

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>

©2024 Bo Isaksson



This work is licensed under an Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). This license allows you to share, copy, distribute, and transmit the text; to adapt the text for non-commercial purposes of the text providing attribution is made to the authors (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). Attribution should include the following information:

Bo Isaksson, *The Verb in Classical Hebrew: The Linguistic Reality behind the Consecutive Tenses*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0414>

Further details about CC BY-NC licenses are available at
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at
<https://archive.org/web>

Any digital material and resources associated with this volume will be available at
<https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0414#resources>

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.

3. THE SHORT *YIQTOL* AS A SEPARATE VERBAL MORPHEME IN CBH

The theory of consecutive tenses hides the true nature of the short *yiqtol*. In one respect, it is put out of sight as the ‘jussive’, as if the jussive were not also a *yiqtol*. Among the four principal ‘tenses’, only one *yiqtol* is mentioned. The short *yiqtol* is again put out of sight, because it is concealed in one of the other principal verb forms: *wa(y)-yiqtol*, a ‘tense’ of its own in the consecutive system.

The purpose of the present chapter is to clarify the independent status of the short *yiqtol* in CBH and its Semitic background (Isaksson 2021a). The *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause-type is one of four primary constituents of the ‘consecutive tenses’, and a correct analysis of the short *yiqtol* is of utmost importance for a synchronically correct understanding of *wa(y)-yiqtol* in CBH. The false idea of only one *yiqtol* conjugation in the synchronic state of CBH is so established in Biblical Hebrew grammars that this alone motivates a separate chapter on the issue. Did the native speakers and writers of CBH recognise two *yiqtol*s or only one?

Already in Proto-Semitic, a short prefix conjugation stood in opposition to a long prefix conjugation. In the earliest attested stages, the long prefix verb was a formation with reduplication of the second radical (type *iparras*). In Central Semitic, a probably new formation emerged as a long prefix conjugation with an enclitic imperfective marker *-u* (type *yaqtul-u*).

The distinguishing features of the PS short prefix conjugation (type *yaqtul*) were: (1) two meanings, perfective/past and jussive,¹ and (2) a short form, as opposed to the long imperfective prefix conjugation (Huehnergard 2019, 62; also Rabin 1984, 393). These features of the *yaqtul* gram were constitutive in the earliest attested Semitic languages, and are found in CBH as well.

3.1. The Semitic Background of the CBH Short *Yiqtol*

Cook (2012a, 118) writes:²

The historical-comparative data from Akkadian, Ugaritic, and El-Amarna Canaanite have been revolutionary with respect to the BHVS. The most important conclusion arrived at through the historical-comparative investigations is that WS originally possessed a Past prefix form *yaqtul*. Comparison of the Akkadian Past *iprus* with BH *wayyiqtol* and the Arabic syntagm *lam yaqtul* supported the supposition that a Past prefix form *yaqtul* existed in WS.

It is possible to trace the origin of an old perfective *yaqtul* back to Afroasiatic (Kouwenberg 2010a, 126ff.; Hasselbach 2013b, 329; Kossmann and Suchard 2018, 47, 52; Huehnergard 2019, 62). A plausible assumption would be that the Proto-Semitic *yaqtul* is the result of a long grammaticalisation path that began with a resultative periphrastic verbal morpheme with proclitic pronominal element + verbal adjective, *taprus* ‘du (bist) getrennt habend’ (Kienast 2001, 196f., 199; see also Huehnergard 2008, 238; Kossman and Suchard 2018, 41, 51).³ The *yaqtul* gram must have been the standard perfective formation in PS, and it could also be used injunctively (Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008,

416; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 7; Huehnergard 2019, 62). However, in the individual Semitic languages, the grammaticalisation process of *yaqtul* is usually advanced. It is quite possible that *yaqtul* in individual Semitic languages represents a ‘doughnut gram’, in which the prototypical use as a resultative is obscured or completely lost (Dahl 2000, 10).⁴

In Akkadian, the old perfective *iprus* is primarily but not exclusively preserved as a plain past tense (Troppner 1998, 158). Anterior meanings are taken over by an innovative ‘perfect’ (*ip-taras*), a typologically common process (Kuryłowicz 1964, 22). In the later Akkadian dialects, the use of the perfective recedes to negative clauses only, in a development similar to Arabic *lam yaqtul* (Soden 1969, §79b). In a shared single proto-language of West Semitic, the innovative perfective *qatal(a)* to a large extent replaced the perfective *yaqtul* (Huehnergard 2005, 163). The latter is retained in jussive and negated indicative clauses, as in Arabic; only as a jussive, as in Aramaic;⁵ or as a receding old past perfective (*yaqtul*) competing with a new perfective (*qatal*), as in Amarna Canaanite, Ugaritic, and CBH (Kuryłowicz 1949, 49f.; Rainey 2003a, 406f.).⁶

It has been regarded as a puzzle that the old Semitic perfective *yaqtul*, side by side with its realis and usually past meanings, could be used with irrealis meanings in the Akkadian precativ and the Central Semitic jussive.⁷ But from a cross-linguistic perspective, there is considerable variation as to the degree to which a ‘past time reference only’ is manifested. In the prototypical properties of a perfective grammatical morpheme, “the aspectual properties could thus be seen as ‘dominant’ relative to

the temporal properties: both kinds of properties characterize the prototypical instances” (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 84). It is “fairly frequent that perfective categories may have non-past reference in non-indicative moods or (which is the same thing) certain non-assertive contexts” (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 84).⁸

This fact, realis meaning side-by-side with irrealis, has resulted in a theory of two separate, but morphologically identical, *yaqtul* conjugations, one indicative and another modal.⁹ But the use of perfectives in the marking of subjunctive clauses is widely attested. According to Givón (2001, I:362), it proceeds in several related developments (see also Bybee 1995).¹⁰ It is reasonable to assume that the domain type (§1.2.4) determined the realis or irrealis meaning in Proto-Semitic.¹¹ In a modal domain, the irrealis meaning was understood, while in a narrative domain, the realis meaning (usually with past time reference) dominated. Such is still the case in Archaic Hebrew poetry, where the domain type determines the irrealis or realis meaning of short *yiqtol*. Some Semitic languages have handled the dual nature of the old perfective by the use of grammatical markers, in order to explicitly mark the intended irrealis meaning (Kogan 2015, 119). In Akkadian, an irrealis marker became obligatory, as in the precative *l-iprus*¹² and the vetitive (prohibitive) *ay iprus* (Soden 1969, §81c, i; Tropper 1998, 158; Kouwenberg 2010a, 33, 130ff.);¹³ in Arabic, the clitic *l-* became a facultative signal of the irrealis mood (in *li-yaqtul*).¹⁴ If a proclitic *l-* ever existed in Hebrew, it must have been entirely optional: its alleged use as clitic before jussive *yiqtol(Ø)* rests on extremely shaky examples (Huehnergard 1983, 591).

3.1.1. East Semitic: Akkadian

The past-tense usage of *iṣrus* in a narrative main line has the linking pattern *iṣrus-ma* + *iṣrus-ma* + *iṣtaras*# (Soden 1969, §156c). This *iṣrus* is neutral as to the durativity or punctuality of the event, and thus compatible with durative meanings. The essential nature of the perfective is to view the event as a bounded whole, as completed. It is not specifically a past tense (Tropper 1998, 158f.; Kouwenberg 2010a, 127):¹⁵

- (1) *ištu mūtānī 10 šanātīm abī ib-lá-aṭ*

‘after the plague, my father **was** (still) **alive** for ten years’
(Old Assyrian ArAn. 1, 48 n. 23 kt 88/k 507b:11–12)

It is also significant that this old perfective may take anterior or pluperfect meanings (Soden 1969, §79b; Kouwenberg 2010a, 128):

- (2) *x a.šà še.giš.ì ša am-ḥu-ru itbalma alpī ša ina maḥriya il-qú-ú ana libbu x eqlim šuāti [iš]talal*

‘he appropriated the 2 bur of sesame field that I had received and dragged the oxen which **he had taken** from me to that 2 bur field.’ (AbB 11, 116:13’–14’ [OB], my emphasis)

The old perfective *iṣrus* in Akkadian competes with, and is restricted in its usage by, the newly formed ‘perfect’ *iṣtaras* (Soden 1969, §79b). In this competition, *iṣrus* is neutral, and lacks “speaker involvement, actuality, and recentness” (Kouwenberg 2010a, 128; also Tropper 1998, 157f.).

3.1.2. Ethio-Semitic

The reflex of *yaqtul* in Gə‘əz¹⁶ is a non-indicative (irrealis) form, traditionally called ‘subjunctive’. In independent position, it functions as a jussive (Butts 2019, 131): *yəngər* or *yəlbəs* contrasts with an imperfective conjugation with geminated second radical, *yənāggər* (Tropper 2002, 90; Huehnergard 2005, 157). In subordinate clauses, *yaqtul* often expresses purpose or result. This opposition between a short prefix conjugation and a long one with gemination of the second root consonant is usually regarded as a retention from Proto-Semitic, since it is compared with the Akkadian *iprus/iparras* opposition (Weninger 2011, 1131).¹⁷ The jussive may optionally be preceded by the clitic *la* (Lambdin 1978, 150), which according to some grammars indicates an emphatic wish or command. The clitic *la* is especially frequent before third-person forms of the jussive (Tropper 2002, 150, 192):

- (3) *la-yəqrab*
‘let him approach’
- (4) *’əngər*
‘let me speak’
- (5) *wa-kiyāhu bāhtito tāmłək*
‘and him only **shall you serve**’

The jussive *yaqtul* in Gə‘əz can be used in all persons. There seem to be very few, if any, traces of a realis usage of a perfective *yaqtul* in Ethio-Semitic.¹⁸

The modern Ethiopian dialects generally preserve a short jussive that contrasts with an imperfective with an (originally) geminated second radical: Tigrinya *yəgbär* versus imperfective

yəǧäbbär (Voigt 2011, 1164); Amharic *yəsbär* ‘may he break’ (but 1cs with the *l* clitic: *ləsbär*) versus imperfective *yəsäbr* (Meyer 2011, 1193f.); Gurage *yädläs* versus imperfective *yädäls-ənā* (Meyer 2011a, 1245);¹⁹ Harari *yasbar* versus *yisabri* (Wagner 2011, 1260).

3.1.3. Modern South Arabian (MSA)

The speakers of Proto-Modern South Arabian departed from the West Semitic speech community very early, before the time when Ethio-Semitic and Central Semitic developed into two distinct branches of the West Semitic family tree (Kogan 2015, 109, 600). This is not undisputed, of course, and some scholars prefer to speak of a Western South Semitic group (Simeone-Senelle 2011, 1074).²⁰ In the present book, Central Semitic, Ethio-Semitic, and Modern South Arabian (MSA) are regarded as three independent West Semitic branches, among which there is “a special diachronic unity” between Central Semitic and Ethiopian Semitic. Of the six MSA dialects, Jibbali and Soqotri form an eastern group and Mehri, Harsusi, Bathari, and Hobyot a western branch (Kogan 2015, 115, 597; also Rubin 2014, 14; 2015, 313).

