen 1969, §89):

(33) לתשלח לש(18)נך בניהם ותאמר לה קתל אחד

‘Do not speak up between them **in that** you say to him: “Kill your brother!”’ (KAI[5] 224:17–18, my translation and emphasis)

Another example of a *wa*-clause describing an action concomitant with that in the preceding clause is found in the Deir ʿAllā inscription (Schüle 2000, 110):[21]

(34) (3) ויקם . בלעם . מן . מחר[..] ---[...]ל . ימן . -[.....]-ה . ול יכ[ל . אכל ויצ]ם [.]ובכ(4)ה . יבכה .

‘Then Balaam stood up in the morning… **and by that he** wept grievously.’ (KAI[5] 312, I:3)

2.2.10. PS **Wa* in Epigraphic Hebrew

In Epigraphic Hebrew, *wa* in the main functions as it does in Classical Hebrew. An example of temporal succession is found in (35):

(35) *(wa-NP)*[22] + *Ø-qaṭal* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*

וסמכיהו לקחה . שמעיהו ו(7)יעלהו העירה .

‘As for Semachiah, Shemaiah has taken him **and** sent him up to the city’ (Lachish 4:6–7, text and translation HI 315, my transcription and emphasis; cf. Gogel 1998, 262)

Wa may also indicate temporal succession in a modal domain, as in an Arad letter:

(36) *Ø-IMP* + … + ***wa****-IMP*

(3) [אל אלי]שב ק[ח] שׂמן 1 וֹ(2)[חתם וקח] 1 ל קמח ותן . א[תם]
[לקו]סׂענל מהרה .

'[To Elia]shib: Ta[ke] 1 (jar of) oil and [seal it and take] 2 (jars of) flour **and** give t[hem to Qau]s'anali quickly' (Arad 12:1–2, text and translation HI 28, my transcription and emphasis; cf. Gogel 1998, 264)

Wa in a modal domain may also indicate an additional instruction that is added to an initial imperative clause, as in (37):

(37) *Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*

תן . מן . היין 1 1 1 ב\ ו(3)צוך . חנניהו . על ב(4)אר שבע עם . משא
צ(5)מד . חמרם . ושררתׂ (6)אתם . בצקׂ .

'Give from the wine, 3 baths, **and** Hananiah **will then** order you to Beersheba with the load of a pair of donkeys, **and you are to** bind them with dough.' (Arad 3:2–5, text HI 15, my transcription and emphasis; cf. Gogel 1998, 266)

A possible case of two concomitant main clauses connected by *wa* in a modal domain is found at Kuntillet Ağrūd:

(38) *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)!*

]י(10)[נ]אד . עם יהי ויש(9)מרך רך(8)יב

'May he bless **and** keep you **and** may he be with my Lord.'[23] (Kuntillet Ağrūd 19:7–9, text and translation HI 293, my transcription and emphasis; cf. Gogel 1998, 287)

2.3. The Reflex of PS *Wa in CBH

This section will treat in some detail the semantics of the conjunction *wa* as a natural language connective in CBH.[24] Because the aim of this book is to clarify the linguistic reality behind the 'consecutive tenses', I will endeavour to recognise both what is traditionally called the 'consecutive *waw*' (discourse-continuity clauses),[25] and the so-called 'copulative *waw*' (usually discontinuity clauses).

2.3.1. *Wa*-linking as Elaboration or Summary

In an elaboration, "the second clause echoes the first, adding additional information about the event or state described" (Dixon 2009, 2, 27). A summary amounts to the opposite: it echoes the previous clauses, but supplies fewer details and less information about the event or state described in the previous clauses. Elaboration and summary clauses are frequently introduced by *wa* in Biblical Hebrew (Brongers 1978, 276).[26]

2.3.1.1. Discourse-discontinuity Clauses

In the following example, a syndetic *qaṭal* clause breaks the chain of main-line narration in a chiastic construction:

(39) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [16]***wa****-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶל־נֹחַ אֶל־הַתֵּבָה שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם מִכָּל־הַבָּשָׂר «אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ רוּחַ חַיִּים»׃
וְהַבָּאִים זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה מִכָּל־בָּשָׂר בָּאוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים וַיִּסְגֹּר יְהוָה בַּעֲדוֹ׃

> ‘Pairs of all creatures that have the breath of life came into the ark to Noah. [16]**And** those that entered went in male and female of all flesh as God had commanded him. Then the LORD shut him in.’ (Gen. 7.15–16)

In (39), the information conveyed by the *qaṭal* clause with initial *wa* (*wa-X-qaṭal*) adds more details (elaboration) about the event described by the preceding *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause.

(40) ***wa**-S.noun-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-lō-qaṭal*

> וּמֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן עָשׂוּ אֶת־כָּל־הַמֹּפְתִים הָאֵלֶּה לִפְנֵי פַרְעֹה וַיְחַזֵּק יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פַּרְעֹה וְלֹא־שִׁלַּח אֶת־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאַרְצוֹ׃

> ‘**And** Moses and Aaron, they did all these wonders before Pharaoh. But Yahweh strengthened Pharaoh’s heart, and he did not release Israel’s sons from his land.’ (Exod. 11.10; Propp 1999, 292)

Example (40) is a summary that refers to both the plagues that have hit Egypt already, and what is going to happen. The summary is a complex of three clauses, of which only the first is discontinuous.[27]

2.3.1.2. Discourse-continuity Clauses

In (41), a discourse-continuity *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause elaborates on a preceding *qaṭal* clause:

(41) *wa-S.noun-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol + **wa**(y)-yiqṭol*

> וַיהוָה בֵּרַךְ אֶת־אֲדֹנִי מְאֹד וַיִּגְדָּל וַיִּתֶּן־לוֹ צֹאן וּבָקָר וְכֶסֶף וְזָהָב וַעֲבָדִם וּשְׁפָחֹת וּגְמַלִּים וַחֲמֹרִים׃

> ‘The Lord has richly blessed my master, and he has become very wealthy. **And** (the Lord) has given him sheep and

cattle, silver and gold, male and female servants, and camels and donkeys.' (Gen. 24.35)

The second *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (וַיִּתֶּן) in this verse is not sequential, but adds additional information and more details about the blessing coded by the first verbal clause (בֵּרַךְ).[28]

Wa-qaṭal clauses too may code elaborations, as is seen in (42):

(42) *Ø-VNabs* + [11]***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*

הִמּוֹל לָכֶם כָּל־זָכָר: **וּ**נִמַלְתֶּם אֵת בְּשַׂר עָרְלַתְכֶם **וְ**הָיָה לְאוֹת בְּרִית בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם:

'Every male among you must be circumcised. [11]**And** you shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin; **and** it shall be the sign of the covenant between Me and you.' (Gen. 17.10b–11)

In (42), the instruction starts with an infinitive absolute (הִמּוֹל) giving the general command of circumcision. There then follow two *wa-qaṭal* clauses that detail how the command should be worked out and also explain its significance.[29]

A summary can also be introduced by a traditional 'consecutive *waw*' (J-M §118i), as in example (43):[30]

(43) *wa(y)-yiqṭol…* [19]*wa-ADV-qaṭal* + [20]***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיָּקָם | שְׂדֵה עֶפְרוֹן אֲשֶׁר בַּמַּכְפֵּלָה אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי מַמְרֵא הַשָּׂדֶה וְהַמְּעָרָה אֲשֶׁר־ בּוֹ וְכָל־הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה אֲשֶׁר בְּכָל־גְּבֻלוֹ סָבִיב: 18 לְאַבְרָהָם לְמִקְנָה לְעֵינֵי בְנֵי־חֵת בְּכֹל בָּאֵי שַׁעַר־עִירוֹ: 19 וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן קָבַר אַבְרָהָם אֶת־שָׂרָה אִשְׁתּוֹ אֶל־מְעָרַת שְׂדֵה הַמַּכְפֵּלָה עַל־פְּנֵי מַמְרֵא הִוא חֶבְרוֹן בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן: 20 **וַיָּקָם** הַשָּׂדֶה וְהַמְּעָרָה אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ לְאַבְרָהָם לַאֲחֻזַּת־קֶבֶר מֵאֵת בְּנֵי־חֵת:

> ‘So Abraham secured Ephron’s field in Machpelah, next to Mamre, including the field, the cave that was in it, and all the trees that were in the field and all around its border, [18]as his property in the presence of the sons of Heth before all who entered the gate of Ephron’s city. [19]After this Abraham buried his wife Sarah in the cave in the field of Machpelah next to Mamre (that is, Hebron) in the land of Canaan. [20]**So Abraham secured** the field and the cave that was in it as a burial site from the sons of Heth.’ (Gen. 23.17–20)

2.3.2. *Wa*-linking as Circumstantial Action or State

In view of the various semantic types of accompanying actions or states coded by *wa*-clauses discussed above, it is not surprising that a clause linked with *wa* can also describe a circumstantial or backgrounded action or state. The exact borderline between the two types is indistinct. As a rule of thumb, a circumstantial clause is concomitant with a (specific) main clause and semantically subordinate to that clause.[31] A circumstantial linking belongs to the sentence level of the text.[32] A background clause belongs to the discourse level, and its action or state may or may not be concomitant with the main line clause(s). Background is often a complex of clauses, which are semantically more independent in relation to the main line than are circumstantial clauses.[33] The present section treats syndetic circumstantial clauses. In the next (§2.3.3), I describe background with an initial *wa*-clause.

2.3.2.1. Discourse-discontinuity Clauses

There are very few syndetic circumstantial long *yiqṭol* clauses in CBH prose. In consideration of the few examples of asyndetic circumstantial long *yiqṭol* clauses in my corpus, it is tempting to assume that CBH preferred asyndesis in this case. However, circumstantial *yiqṭol(u)* clauses with the connective *wa* seem to have been functional in the Archaic Hebrew poetry (as they were in Classical Arabic),[34] and do exist in other Northwest Semitic languages, as is shown in this example from Deir ʿAllā:

(44) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-lā-qaṭal* + *[wa-yVqtV]l* + ***wa**-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)*

. וּלֹ יְכֹ[ל . ויקם . בִּלְעָם . מן . מחר [..] ---[...]ל . ימן . -[.....]ה

אכל . ויצ]ם [.] וְבְכֹ(4)ה . יבכה .

‘And Balaam arose the next day […] days […] but he was not ab[le to eat and he fas]ted **while** weeping grievously.’ (KAI[5] I:3–4)

The small number of examples (syndetic or not) of circumstantial *yiqṭol(u)* clauses in CBH is an indication that the circumstantial function of long *yiqṭol* clauses has been taken over by infinite clauses in CBH, especially the active participle (sometimes finite; see §4.1.1.1 and §7.4). Among the few circumstantial long *yiqṭol* clauses in CBH, we find some that start with asyndesis and continue with syndesis (with *wa*). In such a case, a ‘continuing’ circumstantial long *yiqṭol* can be introduced by *wa*, as in (45):[35]

(45) *wayhī: S.noun-qoṭel* + ***Ø**-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa**-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)-N*

וַיְהִי֙ קֹ֣ול הַשֹּׁופָ֔ר הֹולֵ֥ךְ וְחָזֵ֖ק מְאֹ֑ד מֹשֶׁ֤ה יְדַבֵּר֙ וְהָאֱלֹהִ֣ים יַעֲנֶ֔נּוּ בְּקֹֽול׃

‘The blast of the shofar grew louder and louder, **while** Moses was speaking **and** God was answering him with thunder.’ (Exod. 19.19, NAB)

The *wayhī* in this construction is macro-syntactic, and the first half of the verse exhibits a type of biclausal cleft construction that has developed into a monoclausal syntagm (קֹ֣ול הַשֹּׁופָ֔ר הֹולֵ֥ךְ) with a focus marker (וַיְהִי֙; Khan 2019, 15–18). The monoclausal construction is a participle clause, which is strengthened by another participle/adjective (HALOT: “grew stronger and stronger”). This participle clause is the main informative component of the message (cf. Khan 2019, 19). What concerns us here is the two circumstantial long *yiqṭol* clauses that form a circumstantial complex, the first clause of which is asyndetic, the second connected by *wa*.[36]

The most frequent syndetic circumstantial clause in CBH has a participle predicate (§7.4). An often quoted example is (46):

(46) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**-S.pron-qoṭel*

וַיֵּרָ֤א אֵלָיו֙ יְהוָ֔ה בְּאֵלֹנֵ֖י מַמְרֵ֑א וְה֣וּא יֹשֵׁ֔ב פֶּ֖תַח־הָאֹ֥הֶל כְּחֹ֖ם הַיֹּֽום׃

‘YHWH appeared to Abraham by the oaks of Mamre **while** he was sitting at the entrance to the tent during the hottest time of the day.’ (Gen. 18.1)

As is sometimes the case, the circumstantial clause is ambiguous as to which constituent is referred to in the main clause. Syntactically, it could have been YHWH (the last mentioned in the

matrix clause) that was sitting at the entrance, but the pragmatic situation decides that it must be Abraham.

Such circumstantial clauses are often to be translated with an *ing*-form, but sometimes a prepositional phrase is a better choice, as in (47):[37]

(47) *wa-ADV-qaṭal* + ***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵ֗ן יָצָ֤א אָחִיו֙ וְיָד֣וֹ אֹחֶ֔זֶת בַּעְקֵ֖ב עֵשָׂ֑ו וַיִּקְרָ֥א שְׁמ֖וֹ יַעֲקֹ֑ב

‘Then his brother emerged, **with** his hand holding on to the heel of Esau. So they named him Jacob.’ (Gen. 25.26)

The example shows how tightly connected a circumstantial *wa*-clause often is to the matrix clause semantically. In Hebrew, they are two separate clauses, but in an English translation, the *wa*-clause corresponds semantically to a prepositional phrase and is a constituent in the matrix.