The reflex of the old perfective *yaqtul* in MSA is an irrealis (jussive) category usually called the ‘subjunctive’: Jibbali *yósfār* ‘May he travel’, which contrasts with a long imperfective,²¹ *yəsófār* ‘He will travel’ (Rubin 2014, 103). The term ‘subjunctive’ as used in the grammars is inappropriate, since this *yaqtul* can be used in independent jussive clauses, as in (6):

(6) *yəfórḥək ǰǰ bə-xár*

‘may God make you happy with good things’ (Jibbali, Rubin 2014, 147; also in Mehri, Rubin 2010b, 128)

The II-y verbs exhibit a shortening of the stem vowel in the jussive: Jibbali *yəfʕt* ‘may he die’, versus the long imperfect *yəfʕt* (Rubin 2014, 190).

An *l* clitic is added before all vocalic prefixes of the jussive in the 1cs and 1cd forms in Mehri and Jibbali: *l-ʕkdər* ‘may I be able’, *l-əḵʕdrʕ* ‘may we two be able’, versus 3ms *yʕkdər* ‘may he be able’ (Rubin 2010a, 90; 2014, 103).²²

3.1.4. Ancient South Arabian

Ancient South Arabian is probably not closely related to the Modern South Arabian dialects.²³ Ancient South Arabian is nowadays generally classified as a Central Semitic language group, whereas MSA is regarded a separate branch of West Semitic (Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 5). A turning point in the classification of Ancient South Arabian was a study by Norbert Nebes (1994b), who was able to show that there is no indication in any Ancient South Arabian language of an imperfective formation with geminated second root consonant, such as is found in the Ethiopian *yəṇaggər* (Tropper 1997a, 45f.; Huehnergard 2005, 160; Stein 2011, 1061).²⁴ Nebes clarified that the graphically attested prefixed conjugation had only one stem, and that this prefixed verb form functionally corresponded to two conjugations in other Semitic languages (a perfective and jussive *yaqtul* on the one hand and an imperfective *yVqattVl* or *yaqtulu* on the other): “Diese Basis lautet /qtVl/ und hat somit dieselbe Gestalt wie im Nordarabischen und in den nordwestsemitischen Sprachen” (Nebes 1994b, 74f., 78).

The defective consonantal script allows for *matres lectionis* only in final position of a word structure, marking long *ī* (by *y*) and long *ū* (by *w*). This makes a distinction between two different prefix conjugations, one short and one long, difficult to verify (Stein 2013, 77).²⁵ If within the Ancient Arabian prefix conjugation there is one reflex of the Central Semitic *yaqtul* and another reflex of the Central Semitic *yaqtulu*, as Huehnergard's (2005, 161, 165) hypothesis presupposes,²⁶ then this distinction can be verified only on the basis of typical uses and meanings of perfective verbs and imperfective verbs respectively.²⁷

The jussive is marked by the proclitic particle *l* (probably /li-/; Stein 2003, 240 n. 258; 2013, 112; also Huehnergard 1983, 584). An example is (7):

(7) *w-ʾlmqhw l-ykrbn-k*

‘May ʾLMQHW bless you’ (X.BSB 98/1–2; Stein 2011, 1064)

An interesting feature of Sabaic syntax is the use of chains of *w-yfʿl* clauses in past contexts marking temporal succession in narratives (cf. §1.2.4):²⁸

(8) *w-bn-hw f-ygbʾw ʿdy hgrn nʿd w-bn-hw f-yhšrn mlkn ʾlšrh yḥdb w-d-bn ḥms-hw w-ʾfrs-hw ʿdy ʾrd mhʾnfm w-yqmʿw w-hbʿln hgrnhn ʿty w-ʿty w-ylyfw b-hw mhrgrtm w-sbym w-mltm w-gnm d-ʿsm w-bn-hw f-ytʾwlw b-ʿly hgrn ḏfw w-ykbnn b-hw d-mḏrhm w-šʿbn mhʾnfm w-yhbrrw šʿbn mhʾnfm b-ʿly mqdmt-hmw w-hsḥt-hmw mqdmt-hmw ʿdy dṭ ḥml-hmw hgrn ḏfw w-yhrgw bn-hmw mhrgrm d-ʿsm*

‘And from there, **they returned** to the city of NʿD. And from there, the king ʾLŠRH YḤDB and some of his troops and his cavalry **marched** against the land of MHʾNFM. **And**

they overthrew and seized the two cities ʿTY and ʿTY. **And they got** there trophies, captives, loot, and booty that were numerous. And from there, **they turned** to the city of ḌFW. **And they found** there the (clan) Ḍ-MḌRḤM and the tribe MHʾNFM. **And** the tribe MHʾNFM **came** into the open against their vanguard, but their vanguard defeated them until they drove them back into the city of ḌFW. **And they killed** a number of them that was considerable.’ (J 576/7–9)

Traces of the narrative pattern in (8) are attested also in Minaic and Qatabanic. As can be seen in (8), there is a narrative pattern of the type *w-f-yfʿl* involving the conjunction *f*, corresponding to the Arabic *fa*.²⁹ On the basis of such narrative chains, Tropper (1997a, 39, 43) has argued that there must have existed in Sabaic a perfective short *yaqtul* with past time reference.

In Qatabanic, a short plural prefix form *yfʿlw* is found in past narrative contexts, which can be interpreted as **yifʿalū*. It contrasts with a long imperfective plural form *yfʿln* (**yifʿalūna*; Avanzini 2009, 213; Stein 2011, 1060; for Sabaic, Stein 2013, 80):

- (9) **w-ygbʾw** w-h[t]b Yḏmrmlk ʾbyt w-ʾrḏty w-ʾqny Qṭbn

‘Yḏmrmlk **gathered** and returned the houses, the lands, and the possessions of Qataban’ (Avanzini 2009, 213, my emphasis)

- (10) **w-yhrgw** w-sʾlqh Ḥḏrmwt

‘**and then they scattered death** and destruction on the Ḥaḏramawt’ (Avanzini 2009, 213, my emphasis)

In many Minaic legal texts, there are prefix forms expressing past time “without the form necessarily having the *w*-prefix” (Avanzini 2009, 213):

(11) *kl ʾklh ys¹rbn byt Wd k-s¹m*

‘all comestibles **marked** in the bayt Wadd, whether belonging to them’ (Avanzini 2009, 213, my emphasis)

Similar examples are found in Hadʿramitic:

(12) *ḏ-ʾl ys³b h-ḏt Ḥmym ḏt ynsf*

‘he who did not offer to *ḏt Ḥmym* that which he had to provide according to the rite’ (Avanzini 2009, 214, my emphasis)

Though the orthography is not distinctive in most cases, Avanzini’s conclusion is that all Ancient South Arabian languages had a prefix form *yaqtul/yaqtulū* for the past, and another prefix form *yaqtulu/yaqtulūna* for the ‘present’, a fact that is most clearly displayed in Qatabanic, where the imperfective prefix form is preceded by the particle *b* (*b-yf^l/b-yf^llwn*), and the jussive is distinguished by the precative particle *l* (*l-yf^l/l-yf^llwn*; Avanzini 2015, 18).³⁰ The past time prefix form is not always preceded by the conjunction *w*, as in (13):³¹

(13) *w-hgrn Ns²n yhh^hrm bn mwftm*

‘and the city of Nashshān, **he annihilated** with fire’ (RES 3945, 16; Avanzini 2009, 215; 2015, 15f., my emphasis)

In verbs IIwy, the long vowel is generally not indicated in the script. Only occasionally can a short, defectively written stem vowel in a short jussive form contrast with a plene spelling of the

corresponding long imperfective form (as is also pointed out by Multhoff 2019, 332, 334):³²

(14) jussive

l-yšmn wfy

‘may he set up the well-being of (...)’ (J 611/16–17; Stein 2011, 1061)

(15) imperfective

đt šym w-yšymn wfy

‘that he has set up **and will set up** the well-being of (...)’ (München VM 91–315 336; Stein 2011, 1061)

The North Sabaic idiom *Amiritic* exhibits a negation *lm*, which is followed by a prefix conjugation form with past meaning, as in Classical Arabic *lam yaqtul* (Stein 2011, 1047, 1063; see also Smith 1991, 12, who refers to Beeston 1984, 47). For example:

(16) *fa-nažara l-laššu ʾilā l-mawti wa-rāma ḥīlatan fī naqbin ʾaw manfaḍin fa-lam yağid*

‘The thief faced death and searched for an escape through a hole or an exit, **but found none.**’ (Brunnow et al. 2008, 9: lines 4–5)

3.1.5. Classical Arabic

In Classical **Arabic**, *yaqtul* is used as both jussive and ‘negative preterite’ *lam yaqtul* (Fischer 2002, 103).³³ The indicative use of *yaqtul* is confined to negative clauses preceded by *lam* ‘not’ or *lammā* ‘not yet’ (Lipiński 1997, §39.16; Fischer 2002, §194; Blau 2010, 195; Huehnergard 2017, 7, 26):³⁴

(17) *lam ya'ti*

‘he did not come’

(18) *fa-lam yaḥfil Bābaku bi-dālika wa-halaka fī tilka l-'ayyāmi*

‘but Bābak **took no notice** of this and he died in those days’

(Ṭab. I.816:5)

(19) *lammā ya'ti*

‘He has not yet come’

The *lam yaqtul* in Classical Arabic can take anterior meaning. It is also independent of the temporal reference of the preceding verb, as is shown by this example from *Kalīla wa-Dimna*:

(20) *mā lī 'arā-ka l-yawma ḥabīta l-nafsi wa-lam 'ara-ka mud 'ayyāmin*

‘Why is it that I see you today depressed **and haven't seen you** for days?!’ (Marmorstein 2016, 181)³⁵

In some weak verbs, the Arabic *yaqtul* exhibits a distinctively short form, as the examples *ya'ti* and *'ara-ka* above illustrate (Lipiński 1997, §39.14). In verbs IIwyy, the long stem vowel was shortened in closed syllables, possibly already in Proto-Semitic (Brockelmann 1908, 608, 613; Kienast 2001, §324.1),³⁶ resulting in a change of stress, since word stress was non-phonemic (Huehnergard 2019, 53): *yáqum* < **yaqūm*, *yásir* < **yasīr*, *yánam* < **yanām*. In verbs IIIwyy, a final root vowel is short in *yaqtul*: *yarmi*, but imperfective *yarmi* ‘he throws’; *yad'u*, but imperfective *yad'ū* ‘he calls’; *yalqa*, but imperfective *yalqā* ‘he meets’ (Fischer 2002, §§244, 253b).³⁷

In affirmative narrative clauses, the suffix conjugation *qatala* has completely replaced the old past perfective *yaqtul*.

An affirmative jussive *yaqtul* is practically always combined with the particle *li-*, usually in the third person (*li-ya'ti* 'Let him come!'), and only rarely in the first and second persons (Brockelmann 1977, §94):

(21) *li-tukabbiri-hi*

'make it (the tray of palm leaves) large' (uttered to a woman; Wright 1896–98, I:35D)

In Arabic poetry, the particle *li-* is optional. Originally, the *li-* must have been facultative also in prose (Wright 1896–98, I:35D–36A; Huehnergard 1983, 580).