Verbless clauses with a circumstantial relation to a previous matrix are often introduced by *wa*.[38] Such clauses always indicate a state. An example in direct speech is (48):

(48) *Ø-IMP-A* + *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)-V* + ***wa****-XØ*

וַיֹּאמְר֗וּ הָ֚בָה | נִבְנֶה־לָּ֣נוּ עִ֔יר וּמִגְדָּ֖ל וְרֹאשׁ֣וֹ בַשָּׁמָ֑יִם

‘Then they said, Come, let’s build ourselves a city and a tower **with** its top in the heavens’ (Gen. 11.4)

This is a classic example of a concomitant attendant circumstance coded by a syndetic verbless clause.[39] The verbless clause in (48) belongs to the quotation and describes how the tower is intended to be.[40]

An example of a syndetic verbless clause coding an attendant circumstance in a narrative main line is (49):[41]

(49) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**-XØ*

וַיִּקַּח֩ הָעֶ֨בֶד עֲשָׂרָ֜ה גְּמַלִּ֗ים מִגְּמַלֵּי֙ אֲדֹנָ֔יו וַיֵּ֣לֶךְ **וְכָל**־טוּב֙ אֲדֹנָ֔יו בְּיָד֖וֹ

'Then the servant took with him ten of his master's camels and left, **loaded with** all kinds of good things from his master.' (Gen. 24.10)

2.3.2.2. Discourse-continuity Clauses

A clause that expresses a concomitant circumstance and a dependence on a previous matrix clause cannot at the same time express discourse continuity. Not surprisingly, I have found no example of a traditional 'consecutive *waw*' connecting an attendant circumstantial clause.

2.3.3. *Wa*-linking as Background

2.3.3.1. Discourse-discontinuity Clauses

Nearly two out of three background clauses or clause complexes introduced by *wa* are connecting a clause signalling discontinuity.[42] From the frequencies in my corpus, it seems that relatively few of the *wa*-clauses with background function have a long *yiqṭol* predicate (8×).[43] A prose example is (50):

(50) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [34]***wa**-PREP-VN-yiqṭol(u)!* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + [35]*wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*

וַיְכַל֙ מֹשֶׁ֔ה מִדַּבֵּ֖ר אִתָּ֑ם וַיִּתֵּ֥ן עַל־פָּנָ֖יו מַסְוֶֽה׃ 34 **וּבְבֹא֩** מֹשֶׁ֨ה לִפְנֵ֜י יְהוָ֗ה לְדַבֵּ֤ר
אִתּוֹ֙ יָסִ֣יר אֶת־הַמַּסְוֶ֔ה עַד־צֵאתֹ֑ו וְיָצָ֗א וְדִבֶּר֙ אֶל־בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל אֵ֖ת אֲשֶׁ֥ר יְצֻוֶֽה׃
35 וְרָא֤וּ בְנֵֽי־יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ אֶת־פְּנֵ֣י מֹשֶׁ֔ה כִּ֚י קָרַ֣ן עֹ֔ור פְּנֵ֖י מֹשֶׁ֑ה וְהֵשִׁ֤יב מֹשֶׁה֙ אֶת־
הַמַּסְוֶ֔ה עַל־פָּנָ֖יו עַד־בֹּאֹ֥ו לְדַבֵּ֖ר אִתֹּ֑ו ס

‘And Moses finished speaking with them, and he put a veil on his face. [34]**And** in Moses’ entering before Yahweh to speak with him, he would remove the veil until he came out, and he would go out and speak to the Israelites what he would be commanded. [35]And the Israelites would see Moses’ face, that the skin of Moses’ face shone, and Moses would return the veil over his face, until he went in to speak with him.’[44] (Exod. 34.33–35)

The background complex in (50) relates to a narrative main-line (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses). It starts with *wa* and a verbal noun construction followed by a morphologically distinctive long *yiqṭol* with habitual past meaning. This *yiqṭol(u)* is followed by four (discourse-continuous) *wa-qaṭal* clauses that conclude the background section.[45]

Among the syndetic background clauses with finite predicate, the most frequent in the corpus are those having a *qaṭal* morpheme (75×). An example is (51):

(51) ***wa**-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [57]***wa**-S.noun-qaṭal* + *kī-qaṭal*

וְהָרָעָב הָיָה עַל כָּל־פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ וַיִּפְתַּח יוֹסֵף אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם וַיִּשְׁבֹּר לְמִצְרַיִם
וַיֶּחֱזַק הָרָעָב בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם: וְכָל־הָאָרֶץ בָּאוּ מִצְרַיְמָה לִשְׁבֹּר אֶל־יוֹסֵף כִּי־חָזַק
הָרָעָב בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ:

‘The famine was over all the earth, but then Joseph opened all the storehouses and sold food to the Egyptians. The famine became more and more severe in the land of Egypt. [57]Moreover all countries came to Egypt to Joseph to buy grain, because the famine was severe throughout the earth.’ (Gen. 41.56f.)

The initial copula verb *qaṭal* (הָיָה) describes the general situation. It functions as a background to Joseph's actions. The perfective past *qaṭal* clause at the beginning of verse 57 is also background, describing actions taking place in the countries outside Egypt.[46]

A frequent background clause-type is the verbless one. It is most often syndetic, with an initial *wa* (76×).[47] A good example is (52):

(52) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [27]*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ* + [28]***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*

וַיַּעֲלוּ כָל־בְּנֵי֙ יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל וְכָל־הָעָ֖ם וַיָּבֹ֣אוּ בֵית־אֵ֑ל וַיִּבְכּוּ֙ וַיֵּשְׁב֣וּ שָׁ֔ם לִפְנֵ֖י יְהוָ֑ה
וַיָּצ֣וּמוּ בַיּ֣וֹם־הַה֗וּא עַד־הָעֶ֙רֶב֙ וַיַּעֲל֣וּ עֹל֔וֹת וּשְׁלָמִ֖ים לִפְנֵ֥י יְהוָֽה׃ 27 וַיִּשְׁאֲל֣וּ
בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל בַּֽיהוָה֙ וְשָׁ֣ם אֲר֣וֹן בְּרִ֣ית הָאֱלֹהִ֔ים בַּיָּמִ֖ים הָהֵ֑ם׃ 28 וּפִינְחָ֞ס בֶּן־
אֶלְעָזָ֤ר בֶּן־אַהֲרֹן֙ עֹמֵ֣ד | לְפָנָ֔יו בַּיָּמִ֖ים הָהֵ֑ם׃

'So all the Israelites, the whole army, went up to Bethel. They wept and sat there before the LORD; they did not eat anything that day until evening. They offered up burnt sacrifices and tokens of peace to the LORD. [27]The Israelites asked the LORD (**for** the ark of God's covenant was there in those days; [28]Phinehas son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, was serving the LORD in those days)' (Judg. 20.27–28a)

In (52), a syndetic verbless clause and a syndetic participle clause together form a parenthetic background to the storyline.[48]

A participle clause with initial *wa* can also describe backgrounded information:[49]

(53) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.noun-ADV-qoṭel*

וַיְהִי־רִיב בֵּין רֹעֵי מִקְנֵה־אַבְרָם וּבֵין רֹעֵי מִקְנֵה־לוֹט וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי וְהַפְּרִזִּי אָז יֹשֵׁב בָּאָרֶץ׃

‘So there were quarrels between Abram's herdsmen and Lot’s herdsmen. (**Now** the Canaanites and the Perizzites were living in the land at that time.)’ (Gen. 13.7)

In (53), a parenthetic piece of historical information is inserted into the storyline. The background is coded by *wa* and an active participle clause.

2.3.3.2. Discourse-continuity Clauses

Since an attendant circumstance cannot be coded by a discourse-continuity clause (as was noted above), it is striking indeed that continuity clauses (§1.2.6) may be utilised for background descriptions. There is a considerable number (18×) of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses that either take part in background complexes or (rarely) introduce background. In 17 instances, *wa-qaṭal* clauses partake in background or introduce background. In addition, 13 cases of the so-called macro-syntactic *wa-haya* introduce background (Isaksson 1998).

The *wa-qaṭal* clause-type never enters into a storyline in CBH. The continuity function in the storyline was still fulfilled by *wa(y)-yiqṭol*.[50] While the most frequent backgrounding clause-type was marked for discontinuity (*wa-X-qaṭal*), *wa-qaṭal* on the other hand was marked for continuity (type *wa-VX*) and remained a relatively infrequent clause-type for the introduction of background descriptions in narrative.

An illustration of the complexity of both *wa(y)-yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal* clauses taking part in background sections is found in (54), where backgrounding is set within square brackets:

(54) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + "…" +* [5]*[wa-S.noun-qaṭal + kī-qaṭal + wa-S.noun-qaṭal +* ***wa****-qaṭal]* + [6]*wa(y)-yiqṭol +* [7]*[wa-S.noun-qaṭal +* ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol +* ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol]* + [8]*wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁכֶם אֶל־חֲמֹור אָבִיו לֵאמֹר קַח־לִי אֶת־הַיַּלְדָּה הַזֹּאת לְאִשָּׁה: 5 וְיַעֲקֹב שָׁמַע כִּי טִמֵּא אֶת־דִּינָה בִתֹּו וּבָנָיו הָיוּ אֶת־מִקְנֵהוּ בַּשָּׂדֶה וְהֶחֱרִשׁ יַעֲקֹב עַד־בֹּאָם: 6 וַיֵּצֵא חֲמֹור אֲבִי־שְׁכֶם אֶל־יַעֲקֹב לְדַבֵּר אִתֹּו: 7 וּבְנֵי יַעֲקֹב בָּאוּ מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה כְּשָׁמְעָם וַיִּתְעַצְּבוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים וַיִּחַר לָהֶם מְאֹד כִּי־נְבָלָה עָשָׂה בְיִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁכַּב אֶת־בַּת־יַעֲקֹב וְכֵן לֹא יֵעָשֶׂה: 8 וַיְדַבֵּר חֲמֹור אִתָּם לֵאמֹר...

'[4]Shechem said to his father Hamor, "Get me this girl to be my wife." [5][But Jacob had heard[51] that Shechem had dishonoured his daughter Dinah. At that time[52] his sons were out in the countryside with his livestock, **so** Jacob kept quiet until they came back.] [6]Hamor Shechem's father went to Jacob to discuss the matter with him. [7][Meanwhile Jacob's sons had come in from the field, having heard the news. The men were distressed **and** very angry because Shechem had done a disgrace in Israel by sleeping with Jacob's daughter—a thing never to be done.] [8]Hamor spoke with them as follows:…' (Gen. 34.4–7)

After Shechem's shameful act against Jacob's daughter, Hamor the father of Shechem visits Jacob to settle the matter and negotiate for a marriage between his son and Jacob's daughter. In this passage, the storyline is interrupted by two separate sections of background information necessary for the listener to understand the motives behind Jacob's behaviour and the actions undertaken

by his sons. The background sections both consist of several clauses, and each background complex interrupts a narrative main-line coded by *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses.[53] The main-line is resumed with Hamor's speaking in verse 8 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol*). The great syntactic problem in this passage is the use of discourse-continuity clauses within the background sections. In the first background section, there is a *wa-qaṭal* clause (וְהֶחֱרִשׁ), and the second background section contains two *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses (וַיִּתְעַצְּבוּ and וַיִּחַר) that form part of the background. Both *wa(y)-yiqṭol* have stativic meaning (or at least may be interpreted as stativic), but the question arises as to why a *wa-qaṭal* clause is used in the first background section and why *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses continue from the initial (*qaṭal*) clause in the second section. Both clause-types signal discourse continuity and both have past time reference. The *wa-qaṭal* clause describes a continuative process which takes place during a specific space of time: the aspectual meaning of the verb is imperfective (past), i.e., Jacob kept quiet until his sons came back (Ges-K §112ss). That fits well with the acquired meaning of the *wa-qaṭal* construction in CBH, a meaning close to the meaning of the long *yiqṭol* gram (see §§6.11–14). A long *yiqṭol* clause could not be used here.[54] What is required in this final position of the background complex is a clause signalling continuity. That is why a *wa-qaṭal* clause must be used: it must express an imperfective meaning in temporal (or logical) succession to the fact that Jacob's sons were out in the countryside with his livestock, a succession that is also perceived as a consequence ('so Jacob kept quiet'; cf. Dixon 2009, 28, 17).[55] The second background section is introduced by a pluperfect *wa-X-qaṭal* clause

and the two *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses describe the feelings of Jacob's sons: they were outraged already when they arrived. The continuity in this case signals temporal (or logical) succession: they came home and were outraged and infuriated.[56] In the example, none of the discourse-continuity clauses in background sections is positioned as the first in that section. They just continue a preceding discontinuity clause that signals the background. If discourse-continuity clauses are at all involved in the construction of background complexes, they most frequently do this in non-initial position of the background complex.

Nearly all examples of discourse-continuity clauses in background are disputed, controversial, or regarded as text-critically doubtful by scholarship on the Hebrew. They deserve special consideration.

2.3.3.3. *Wa(y)-yiqṭol* Clause(s) in Background

A *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause is marked for discourse continuity (type *wa-VX*). If it is perceived as background, there are two possibilities: it constitutes a continuity clause within a narrative background complex, or, for some exceptional reason, it starts a background that should have the property of discourse continuity. The former possibility is already exemplified above.[57]

One rare example of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* introducing background is attested in my corpus, (55):

(55) *wayhī-PrP* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [24]***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיְהִי בָעֶרֶב וַיִּקַּח אֶת־לֵאָה בִתּוֹ וַיָּבֵא אֹתָהּ אֵלָיו וַיָּבֹא אֵלֶיהָ׃ **וַיִּתֵּן** לָבָן לָהּ אֶת־
זִלְפָּה שִׁפְחָתוֹ לְלֵאָה בִתּוֹ שִׁפְחָה׃

> ‘In the evening he brought his daughter Leah to Jacob, and Jacob had marital relations with her. [24](Laban gave his female servant Zilpah to his daughter Leah to be her servant.)’ (Gen. 29.24)

In (55), a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause is used as backtracking to the surrounding clauses and background information (Joosten 2012, 172),[58] which most translations render with parentheses. It is only the pragmatics of the situation that triggers the background interpretation of the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause in (55), and it is quite possible that this *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause was perceived by a native as a storyline clause expressing an action that overlapped with a preceding complex activity (Cook 2012a, 290). The pragmatic setting presupposes knowledge about the custom of giving a rich dowry to a daughter upon marriage (Wenham 1994, 236). The problem for us interpreters is that it is impossible to insert the action of the clause into a consequent series of temporally sequential actions. Where is it to be placed? During Jacob’s sleep?

2.3.3.4. *Wa-qaṭal* Clause(s) in Background

Wa-qaṭal clauses are also sometimes used to introduce background clauses in a narrative setting.

(56) *“wa-ʿattā-IMP + Ø-ʾim-yiqṭol(u) + Ø-PrP-«REL-qaṭal»-yiqṭol(u)!” [24]wa(y)-yiqṭol + “Ø-S.pron-yiqṭol(u)” + [25]**wa**-qaṭal*

> וְעַתָּה הִשָּׁבְעָה לִּי בֵּאלֹהִים הֵנָּה אִם־תִּשְׁקֹר לִי וּלְנִינִי וּלְנֶכְדִּי כַּחֶסֶד אֲשֶׁר־
> עָשִׂיתִי עִמְּךָ תַּעֲשֶׂה עִמָּדִי וְעִם־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־גַּרְתָּה בָּהּ׃ 24 וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם
> אָנֹכִי אִשָּׁבֵעַ׃ 25 וְהוֹכַח אַבְרָהָם אֶת־אֲבִימֶלֶךְ עַל־אֹדוֹת בְּאֵר הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר
> גָּזְלוּ עַבְדֵי אֲבִימֶלֶךְ׃

> ‘23 “Now therefore swear to me here by God that you will not deal falsely with me or with my descendants or with my posterity, but as I have dealt kindly with you, so you will deal with me and with the land where you have sojourned.” 24And Abraham said, “I shall swear,” 25**and at that** Abraham reproved Abimelech about a well of water that Abimelech’s servants had seized.’ (Gen. 21.23–25)

Abraham’s answer to Abimelech’s friendly proposal is terse: “I shall swear,” but not now, because I have some complaints against you that must be settled first (Wenham 1994, 92). The answer is coded as a long *yiqṭol* with its usual *XV* word order. It has future time reference. This is certainly not the usual syntax of a binding contract or covenant formula, for which we would expect a performative *qaṭal*, as in Genesis 23.11. The real covenant between Abraham and Abimelech is related in Genesis 21.27 without quotation of the contract formula. After his terse answer, Abraham is quick to put forward the reproofs about one of the water wells. This complaint is formulated as a background construction that answers the questions that have occurred in the minds of the receivers of the text: why Abraham’s answer is so terse, and why he does not immediately enter into the covenant. There is a continuity between the background description and the direct speech quotation immediately before. It is not correct to translate the *wa-qaṭal* clause with ‘Now it was so that Abraham reproved/had reproved Abimelech’, which would have required a discontinuity syntax (type *wa-XV*, for example וְאַבְרָהָם הוֹכִ֣חַ אֶת־אֲבִימֶֽלֶךְ). A discontinuity clause would not have been so tightly connected (semantically) with the preceding quoted speech.[59]

In (56) above, it is hard to perceive a repetitive nuance, and the same holds for the *wa-qaṭal* clause in the much-discussed example (57):

(57) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + "Ø-IMP + wa-IMP" + wa(y)-yiqṭol + "Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)" +* [6]***wa****-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיּוֹצֵא אֹתוֹ הַחוּצָה וַיֹּאמֶר הַבֶּט־נָא הַשָּׁמַיְמָה וּסְפֹר הַכּוֹכָבִים אִם־תּוּכַל לִסְפֹּר אֹתָם וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ כֹּה יִהְיֶה זַרְעֶךָ׃ **וְהֶאֱמֶן** בַּיהוָה **וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ** לוֹ צְדָקָה׃

'He took him outside and said, "Look up at the sky and count the stars – if indeed you can count them." Then he said to him, "So shall your offspring be." [6]**And at that** Abram believed YHWH, and therefore YHWH counted it to him as righteousness.' (Gen. 15.5–6)

YHWH has uttered some very hard-to-believe promises of offspring—hard-to-believe, because Abram is childless and his wife Sarah is old. The utterances of YHWH are presented in direct speech quotations. Directly after the expressed promises, we expect a response, an answer from Abram. But no answer is supplied as a quotation. Instead, Abram's response is related in a background clause in direct connection to the utterance of YHWH. *Wa-qaṭal* is a continuity clause and this expresses a close connection to the preceding quoted promise. There is nothing repetitive or habitual in this verbal action. The conclusion of the passage exhibits the unusual word order *wa-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol*. The *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause (וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ) has focal-result semantics (see §2.3.6): 'therefore he counted it to him as (covenant) righteousness'.[60]

The distinguishing features of *wa-qaṭal* as an initial background clause in narrative are the continuity with the preceding clause, its background signalling, and its semantic affinity with the imperfective *yiqṭol(u)*, features that hold also for the macrosyntactic *wa-haya* (Isaksson 1998).[61]

2.3.4. *Wa-linking* as Same-event Addition and Parallelism

In not a few cases, two clauses joined by *wa* just "describe different aspects of a single event," a semantic relation that Dixon (2009, 3, 27) calls same-event addition (cf. Müller 1994, 143). Both elaboration and same-event addition describe the same event. But while elaboration "echoes the first" (Dixon 2009, 27), and usually adds more details, a same-event addition does not echo; instead, it supplies a different aspect of the event in the first clause. In the example *John telephoned, he invited us to dinner*, the second clause echoes the first and is an elaboration that adds some details. However, in *You are together with me; (and) as for me, I am together with you*, the second clause describes the same event (or state), but it does not echo the first; the two clauses just describe different aspects of the same state (Dixon 2009, 27).

The most frequent cases of same-event addition with *wa* in the Hebrew Bible are found in poetry, in the type of semantic linking that is called parallelism (Brongers 1978, 273–275). A good example is (58).[62]

(58) *kī-XØ* + ***wa****-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)!*

כְּי־אַתָּה נֵירִי יְהוָה וַיהוָה יַגִּיהַ חָשְׁכִּי׃

> ‘You are my lamp, O Lord; the Lord illumines my darkness.’ (2 Sam. 22.29)

In (58), the fact that the Lord is the lamp of the poet is another aspect of the Lord’s giving light to the poet’s darkness. The second clause does not ‘echo’ the first.

2.3.4.1. Discourse-discontinuity Clauses

Very few discontinuity clauses expressing same-event addition in the corpus begin with a *wa*. An example is (59):

(59) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**-O.noun-S.pron-haya* + *qoṭel*[63]

> וַיִּתֵּן שַׂר בֵּית־הַסֹּהַר בְּיַד־יוֹסֵף אֵת כָּל־הָאֲסִירִם אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית הַסֹּהַר וְאֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עֹשִׂים שָׁם הוּא הָיֶה עֹשֶׂה׃

> ‘The warden put all the prisoners under Joseph’s care. **Moreover**, he was in charge of whatever they were doing.’ (Gen. 39.22)

The clauses in (59) describe the same situation, Joseph being given the responsibility for the prisoners, but the second clause construction with *haya* and *qoṭel* is even more broad-reaching: he was in charge of everything that was going on there. This type of linking is also called same-event addition by Dixon (2009, 43, 50).[64]

2.3.4.2. Discourse-continuity Clauses

The continuity examples in prose are more numerous. One is (60):

(60) *Ø-ADV-qaṭal* + ***wa(y)**-yiqṭol*

> לָמָּה נַחְבֵּאתָ לִבְרֹחַ וַתִּגְנֹב אֹתִי

> ‘Why did you run away secretly **and** deceive me?’ (Gen. 31.27a, NET, my emphasis)

In (60), the running away secretly and the deception are one and the same event. The clauses just describe different aspects of this event.

An example with a *wa-qaṭal* clause is found in (61):

(61) *wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa**-qaṭal*

וּמִפָּנֶיךָ אֶסָּתֵר וְהָיִיתִי נָע וָנָד בָּאָרֶץ

'and I must hide from your presence; I will be a restless wanderer on the earth' (Gen. 4.14)

It is reasonable to evaluate the two clauses as expressing the same event. The *wa-qaṭal* clause does not echo the first. Being a restless wanderer describes another aspect of hiding from God's presence.[65]

2.3.5. *Wa*-linking as Temporal Succession

As in West Semitic in general, the proclitic *wa* in CBH may also serve as a marker of temporally successive events (Dixon 2009, 9).[66] In this case, the *wa*-clause describes an action or state that is temporally sequential in relation to the preceding clause.

2.3.5.1. Discourse-discontinuity Clauses

A clause-type *wa-XV*, where *X* is not merely a negation and *V* is a finite verb, signals discontinuity and needs explicit adverbs to describe a sequential action or state. If, for example, a temporal succession is to be expressed by an affirmative *qaṭal* clause, then a temporally explicit adverb is used, as in (62):

(62) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol!* + ***wa**-ADV-qaṭal*

וַיִּנַּשֵּׁק לְכָל־אֶחָיו וַיֵּבְךְּ עֲלֵיהֶם וְאַחֲרֵי כֵן דִּבְּרוּ אֶחָיו אִתּוֹ׃

> ‘He kissed all his brothers and wept upon them; **only then** were his brothers able to talk to him.’ (Gen. 45.15)

Without an explicitly temporal adverbial expression, the suffix-verb clause would have described a temporal indifference as to the previous clause. With the temporal adverb (אַחֲרֵי כֵן), the clause describes an emphasised temporal succession. Joseph’s brothers were so shocked, so frightened, that only *after* his hugging and kissing them did they dare to talk with him (Westermann 1982, 153, 161).[67]

In a similar way, a *wa*-clause with a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate (*wa-X-yiqṭol(u)*) is not an expression of temporal succession. If such a clause must be marked as temporally sequential, an explicit temporal adverb is added. An example is (63):

(63) *Ø-S.noun-REL-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + [7]*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + *kī-XØ*

> נֶ֣פֶשׁ אֲשֶׁ֣ר תִּגַּע־בּ֗וֹ וְטָמְאָה֙ עַד־הָעֶ֔רֶב וְלֹ֥א יֹאכַ֖ל מִן־הַקֳּדָשִׁ֑ים כִּ֥י אִם־רָחַ֖ץ בְּשָׂרֹ֥ו בַּמָּֽיִם׃ וּבָ֣א הַשֶּׁ֔מֶשׁ וְטָהֵ֖ר וְאַחַ֣ר יֹאכַ֑ל מִן־הַקֳּדָשִׁ֔ים כִּ֥י לַחְמֹ֖ו הֽוּא׃
>
> ‘The person who touches any of these will be unclean until evening and must not eat from the holy offerings unless he has bathed his body in water. [7]When the sun goes down he will be clean. **Only afterward** he may eat from the holy offerings, because they are his food.’ (Lev. 22.6–7)

With a constituent other than *lō* before *yiqṭol(u)*, the clause signals discontinuity and can signal temporal succession only with an explicit temporal adverb (אַחַר), and in such a case with a sense of emphasis (Milgrom 2000, 1855). The *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* clause (וְלֹ֥א יֹאכַ֖ל) signals continuity (§7.12) and carries over the time period indicated by the previous clause (וְטָמְאָה֙ עַד־הָעֶ֔רֶב, cf. §2.3.8).[68]

2.3.5.2. Discourse-continuity Clauses

In narrative and report, the conjunction *wa* and the reflex of the old Semitic perfective *yaqtul*, the CBH perfective short *yiqṭol*, often form narrative chains expressing successive actions (see §§3.4.2, 7.11; Kienast 2001, 438; Kogan 2014, 52).

(64) ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיַּשְׁכֵּם אַבְרָהָם בַּבֹּקֶר וַיַּחֲבֹשׁ אֶת־חֲמֹרוֹ וַיִּקַּח אֶת־שְׁנֵי נְעָרָיו אִתּוֹ וְאֵת יִצְחָק בְּנוֹ וַיְבַקַּע עֲצֵי עֹלָה וַיָּקָם וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־אָמַר־לוֹ הָאֱלֹהִים׃

‘**So** Abraham rose early in the morning, saddled his donkey, **and** took two of his young men with him, and his son Isaac. **And** he cut the wood for the burnt offering **and** arose **and** went to the place of which God had told him.’ (Gen. 22.3)

In the sequence displayed in (64), “temporal succession refers to the linear portrayal of events according to the order of their occurrence in the depicted world” (Cook 2004, 251). This is the default interpretation of the discourse-continuity clauses in such a chain: “the order in which clauses are presented in discourse is semantically significant… That is, in the absence of any linguistic cues to the contrary, events are understood as occurring in the order in which they are reported in narrative discourse” (Cook 2004, 251, who refers to Fleischman 1990, 131; also Hornkohl 2018, 47, 49).