3.1.6. Amorite

The data from the linguistic subdivision of Northwest Semitic called Amorite come from several thousand West Semitic names and loanwords in Akkadian and Sumerian sources, from the middle of the third millennium down to about 1200 BCE (Streck 2011, 452; Gzella 2011a, 427). Data also come most recently from a publication of two lexical texts from the early second millennium BCE (George and Krebernik 2022). The speakers possessing the names are called Amorites in the extant sources, and occupied roughly the same area as the first Aramaeans later came to do: the Middle Euphrates and the Syrian steppe. The lexical texts are two Old Babylonian tablets containing bilingual vocabularies in which the left-hand column presents words and phrases from a variety of Amorite dated to the early second millennium BCE. At that time, Amorite was still a living language (George and Krebernik 2022, 46). The two columns are typical of southern Old Babylonian pedagogical scholarship. These two tablets

confirm that Amorite was a Northwest Semitic language with both a short prefix conjugation *yaPRuS/yaPruSū* and a long prefix form *yaPRuSu/yaPruSūna* (George and Krebernik 2022, 2, 29).

The short prefix conjugation is attested as a ‘preterite’ *yaqtul* and jussive *l-aqtul* with (an optional) proclitic *la-* or *li-* (Golinets 2010, 287f., 336; 2020, 192f.; Streck 2011, 455; Cook 2012a, 119; George and Krebernik 2022, 29):

(22) *Yaśma‘-Hadda*

‘Hadda has heard’

(23) *’Annu-taśma‘*

‘Annu has heard’ (fem. name)

(24) *’Ašūb*

‘I have turned’ (Golinets 2010, 337; 1cs, root IIw)

(25) *ta-aḥ-ni-šum el-ḥa-ku-un-na-ni-la-a-ka*

‘The woman **sent me** to you.’ (2:14, George and Krebernik 2022, 5, 21, my emphasis)³⁸

In (25), the *yaqtul-N* is translated by an Akkadian *iprus* in the second column.

An example of a jussive with precative particle is (26):

(26) *li-iḥ-wi-i-ka* [DIĜIR]³⁹

‘May the god (El) preserve your life!’⁴⁰ (George and Krebernik 2022, 14f., 30)

Example (27) exhibits a jussive *yaqtul* without precative particle:

(27) *ta-mar ḥa-aš-ti*

‘Talk with me!’⁴¹ (George and Krebernik 2022, 14, 30)

The typical Central Semitic shortening of the middle root vowel in verbs IIwy does not seem to be attested in Amorite names:⁴² *Yašūb-lîm* ‘The tribe has turned to face’. In verbs IIIwy, the final root vowel does not seem to be short: *Yabnî-dagan* ‘Dagan has created’ (Streck 2011, 457).

3.1.7. Ugaritic

Ugaritic is now classified as a separate Northwest Semitic language.⁴³ It is attested in more than a thousand texts from the thirteenth century down to ca 1180 BCE. The poetic texts seem to represent a somewhat older stage (Gzella 2011a, 427).

It is possible to discern three indicative verb forms in Ugaritic: the long prefix conjugation *yaqtulu* (imperfective), the short prefix conjugation *yaqtul* (perfective, mostly past), and the (with non-stative verbs) perfective suffix conjugation *qatal* (Tropper and Vita 2019b, 493, 495). As in PS, the *yaqtul* in Ugaritic is a category with two meanings, indicative perfective and jussive. The indicative *yaqtul* is attested as past perfective only in the corpus of narrative poetry. In that corpus, it can be used with or without proclitic *w*, probably **wa-* (Tropper 1998, 162; 2012, 454f., 696; Huehnergard 2012, 56):⁴⁴

(28) *tšu . ilm . rašthm*

‘die Götter **erhoben** ihre Häupter’ (KTU³ 1.2:I:29, my emphasis; Tropper 2012, 697)

In such contexts, the *yaqtul* can be linked with the connective *w*:

(29) *tša / ḡhm . w tšh*

‘Die beiden (sc. zwei Boten) erhoben ihre Stimmen **und riefen**’ (KTU³ 1.5:II:16f., my emphasis; Tropper 2012, 699)

The following is an example of a (graphically) proclitic *w*- before a perfective distinctively short *yaqtul*:

(30) *w yʿn . aliyn / bʿl*

‘Then answered mighty Baal’ (KTU³ 1.4.VII:37f.; cf. Huehnergard 2012, 57)⁴⁵

With stative verbs, the perfective *yaqtul* may refer to the present. This shows that *yaqtul* in Ugaritic cannot be classified as a general past tense:

(31) *abn . brq . d l . tdʿ . šmm*

‘Ich weiß Bescheid über den Blitz, den die Himmel nicht **kennen**’ (KTU³ 1.3:III:26, my emphasis; Tropper 2012, 701)⁴⁶

A jussive meaning of *yaqtul*, with preposed subject, is found in (32):⁴⁷

(32) *ilm . tḡrk / tšlmk*⁴⁸

‘may the gods protect you (ms) (and) keep you well’ (KTU³ 2.14:4–5; Huehnergard 2012, 56)

In Ugaritic prose texts, *yaqtul* is mainly a jussive.⁴⁹ As a past perfective verb, *yaqtul* is largely replaced by (1) the suffix conjugation and (2) the diegetic present function of *yaqtulu* (Tropper 2012, 700; Huehnergard 2012, 56).⁵⁰

Ugaritic has a ‘precative particle’ *l*, but it is infrequent and its use is facultative.⁵¹ An example of precative *l* with *yaqtl* is (33):

(33) *l tbrkn*

‘let them (m) bless me’ (KTU³ 1.19.iv:32; Huehnergard 2012, 78: /la-tvbarrikū-nī/; cf. Tropper 2012, 812)

In response to the heated discussion on the existence of a short *yqtl*, Hackett has published a number of instances of distinctively short forms in Ugaritic, some of which are displayed below (Hackett 2012, 112ff.).

Some examples of short jussive *yaqtl* are found in (34):

(34) *wa-yarid Kirta li-gaggāti* ‘adbu / ‘akla li-qaryīti / ḥittata⁵² li-Bēti Ḥubūri / **ya’pi** laḥma dā-ḥamši / magīda tadīti yaraḥima / ‘adānu nagubu **wa-yaši’** / šaba’u šaba’i nagubu / **wa-yaši’** ‘adānu ma‘u

‘Now, let Kirta come down from the roof, [let him] prepare food for the city, wheat for Bêt Ḥubūr; **let him bake** bread for five months, provisions for six. **Let** the equipped host **go forth**, the great equipped host, **let** the strong host **go forth**.’ (KTU³ 1.14.ii.26–31, vocalised and translated by Hackett 2012, 112, my emphasis)

An example of short past reportive *yaqtl* is (35):

(35) *yarid/yarada Kirta li-gaggāti* ‘adaba / ‘akla li-qaryīti / ḥittata li-Bēti Ḥubūri / **ya’pi** laḥma dāḥamsi / magīda⁵³ tadīti yaraḥima, and so forth.

‘Kirta came down from the roof, prepared food for the city, wheat for Bêt Ḥubūr; **he baked** bread for five months,

provisions for six (and so on).’ (KTU³ 1.14.iv.8–12, vocalised and translated by Hackett 2012, 113, my emphasis)

3.1.8. Amarna Canaanite

Proto-Canaanite can be dated no earlier than 1550 BCE (Wilson-Wright 2019, 509). Data about early Canaanite dialects are found in more than 300 diplomatic letters from Canaanite vassal rulers of city-states to their overlords in Egypt, written during the thirteenth century BCE.⁵⁴ The letters are written in cuneiform Akkadian, but interesting traits of the scribes’ Canaanite native language are revealed by their insufficient knowledge of standard Akkadian in this peripheral area. The language of the Amarna letters can be classified as an ‘institutionalised interlanguage’ which provides the data for an analysis of this early Canaanite. Dialectal distinctions are “hard to establish in this corpus” (Gzella 2011a, 428; Baranowski 2016a, ch. 2).⁵⁵

The morphological distinction between a short *yaqtul* and a long *yaqtulu* is clearly seen in many examples:

(36) short *yaqtul*: 3fs

^{4d}NIN ša URU Gub-la **ti-din** ⁵ba-aš-ta-ka i-na pa-ni ⁶šār-ri

‘**May** the Lady of the city of Byblos **grant** you honor before the king, your lord.’ (EA 73:4-6; Baranowski 2016a, 74)

(37) short *yaqtul*: 1cs

ù aš-pu-ur! ³¹[a]-na LUGAL be-li-ia

‘**And I wrote** to the king my lord’ (EA 138:31–32; cf. EA 362:18 ù aš-pu-ur; Tropper and Vita 2010, 68; Baranowski 2016a, 79)

- (38) short *yaqtul*: 3mp

ù **i-ša-ra-pu** KUR.M[^ěEŠ *a-n*]a IZI

‘and they have set fire to the country.’ (EA 126:52, Baranowski 2016a, 80)⁵⁶

- (39) long *yaqtulu*: 3fs

a-di ti-ik-šu-du ¹⁵*a-wa-at šārri*

‘until the word of the king, my lord, **comes to me**.’ (EA 221:14–15, Tropper and Vita 2010, 64)

- (40) long *yaqtulu*: 3mp

⌈ù⌋ *a[l-lu-ú-mi]* ¹²²***ta-aš-pu-ru-na***

‘And be[hold, the men of the city of Byblos **write**’ (EA 138:121–22; similarly Tropper and Vita 2010, 65)

The old *yaqtul* in Amarna Canaanite was one of three primary verbal forms and was seemingly used interchangeably with the new *qatal* gram (Baranowski 2016a, 184, 188). The *yaqtul* exhibits the same dual nature, past indicative and jussive, as the Akkadian *iprus*, except that a ‘precativ particle’ *l-* is not needed to signal the jussive meaning (Baranowski 2016a, 77). The indicative use of *yaqtul* is mainly as a past verb form that forms chains of the type *ù yaqtul* + *ù yaqtul*. And there is a tendency to place the *yaqtul* in initial position in the clause (Tropper 1998, 162f.; Notarius 2015, 249; Baranowski 2016a, 137):⁵⁷

- (41) [...] *ù yi-il-qé-šu* ^{31I}*Sú-ra-ta* *ù yu-ta-šir₉-šu* ³²*iš-tu* URU *Ḫi-na-tu-na*^{KI 33}*a-na É-šu*

‘So Surata took him but he released him to his home from the town of Hannathon’ (EA 245:30–33)

Two coordinated morphologically distinctive short indicative *yaqtul* in report are attested in (42):

- (42) *ù a-nu-ma i-na-an-na ši-iḥ-tá-at* ¹¹URU *Ṣu-mu-ur a-di a-bu-li-ši* ¹²*ša-ḥa-at-ši i-le-ú* *ù* *ša-bat-ši* ¹³*la i-le-ú* (EA 106:10–13)

‘And right now Ṣumur is besieged up to its city gate. They are able **to besiege** it but they are unable **to conquer** it.’⁵⁸

The typical usage of the jussive is in a modal domain. A distinctively short jussive *yaqtul* is found in the following modal sequence:

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

‘Send a large regular army and you can drive out the enemies of the king from within his land and all the lands **will be joined** to the king.’ (EA 76:38–43)⁵⁹

A focalised clausal constituent, or the negation *lā*, may be placed before *yaqtul*,⁶⁰ as in (44), where *yaqtul* has anterior meaning (Baranowski 2016a, 138):

- (44) [...] *ù la-a ar-na-ku* ¹²*ù la-a ḥa-tá-ku* *ù* ¹³*la-a a-kal-li*
GÚ.UN.ḪI.A-ia ¹⁴*ù la-a a-kal-li* ¹⁵*e-ri-iš-ti*, LÚ *ra-bi-ší-ia*