But temporal succession is of course described also by other types of *wa*-clauses. The new (West Semitic) perfective *qaṭal* has in CBH taken over some of the functions of the old past perfective *yiqṭol(Ø)*, and one such overtaken function is found in negative

storyline clauses (Tenet 4, see §7.12; cf. Isaksson 2015a, 256–59):[69]

(65) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [9]***wa**-lō-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיְשַׁלַּח אֶת־הַיּוֹנָה מֵאִתּוֹ לִרְאוֹת הֲקַלּוּ הַמַּיִם מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה: וְלֹא־מָצְאָה
הַיּוֹנָה מָנוֹחַ לְכַף־רַגְלָהּ וַתָּשָׁב אֵלָיו אֶל־הַתֵּבָה כִּי־מַיִם עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ
וַיִּשְׁלַח יָדוֹ וַיִּקָּחֶהָ וַיָּבֵא אֹתָהּ אֵלָיו אֶל־הַתֵּבָה:

‘Then he sent out a dove, to see if the water had gone from the surface of the ground. [9]**But** the dove found no place for her feet to rest, so she returned to him in the ark, because the water still covered the whole earth. He put out his hand, took her and brought her in to him in the ark.’ (Gen. 8.8f.)

After Noah sent the dove, it found no place to rest, and so it returned. The negative clause implies a searching with no result, which is a successive event in relation to the sending out.[70]

Not surprisingly, the discourse-continuous *wa-qaṭal* clause-type may also describe temporal succession. Such is often the case in complex *pɛn*-constructions:

(66) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *“Ø-hēn-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa-ʿattā-pɛn-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa**-qaṭal* + ***wa**-qaṭal”*

וַיֹּאמֶר | יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים הֵן הָאָדָם הָיָה כְּאַחַד מִמֶּנּוּ לָדַעַת טוֹב וָרָע וְעַתָּה | פֶּן־
יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ וְלָקַח גַּם מֵעֵץ הַחַיִּים וְאָכַל וָחַי לְעֹלָם:

‘Then the LORD God said, “Behold, the man has become like one of us in knowing good and evil. Now, lest he reach out his hand **and** take also of the tree of life and eat, **and** live forever—”’ (Gen. 3.22)

The two *wa-qaṭal* clauses in (66) are positioned after a *pɛn*-clause with initial *yiqṭol(u)* predicate. This *pɛn* construction involves both the *yiqṭol(u)* clause and the two *wa-qaṭal* clauses, and the whole *pɛn* complex can be interpreted as a subordinate sentence whose main clause is not expressed within the direct speech, but by the action verb starting Genesis 3.23.[71] The two *wa-qaṭal* clauses express temporally successive actions in a 'possible consequence' construction (Dixon 2009, 23).[72]

A *wa-qaṭal* clause may often express a temporally successive event after an imperative. In such a case, it takes part in a modal domain and expresses, for example, the intention of the actant who formulates the command (see further §6.4). In the following example, *wa-qaṭal* clauses follow three coordinated imperative clauses, and the context makes clear that the *wa-qaṭal* clauses both describe temporal sequentiality:

(67) *wa(y)-yiqṭol: Ø-hinnē-nā-VOC-IMP + wa-IMP + wa-IMP + **wa**-qaṭal + **wa**-qaṭal*

וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֶּה נָּא־אֲדֹנַי סוּרוּ נָא אֶל־בֵּית עַבְדְּכֶם וְלִינוּ וְרַחֲצוּ רַגְלֵיכֶם וְהִשְׁכַּמְתֶּם וַהֲלַכְתֶּם לְדַרְכְּכֶם

'He said, My lords, please turn aside to your servant's house and spend the night and wash your feet. **Then** you may rise up early **and** go on your way.' (Gen. 19.2a)

The two *wa-qaṭal* clauses in (67) constitute additional instructions (intended) to be performed after the fulfilment of the first commands coded by the imperatives. Such additional instructions with *wa-qaṭal* clauses in modal domains are frequent in CBH.[73]

In a narrative setting also, *wa-qaṭal* clauses signal discourse continuity and may code temporally successive habitual events.

In such cases, the past reference is marked in a preceding clause with explicit temporal marking, such as a past perfective *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause. An example is found in (68):

(68) *wa(y)-yiqṭol!* + *wa-hinnē-XØ* + *wa-hinnē-qoṭel* + *kī-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-XØ* + [3]*wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*

וַיַּ֣רְא וְהִנֵּ֣ה בְאֵ֗ר בַּשָּׂדֶה֙ וְהִנֵּה־שָׁ֣ם שְׁלֹשָׁ֔ה עֲדְרֵי־צֹ֖אן רֹבְצִ֣ים עָלֶ֑יהָ כִּ֣י מִן־הַבְּאֵ֞ר הַה֣וּא יַשְׁקוּ֮ הָעֲדָרִים֒ וְהָאֶ֤בֶן גְּדֹלָה֙ עַל־פִּ֣י הַבְּאֵ֔ר: וְנֶאֶסְפ֥וּ־שָׁ֖מָּה כָּל־הָעֲדָרִ֑ים וְגָלֲל֗וּ אֶת־הָאֶ֙בֶן֙ מֵעַ֣ל פִּ֣י הַבְּאֵ֔ר וְהִשְׁק֖וּ אֶת־הַצֹּ֑אן וְהֵשִׁ֣יבוּ אֶת־הָאֶ֗בֶן עַל־פִּ֥י הַבְּאֵ֖ר לִמְקֹמָֽהּ׃

‘He looked up and saw a well in a field, and three flocks of sheep lying there next to it. This well was used for watering the flocks. But the stone on the well’s mouth was large, [3]and only when all the flocks had gathered there would they roll the stone away from the opening of the well **and** water the sheep. **Then** they would put the stone back in its place on the well’s opening.’ (Gen. 29.2–3)

In this narrative passage, the temporal frame is defined by the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (וַיַּ֣רְא) clause, which connects what follows to the current (preceding) narration. The *kī* particle is in this case an adverb (‘indeed’) that introduces a background description for the information of the receiver (listener or reader) of the text. The *yiqṭol(u)* (יַשְׁקוּ֮) clause that follows *kī* codes a habitual past action and the same holds for the four succeeding *wa-qaṭal*-clauses. The verbless clause that closes 29.2 determines the interpretation of the first *wa-qaṭal* clause in 29.3. Formally, 29.3 consists all in all of four *wa-qaṭal* clauses, and there are no syntactic signals that inform the receiver of the semantic relations between the four

clauses. But an initial *wa-qaṭal* clause in such a chain may sometimes take the meaning of a temporal clause, or, in other cases, a conditional clause (see §§2.3.10, 6.7; Ges-K §§159g, 164b; Num. 10.5). The most reasonable interpretation of the first *wa-qaṭal* clause (וְנֶאֱסְפוּ) is as a 'when'-clause, the second *wa-qaṭal* clause (וְגָלֲלוּ) being the focal clause after the temporal clause. The last two *wa-qaṭal* clauses express temporally successive past (habitual) events.[74]

Wa-qaṭal clauses may also be sequential in a future chain of events. In a sense, the events in such a chain are *irrealis*, because they are predicted or expected or instructed to occur. But they can be *realis* in being depicted as real in a future moment of time. An example is (69), which is the description of a foreseen series of events in the future:

(69) *Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*

בְּעוֹד | שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים יִשָּׂא פַרְעֹה אֶת־רֹאשְׁךָ מֵעָלֶיךָ וְתָלָה אוֹתְךָ עַל־עֵץ וְאָכַל הָעוֹף אֶת־בְּשָׂרְךָ מֵעָלֶיךָ׃

'In three more days Pharaoh will decapitate you **and** impale you on a pole. **Then** the birds will eat your flesh from you.' (Gen. 40.19)

This is pure (prophetic) prediction of a chain of events. As is frequently the case in CBH, the prediction starts with a discontinuity *yiqṭol(u)* clause (or *qoṭel* clause), and the successive events are coded by *wa-qaṭal* clauses.[75]

A *wa-qaṭal* clause may also at times describe a temporal succession within a protasis. In the typical case, the protasis is initially marked by a conditional conjunction (such as *ʾim* or *kī*) and a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate, and the *wa-qaṭal* clause then follows,

extending the protasis with a sequential action. An example is (70):

(70) *(Ø-ʾim-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal)* + *Ø-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)!* + *wa-S.pron-yiqṭol(u)*

(אִם־אֲדֹנָיו יִתֶּן־לוֹ אִשָּׁה וְיָלְדָה־לוֹ בָנִים אוֹ בָנוֹת) הָאִשָּׁה וִילָדֶיהָ תִּהְיֶה לַאדֹנֶיהָ וְהוּא יֵצֵא בְגַפּוֹ׃

'(If his master gives him a wife **and** she bears him sons or daughters), the woman and her children shall belong to her master, and only the man shall go free.' (Exod. 21.4, parentheses enclose the protasis)

In (70), it is pragmatically clear that the *wa-qaṭal* clause describes an added condition that is temporally sequential in relation to the initial stipulated event in the protasis. The apodosis then follows and is asyndetically attached to the protasis.[76]

2.3.6. *Wa*-linking as a Focal Result Clause

Sometimes a *wa*-clause describes an action or state that is the result of the action or state described in the preceding clause(s) and at the same time a focal clause. The previous clause describes a certain cause or reason, and the *wa*-clause describes a natural consequence of what was previously related (Dixon 2009, 2, 6, 17). Such a result clause is in CBH usually not syntactically subordinate (see §1.2.7). It can often be translated by an initial 'therefore', or 'because of that', or just 'then'.[77]

2.3.6.1. Discourse-discontinuity Clauses

When a focal result clause is to be coded, a discontinuity clause is not the most intuitive choice for this purpose. In the examples

registered in my database, a constituent in the clause is focused and thus placed before the verb (type *wa-XV*). An example is (71):

(71) *wa-XØ* + ***wa****-O.noun-lō-qaṭal*

וּפְנֵיהֶם אֲחֹרַנִּית וְעֶרְוַת אֲבִיהֶם לֹא רָאוּ׃

'Their faces were turned the other way **so** they did not see their father's nakedness.' (Gen. 9.23b, NET, my emphasis)

In (71), the nakedness of their father (עֶרְוַת אֲבִיהֶם) is the focused constituent and has been placed before the verb. Semantically, the verbless clause constitutes the reason for what is expressed by the *qaṭal* clause, which is the focal clause in Dixon's sense.[78]

2.3.6.2. Discourse-continuity Clauses

The most natural expression of a focal result is a continuity clause. When a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause is used, the temporal reference is usually past with perfective aspect, as in (72):

(72) *Ø-PrP-qaṭal* + [2]*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa-XØ* + *wa-S.noun-qoṭel* + [3]***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*

בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ׃ 2 וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם׃ 3 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי־אוֹר׃

'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. [2]Now the earth was without shape and empty, and darkness covered the deep and the Wind of God hovered over the water. [3]**Then** God said, "Let there be light." And there was light.' (Gen. 1.1–3)

In an initial act of creation, God created the heavens and the earth. After this act, the earth was total chaos, and there was

darkness over the deep waters (see Westermann 1976; Isaksson 2021, 227f.).[79] This is the reason for the next step in creation, to command light into existence, which could have been translated, 'Therefore God said,…'.[80]

When a *wa-qaṭal* clause expresses a focal result, it usually has future time reference, sometimes with an obligatory meaning. In the next example, YHWH gives a reason for his future saving acts concerning the people of Israel (73):

(73) *Ø-ADV-IMP: Ø-S.pron-XØ* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + [7]***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*

לָכֵן אֱמֹר לִבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲנִי יְהוָה וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם מִתַּחַת סִבְלֹת מִצְרַיִם
וְהִצַּלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מֵעֲבֹדָתָם וְגָאַלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם בִּזְרוֹעַ נְטוּיָה וּבִשְׁפָטִים גְּדֹלִים:
וְלָקַחְתִּי אֶתְכֶם לִי לְעָם וְהָיִיתִי לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים וִידַעְתֶּם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
הַמּוֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם מִתַּחַת סִבְלוֹת מִצְרָיִם:

'So say to the Israelites: I am YHWH. **And therefore** I will bring you out from your enslavement to the Egyptians, **and** I will rescue you from the hard labor they impose, **and** I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great judgments. [7]**And** I will take you to myself for a people, **and** I will be your God. Then you will know that I am YHWH your God, who brought you out from your enslavement to the Egyptians.' (Exod. 6.6–7)

In (73), YHWH, the God of Israel, states his reasons for rescuing his people from Egypt, and the reasons he gives are himself, his own personality, his nature as represented by his name. And the temporal reference is future (cf. Pedersen 1934, 190).[81]

2.3.7. *Wa*-linking as a Supporting Reason Clause

In many instances, a clause is introduced by *wa* that expresses a cause or reason as a supporting clause. In such a case, the supporting clause specifies a cause or reason for the focal clause (Dixon 2009, 3, 6). Reason is often expressed by the conjunction *kī* (or another conjunction). Such instances are not discussed here, since they are not introduced by *wa*. However, in many cases, a *wa*-clause is enough.

2.3.7.1. Discourse-discontinuity Clauses

Most discontinuity examples are verbless clauses. One with a *qaṭal* predicate is (74):

(74) *Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-S.pron-qaṭal*

מַה־נַּעֲשֶׂה לָהֶם לַנּוֹתָרִים לְנָשִׁים וַאֲנַחְנוּ נִשְׁבַּעְנוּ בַיהוָה לְבִלְתִּי תֵּת־לָהֶם מִבְּנוֹתֵינוּ לְנָשִׁים׃

‘How can we provide wives for those who are left, **since** we have taken an oath by the LORD not to give them any of our daughters in marriage?’ (Judg. 21.7, NIV, my emphasis)

In (74), the supporting clause with *qaṭal* supplies a reason for the question. There was a difficulty providing wives for those who were left, and the supporting clause explains why.[82]

2.3.7.2. Discourse-continuity Clauses

A few *wa-qaṭal* also function as supporting clauses expressing reason (no *wa(y)-yiqṭol* has this function). An example is (75):[83]

(75) *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*

וּזְרַעְתֶּם לָרִיק זַרְעֲכֶם וַאֲכָלֶהוּ אֹיְבֵיכֶם׃

> ‘You will sow your seed in vain **because** your enemies will eat it.’ (Lev. 26.16b)

2.3.8. *Wa*-linking Carrying over the Preceding Manner

2.3.8.1. Discourse-continuity Clauses

In many instances, the coded ‘world’ that precedes a *wa*-clause represents a procedure or method or circumstance that is presupposed in the *wa*-clause. This close relationship with the preceding clause(s), the sharing of a common ‘world’, seems to be coded only by discourse-continuity clauses (type *wa-VX* or *wa-NEG-VX*; see §7.11–12). In this type of semantics, the *wa*-clause can often be translated with an understood (or explicitly stated) ‘in this way’, or ‘under such circumstances’, referring back to the previous clause(s). An example is (76):

(76) *wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)!* + *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-qaṭal* + ***wa**-qaṭal*

> וְאֶת־כָּל־חֶלְבָּהּ יָסִיר כַּאֲשֶׁר יוּסַר חֵלֶב־הַכֶּשֶׂב מִזֶּבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֹתָם הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל־חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא וְנִסְלַח לוֹ׃
>
> ‘They shall remove all the fat, just as the fat is removed from the lamb of the fellowship offering, and the priest shall burn it on the altar on top of the food offerings presented to the LORD. **In this way** the priest will make atonement for them for the sin they have committed, **and** they will be forgiven.’ (Lev. 4.35, NIV, my emphasis)

The clause that starts with *wə-ḵippɛr* is not a separate further action to be taken by the priest, as some translations suggest by the rendering ‘and the priest shall make atonement’ (thus ESV), and

it is not a subordinate result or a purpose clause. This discourse-continuity clause has the same status as the preceding clauses, and it describes (together with the last *wa*-clause, *wə-nislaḥ lō*) what is achieved by the procedural steps taken in the previous clauses.[84]

The corresponding negated continuity clause, *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* (Tenet 4, §7.12), may also carry over the manner or procedure in the preceding clause(s). An example is (77):[85]

(77) *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)*

וְהָיָה הָאֹכֶל לְפִקָּדוֹן לָאָרֶץ לְשֶׁבַע שְׁנֵי הָרָעָב אֲשֶׁר תִּהְיֶיןָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם וְלֹא־
תִכָּרֵת הָאָרֶץ בָּרָעָב׃

‘This food should be held in storage for the land in preparation for the seven years of famine that will occur throughout the land of Egypt. **In this way** the land will survive the famine.’ (Gen. 41.36; NIV, my emphasis)

Such continuity clauses are found also in narrative contexts. An example is (78):

(78) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה אֶת־שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה וַיִּמְשַׁח אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ וַיְקַדֵּשׁ
אֹתָם׃

‘Then Moses took the anointing oil and anointed the tabernacle and everything in it, **and in this way** he consecrated them.’ (Lev. 8.10)

In (78), the action of consecrating (וַיְקַדֵּשׁ) is not a successive separate action, but summarises what was achieved by the preceding procedure.[86]

2.3.9. *Wa*-linking as Semantic Complement

Examples of *wa*-clauses functioning as semantic complements are found only with discourse-continuity syntax (*wa-VX*).[87] A complement is defined as one clause functioning semantically "as an argument (generally as a core argument) of a higher clause" (Dixon 2009, 1). This section treats *wa-IMP* as second-person complement, *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* as third-person complement, and *wa-qaṭal* clauses as complements independent of grammatical person.

2.3.9.1. Discourse-continuity Clauses

As is well known, second-person purpose clauses may be coded by *wa-IMP* clauses in CBH (J-M §116f.). In complementary distribution, first- and third-person purpose clauses are often coded by jussive *wa-yiqṭol* clauses, the first person often with a ventive/cohortative clitic (J-M §116d; Notarius 2017; Sjörs 2019). However, when the preceding clause describes a request or prayer or admonition or instruction or learning, a discourse-continuity clause may function semantically as a simple complement. In the second person, this pertains also to a *wa-IMP* clause. An example is (79):

(79) *wa-ʿattā-IMP* + *kī-XØ* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa**-IMP*

וְעַתָּה הָשֵׁב אֵשֶׁת־הָאִישׁ כִּי־נָבִיא הוּא וְיִתְפַּלֵּל בַּעַדְךָ וֶחְיֵה

'So now, return the man's wife, because he is a prophet, so that he may intercede for you **that** you may live.' (Gen. 20.7a)

In (79), the initial imperative clause is followed by an added third-person jussive (וְיִתְפַּלֵּל) that expresses the purpose of the imperative ('so that he may intercede for you'). The last clause before the pause describes in the second person the content of the intercession, which makes it semantically a complement clause ('that you may live'). The complement clause in the second person is expressed by a discourse-continuity clause with imperative predicate.[88]

Third-person purpose clauses may also, when the preceding clause describes a request or prayer etc., turn semantically into a complement. In such a case, a discourse-continuity clause with jussive predicate is used, as in (80):

(80) *Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)!* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)*

הַעְתִּירוּ אֶל־יְהוָה וְיָסֵר הַצְפַרְדְּעִים מִמֶּנִּי וּמֵעַמִּי וַאֲשַׁלְּחָה אֶת־הָעָם וְיִזְבְּחוּ לַיהוָה׃

'Plead with the LORD **to** take away the frogs from me and from my people, and I will let the people go **to** sacrifice to the LORD.' (Exod. 8.4, ESV, my emphasis)

In (80), the initial imperative clause (הַעְתִּירוּ) has the lexical meaning of 'to plead' and, with this type of semantics in the first clause, the following jussive clause (וְיָסֵר) receives the connotation of a simple complement 'to take away'. The following ventive/cohortative expresses the response of the same subject (Pharaoh) as in the imperative clause, but after that, once again, a jussive in the third person with initial *wa* codes a motion purpose clause (וְיִזְבְּחוּ '**to** sacrifice'), which is semantically close to a complement (Dixon 2009, 45). In the latter case, the jussive does not show a distinctively short *yiqṭol(Ø)* form, but the preceding

distinctive jussive (וְיִסַּר), and the initial position of the verb (see §3.4.3), inform us that a jussive is intended.[89]

Wa-qaṭal clauses as personal (volitive) purpose clauses are practically non-existent in CBH.[90] As we have remarked above, the normal syntax for purpose clauses is *wa-IMP* or *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* (the latter including ventive/cohortative *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*), depending on the grammatical person to be expressed.[91] But *wa-qaṭal* is now and then also used with the meaning of a complement. In this function, *wa-qaṭal* can be used in all grammatical persons. As usual, the preceding semantic context is one of request or prayer or admonition. An example is (81):

(81) *Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*

צַו֙ אֶת־בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל וְנָתְנ֣וּ לַלְוִיִּ֗ם מִנַּחֲלַ֛ת אֲחֻזָּתָ֖ם עָרִ֣ים לָשָׁ֑בֶת

‘Instruct the Israelites **to** give the Levites towns to live in from the inheritance the Israelites will possess.’ (Num. 35.2a, NET, my emphasis)

In (81), the initial command is coded by an imperative clause (צַו֙ אֶת־בְּנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל) and the *wa-qaṭal* clause gives the content of the command, that is, its complement.

An example of a *wa-qaṭal* complement clause in the second person, preceded by an imperative, is (82):

(82) *Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*

שְׁמֹ֣ר וְשָׁמַעְתָּ֗ אֵ֚ת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִ֣ים הָאֵ֔לֶּה אֲשֶׁ֥ר אָנֹכִ֖י מְצַוֶּ֑ךָּ

‘Be careful **to** obey all these words that I command you’ (Deut. 12.28a, ESV, my emphasis)

The examples (81) and (82) are the only ones registered in my corpus with *IMP + wa-qaṭal* linking where *wa-qaṭal* has the function of a complement. A *yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal* linking is a more frequent way to express a complement. The following example (83) is from instructional discourse (obligation):

(83) *Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u) + **wa**-qaṭal + CONJ-qaṭal + REL-qaṭal*

מוֹצָא שְׂפָתֶיךָ תִּשְׁמֹר וְעָשִׂיתָ כַּאֲשֶׁר נָדַרְתָּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נְדָבָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ בְּפִיךָ׃

‘Whatever vow that passes your lips you must be careful **to** do, exactly according to what you voluntarily vowed to YHWH, your God, what you promised in words spoken aloud.’ (Deut. 23.24)

The example (83) expresses with its initial *yiqṭol(u)* an obligation, and its semantics (‘be careful to’) cause *wa-qaṭal* to function as a complement. This is possible also in a context with future time reference, as in (84):

(84) *kī-qaṭal + CONJ-yiqṭol(u)! + **wa**-qaṭal*

כִּי יְדַעְתִּיו לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יְצַוֶּה אֶת־בָּנָיו וְאֶת־בֵּיתוֹ אַחֲרָיו וְשָׁמְרוּ דֶּרֶךְ יְהוָה לַעֲשׂוֹת צְדָקָה וּמִשְׁפָּט

‘I have chosen him so that he may command his children and his household after him **to** keep the way of the LORD by doing what is right and just.’ (Gen. 18.19, NET, my emphasis)

The complement clause in (84) is part of a complex purpose sentence explicitly signalled by a compound conjunction (לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר). The purpose sentence has a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate with the lexical meaning ‘to command’ and these semantics lead the *wa-qaṭal*

clause to be perceived as a complement (and not as a normal coordination).[92]

It seems obvious that *wa-qaṭal* clauses may function as semantic equivalents to complement clauses, just as discourse-continuity ventives/cohortatives (*wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*), imperatives (*wa-IMP*), and jussives (*wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*) can, but without the restriction to grammatical person.

2.3.10. *Wa*-linking and Conditionality without Conditional Conjunction

As in the English example *Give me your picture and I'll give you mine*, CBH can express a conditional linking without conditional conjunction but instead using *wa* as the connective between protasis and apodosis. Cases with an initial imperative clause as protasis and a *wa*-clause as apodosis are relatively frequent, as in (85):

(85) *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 (85), it is understood that the imperatives state a condition for the promise to be fulfilled: ‘If you walk before me and are perfect, then I will make my covenant…’. In the example, the apodosis is constituted by two jussive clauses with ventive/cohortative clitic (see §3.4.2.3), both introduced by the connective *wa*.[93] All my examples with imperative as protasis have a discourse-continuity

apodosis, and this *wa* is in traditional Hebrew grammars regarded as 'copulative', not 'consecutive'.

2.4. Summary

The traditional theory of consecutive tenses with its thesis of two different conjunctions *wa* in Biblical Hebrew has disguised the fact that every *wa* has the same basic meaning.[94] This chapter has shown that both 'consecutive *waw*' and 'copulative *waw*' may have meanings of simultaneity, temporal succession, conditionality, reason, result, and conclusion. In all instances discussed above, a *wa*-clause relates to the preceding clause(s), and the meaning that *wa* is perceived to possess is determined by the semantic relation between the two clauses. A *wa*-clause may even function semantically as a complement, and such cases include instances of both traditional 'copulative *waw*' (as in *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* and *wa-IMP*) and traditional 'consecutive *waw*' (as in *wa-qaṭal*).

It turns out that the principal syntactic distinction in CBH is not between 'consecutive *waw*' and 'copulative *waw*', but instead between discourse-continuity clauses and discontinuity clauses. In this distinction, *wa* plays a fundamental role, in the formation of the principal continuity clause-type in CBH prose: *wa-V*.

In this chapter, I have given examples of the semantics of clause linking with *wa*, and many of the semantic types can be coded by both continuity and discontinuity clauses (temporal succession, elaboration). Some semantic types require a strict discontinuity coding (attendant circumstance), and others require a

continuity coding (carrying over the preceding manner; semantic complement).

---

[1] I owe this reference to Khan (1991).

[2] "That is, the negation of both P and Q is logically equivalent to the negation of either P or Q" (Schiffrin 1986, 42).

[3] Schiffrin refers to Posner (1980, 186). This is the so-called 'maximalist view', which Traugott (1986, 147) shows is supported by historical data (cf. Schiffrin 1986, 45 n. 1).

[4] In a similar way, Müller (1991, 156) compares *wa* with the German *und*. Tropper (1996, 635) defines the meaning of *wa* in Biblical Hebrew and Old Aramaic as 'und (dann)'.

[5] The '(*wa*-)' before Clause_1 indicates a possible connection backwards to previous clause(s), as is often the case. This connection can be a linking to a preceding clause and *wa* is in this case simply a clausal conjunction. But the '(*wa*-)' before Clause_1 can also be a discourse marker, in which case it fulfils a discourse-pragmatic function and does not provide a syntactic linking to a preceding clause. At the level of the discourse, such a *wa* marks "the location of an utterance with respect to its emerging context" and, at the textual level, it signals "the pragmatic relationship of an utterance to its broader context" (Miller 1999, 167f.). A discourse marker is syntactically nonessential and can be syntactically detached from the clause. For the notion of 'connection' to a previous context, see Miller (1999, 170). See further Tenet 2 (§§7.7–10).

[6] It is certainly practical in complicated text analysis to note that *wa*, in addition to linking two clauses, also "delimits the boundary between them," as Smith (1991, 14) says about "the consecutive *waw*," an observation that actually holds for all uses of *wa* as long as it is a clausal connective.

[7] Dixon (2009, 2, 9, 28): "$[\text{Mary left John}]_{SC}$ and he went into a monastery."