‘and I am not a wrongdoer nor am I a criminal and **I have not withheld** my tribute **nor have I withheld** the request of my commissioner.’ (EA 254:11–15)

With stative verbs, *yaqtul* usually refers to “the moment in which the state began” (ingressive; Baranowski 2016a, 139), as in (45):

- (45) *ù i-nu-ma iš-te-mé a-wa-at* ¹⁴LUGAL EN-*ia i-nu-ma iš-tap-pár a-na ÌR-šu* ¹⁵*ù yi-iḥ-di lib-bi-ia* *ù* ¹⁶*yi-ṛša-qí* SAG-*ia* *ù in₄-nam-ru* ¹⁷2 IGI-*ia \ ḥe-na-ia i-na ša-me* ¹⁸*a-wa-at* LUGAL EN-*ia*

‘And when I heard the word of the king, my lord, when he wrote to his servant, then my heart **rejoiced** and my head **was lifted up** and my eyes **shone** at hearing the word of the king, my lord.’ (EA 144:13–18)

A prohibitive meaning with *yaqtul* can have two different negations, *lā* interfering with *ul* spelled with the OB orthography (*ú-ul*). The latter use of *ul* is against Babylonian syntax and reminiscent of the Hebrew negation *ʾal* (Rainey 1996, III:221). Examples are (Baranowski 2016a, 156):

- (46) *ši-mé ia-šib* UGU-*šū-nu* ⁵¹*ú-ul ti-im-i*

‘Listen to m(e); **do not refuse** concerning (them).’ (EA 122:50–51)

- (47) *la-a ta-qú-ul* L[UGAL *a-na Gu-(ub)-la^{KI}*] ⁶URU-*ka* *ù* URU *a-bu-t[i-ka]* ⁷*iš-tu da-ri-ti [...]*

‘**Do not keep silent**, (O) k[ing, concerning Byblos], your city and the city of [your] ancest[ors] from of old.’ (EA 139:5–7)

The jussive is attested in all three persons. As a rule, the verb occupies first position in the clause, except for the conjunction *u* and the particle *lū* (Baranowski 2016a, 156–158). Example (48) is in the second person singular (Baranowski 2016a, 156):

- (48) [...] *ša-ni-tam šum-ma* ²⁸*ap-pu-na-ma a-nu-ma pa-aṭ-ra*
²⁹URU¹ *Šu-mu-ra* *ù* URU *É-Ar-[ḥ]a(?)* ³⁰[*t*]***a-din-ni*** *i-na qa-*
at ³¹*Ia-an-ḥa-mi* *ù* *ia-dì-na* ³²ŠE.IM.ḪI.A *a-na a-ka-li-ia* ³³*a-*
na-ša-ra URU LUGAL *a-na ša-a-šu*

‘Furthermore, if moreover now the town of Šumur and the town of Bêt-Arḥa have defected, **assign me** to Yanḥamu and allot grain for my sustenance so that I may guard the city of the king for him.’ (EA 83:27–33)⁶¹

The jussive *yaqtul* is nearly always clause-initial. There are some rare cases when a subject or object is placed in focalised position before *yaqtul* (Baranowski 2016a, 158).⁶²

The indicative past *yaqtul* is often used in narrative sequences. In this type of domain also, the verb is usually placed first in the clause (type *ù yaqtul*). This is the unmarked word order of the narration. If another constituent of the clause is placed before the verb, it is a signal of a specific discourse function (here a left dislocation), as in (49):

- (49) *ù* ¹*Sú-ra-t[a]* ²⁵*yi-il₅-qé-mì* ¹*La-[ab-a-ia]*

‘But Surata took La[ba’aya]’ (EA 245:24–25)⁶³

3.1.9. Phoenician

The original language area of Phoenician coincided more or less with the present state of Lebanon. At the beginning of the Early Iron Age, Byblos became the centre of alphabetic writing, and the Phoenician variant of the alphabet the standard medium for writing in the adjacent linguistic areas. Soon the dialect of Tyre and Sidon “became a kind of ‘Standard Phoenician’ which replaced or influenced others” (Gzella 2012a, 55).⁶⁴

The Central Semitic morphological distinction between a short prefix conjugation and a long prefix conjugation was upheld in the 2fs, 2mp, and 3mp forms by the final *-n* (< **-īna*, **-ūna*) in the imperfective long *yqtl*.⁶⁵ The corresponding short forms lack this *-n*: the short prefix form ended in *ī* (2fs) or *ū* (2mp, 3mp).⁶⁶ In most forms, the morphological distinction is blurred, at least in the script.⁶⁷

A syntactic distinction is upheld in negative clauses. The jussive is preceded by the specific ‘prohibitive’ negation *’l*, while the long imperfective form is negated (mainly) by *bal* (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §318).

In the earliest stage of the Phoenician textual tradition, about 1000 BCE, it is possible to point to a perfective usage of the old *yaqtul* in a protasis domain (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §324).⁶⁸ The speaker is Ittōba‘l, son of Aḥīrōm, who threatens a possible desecrator of his father’s grave:

(50) ואל . מלך . במלכם . וסכן . בס(כ)גם . ותמא . מחנת . עלי . גבל . ויגל .
ארן . זן . תחתסף . חטר . משפטה . תהתפך . כסא . מלכה . ונחת . תברח
. על . גבל . והא . ימח . ספרה . לפן . גבל

‘Now, if any king among kings, or any governor among governors, or any commander of an army has come up against Byblos **and has uncovered** this coffin, may then the sceptre of his rule be torn away, may the throne of his kingdom be overturned, and peace shall flee from Byblos!’ (KAI⁵ 1:2, my emphasis)

The prefix form *wygl* in the example follows a suffix-conjugation form *’ly* within the protasis (Korchin 2008, 339 n. 23; Gzella 2009, 63: ‘*alaya*). This is a construction with several parallels in CBH.⁶⁹ The structure of the whole conditional linking, with the

protasis set within parentheses, is: (*w-illū-S.noun-qtł* + ***w-yqtł***) + *Ø-yqtł* + *Ø-yqtł* + *wa-S.noun-yqtł*. The form *ʿly* expresses a completed action. “Das ‘Perfekt’ für den Sachverhalt in der Protasis drückt dessen relative Vorzeitigkeit gegenüber seinem Gegenstück in der Apodosis aus” (Gzella 2009, 66). And the same can be stated for the form that continues the *qtł*, namely *w-ygl*,⁷⁰ which is “wohl Kurzimpf.” (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §324; also Segert 1975b, 90).⁷¹ The apodosis in (47) above, with its many *yqtł* forms, expresses a wish (or possibly a prediction about the future), and at least the first two (*thtsp* and *thtpk*) are jussives (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §264; Gzella 2013b, 190).

Apart from the Byblos inscription, there are only a few possible traces in the extant Phoenician texts of an indicative short prefix form *wyqtł* for narration of past events (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §266; Röllig 2011, 477f.).⁷² In such functions, the old perfective *yaqtul* is normally replaced by the suffix conjugation. The possible, but shaky, examples of perfective narrative *wyqtł* clauses are (text and translation from Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §266):

(51) מל שער ז גלב ויפג[ע]

‘ML schor dieses Haar (?) und fleh[te an (??)]’ (Kition III D 21, 1)’⁷³

(52) ובארץ המלך אשר ויבא

‘... und er kam’ (KAI⁵ 23.4; cf. Lemaire 1983)

(53) [ג]בל בד אורך ויפעל בחלב [של]ם ו[]

‘... und er machte...’ (KAI⁵ 23.5)

Krahmalkov (2001) has added a few doubtful examples of past perfective meaning of a *wyqtl* clause (with presumably short *yqtl*) in Phoenician and Punic.⁷⁴ The paucity of examples might suggest that “narrative tenses in Phoenician, including its lack of the *waw*-consecutive, apparently reflect a more highly accelerated rate of linguistic change than Aramaic and Hebrew” (Smith 1991, 20).

There are traces of a proclitic *l* before jussive forms in Punic—*l-yšmʿ qlʾ* ‘May he hear (*lišmaʿ*) his voice’ (Krahmalkov 2001, 190)⁷⁵—but in Phoenician, the jussive lacks this clitic:

(54) יארך . בעל . שמם . ובעל(ת) (4) גבל . ומפחרת . אל גבל (5) קדשם .
ימת . יחמלך . ושנתו (6) על גבל

‘**May** the Baʿal of the Heavens and the Lady of Byblos and the assembly of the holy gods of Byblos **lengthen** the days of Yahūmilk and his years over Byblos.’ (KAI⁵ 4.3–4, translated after Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §264)

3.1.10. Moabite

There is no consensus as to the internal classification of the Canaanite dialects in the Iron Age, and this concerns especially the Trans-Jordanian dialects Ammonite, Moabite, and Edomite, which from the fifth century BCE were replaced step by step with Aramaic. The debate is partly caused by the paucity of textual material.⁷⁶ Given the available data, there is no reason to regard the Trans-Jordanian spoken varieties as three distinct national languages. Rather they should be seen as located in an area with dialectal variations.⁷⁷

Ammonite is attested from about 800 BCE to the beginning of the sixth century BCE, and the corpus consists mainly of seals

and bullae, but also a number of inscriptions of up to 10 lines (Ahituv 2008, 357–386; Lemaire 2013a). The Edomite corpus is even smaller: two ostraca,⁷⁸ and some seals, bullae, and seal-impressions. The inscriptions in Ammonite and Edomite are very short and “unrevealing of linguistic peculiarities” (Parker 2002, 47; Lemaire 2013b). The old Semitic *yaqtul* does not seem to be attested in either of the two dialects.⁷⁹

Only the Moabite corpus of inscriptions permits a reasonable discussion of the verb forms and their meanings, and especially the Moabite stone from about 830 BCE (the Mēšaʿ stele, now in the Louvre: Smith 1991, 17–19; Parker 2002, 49).⁸⁰ The oldest inscriptions are from the ninth century BCE and written in the Hebrew script (Fassberg 2013a). Practically all linguistic features of Moabite discussed below are drawn from the 34-line Mēšaʿ inscription.⁸¹ The inscription at el-Kerak (KAI⁵ 306) by Mēšaʿ (Swiggers 1982; Ahituv 2008, 387), or by his father Kmšyt, adds very little to our knowledge of the language (Parker 2002, 54).

The old *yaqtul* is attested both with jussive meaning and with past perfective meaning. Despite the defective spelling, it is possible to identify a short prefix form in some cases (Smith 1991, 17–19; Parker 2002, 49; Hasselbach 2013a). Several examples of a narrative short *yaqtul* are found in the Mēšaʿ inscription (Garr 1985, 138; Schüle 2000, 164; Renz 2016, 629f.):

(55) אבי . מלך . על . מאב . שלשן . שת . ואנך . מלכתי . אחר . אבי | ואעש
 . הבמת . זאת . לכמש . בקרחה |

‘My father ruled over Moab thirty years, and I have taken over the kingship after my father, **and I have made** this high place for Chemosh in Qarchoh’ (KAI⁵ 181: 2–3)⁸²

The syntactic structure of this quotation is *w-S.noun-qtl* + *w-S.pron-qtl* + *w-yqtl*. We can see that the new perfective *qatal* has been utilised for establishing the narrative frame of the inscription (Dahl 1985, 30), whereas the old *yaqtul* (always with a preceding conjunction *w*) has been retained for successive narrative events.⁸³ The reference to a building (*hbmt z't* 'this high place') in the close neighborhood of the monument triggers an anterior meaning of the *w-yqtl* (*w-יָצַע* 'and I have made').⁸⁴ Since the Trans-Jordanian scribes usually marked long final vowels with corresponding *matres lectionis*, the letters *w-יָצַע* indicate a short form, as in the CBH form with the same consonantal orthography (*wā-ʿaʿas*).⁸⁵

A passage with past perfective meaning of *w-yqtl* is found some lines further in the same inscription:

(56) וישראל . אבד . אבד . עלם . וירש . עמרי . את . כָּל . ארץ . מהדבה |
 וישב . בה . ימה . וחצי . ימי . בנה . ארבען . שט . וישבה . כמש . בימי |
 ואבן . את . בעלמען . ואעש . בה . האשוח . ואבָּן [ן] את . קריתן |

'But Israel is utterly destroyed forever: Omri **took possession** of the land of Medeba, **and he dwelled** in it in his days and half the days of his son, forty years. **But then** Chemosh **restored it** in my days. **And I built** Baal-Meon, **and I made** in it a reservoir, **and I bui [It] Qiriathaim.**'
 (KAI⁵ 181: 7–10)

The narrative frame in this case is again established by the new perfective *qatal* (*ʿbd*), in a clause that functions as a subheading or preamble, which could be followed by a colon in the translation.⁸⁶ All in all, there are 35 attested realis *w-yqtl* clauses with past time reference in the Mēšaʿ inscription.⁸⁷

The old *yaqtul* with jussive meaning is attested in some Trans-Jordanian inscriptions, but the forms are not distinctive in the script. A semantically evident example is found in an Ammonite seal:⁸⁸

(57) אבנדב ש נדר לעשתרת בצדן תברכה

‘Abinadab, who has fulfilled a vow to ‘Aštart in Šīdōn. **May she bless him!**’ (Jackson 1983, 77, 101; Aufrecht 1989, no. 56)

3.1.11. Aramaic

Aramaic belongs to the Aramaeo-Canaanite group of Northwest Semitic (Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 5). The Aramaic discussed under this heading is Old Aramaic (inscriptions) and Imperial (or Official) Aramaic, with an emphasis on the more ancient stage.⁸⁹

The reflex of the Central Semitic imperfective marker *-u/-na* was retained in Aramaic after the decline of short final vowels in the form of the *-n* endings in 3mp and 2mp forms of the (imperfective) long prefix conjugation. This resulted in a preserved distinction (in forms 3mp and 2mp) between a short *yqtl* without *-n* and a long *yqtl* with *-n* in all verb classes (Degen 1969, §§49–50; Voigt 1987, 6; Kogan 2015, 162):

Table 5: Imperfective markers in Aramaic

	short <i>yqtl</i>	long <i>yqtl</i>
3mp	<i>y-...-w</i>	<i>y-...-n</i>
3fp	<i>y-...-n</i>	<i>y-...-n</i>
2mp	<i>t-...-w</i>	<i>t-...-n</i>
2fp	not attested	not attested

The long *yqtl* (*yaqtulu*) is an imperfective formation and can be used for present and future actions (“kursiven Aspekt,” Degen 1969, §75). The short *yqtl* can be both jussive and indicative (past). The indicative past short *yqtl* occurs in clauses of the type *w-yqtl* (Degen 1969, 114; Voigt 1987, 6). It is obvious that the short *yqtl* in Old Aramaic is a reflex of the PS **yaqtul*.

The indicative past meanings of the old *yaqtul* are confined to the earliest inscriptions.⁹⁰ Some of the oldest texts exhibit a narrative past use of (*w*) *yqtl* reminiscent of the realis *yaqtul* in Amarna Canaanite and CBH *wa(y)-yiqtol* (Troppe 1996; 1998, 163f.). Such is the case in the Zakkūr stela from the beginning of the eighteenth century (Bron 1973–79, 607; Smith 1991, 18; Rainey 2003a, 404f.; 2007, 79).⁹¹

ושמו . כל <.> מלכיא <.> אל . מצר . על . חזר[ך] (10) והרמו . שר . (58)
 מן . שר . חזרך . והעמקו . חרץ . מן . חר[צה] (11) ואשא . ידי . אל .
 בעלש[מי]ן . ויענני <.> בעלשמין . ויד(12)בר . בעלשמין . אלי . [ב]יד
 . חזין . וביד . עדדן[. ויאמר . (13)לי . בעלשמין

‘all these kings put up a wall against Ḥazrak and raised a siege wall higher than the wall of Ḥazrak and dug a trench deeper than its moat. **But then I lifted up** my hands to Ba‘al-Šamayin, **and Ba‘al-Šamayin answered** me... [**and**] Ba‘al-Šamayin [**said** to me]’ (KAI⁵ 202A:9–13)

In the example, the *w-yqtl* forms (bold in translation) express a temporal succession or a response to the activities of the enemy. Reacting to the hostile actions described by suffix conjugation forms, Zakkūr, the king of Ḥamat, lifted his hands to Ba‘al-Šamayin, and as a result Ba‘al-Šamayin answered him.⁹²

If scholarly opinion was hesitant about the status of the *w-yqtl* clauses in the Zakkūr inscription,⁹³ the discussion came practically to an end with the discovery of the Tel Dan (Tel el-Qāḏi) inscription from around 800 BCE (KAI⁵ 310) by A. Biran and J. Naveh (1993; 1995) and the judgement of T. Muraoka (1995a; 1995b; 1998).⁹⁴ It is now widely accepted that a reflex of the Proto-Semitic perfective **yaqtul* was used as a past perfective verb in the earliest attested stage of Aramaic (Emerton 1994; Huehnergard 2005, 165; Fales 2011, 559; Renz 2016, 631f.).⁹⁵ Lines 2–6 in (59) are a good illustration:

- (59) (ב)ר[ה]דד . אבי . יסִקְן . עלוה . בה[תלחמה . בא x [.] (3)]
 וישכב . אבי . יהד אל[. אבהו]ה .
 ויעל . מלך י[ש] (4)ראל . קדם . בארק . אבִי[.
 ו]המלך . הדד [. א[יתי . (5)אנה .
 ויהד . הדד . קדמי[.
 ו]אפק . מן[. שבִע[ת . (6) י מלכי .
 ואקתל . מל[כן שב]עֵן אֶסרי . א[לפי . ר(7)כב . ואלפי פרש .

‘Bar Hadad, my father, **went up** [against him when] he was fighting at A[...]³ and my father **lay down** (and) **went** to [his ancestors.] The king of Israel **entered**⁴ formerly in my father’s land, [but] **then** Hadad **made me king**.⁵ And Hadad **went** before me; [and] **I departed** from seven[...]⁶ of my kingdom. **And I slew** seven[nty ki]ngs harnessing thou[sands of cha]r⁷riots and thousands of horsemen.’ (KAI⁵ 310:2–6, my emphasis)

Following the discovery of this text, few scholars deny that *yqtl* in *w-yqtl* clauses was used as a narrative past tense in early Aramaic, and many maintain that the *yqtl* forms even without

preceding *waw* can be analyzed as narrative pasts as well (Kottsieper 1999, 62; Rainey 2003a, 405).⁹⁶ Though the inscription is damaged, it seems that a perfective *yqtl* may be preceded by a subject noun (‘by *ysq* ‘my father went up’),⁹⁷ as is sometimes found in Amarna Canaanite, and it appears that an asyndetic \emptyset -*yqtl* (*yhk* ‘he went’) can be attached to a foregoing past tense *w-yqtl* clause (*wyškb* ‘by ‘and my father lay down’) as an elaboration (Muraoka 1995a, 19; Gzella 2015, 81 n. 225).⁹⁸ At least one form appears morphologically ‘short’: line 9 *wšm* ‘and I laid’ (Muraoka 1995b, 115; but against this, see Tropper 1996, 638f.). The conclusion is inevitable that the “altaramäische *w-yqtl*-Konstruktion ist nicht nur formal mit der hebr. *wayyiqtol*-Konstruktion vergleichbar, sie teilt mit dieser auch die gleiche Hauptfunktion, nämlich die Bezeichnung singularischer (pfv.), im Progreß verlaufender SVe der Vergangenheit” (Tropper 1998, 163f.).

An indicative past usage of the old *yaqtul* is attested also in the much disputed⁹⁹ Deir ‘Allā inscription from between 850 and 750 BCE, probably around 800 BCE,¹⁰⁰ painted by a professional scribe on a lime plaster wall in the mid-Jordan valley.¹⁰¹ There are five clear examples of a realis perfective *yaqtul* in the inscription, all showing an initial *wa* conjunction (Smith 1991, 18).¹⁰² A good example is (60):

- (60) [זנה . ספר] [ב[לעם] . בר בער . אש . חזה . אלה] הא [.]
 ויאתו . אלוה . אלהן . בלילה [. ויאמרו . ל] ה (2) כמשא . אל . ויאמרו .
 ל[בלעם] . בר בער .

‘[This is] the book of [Balaam, son of Beo]r. He was a seer of the gods. The gods **came** to him in the night, [and spoke

to him] like an oracle of 'El. **And they said** to [Balaam], son of Beor'¹⁰³ (KAI⁵ 312:1–2, Combination I: lines 1–2)

The inscription starts with a headline: “[This is] the book of Balaam, son of Beor.” After a verbless clause, a preamble with a presentation of Balaam as a seer of the gods, there follow at least two (possibly three) *w-yqtl* clauses that function as a historical elaboration of the preamble in the form of a narration of single events. In the narrative, details are given of Balaam’s career as a seer. Instances of distinctively short jussive *yaqtul* are found in I:7 ואל תהגי ‘do not remove’ (text quoted from KAI⁵ 312:7) and II:6 ירוי ‘may he be satisfied’ (Garr 1985, 138).¹⁰⁴

The instances of at least two distinctively short jussive *yaqtul* (Lipiński 1994, 130, 163; Voigt 1987, 6), and especially the construction with the negation אל and a short 2fs form תהגי, point to the existence of a short prefix conjugation in Aramaic. Unfortunately, there are no clear cases of long imperfective *yaqtulu* with final *n* in this inscription, such as we expect to see in other Aramaic texts, “so it is impossible to know whether this dialect employed the long form of the 2 f. sg. imperfect” (Hackett 1984, 46).