[8] As in 'Result linking' (Dixon 2009, 2, 17–23): "$[\text{It rained on Saturday}]_{SC}$ and so we could not hold the planned picnic" (Dixon 2009, 19).

[9] As a natural connective, *wa* is non-commutative. If the antecedent clause and the following clause change place, the complex sentence usually becomes unacceptable (Van Dijk 1977, 61). The cases of *wa* connecting two clauses in 'unordered addition' (Dixon 2009, 26) are extremely rare in CBH. Possible cases are: Gen. 4.22 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol…* + *wa-S.noun-qaṭal*, genealogy); 17.6 (*wa-qaṭal* + *wa-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)*, prediction); Exod. 3.7 (*Ø-VNabs-qaṭal* + *wa-O.noun-qaṭal*, direct speech); 34.25 (*Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*!, instruction); Judg. 7.25 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-O.noun-qaṭal*, narrative); and, outside the corpus, 1 Sam. 2.6–7 (*Ø-S.noun-qoṭel* + *wa-qoṭel*, poetry); Ps. 18.26f. ([26]*Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + *Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + [27]*Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)*, archaic poetry). For further discussion of clause combining with *wa* (and all its allomorphs) in Semitic, see Isaksson (2009); Isaksson and Persson (2014; 2015).

[10] The shift to SOV word order in Akkadian changed all this. With this gradual shift of word order, the original conjunction *wa/u* came to be attached to other constituents in the clause, so that the close connection to the verbal predicate was lost. This was the driving force behind its early replacement in Akkadian by the enclitic particle *-ma*, which was attached to the verbal predicate at the end of the clause. This is an indication that the Proto-Semitic word order was VSO (Kogan 2014, 52–54).

[11] For the term, see Givón (2001, II:330–351). A subordinate clause has unequal status in relation to a main clause. Hypotaxis refers to the relation between two (or more) clauses of unequal status (Halliday 2004, 374, 489). For what it is worth, this is possibly the best definition of a subordinate clause I can offer (though it is close to being circular: Isaksson 2013, 657). A subordinate clause being embedded is a special case (see §1.2.7)

[12] Some scholars call this usage of *wa* '*wāw* of apodosis' (Kogan 2014, 54), though the linking is not conditional.

[13] To support the interpretation of *wa* as '*wāw* of apodosis', Kogan supplies the translations of two independent editors of the text, which are

quoted in Kogan. Of course there is no special '*wāw* of apodosis' in Semitic, there is only one *wa* (pseudopolysemy: Blau 2010, 285).

[14] The text is partly complemented by Stein (2011, 1064).

[15] For the phrase *(w-)ywm*, see Nebes and Stein (2008, 165).

[16] The translation is partly taken from Stein (2011, 1064).

[17] For a discussion of the linguistic entity called 'Classical Arabic', see Birnstiel (2019, 367–70).

[18] Reckendorf (1895–98, 447): "es wird nicht der Inhalt des zweites Satzes, sondern die Tatsache, dass Etwas geäussert werden soll, an den ersten Satz angeknüpft." Concerning *fa*, see Reckendorf (1895–98, §157). Miller (1999, 168): "To function as a discourse marker, the conjunction must be syntactically detachable from the sentence (i.e., syntactically nonessential)."

[19] This is Dixon's same-event addition (2009, 27); see §2.3.4. In the transcription, translation, and division of the clauses in the example, I follow Tropper (2012, 785).

[20] In later stages of Aramaic, the use of this *p* has come to an end (Segert 1975a, §7.5.2).

[21] The classification of the Aramaic of the Deir ʿAllā inscription is disputed. See the discussion in §3.1.11, and Huehnergard and Pat-El (2019, 3). For the purpose of the present book, this classification is not essential.

[22] The parentheses indicate a left dislocation.

[23] "*ybrk wyšmrk*: The formula here recalls the priestly benediction in Num. 6.24–26, where one finds the pair *ybrkk… wyšmrk*" (HI 294).

[24] Schulz (1900, 28) argues that the meaning of *waC-* as a connective is the same as the meaning of *wə-*, but takes the impossible position that the *yiqṭol* in *wayyiqṭol* is a normal 'Imperfekt' (that is, *yiqṭol(u)*) used as a historical present in the Hebrew narrative: "Das Imperfekt mit ו setzt also niemals andere Funktionen in Kraft, als solche, welche auch dem Imperfekt an sich eigentümlich sind." For a survey of *wa* as a connective of constituents *within* a clause, see Müller (1994).

[25] As an example, Cook (2004, 259–61) shows convincingly that temporal succession is not a specific semantic feature of *wa(y)-yiqṭol*.

[26] The examples of elaboration overlap considerably with the use of the so-called '*waw* explicativum' (Baker 1980).

[27] Judg. 20.34 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa-S.pron-lō-qaṭal*) is a summary before the main events.

[28] The first *wa(y)-yiqṭol* in the verse (וַיְגַדֵּל) is not analysed as elaborative here. It can be interpreted as a consequence of the blessing ('result', Dixon 2009, 19, 22, 45), which is supported by the *ʾatnāḥ* that indicates the conclusion of the first hemistich: "Jahwe hat meinen Herrn gesegnet so daß er 'sehr' reich wurde" (Westermann 1981, 465). The examples in CBH of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses coding an elaboration are so numerous that I restrict them to the book of Genesis and one example in Exodus: Gen. 5.7 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*, genealogy); 10.18b–19 (*wa-ADV-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 12.16 (*wa-PrP-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 14.19—according to Hornkohl (2018, 46), this is not sequential, the speaking and blessing are the same act; 18.2 (Joosten 2012, 174); 19.19; 21.1f. (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*, narrative); 24.35 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 25.17 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 26.15 *(wa-O.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 26.29 (*wa-CONJ-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 31.26 (*Ø-O.pron-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 32.23f. (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [24]***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—but the elaboration has been explained as being due to different sources, namely, v. 23 is from J, 24a from E, and 24b from L (Eissfeldt 1922, 66*); 34.3 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—concomitant clauses according to Joosten (2012, 169 n. 24); 35.16 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 37.5f.—"an event is first stated generally and then told in detail" (Joosten 2012, 174); 37.17b–18a (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*, an anticipating clause is followed by elaboration); 42.30 (*Ø-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*, report); 48.3 (*Ø-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 50.12f. (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); Exod. 19.18 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + *Ø-CONJ-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—simultaneity according to Joosten (2012, 169 n. 24).

[29] Of course, an English translation may leave out the conjunction *and* in the elaboration, as most versions do. More examples of elaborative *wa-qaṭal* clauses: Gen. 9.9–11 (*wa-S.pron-hinnē-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa-****lō-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-****lō-yiqṭol(u)*, future, direct speech); 31.7a (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal*-PrP + ***wa****-qaṭal*, habitual anterior); 32.13; 48.4 (*Ø-hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Exod. 4.15b–16a (*wa-S.pron-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, direct speech, volitive future); 7.27b–28 (*Ø-hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, an apodosis); 12.11; 15.26a (*ʾim-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, in protasis); 20.9 (*Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-qaṭal***)—the temporal frame of the *wa-qaṭal* clause is determined by the preceding *yiqṭol(u)* clause, so the *wa-qaṭal* may also be interpreted temporally, i.e., 'then you shall do all your work'; 26.3f. (*Ø-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa-***ADV-*yiqṭol(u)*); 26.24f. (*Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Num. 4.24f. (*Ø-XØ* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, elaboration of initial general instruction).

[30] More examples of a summary introduced by 'consecutive *waw*': Exod. 39.32 (***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*, both clauses a summary of preceding narrative unit); Num. 8.15 (***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*)—'So you must cleanse them and offer them like a wave offering' (NET), but Levine (1993, 277) misinterprets the summary as an interpolation; Judg. 20.46 (copula verb).

[31] Cf. Isaksson (2009); but the present definition with its 'concomitant' restriction is narrower. A circumstantial clause qualifies a specific preceding clause and usually also supplies information about a constituent in that clause (see further §7.4). Backgrounded clauses are not necessarily concomitant with the main clause, and give explanatory or other information important for the reader to understand the main events. Information in the background belongs to the world of the text. If a piece of information is added by the editor of the text, not belonging to the pragmatic world of the text (for example, information for later readers), I call such a clause comment.

[32] While the definition of a clause is fairly straightforward (any syntagm that contains one predication), I must admit that I am unable to supply a tenable definition of 'sentence' (cf. Dixon 2010, 340). For what it is

worth, I preliminarily regard such an entity as a syntagm made up of a complex of clauses with a common illocutionary function.

[33] I restrict the concept of background to cases when the author/narrator is an anonymous text creator not mentioned in the text. In the present section about circumstantial and background clauses introduced by *wa*, I have decided to exclude (editorial) added comments.

[34] On this point, I take the position of Notarius (2008, 63, 83; 2013, 143, 282f.; 2015, 242); see also Isaksson (2014a, 127). An example put forward by Notarius (2013, 165) is 2 Sam. 22.5/Ps. 18.5, with the clausal pattern (*kī*)-*qaṭal* + (***wa***)-*S.noun-yiqṭol(u)*, in which the *yiqṭol(u)* clause is asyndetic in 2 Sam. 22.5 but introduced by *wa* in Ps. 18.5.

[35] Another possible example is Gen. 2.25 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa***-*lō-yiqṭol(u)*), regarded as circumstantial also by Brockelmann (1908–13, II, §321b; Nyberg 1972, §86t). The long *yiqṭol* clause in Gen. 2.25 can also by analysed as background. Joosten (1999, 24) regards this *yiqṭol(u)* as a "past modal."

[36] Asyndetic circumstantial long *yiqṭol* clauses are also rare, though possibly more frequent than the syndetic ones. In my corpus, there are three examples: Exod. 8.5; 12.34; Num. 14.3 (thus also Driver 1892, §163). Outside my corpus, examples include 1 Sam. 13.17—thus Driver (1892, §163); Muraoka (2001, 390), but Joosten (2012, 133) discerns a possible prospective function; 1 Sam. 18.5 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***Ø***-*PrP-yiqṭol(u)*!)—but Driver (1892, §163) analyses the clausal boundaries incorrectly and regards it as an example of circumstantial *Ø-yiqṭol(u)*, which would be an anomaly in CBH prose.

[37] No such circumstantial active participle clauses are found in the archaic poetry, a fact that indicates their gradual diachronic take-over of circumstantial functions from the long *yiqṭol* clauses in CBH. There are about 40 syndetic circumstantial active participle clauses in my corpus (linking patterns are supplied only in Genesis): Gen. 14.13 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa***-*S.pron-qoṭel*); 18.1 (see above); 18.8 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + **wa**-*S.pron-qoṭel*); 18.10 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + "…" + ***wa***-*S.noun-qoṭel*); 18.16 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa***-*S.noun-qoṭel*);

18.22 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.noun-ADV-S.pron-qoṭel*); 19.1 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); 24.21 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); 24.30 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-hinnē-qoṭel*); 25.26 (*wa-ADV-qaṭal* + ***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); 30.36 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); 32.32 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + CONJ-*qaṭal* + ***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel*); 37.15 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-hinnē-qoṭel*); Exod. 2.5; 2.13; 5.13; 9.24; 13.21; 14.8; 14.27; 18.14; Num. 10.33; 23.6; 23.17; 24.18 (but archaic); 25.6; 33.4 (the matrix *qaṭal* is in 33.3); 33.40 (circumstantial clause inserted within matrix: *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel*); 35.23; Deut. 4.11; 4.42; 5.23; 22.6; Judg. 3.20; 3.25; 6.11; 7.13; 11.34 (Nyberg 1972, §86bb); 13.9; 13.20; 16.9 (circumstantial *qoṭel*-clause before matrix, cf. Judg. 16.12); 16.12 (matrix this time before the *qoṭel*-clause); 18.7 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***Ø****-qoṭel* + ***Ø****-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qoṭel*); 18.17; 19.27; 20.33.

[38] Circumstantial verbless clauses are introduced by *wa* practically twice as often as they are asyndetic. In my corpus, there are 87 examples of circumstantial *wa-XØ* and 44 of *Ø-XØ* (archaic examples exist but are excluded).

[39] The modal forms in the verse (הֶֽבָה׀ נִבְנֶה) are 'long' (ending in *ā* or ē), which in both instances should be interpreted as a ventive enclitic (*-V*), but this does not concern us here (Sjörs 2019). Thus, the verb *nibnē* should be derived from **nabniy-an* rather than **nabniy-u*.

[40] My examples of syndetic circumstantial *XØ* in Genesis are: 4.7 (*Ø-PrP-S.noun-qoṭel* + ***wa****-XØ*); 8.11 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-hinnē-XØ*); 9.23 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 11.4; 18.10 (*Ø-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-hinnē-XØ*); 18.12 (*Ø-PREP-VN-qaṭal* + ***wa****-XØ*); 18.14 (*Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-XØ*); 24.10 (Brockelmann 1908–13, II, §321b); 24.45 'along came Rebekah with her water jug on her shoulder' (NET); 25.1; 25.29 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 29.2 (*kī-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-XØ*); 29.31 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 32.7 (*wa-gam-qoṭel* + ***wa****-XØ*); 33.1 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-hinnē-S.noun-qoṭel* + ***wa****-PrP-XØ*); 36.32 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 36.39 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ* + *wa-XØ*; the first *XØ* is an attendant circumstantial clause, the second is background); 38.1 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 38.2 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 38.6 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.noun-XØ*); 41.8 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-ʾēn-XØ*; the participle is a noun here); 42.27

(*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-hinnē-XØ*); 44.14 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*), 44.30 (*wa-ʿattā-PREP-VN* + ***wa****-XØ* + ***wa****-XØ*, within a temporal clause); 44.34 (*kī-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-S.noun-ʾēn-XØ*).

[41] There are also some uses of the infinitive that must be called circumstantial. Such infinitive clauses are always asyndetic; see Isaksson (2007).