After the earliest (inscriptional) state of Old Aramaic, represented by the Tel Dan, Zakkūr, and Deir ‘Allā inscriptions, the emerging perfective *qatal* came to replace the earlier perfective *yaqtul*, and only the jussive meaning of the old *yaqtul* was retained in Old and Imperial Aramaic (Gzella 2004, 305), as is in fact the case in all the classical languages except Biblical Hebrew (Huehnergard 2002, 126).¹⁰⁵ As a prohibitive, the jussive is negated by ל.¹⁰⁶ The morphological difference in the consonantal

writing is slight: only in the plural of masculine forms can the characteristic final *-n* be a distinctive mark of the imperfective as against the ending *-w* of the short form (Degen 1969, 65, 113; Fales 2011, 568). In inscriptional Aramaic, this *-n* is an important retention of a distinguishing feature of the Central Semitic (or even Proto-Semitic; Kouwenberg 2010a, 95–103) imperfective *yaqtul-u*, *-ūna*:

(61) יהפכו אלהן אשׁ(22)א[ה]א

‘**May** the Gods **destroy** that man!’ (jussive *yaqtul*, KAI⁵ 222 1C: 21–22)

(62) והן יקרק מני קרק׳ חד פֿקדי... ויהכן חלב

‘If a fugitive escapes from me... **and they go** to Aleppo...’ (imperfective *yaqtulu*, KAI⁵ 224: 4–5)¹⁰⁷

Verbs IIwy in Old Aramaic have short *yaqtul* forms (Gzella 2011a, 443), as is shown in the opposition between לשם /*lašim*/ ‘may he erect’ and וישים /*wa-yašim*/ ‘and he will erect’ (KAI⁵ 309: 11, 12).¹⁰⁸ In verbs IIIwy, the orthography has a distinction between a final radical *y* (= *ay*)¹⁰⁹ or *w* (= *aw*) in the short form, and a final mater lectionis *h* (= *ê*) in the long prefix conjugation (Degen 1969, §§6–7, 62; Voigt 1987, 6; Gzella 2011a, 444).¹¹⁰ This is illustrated in (63) with initial position of the verb, and (64) with non-initial (internal) position:

(63) תהוי מלכתה במלכת חל מלך חלם זי ימלך אשׁר׳

‘**may** his kingdom **become** like a kingdom of sand, a dream kingdom that Assur rules!’ (short *yqtl*, KAI⁵ 222 I A: 25)

(64) והן יאתה חד מלכן ויסבני

‘if some king **comes** and surrounds me...’ (long *yqtl*, KAI⁵ 222 I B: 28)

Word order is one of the features that help distinguish the old *yaqtul* from the long imperfective *yaqtulu*. If a subject is preposed before a prefix conjugation verb, the latter is always long in Old Aramaic (Degen 1969, 108).¹¹¹ A jussive *yaqtul* is always negated by ʾl (ʾal), while *yaqtulu* is negated by l (*lā*; Degen 1969, 113f., 110f.; §§84, 86b).¹¹² In Imperial Aramaic, the initial position of the jussive is a tendency, and there are many exceptions to this rule (Muraoka and Porten 2003, 199).¹¹³

The distinction between a short jussive and a long imperfective is generally maintained in Imperial Aramaic, “but not all forms can be clearly distinguished on morphological grounds” (Gzella 2011b, 580), and there are groups of texts, such as the Aḥiqar proverbs, that seem to indicate a less consistent spelling (Muraoka and Porten 2003, 137, 198, 200; Gzella 2011b, 580).¹¹⁴ The examples of jussives that are graphically long (with final *h* instead of *y*) are usually found in otherwise unambiguous syntagms, such as clauses negated by ʾl, used only before the short jussive (Segert 1975a, §§6.5.4.7, 6.6.6.3.2; Muraoka and Porten 2003, 138):

(65) לבבך אל יחדה

‘Let not your heart rejoice!’ (TAD3, p. 36: C1.1, 90)

In Biblical Aramaic verbs IIIwy, the morphological opposition between a short jussive and a long imperfective has disappeared and the long form is used for both purposes (Folmer 2012, 156).

Early Aramaic developed a distinctive morphological feature that compensated for the partial collapse of the short and long prefix conjugations. The short prefix conjugation always takes suffixes without ‘energetic’ *n*, and the long imperfective shows a *tendency* to take suffixes preceded by the inherited ‘energetic’ ending: in Old Aramaic, the 3ms suffix, and in Imperial Aramaic, all suffixes attached to the long form are ‘energetic’ (Degen 1969, 80; Hug 1993, 87f.):¹¹⁵

(66) Old Aramaic

long form + 3mp suffix without energetic clitic

רקה תרקהם ותהשבהם לי

‘Rather you shall convince them and you shall bring them back to me’ (KAI⁵ 224, 6)

(67) Imperial Aramaic

long form + 3ms suffix with energetic clitic

אתננהי לך

‘I give him to you’ (TAD2, p. 12: B1.1, 11)

(68) Imperial Aramaic

short form + 2ms suffix without energetic clitic

יבטלוך

‘May they kill you’ (KAI⁵ 225:11)

In summary: the earliest inscriptional stage of Aramaic exhibits a morphological distinction between a short *yqtl* and a long (imperfective) *yqtl*. The short *yqtl* has two meanings: jussive, and a perfective past used in narrative and report in the clause-type *w-yqtl*. In later inscriptions and in Official Aramaic, a perfective *qatal* has replaced perfective past *yqtl*, while a jussive short *yqtl* is retained.

3.2. The Short *Yiqtol* in the Archaic Hebrew

Poetry

The reflex of the old Semitic *yaqtul* is fully attested in the archaic poetry, both with indicative meaning and as a jussive.¹¹⁶ The main divergences in comparison to the CBH corpus are syntactic: the indicative short *yiqtol* occurs in some contexts without the proclitic conjunction *wa* (Finley 1981, 246; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416; Baranowski 2016b, 11), and in at least one instance short *yiqtol* is used in non-initial position. So the word order of the short *yiqtol* is somewhat more free in the Archaic Hebrew poetry than in CBH, a situation that is even more prevalent in the Canaanite of the Amarna letters (Baranowski 2016b, 11).

The anterior meaning is one of the steps on the grammaticalisation path of a perfective gram. In distinction to simple pasts, an anterior may, as a generalisation of its meaning, describe a present state, even with a dynamic lexeme, which results in a general, or gnomic, present (Bybee et al. 1994, 69). An example is (69):

(69) \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)! + «DEF-*qotel* + *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol*»

יְהִידָן נָחֵשׁ עַל־דָּרֶךְ שְׁפִיפֶן עַל־אֶרֶח הַנֶּשֶׁף עֲקֵב־סוֹס וַיִּפֹּל רֹכֵבוֹ אַחֲרָיו:

‘Dan is a snake by the roadside, a viper along the path, that bites the horse’s heels **and** its rider **falls** backward.’ (Gen. 49.17)

In (69), the *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* clause belongs to the *qotel*-clause, which with its definite article functions as a relative clause that characterises the viper (Dan).¹¹⁷ Within this relative sentence, *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* (וַיִּפֹּל) codes an action that is temporally sequential in relation to the previous clause (*qotel*). Both *qotel* and *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* are gnomic and characterising, but they describe actions that are not simultaneous (Ges-K §111r-w; J-M §118o).¹¹⁸

The past perfective meaning of the short *yiqtol* is mostly found in the narrative fragments. An example of short *yiqtol* (*yiqtol*(\emptyset)) without initial *wa* in narrative main line is (70):¹¹⁹

(70) \emptyset -X \emptyset + \emptyset -X \emptyset + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)!¹²⁰ + ⁹*kī*-X \emptyset + \emptyset -X \emptyset + ¹⁰ \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(*u*)-N + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(*u*)-N + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(*u*)-N + ¹¹*kā*-S.noun-*yiqtol*(*u*)! + \emptyset -PrP-*yiqtol*(*u*) + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)

בַּהֲנַחַל עֲלִיזִין גּוֹזִים בַּהֲפָרִידוֹ בְּנֵי אָדָם יַעֲבֹ גְבֻלַת עַמִּים לְמַסְפָּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:
9 כִּי חָלַק יְהוָה עַמּוֹ יַעֲקֹב חֶבֶל נַחֲלָתוֹ: 10 יַמְצֵאֵהוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִדְבָּר וּבְתֵהוּ יִלֵּל
יִשְׁמֹן יִסְבְּנָהוּ יְבוֹנְנָהוּ יַצְרֵנָהוּ כְּאִישׁוֹן עֵינָיו: 11 כְּנֶשֶׁף יַעִיר קִנּוֹ עַל־גּוֹזְלָיו
יִרְחֹף יִפְרֹשׁ כְּנָפָיו יִקְלָהוּ יִשְׁאָהוּ עַל־אֲבָרָתוֹ:

‘When the Most High apportioned the nations, when he divided humankind, **he fixed** the boundaries of the peoples according to the number of the gods.¹²¹ ⁹The LORD’s own portion was his people, Jacob his allotted share. ¹⁰**He found him** in a desert land, in a howling wilderness waste:

he shielded him, cared for him, guarded him as the apple of his eye. ¹¹As an eagle stirs up its nest, and hovers over its young, **he spread** his wings, **took them** up, and **bore them** aloft on his pinions.’ (Deut. 32.8–11, Notarius 2013, 307, my verse numbers and emphasis)

Example (70) shows a narrative detached from speech time. The main line is coded by *yiqtol*(\emptyset) clauses with the verb in clause-initial position. The main function of a switch to a *yiqtol*(*u*) clause is to express simultaneous habitual or iterative meaning. But the *yiqtol*(*u*) verbs are also mainly clause-initial, so word order is not decisive in distinguishing the perfective short *yiqtol* from the imperfective *yiqtol*(*u*).¹²² And the conjunction *wa* is not used as a connective of clauses in this section of the poetic narration. The same poem also exhibits linkings with *wa*, as can be seen in (71):

(71) \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* + *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol*

יָרַבְהוּ עַל-בְּמוֹתַי אֶרֶץ וַיֵּאָכֵל תְּנוּבַת שָׂדֵי וַיְנַקְהוּ דָּבֶשׁ מִסִּלֵּעַ וְשֶׁמֶן
מִחֶלְמִישׁ צוּר:

‘**He set him** atop the heights of the land, **and fed him**¹²³ with produce of the field; **he nursed him** with honey from the crags, with oil from flinty rock.’ (Deut. 32.13, Notarius 2013, 307, my emphasis)

This syntax, with an initial asyndetically attached past perfective \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) and two following *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol*, is archaic.¹²⁴ It is found also in Amarna Canaanite (Bloch 2013; Baranowski 2016b, 11), but not in CBH. The two *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* clauses connect semantically with the initial *yiqtol*(\emptyset) clause, and have meanings that might be temporally sequential, but not necessarily so. In CBH, such a narrative chain might have been introduced by a *qatal*

clause with past perfective meaning (see §§7.7–8). The typical CBH narrative/reportive sequence *qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* is attested in the relatively more innovative Blessing of Moses (Notarius 2013, 290):¹²⁵

(72) \emptyset -O.noun-*qatal* + ⁵*wa(y)-yiqtol*!

תֹּרָה צִוָּה-לָנוּ מֹשֶׁה מֹרֶשֶׁה קְהֵלֶת יַעֲקֹב: וַיְהִי בִישֻׁרוּן מֶלֶךְ בְּהַתְאַסֵּף רָאשֵׁי
עַם יִחַד שְׁבֵטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

‘Moses **charged** us with the law, as a possession for the assembly of Jacob. ⁵**There arose** a king in Jeshurun, when the leaders of the people assembled—the united tribes of Israel.’ (Deut. 33.4–5, Notarius 2013, 239f., my emphasis)

The *qatal* form (צִוָּה) in (72) expresses a past perfective meaning and codes the foreground in a retrospective report. The *wa(y)-yiqtol* is temporally sequential to the event in the *qatal* clause.¹²⁶

But the archaic realis short *yiqtol* may also have a future meaning, as is the case when it follows a so-called ‘prophetic perfect’ *qatal*.¹²⁷ This future meaning is achieved with a metaphorical transposition to a future-time reference in prophetic prospective report, as in (73):

(73) *kī*-S.noun-*qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

כִּי־אֵשׁ קִדְחָהּ בְּאַפִּי וַתִּקְדַּח עַד־שְׁאוֹל תַּחֲתִית וַתֹּאכַל אֶרֶץ וַיִּבְלֶה וַתִּלְהַט
מוֹסְדֵי הָרִים:

‘For a fire will kindle by my anger, **and it will burn** to the depths of Sheol; **it will devour** the earth and its increase, **and will set on fire** the foundations of the mountains.’ (Deut. 32.22, Notarius 2013, 87, 282, my emphasis)

In (73), the *qaṭal* form expresses a resultative aspect which is “metaphorically relocated to the future;” it is “an expression of the speaker’s illocutionary intention to warn about the coming punishment” (Notarius 2013, 91, 88, 268 n. 6, 282).¹²⁸ It seems that the new perfective *qaṭal* has taken over (from short *yiqṭol*) the role of starting a chain of prospective report events viewed as finished in the future (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 74), while the discourse-continuous *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause-type is retained for the expression of the sequential future actions in the sequence.

The short *yiqṭol* can also be used after a *qaṭal* clause to express a past action the effects of which are present in speech time (anterior). In this case also, *yiqṭol*(\emptyset) occurs in a clause expressing discourse continuity:

(74) *INT-PrP-yiqṭol(u) + INT-lō-X \emptyset -«qaṭal» + \emptyset -S.pron-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

הֲלִיְהוֹה תִּגְמְלוּ־זֹאת עִם נָבִל וְלֹא חָכָם הֲלֹא־הוּא אֲבִיךָ קִנְיָהּ הוּא עָשָׂה
וַיִּבְנֶנּוּךָ:

‘Do you thus repay the LORD, O foolish and senseless people? Is not he your father, who created you, who made you **and established you?**’ (Deut. 32.6, Notarius 2013, 86, 282, my emphasis)

In (74), the speaker “contributes to the argument which develops within this conversational framework” (Notarius 2013, 87). The meaning of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* is present anterior rather than a remote perfective.¹²⁹ An anterior meaning of short *yiqṭol* is not frequent in the archaic poetry. It seems that the new perfective *qaṭal* has taken over this function in the verbal system too. The discourse-continuous *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (וַיִּבְנֶנּוּךָ) hardly attests to a (temporally)

sequential meaning; it can possibly be defined as an elaboration (cf. Notarius 2013, 87).

The jussive meaning of the short *yiqtol* is found in many types of modal domains, such as prayer, blessing, warning, or praise. This makes a confusion with indicative meanings impossible in the archaic poetry. The jussive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) in affirmative clauses is practically always clause-initial. An example is (75):

(75) \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)! + *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)!

תָּמַת נַפְשִׁי מוֹת יְשָׁרִים וְתָהִי אַחֲרִיתִי כְּמָהוּ:

‘**Let me die** the death of righteous ones, **and let my end be** like this!’ (Num. 23.10b, Notarius 2013, 225, my emphasis)¹³⁰

In at least one case, a perfective past *yiqtol*(\emptyset) is non-initial. The syntax is complicated, with an asyndetic relative clause and a chiasmic linking with the indicative short *yiqtol* in final position in the first clause,¹³¹ and an initial verb in the second clause (Isaksson 2017, 232f.):

(76) \emptyset -O.noun-« \emptyset -*qatal*»-*yiqtol*(\emptyset)! + *wa(y)*-*yiqtol*

צֹר יִלְדֶּךָ תֵּשִׁי וְתִשְׁכַּח אֵל מְחַלְלֶךָ:

‘**You were unmindful** of the Rock that bore you; you forgot the God who gave you birth.’ (Deut. 32.18, Notarius 2013, 307, my emphasis)

Joosten (2012, 417f.) describes this language as “a system where the preterite is free with regard to word order, and free of the *waw*.” The statistics suggest, however, that it is a freedom bound by relatively consistent conventions. There is only one example of a non-initial affirmative jussive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) in an archaic text,

also in a case with a chiastic word order (Notarius 2013, 78, 146f., 281, 294, 307; 2015, 240):

(77) \emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset) + \emptyset -PrP-yiqtol(\emptyset)

תְּבָרַךְ מְנַשִּׁים יְלֵל אִשֶּׁת חֶבֶר הַקֵּינִי מְנַשִּׁים בְּאֶהָל תְּבָרַךְ:

‘Most blessed of women be Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, of tent dwelling women **most blessed**’ (Judg. 5.24, Notarius 2013, 146f., 294, my emphasis)

Deviations from the word order rule are common when the verb is negated (always with *’al*), as in (78):

(78) \emptyset -PrP-’al-yiqtol(\emptyset) + \emptyset -S.noun-PrP-’al-yiqtol(\emptyset)...

בְּסֶדֶם אֶל־תִּבְאָ נַפְשִׁי בְּקֹהֶלָם אֶל־תִּתְּחַד כְּבִדִּי כִּי בְּאַפָּם הָרְגוּ אִישׁ וּבְרִצְנָם
עֲקְרוּ־שׁוֹר:

‘**May I never come** into their council; **may I not be joined** to their company—for in their anger they killed men, and at their whim they hamstrung oxen’ (Gen. 49.6, Notarius 2013, 191, my emphasis)

Negative jussive clauses seem to have been employed with a free word order, in contrast to the word order in affirmative clauses.¹³² Since the word order is relatively free also in the case of imperative and ventive/cohortative clauses,¹³³ I conclude that the more restricted word order applies primarily to affirmative *yiqtol*(\emptyset) clauses in the archaic poetry. And this concerns both indicative and jussive clauses. It is not true that volitive forms in general are clause-initial. The word order restriction pertains specifically to the old *yaqtul* verb form in affirmative clauses and without the paragodic *heh*.

The jussive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) is regularly employed in a specific type of subordinate clause, the syntagm *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset), predominantly with the meaning of purpose in a modal domain, as in (79):

- (79) \emptyset -IMP + \emptyset -IMP + \emptyset -IMP + ***wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)!** + (IMP) + ***wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)**

זְכֹר יָמֹת עוֹלָם בְּיָנֵינוּ שָׁנֹת דּוֹר-וָדוֹר שְׁאַל אָבִיךָ וְיַגִּידְךָ זִקְנֶיךָ וְיֹאמְרוּ לָךְ:

‘Remember the days of old, consider the years long past; ask your father, **and he will inform you**; your elders, **and they will tell you.**’ (Deut. 32.7, Notarius 2013, 80, my emphasis)¹³⁴

The example exhibits an unusual distinctively short *yiqtol* with object suffix (יַגִּידְךָ; Notarius 2013, 101 n. 90). The semantic meaning of the *wa-yiqtol* after the imperative is clearly the purpose of the action. The second imperative is left out by ellipsis.

The *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset) clause-type with purposive meaning seems to have attained a certain independence (as a non-main clause), and is not confined to modal series, an example of which is shown in (80):

- (80) \emptyset -l \bar{o} -X \emptyset + ***wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)** + *wa*-(l \bar{o})-X \emptyset + ***wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)**

לֹא אִישׁ אֶלֹּי יִכְזֵב וּבֶן-אָדָם וְיִתְנַחֵם

‘El is not a human being, **that he should lie**, or a mortal, **that he should change his mind.**’ (Num. 23.19a, Notarius 2013, 226, my emphasis)

The same syntagm as in the purpose clauses already described now expresses a subordination that is slightly more general than ‘purpose’. Notarius (2013, 226) calls this “the subjunctive mood

in a purpose clause,” but it could just as well be regarded as a consequence clause.¹³⁵

It has been argued that the jussive can also introduce a protasis in a conditional clause linking.¹³⁶ This idea is based on the Classical Arabic syntax of conditional sentences,¹³⁷ where both short jussives and perfects may occur (seemingly indiscriminately) in both protasis and apodosis. The prime alleged example of a jussive introducing protasis in Archaic Hebrew is (81).

(81) \emptyset -yiqtol(u)-N + wa-lō-ADV + \emptyset -yiqtol(u)-N + wa-lō-ADJ
+ \emptyset -qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal + ¹⁸wa-qatal
+ wa-qatal + wa-S.noun-qotel + ¹⁹wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)! + wa-qatal

אַרְאֶנּוּ וְלֹא עָתָה אֲשׁוּרֶנּוּ וְלֹא קָרוֹב דֶּרֶךְ בּוֹכֵב מֵעֵקֶב וְקָם שְׁבֵט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל
וּמַחֲלֵ פָאֲתַי מוֹאָב וְקָרַקַר כָּל-בְּנֵי-שֵׁת: 18 וְהָיָה אֲדָוָם יִרְשָׁה וְהָיָה יִרְשָׁה
שְׁעִיר אִיבָיו וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עָשָׂה חָיִל: 19 וְיָרַד מֵעֵקֶב וְהָאֶבֶד שָׂרִיד מֵעִיר:

‘I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near—a star shall come out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel; it shall crush the borderlands of Moab, and ruin all the Shethites. ¹⁸Edom will become a possession, Seir will become a possession of its enemies, while Israel does valiantly. ¹⁹**So let** one out of Jacob **rule!** He shall destroy the survivors of Ir.’ (Num. 24.17–19, verses 17–18 from Notarius 2013, 220, verse 19 my translation)

The interpretation of *wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)!* (וְיָרַד) in verse 19 as a protasis¹³⁸ is dubious in several respects. First, it is not a conditional linking at all. There is no condition, not even a temporal clause. Second, there is no other example of a jussive introducing a protasis in CBH. The reference to Gesenius and Kautzsch’s grammar

(Ges-K §109h) is pointless: this grammar bases the idea of a jussive as protasis on Arabic grammar. The interpretations of the adduced examples in Biblical Hebrew are strained (none represents mainstream exegesis), or refer to uses in LBH (in which the distinction between short and long *yiqtol* was gradually lost).¹³⁹ In CBH, there is no example of a short *yiqtol* being a predicate in the first clause of a protasis.

In summary: the short *yiqtol* in the Archaic Hebrew poetry is an authentic remnant of the Proto-Semitic **yaqtul* and is marked by a shorter form where appropriate. This short *yiqtol* is used both as past perfective and as jussive. With very few exceptions, it occurs in clause-initial position. This statement concerns affirmative propositions.

There is no example of a negated past perfective short *yiqtol* in the archaic poetry, and it seems that a *qaṭal* clause was used in the corresponding cases, negated by *lō*. The jussive short *yiqtol*, on the other hand, could be negated (by *ʾal*). The negated jussive seems to be unrestricted as to word order.

Since the imperfective *yiqtol(u)* may sometimes occur in clause-initial position in the archaic poetry, this means, according to Notarius (2013, 79, 281, 293), that

the morphosyntactic distinction between the preterite and the imperfective form of the prefix conjugation is not sufficient to distinguish between the two... one needs to take into consideration semantic, pragmatic, and discursive data in order to provide a more solid foundation for the postulated distinction.

The independent use of the past perfective *yiqtol(Ø)* (without proclitic *wa*) is archaic.¹⁴⁰ With or without *wa*, it is typical of

narrative discourse and tends to build chains of main clauses. In this unrestricted usage, it was gradually substituted by the new perfective *qatal* (Notarius 2013, 281), as was the case also in Ugaritic (Fenton 1973, 34f.).

The indicative *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause-type is occasionally attested with future time reference after a ‘prophetic perfect’ (*qatal*) in prospective report (Notarius 2013, 282:1c). This shows that the perfective meaning of *wa(y)-yiqtol* could be used metaphorically, describing a series of future events (cf. Fenton 1973, 37).