[42] In total, 192 background clauses in the corpus are syndetic (connected with *wa-*). 58 are asyndetic. Editorial comments are mostly asyndetic and are not counted here.

[43] In addition, one such instance in the books of the corpus is archaic: Deut. 32.14 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)*!); see Notarius (2013, 80, 83, 85, 307; 2015, 240), who regards the *tištɛ̄* as a long imperfective form (past habitual).

[44] The translation accords relatively closely with Propp (2006, 585).

[45] Other examples of long *yiqṭol* in background: Gen. 2.10 (*wa-S.noun-qoṭel* + *wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal*, background initiated by a *qoṭel* clause); 34.7 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *kī-O.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****-kēn-lō-yiqṭol(u)*) 'something that is simply not done' (CJB); Exod. 1.12 (***wa****-CONJ-yiqṭol(u)* + *Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-ADV-yiqṭol(u)*, a logical-comparative construction which functions as background); 33.7 ([7]***wa****-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + … [12]*wa(y)-yiqṭol*, the only example in the corpus with a long *yiqṭol* background clause that precedes the mainline; the *wa* in this case marks a connection with the foregoing context); 40.36 (***wa****-VN-yiqṭol(u)*, habitual past); Num. 11.9; Judg. 6.4 ([3]… + *wa-qaṭal* + [4]*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-lō-yiqṭol(u)*, all clauses habitual past and background).

[46] Hornkohl (2018, 49 n. 64) calls this off-line information; verse 57 is "end of scene."

[47] Only 24 backgrounded verbless clauses in the corpus are asyndetic, as in Gen. 11.29 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *Ø-XØ* + *wa-XØ*).

[48] I supply the first ten backgrounding syndetic verbless clauses in the corpus: Gen. 1.2 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****-XØ* + *wa-S.noun-qoṭel*); 2.19 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 9.18 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ*); 12.4 (*wa(y)-*

yiqṭol + ***wa****-XØ*); 13.2 ([1]*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [2]***wa****-XØ*); 13.13 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + [13]***wa****-XØ*); 14.10 (***wa****-XØ* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*); 14.13 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-S.pron-qoṭel* + ***wa****-XØ*); 14.18 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****-XØ*, new paragraph beginning with main-line *qaṭal* and then a piece of historical information with *XØ*); 16.16 ([15]*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [16]***wa****-XØ*).

[49] There are 24 other backgrounding *qoṭel* clauses introduced by *wa*. In the following list of syndetic participle clauses, I supply the linking pattern for the first ten: Gen. 1.2 ([1]*Ø-qaṭal* + [2]***wa****-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****-XØ* + ***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); 2.10 ([9]*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [10]***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); 14.12 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel*; *yōšēb* can also be analysed as a noun); 24.20f. (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel* + *Ø-qoṭel*); 24.62 ([62]*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel* + [63]*wa(y)-yiqṭol*; the *qaṭal* clause here introduces a new paragraph); 27.5 ([4]*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [5]***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); Exod. 13.20f. (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [21]***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel*); Judg. 4.2 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-XØ* + ***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel*); 4.4f. ([4]***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel* + [5]***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, where *wa(y)-yiqṭol* belongs to the background); 7.11f. ([11]*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + [12]***wa****-S.noun-qoṭel* + *wa-XØ*); 10.1; 13.19; 14.4, 5; 16.8f.; 17.7; 18.1; 19.16; 20.28. I have found only one asyndetic background participle clause: Gen. 39.23.

[50] This holds for most of the Biblical Hebrew period. In the archaic poetry, where the semantic development of the construction *wa-qaṭal* is incomplete, there is a rare example of a very expressive report (Judg. 5.26) where the successive actions in a peak of the report are coded by *qaṭal* and *wa-qaṭal* clauses (Bergsträsser 1929, §9n; Müller 1983, 50; Notarius 2013, 134, 289).

[51] The most natural interpretation of the introductory *qaṭal* clauses in the two background sections is as anterior-pluperfect ("off-line anteriority," Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64).

[52] The two *qaṭal* clauses are simultaneous with past time reference (Ges-K §164b.3; Nyberg 1972, §85k; Joosten 2012, 169 n. 24).

[53] On this point, I disagree with the analysis in the excellent article by Hornkohl (2018, 49 n. 64, 52). Hornkohl argues that the *XV* clause signals a new unit.

[54] Long *yiqṭol* as a discourse-continuity clause (type **wa-yiqṭol(u)*) is avoided in CBH (see §4.4 and §6.11). It is replaced by *wa-qaṭal*.

[55] According to Gropp (1991, 48), a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* should be read instead of *wa-qaṭal*. J-M (§119z) regards this as an anomalous occurrence of *w-qatálti*. Joosten (2012, 227) argues that *wa-qaṭal* here has the same meaning as *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, and similarly Nyberg (1972, §86kk) calls it a single past action.

[56] The *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses are, according to Joosten (2012, 169 n. 24), concomitant with the *qaṭal*.

[57] Other examples of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses within background complexes: Gen. 34.7 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—stative verbs that create circumstantial semantics in relation to a preceding *qaṭal* clause, or in Joosten's (2012, 169 n. 24) terms, simultaneity; 35.16 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wayhī-ADV-lə-VN* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—stativic verb that can also be analysed as elaboration, or again, in Joosten's (2012, 169 n. 24) terms, simultaneity; 37.2 (*Ø-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa-S.pron-XØ* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—according to Joosten (2012, 174, 178), *wa(y)-yiqṭol* is iterative and part of the background.

[58] Wenham (1994, 233, 236) renders the verb with a pluperfect: 'Laban had given Leah Zilpah his maid to be her maid'.

[59] Gropp (1991, 48): *wə* + *qaṭal*, "[it] may signal anterior circumstance." Thus also Westermann (1981, 423): "das perf. 'zur Bezeichnung eines Zustandes, der… in die Gegenwart hineinreicht' PNeuenzeit 226 Anm. 7," but Westermann (referring to Ges-K §112tt and BHS) is also open to an emendation. Joosten (2012, 227): "*w*^{e} + QATAL." J-M (§119z): "omission of energic Waw" so that "the form w-qatálti *and I killed* is used instead of the expected *wayyiqṭol* form required by classical usage." Schulz (1900, 37) seems to argue for a "streng aoristische Fassung" of *wa-qaṭal*. BHS suggests an emendation to a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause ("l frt").

[60] According to Nyberg (1972, §86kk), the *wa-qaṭal* has the same function as a long *yiqṭol* clause, and is a verbal circumstantial clause, "that is, it refers to an incidental circumstance beside the main action" (my

translation). De Boer (1974, 47) interprets the *wa-qaṭal* clause as a resumption: "Well, he was a believer in Yahweh, therefore he—Yahweh—planned righteousness—blessing—for him." Gropp (1991, 48) regards it as one of few examples of normal *qaṭal* with normal *wa* (but prefers to read *wa(y)-yiqṭol*). Normal *wa* + *qaṭal* is also affirmed by Schulz (1900, 37) and J-M (§119z). According to Ges-K (§112pp), this case of *wa-qaṭal* does not follow the usual interpretations; it expresses "A longer or constant continuance in a past state," as a variety of the frequentative perfect discussed in Ges-K (§112ss). Westermann (1981, 252): "Das perf. steht hier, weil der Satz die Erzählung nicht weiterführt;" this does not accord with Ges-K (§112ss), to which he refers.

[61] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* clauses introducing background: Gen. 37.2–4 'und zwar als Bursche bei den Söhnen der…' (Westermann 1982, 21); 38.5 (not a macro-syntactic function, but should be regarded as a background clause as well as a straightforward verbal clause; Isaksson 1998, 16); Exod. 18.26 'So they served as judges for the people at all times'; 36.29–30; Judg. 7.13 'on which the tent lay flat' (subevent in close connection with the preceding *wa(y)-yiqṭol*; Isaksson 2009, 76; Khan 2021a, 318); 16.18 (background complex: *wa-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*)—this *wa-qaṭal* cannot be analysed as frequentative (Rubinstein 1963, 64).

[62] Other examples in the archaic poetry: Deut. 33.9 (*kī-qaṭal* + ***wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)***; Notarius 2013, 242); 2 Sam. 22.29 (*kī-XØ* + ***wa-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)***!); Ps. 18.23 (*kī-XØ* + ***wa-O.noun-lō-yiqṭol(u)***!).

[63] For the construction *haya* + *qoṭel*, see Ges-K (§116r).

[64] Another example in prose is Gen. 24.16: *Ø-XØ* + ***wa****-S.noun-lō-qaṭal* 'She was a virgin; no man had ever been physically intimate with her' (NET).

[65] I count as continuity examples also simple negated clauses of the type *wa-NEG-V*, where *V* is a finite verb (Tenet 4; see §7.12). Some continuity cases of same-event addition in prose are: Gen. 31.27 (see above); 39.15 (*kī-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); 39.18 (*PREP-VN* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*); Exod. 19.3 (*Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(u)!*, ellipsis?); 24.7 (*Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)!*

+ ***wa****-yiqṭol(u)*, ellipsis?); Lev. 11.43 (wa-*lō-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Deut. 1.21 (*Ø-ʾal-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-ʾal-yiqṭol*); 2.9 (*Ø-ʾal-yiqṭol!* + ***wa****-ʾal-yiqṭol!*); 2.19 (*Ø-ʾal-yiqṭol!* + ***wa****-ʾal-yiqṭol!*); 31.6 (*Ø-ʾal-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-ʾal-yiqṭol*); Judg. 13.2b (*wa-XØ* + ***wa-****lō-qaṭal*, 'His wife was infertile **and** had no children').

[66] "**Temporal succession**. Two clauses occurring one after the other in a sentence indicate that the actions or states they describe happened in that iconic order: 'X, and following after X, Y'. This is shown in English by marker *and* or *and then* with the Focal clause" (Dixon 2009, 9).

[67] Other examples of *wa-ADV-qaṭal* clauses with temporally explicit adverbial (including prepositional) phrases: Gen. 10.15–18 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa-****ADV-qaṭal*); Gen. 23.17–19 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-ADV-qaṭal*)—it is emphasised that Abraham buried his wife only after his purchase of this piece of Canaanite land property (Westermann 1981, 460); 45.15 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-ADV-qaṭal*); Exod. 5.1; Judg. 1.8f. (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-O.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa-****ADV-qaṭal*, complementary military campaigns of Judah: Jerusalem, and after that outside Jerusalem).

[68] Other examples of *wa*-clauses with *yiqṭol(u)* predicate and temporally explicit adverbial phrases: Exod. 16.12a (*Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-****PrP-yiqṭol(u)*, temporally marked *PrP*); Lev. 14.8, 19, 36 (*wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-****ʾaḥar-kēn-yiqṭol(u)*); 15.29; 16.26, 28; 22.7 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa-****ʾaḥar-yiqṭol(u)*); Num. 5.26; 6.20; 12.14b (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa-****ʾaḥar-yiqṭol(u)*); 19.7 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa-****ʾaḥar-yiqṭol(u)*); Judg. 7.10b–11a (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa-****ʾaḥar-yiqṭol(u)*).

[69] The negated realis *lā yaqtul* attested in Amarna Canaanite—e.g., EA 254:12f. *ù la-a a-kal-li* 'and I have not withheld', analysed as preterite *yaqtul* by Baranowski (2016a, 138)—is not found in BH. It is replaced by the new *wa-lō-qaṭal* clause-type in narrative and report.

[70] More examples of *qaṭal* in negative storyline clauses are given in Isaksson (2015a, 257 n. 153). See also §7.12.1.

[71] Westermann (1976, 254) refers to Ges-K (§152w), which regards the *pɛn* to be "virtually dependent on a cohortative." But it must be admitted that an archaic meaning of the *pɛn* particle would suit the context

very well indeed: *pini* 'turn away!' (Brockelmann 1956, §133e), *pace* the suggestion in J-M (§168g), which appears artificial. In such a case, the *pɛn* complex could be analysed as being made up of main clauses: 'Far be it that he reach out his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat, and live forever!" Procksch (1913, 31) also prefers a main clause: "Und nun ist Gefahr, daß er noch seine Hand ausstrecke und nehme auch vom Baum des Lebens und esse und lebe so ewiglig."

[72] Other examples of *pɛn* constructions with temporally sequential *wa-qaṭal* clauses: Gen. 19.19 (*wa-S.pron-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + *pɛn-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-qaṭal***); 32.12 (*Ø-IMP* + *kī-qoṭel* + *pɛn-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-qaṭal***)—this could also be interpreted as 'motion purpose' (Dixon 2009, 45); Exod. 13.17b (*Ø-pɛn-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-qaṭal***); 19.21 (*pɛn-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-qaṭal***); 23.29 (*Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + *pɛn-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-qaṭal***).

[73] Other examples of temporally sequential *wa-qaṭal* clauses after initial imperative(s): Gen. 27.9–10a (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa-***qaṭal + *wa-qaṭal*, a modal domain that involves also a short *yiqṭol* with ventive morpheme); 27.44 (*wa-ʿattā-VOC-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *Ø-IMP* + ***wa-****qaṭal*); 37.20 (*wa-ʿattā-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa-***qaṭal + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*); Exod. 8.12 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 9.8f. ([8]*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + [9]***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 12.21f. (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + [22]***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 19.24 (*Ø-IMP* + *Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 24.1f. ([1]*Ø-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + [2]***wa****-qaṭal*); 30.34f. ([34]*Ø-IMP* + *Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + [35]***wa****-qaṭal*); 34.1 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Lev. 24.14 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Num. 13.17b–20 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa-****qaṭal* + [18]***wa****-qaṭal…* + [20]***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 19.2f. (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + [3]***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 20.8 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*).

[74] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* clauses expressing temporally sequential habitual events in the past: Exod. 33.7a (*wa-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa-****qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 33.9 (*Ø-PREP-VN-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, similarly in vv. 10–11).

[75] For the meanings of the construction *wa-qaṭal*, see §6. Examples of future sequential events coded by *wa-qaṭal* clauses: Gen. 24.43 (*Ø-*

S.noun-qoṭel + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, a wished-for case); 41.29–30 (*Ø-hinnē-S.noun-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*, prediction, only the first *wa-qaṭal* is sequential); Exod. 3.13 (*Ø-hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, an imagined future sequence of events); 4.14b–15a (*wa-gam-hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, prediction); 7.17b (*Ø-hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, prediction); 8.23 (*Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Judg. 15.18b (*wa-ʿattā-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, fear of future event); 21.21 (*wa-qaṭal* + *wa-hinnē-ʾim-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, a planned future scenario).

[76] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* clauses expressing temporal succession within a protasis (protases enclosed by parentheses): Exod. 21.12 (*(Ø-qoṭel* + ***wa****-qaṭal)* + *Ø-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)*); 21.33–34 ([33]*(ʾō-kī-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal)* + [34]*Ø-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)*); 21.37 (*(kī-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *ʾō-qaṭal)* + *Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)*); 22.1 (*(Ø-ʾim-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal)* + *Ø-XØ*); 22.6a (*(kī-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal)*, only the protasis); 22.9 (*(kī-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *ʾō-qaṭal* + *ʾō-qaṭal* + *Ø-ʾēn-qoṭel)*, only protasis); 22.13 (*(wa-kī-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *ʾō-qaṭal* + *Ø-XØ)*, only protasis); Lev. 5.2 (*ʾō-S.noun-REL-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-XØ* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, alternative protasis); 13.2 (*(Ø-NP-kī-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-qaṭal)* + *wa-qaṭal*)—for the temporally sequential interpretation of וְהָיָה, see Milgrom (1991, 774); Judg. 1.12 (*(Ø-REL-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-qaṭal)* + *wa-qaṭal*).

[77] An example in English (with the focal clause in italics) is: John has been studying German for years, *thus he speaks it well* (Dixon 2009, 17). Focal clause: "One clause refers to the central activity or state of the biclausal linking" (Dixon 2009, 3).

[78] Other discontinuous focal result clauses: Gen. 15.3 (*Ø-hēn-PrP-lō-qaṭal* + ***wa****-hinnē-S.noun-qoṭel*: 'You have given me no children; so a servant in my household will be my heir'); Lev. 11.35 (*Ø-XØ* + ***wa****-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)*, *XØ* supplies a reason); 17.11 (*kī-XØ* + ***wa****-S.pron-qaṭal*) 'for the life of every living thing is in the blood. So I myself have assigned it to you on the altar to make atonement for your lives…' (NET); Num. 30.13 (*Ø-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)*) 'since her husband has annulled them, the LORD will release her from them' (NAB).

[79] On Gen. 1.3, I follow Wenham (1987, 2, 15f.): "This frightening disorganization is the antithesis to the order that characterized the work of creation when it was complete… The same point is made in another powerful image in the next clause, 'darkness covered the deep'."

[80] Wenham (1987, 18) quotes Stadelmann (1970, 49), who writes, "Light manifests most adequately the divine operation in a world which without it is darkness and chaos." Wenham's translation of 1.3 is "Then God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light." Procksch (1913, 422) also emphasises in his translation the connection between verse 2 and 3: 'Wie nun die Erde dalag, eine wüste, leere Masse,—und Finsternis lag über der Urflut, Gottesgeist aber brütete über der Wasserfläche, [3] da sprach Gott: Es werde Licht. Und es ward Licht'. Other examples of focal result clauses with *wa(y)-yiqṭol*: Gen. 3.10; 3.13, 18; 4.4b–5 '**So** Cain was very angry, and his face was downcast' (NIV); 12.19a; 15.6; 16.4, 6; 18.11–12a; 19.11; 20.12; 25.25; 25.26; 29.33; 41.10; 45.6f.; Exod. 17.12; 36.3b–4; Lev. 17.14a; 18.27; 20.23; 20.26 (*wa-qaṭal* + *kī-XØ* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—Milgrom (2000, 1301) translates, 'You shall be holy to me, for I YHWH am holy; **therefore** I have set you apart from other peoples to be mine', and on p. 1762 he comments, "Whereas holiness is God's *nature* and is apprehensible solely from his self-revelation, separation is the result of his *act*, visible in the creation of the world (nature) and in the creation of Israel (history);" Num. 33.9b; Judg. 1.21 and similar examples in Judg. 1 (*wa-O.noun-lō-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*) 'so the Jebusites have shared Jerusalem with Benjamin to this day' (Sasson 2014, 153); 15.2a (*kī-VNabs-qaṭal* + ***wa****(y)-yiqṭol*)—"It stands after a causal clause and expresses a consequence" (Zewi 1999, 85).

[81] Other examples of focal result clauses coded by *wa-qaṭal* clauses: Gen. 6.3 (*Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 20.11; 26.22b (*kī-ʿattā-qaṭal* + ***wa-****qaṭal*); 34.5 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*)—many, with Gropp (1991, 48), suggest an emendation to *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, and Joosten (2012, 227) regards it as one of the cases in CBH when *wa-qaṭal* has the same function as *wa(y)-yiqṭol*; Exod. 3.20 (*wa-S.pron-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa-****qaṭal*); Lev. 11.44a 'For I am ADONAI your God; therefore, consecrate yourselves and be holy, for I am holy' (CJB); 16.4b;

18.4b–5 'I am the LORD your God. You shall **therefore** keep my statutes and my rules' (ESV); 19.36b–37 'I am Yahweh your God who brought you out of Egypt; **hence** you are to keep all my laws and all my customs and put them into practice. I am Yahweh' (NJB). I regard also clauses of the type *wa-NEG-V* as continuity clauses (see §7.12), and they often code focal result. They are not accounted for above. Some few instances are: Num. 14.43b (*CONJ-qaṭal* + ***wa-****lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 25.11 (*Ø-S.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa-****lō-qaṭal*).

[82] Other syndetic discontinuity clauses coding a cause/reason for the preceding focal clause: Gen. 15.2 (*Ø-VOC-O.pron-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-S.pron-qoṭel*); 20.3 (*Ø-hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel* + ***wa****-XØ*); 24.31 (*Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-S.pron-qaṭal*); 34.21 (*wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa****-S.noun-XØ*); 39.3 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa****-O.noun-S.noun-qoṭel*); Exod. 9.28 (*IMP* + ***wa****-XØ*); 23.9 (*wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-S.pron-qaṭal* + *kī-O.noun-qaṭal*); Judg. 13.18 (*Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-XØ*) 'You should not ask me my name, because you cannot comprehend it' (NET).

[83] The rest of my examples of continuity reason clauses are less clear and depend on the interpretation: Lev. 25.36 (*Ø-ʾal-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*, or: 'instead you shall fear…'); 25.43 (*Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, or: 'instead…').

[84] Milgrom (1991, 228): 'Thus the priest shall effect purgation…'. Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* clauses with this type of linking semantics are (I supply the linking pattern only for the first ten): Gen. 17.13 (*Ø-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 39.9 (*wa-ʾēḵ-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 45.19 (*Ø-O.pron-IMP* + *Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Exod. 13.15f. (Ø-ADV-*S.pron-qoṭel* + *wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 17.5 (*IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *wa-O.noun-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 19.23b (*IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 23.25 (*kī-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, within protasis); 28.43 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa****-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); Lev. 4.26 (*wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)!* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 4.31 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 5.6; 5.10; 5.12–13a; 12.7a; 14.18; 14.20; 14.36; 15.15, 30, 31; 16.6, 11, 19; 19.12; 22.2; Num. 4.19 (*wa-O.pron-IMP* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*)—cf. Garr

(1998, lxxxiii), who assigns the *wa-qaṭal* a result value, "and [as a result] they will live," which is close to my interpretation; 8.13f.; 11.17; 20.8; Deut. 13.6; 21.8 (*wa-qaṭal* + *"…"* + ***wa-qaṭal***).

[85] Other examples of *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* clauses presupposing the manner of preceding clause(s): Gen. 42.2 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-V* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)!*, where *-V* is a ventive clitic); 43.8 (*Ø-IMP-V* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-V* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-V* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-V* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 47.19 (*wa-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-V* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)!* + *wa-S.noun-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); Exod. 28.35 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)!*); 28.43 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal*); 30.12 (*kī-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)!*); 30.20 (*PREP-VN-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 30.21 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 39.21 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); Lev. 8.35 (*wa-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + ***wa**-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 14.36; 15.31; Lev. 16.2, 13; 18.28, 30; 19.17, 29; 20.14, 22; 21.6, 15, 23; 22.2; Num. 5.3; 8.19; 11.17; 17.25; 18.5, 22; 35.12; Deut. 13.12; 17.13; 19.10; 22.8.

[86] Cf. the note by NET: "The expression 'and consecrated it' refers to the effect of the anointing earlier in the verse," and Milgrom (1991, 493), who translates 'thus consecrating them'. Similar examples are: Gen. 25.33; 30.38 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*); 31.9; Exod. 12.36 (*wa-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*, supported by the accents, part of background); 20.25 (*kī-O.noun-qaṭal* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*); Lev. 8.10, 15, 30 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*); Num. 7.1b (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*); 26.10 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa**(y)-yiqṭol*, within a relative clause complex).

[87] Jussive clauses in this function may in rare cases be asyndetic: Lev. 9.6 (*REL-qaṭal* + ***Ø**-yiqṭol(Ø)*); Deut. 32.29 (*lū-qaṭal* + ***Ø**-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***Ø**-yiqṭol(Ø)*, archaic, counterfactual). Complements are impersonal. I have found no example of a ventive/cohortative clause (first person!) functioning as complement.

[88] For the form of the imperative, see Ges-K (§63q). Ges-K (§110i) maintains that the meaning of this *wa-IMP* is "a consequence which is to be expected with certainty, and often a consequence which is intended, or

in fact an intention," as referred to by Westermann (1981, 387), 'so daß du am Leben bleibst', and Wenham (1994, 66), 'so that you may live', and Strack (1894, 65). This is close to the truth, but does not recognise that in some semantic contexts the meaning is a plain complement. Andersen (1974, 108) misses the point and translates 'return the man's wife… and live!'. Procksch (1913, 290), however, interprets correctly 'und er wird dann für dich beten [daß du am Leben bleibest]' (although with doubt about the text). Other examples of *wa-IMP* as a complement clause: Gen. 20.7; Exod. 25.40.

[89] Other examples of third-person jussive *wa-yiqṭol* clauses in CBH with the function of a complement: Gen. 23.9 (*wa-IMP* + [9]***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)*); 41.34 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)*!, Westermann 1982, 95); Exod. 6.11; 8.4 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)!*)—*pace* Qimron (1986–87, 152), who regards it as a purpose clause; 10.17 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol*!); 11.2; 10.21 (the second *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*); 14.2, 15; 25.2; Lev. 22.2; 24.2; Num. 5.2; 17.2 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol*!); 19.2; 21.7 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)!*); Judg. 13.4; 14.15 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol*!). A corresponding negated complement: Lev. 16.2 (*IMP* + ***wa****-ʾal-yiqṭol(Ø)*).

[90] *Wa-qaṭal* clauses describing an implied result are relatively frequent. Some instances are: Gen. 29.8; 33.10—according to Rainey (2003, 26f.), apodosis; 43.14; Exod. 8.24; 10.25; 22.5 (within protasis); 26.11; 28.7; 40.9; Lev. 19.29. For the semantics of result clause linking, see Dixon (2009, 2, 19, 22).

[91] For a further discussion on this topic, see Notarius (2017).

[92] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* clauses forming complements after *yiqṭol(u)* or *wa-qaṭal* clauses (since *wa-qaṭal* alternates with long *yiqṭol* with the same meaning, I have included also *wa-qaṭal* main clauses): Exod. 23.30 (*CONJ-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*)—this interpretation is evident in NJB 'I shall drive them out little by little before you, until your numbers grow sufficient for you **to** take possession of the land'; Lev. 13.54 (*wa-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*); 25.49b (*ʾō-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*) 'Or he can afford **to** redeem himself'—*ʾō-qaṭal* is correct and is equivalent to *wa-qaṭal* (see §5.4.8), but most commentators, including Milgrom (2001, 2148), and

Hartley (1992, 422), emend the text according to LXX and translate as Milgrom's 'or if he prospers, he may redeem himself'; Num. 3.10 (*wa-O.noun-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, Levine 1993, 152); 15.38; 23.27 (*Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, Levine 2000, 165); Deut. 5.31 'teach them **to** follow'; 11.8 (*CONJ-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*, with generalised semantics: 'be strong enough **to** enter and possess the land'); 31.12b (*CONJ-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-CONJ-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-qaṭal* + ***wa****-qaṭal*).

[93] Other examples of conditional linking and a *wa* introducing the apodosis: Gen. 12.1f.; 24.49 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*); 26.3 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)-V* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)-N*)—energic clitic is regarded as ventive (Sjörs 2019); 29.27; 30.28; 32.10; 34.12; 47.16 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*); 47.19; 49.1; Exod. 3.10; 9.28; 24.12; Num. 16.22 (*Ø-INT-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ***wa****-PrP-yiqṭol(u)*, Levine 1993, 408); Judg. 6.13 (*wa-yēš-XØ* + ***wa****-ADV-qaṭal*); 9.7 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)*); 9.19 (*Ø-IMP* + ***wa****-yiqṭol(Ø)*).

[94] Blau (2010, 190) rejects the term 'consecutive *waw*', "because it simply is not true that the action is represented as a consequence of a preceding action."