3.3. The Short *Yiqtol* in the Pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions

Sáenz-Badillos (1993, 62) writes:

With the earliest inscriptions dating as far back as the close of the second millennium BCE, the inscriptional material as a whole is contemporary with a substantial portion of the Bible, with the advantage of not having undergone revision over the centuries.

The grammar of the pre-exilic Hebrew inscriptions is practically identical to that of Classical Hebrew (Hackett 2002, 141; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 408; Hutton 2013; Sanders 2020, 283). The growing number of inscriptions, though reflecting several strata of society, shows that the verbal system of CBH “was part of everyday speech” (Pardee 2012, 285). A methodological advantage is that the “epigraphic texts were not subject to the exigencies of textual transmission” (Hutton 2013). As concerns *yiqtol*(Ø), the predominantly defective spelling in the pre-exilic

Hebrew inscriptions allows for only slight and sometimes disputable evidence for a morphologically distinctive *yiqtol*(\emptyset).¹⁴¹ Only in the case of verbs IIIwy can a distinction be established (Gogel 1998, 95).¹⁴² In the inscriptions, the ‘long’ imperfective *yiqtol*(*u*) of verbs IIIwy consistently exhibits a final vowel letter *-h* in the non-affixed forms (Gogel 1998, 96). The *yiqtol*(\emptyset) verb form, on the other hand, whether jussive or past perfective in meaning, lacks any final *mater lectionis*.

There are a few morphologically distinctive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) forms with jussive meaning, as is shown in (82):

(82) *PrP* + “ \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)!”

אל אדני יאוש . ירא . יהוה א(2)ת . אדני את העת הזה . שלם

‘To my lord Ya’ush. **May** YHWH **cause** my lord **to see** this season in peace.’ (HI Lachish 6:1–2, Gogel 1998, 418, my emphasis)¹⁴³

In this typical letter formula, the *hif’il* short jussive (ירא) occupies the initial position in the clause, after the address (Gogel 1998, 95 n. 51, 141, 256 n. 19, 287). An example of a morphologically distinctive jussive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) with proclitic *wa* is found in (83):

(83) \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + *wa*-*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + *wa*-*yiqtol*(\emptyset)!

יב(8)רד וישמרד (9) ויהי עם . אד[נ](10)י .

‘May he bless **and keep you**, **and may he be** with my lo[rd...].’ (HI KAJr 19A:7–10, my emphasis)

The passage in (83) contains three jussive clauses, of which two are linked by *wa*. All jussives occupy an initial position in their respective clauses.¹⁴⁴ The *yiqtol*(\emptyset) in the last clause has a

morphologically distinctive ‘short’ form (יהי) without the *h* vowel letter (Gogel 1998, 95 n. 51, 256 n. 19, 287).

In all other cases, the distinction between *yiqṭol*(Ø) (jussive or past perfective) and *yiqṭol*(*u*) must be worked out by considerations of word order, semantic context, and, when negated, the type of negation employed (Gogel 1998, 93, 258; Renz and Röllig 1995–2003, II/2:43). A semantically clear example is (84), from the late seventh or early sixth century:

(84) *wa-qāṭal* + Ø-ʿ*al-yiqṭol*(Ø)

וה(6)סבת מחר . אל תאחר

‘and you shall deliver (it) tomorrow. Do not be late!’ (HI Arad 2:5–6, my translation)¹⁴⁵

In (84), the jussive form is morphologically indistinctive and could formally be parsed as an imperfective *yiqṭol*(*u*). But the clearly deontic preceding *wa-qāṭal* clause (obligation), and the modal negation אל, indicate that תאחר is a jussive form.

A disputed example of a past perfective IIIwy *yiqṭol*(Ø) form is found in (85):

(85) Ø-*qāṭal* + *wa*(*y*)-*yiqṭol* + *wa*(*y*)-*yiqṭol*! + *wa-qāṭal*

. עבדך (3) קצַר . היה . עבדך . בח(4)צַר אסם . ויקצר עבדך (5) ויכל ואסם כימם . לפני שב(6)ת כאשר כל[. ע]בדך את קצר וא(7)סם כימם

‘As for your servant, ³your servant was harvesting at Ḥaṣar ⁴Asam. And your servant harvested ⁵**and measured** and stored, according to schedule, before quitting. ⁶When your servant measured the harvest and stored, ⁷according to schedule...’ (HI Meṣad Ḥaṣavyahu 1:2–7, line numbers in translation inserted by me)¹⁴⁶

The passage starts with a *qaṭal* clause and continues with two *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses, of which the second (וַיִּכַּל) is analysed by Gogel (1998, 95, 131) as a *qal* or *pi^cel* form of the IIIwy root *klh*.¹⁴⁷ If this is correct, the verb would be morphologically distinctive, since a ‘long’ *yiqṭol(u)* form of a verb IIIwy would exhibit a final *h*. Such long *yiqṭol(u)* forms are attested in *yqrh* ‘It will happen’ (Arad 24:16),¹⁴⁸ *ymḥh* ‘He will efface’ (En Gedi 2:1),¹⁴⁹ *ymnh* ‘He shall count out’ (Samaria 109:3).¹⁵⁰ However, this interpretation does not withstand an examination of the immediate context. The temporal clause on line 6 contains a *qaṭal* verb (כַּל) which cannot be a *qal* or *pi^cel* of a verb IIIwy, since 3ms *qaṭal* forms of such verbs always have a final vowel letter *h*, indicating the long *-ā*. Gogel (1998, 129) concedes that such a *qaṭal* (כַּל) “simply has to be looked upon as anomalous.” The reasonable solution must be that the hypothesis of a IIIwy root is wrong and that a IIw verb (*kyl*) ‘to measure’ is being used, attested at three locations in the letter: line 5: וַיִּכַּל ‘and he measured’, line 6: כַּל ‘he measured’, line 8: כָּלַח ‘I measured’.¹⁵¹ The conclusion is inevitable that, though וַיִּכַּל is evidently a past perfective *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, and the form itself is not morphologically distinctive, the text as a whole contains cases of narrative past perfective *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (Renz 2016, 634f.).¹⁵²

A clear and commonly recognised example of a past perfective *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause following a *qaṭal* clause is found in the Siloam inscription, dated to the end of the eighth century BCE (HI, 500; Smith 1991, 17):

(86) *wa-PrP-S.noun-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

ובים . ה(4)נקבה . הכו . החצבם . אש . לקרת . רעו . גרזן . על . [ג]רזן .
 . וילכו (5) המים . מן . המוצא . אל . הברכה . במאתים . ואלף . אמה .

‘And on the day of the breakthrough, the hewers struck, each to meet his fellow, pick against [p]ick; **and then** the waters **flowed** from the spring to the pool for twelve hundred cubits.’ (HI Silm 1:3–5, my emphasis and translation)

The Siloam inscription is divided in two parts, the second of which forms a paragraph telling “the climax of the story, the moment of the actual breakthrough” (HI, 499). This paragraph starts with a *qaṭal* clause (הכו) and is followed by a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause (וילכו) which has a clear notion of temporal succession (Schüle 2000, 178; Renz 2016, 633f.). Both clauses express a narrative past perfective.

3.4. The Short *Yiqtol* in CBH

3.4.1. The Morphological Contrast *Yiqtol(∅)/Yiqtol(u)* in CBH

Since short final vowels fell out of use at the end of the second millennium BCE,¹⁵³ the *yiqtol(u)* singular forms of the strong verb came to coalesce with the *yiqtol(∅)* forms, which resulted in an extensive but incomplete grammatical homonymy (Garr 1998, xlvi; Gentry 1998, 12; J-M §§46a, 114g n. 3; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416; Blau 2010, 145, 150f.; Gzella 2011a, 442).¹⁵⁴ In a levelling process, this morphological merger came to apply also to 2fs, 3mp, and 2mp *yiqtol(u)* forms with the suffix

-*na* added (Gzella 2018, 27; 2021, 72; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 9); see Table 6.¹⁵⁵

Table 6: The morphology of short and long *yiqtol* in Central Semitic and CBH

	Central Semitic		CBH
<i>qal</i>	<i>yaqtul</i>	<i>yaqtulu</i>	levelled form
3ms	<i>yaqtul</i>	<i>yaqtul-u</i>	<i>yiqtol</i>
3fs	<i>taqtul</i>	<i>taqtul-u</i>	<i>tiqtol</i>
2ms	<i>taqtul</i>	<i>taqtul-u</i>	<i>tiqtol</i>
2fs	<i>taqtulī</i>	<i>taqtulī-na</i>	<i>tiqtəlī</i>
1cs	<i>ʾaqtul</i>	<i>ʾaqtul-u</i>	<i>ʾeqtol</i>
3mp	<i>yaqtulū</i>	<i>yaqtulū-na</i>	<i>yiqtəlū</i>
3fp	<i>yaqtulna</i> ¹⁵⁶	<i>yaqtulna</i>	<i>tiqtolnā</i> ¹⁵⁷
2mp	<i>taqtulū</i>	<i>taqtulū-na</i>	<i>tiqtəlū</i>
2fp	<i>taqtulna</i>	<i>taqtulna</i>	<i>tiqtolnā</i>
1cp	<i>naqtul</i>	<i>naqtul-u</i>	<i>niqtol</i>

When short final vowels fell out of use at the end of the second millennium BCE, only three forms in the regular paradigm remained explicitly ‘long’: those with an ending *na* after long vowel: 2fs, 3mp, 2mp (Bauer and Leander 1922, 300o). This was not enough for the speakers of Hebrew to uphold the morphological distinction in the strong verb, and they levelled the old ‘short’ form across both meanings, except in the *hifʿil* (Bauer and Leander 1922, 300r; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416; Gzella 2011a, 442). In spite of this, “the functional... oppositions underlying the NWS-Can *yaqtul* and *yaqtulu* paradigms remain operative in BH, and need to be heeded” (Korchin 2008, 341 n. 24; see

also Tropper 1998, 165f.). The distinction was made clear by syntactic and semantic signals. One such signal is the distinctive distribution of the negation: jussive *yiqṭol(Ø)* was negated by לֹא and *yiqṭol(u)* was negated by אֵל. The indicative *yiqṭol(Ø)* was not negated at all, since *lō qatāl* had replaced negated indicative *yiqṭol(Ø)* in BH.¹⁵⁸ Another signal is the אֵל clitic after a prefix verb, which indicates that the verb is a jussive *yiqṭol(Ø)*. Thirdly, jussive *yiqṭol(Ø)* in affirmative clauses is practically always clause-initial (Kummerow 2008, 73–75).

There are about 300 cases of 2fs, 3mp, or 2mp prefix-conjugation forms in Biblical Hebrew with final *in* or *ūn*, seemingly with the same meaning as ‘normal’ *yiqṭol(u)* forms (Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416). It is reasonable to suppose that verbal forms with a so-called paragogic *nun* represent a partial retention (for unclear reasons) of the Central Semitic imperfective suffix *na*, which continued to appear as a biform and stylistic variant in 2fs, 3mp, and 2mp, possibly reflecting a higher register.¹⁵⁹ Apart from the special cases of forms with *nun paragogicum*, Biblical Hebrew has lost this distinctive imperfective feature. It is, however, preserved in Amarna Canaanite (see §3.1.8; also Baranowski 2016a, 83), Ugaritic (§3.1.7), early Aramaic (§3.1.11), Phoenician (§3.1.9), and Classical Arabic (§3.1.5).

The marking of the imperfective (*yaqtulu*) in Central Semitic consisted of a special distribution of two suffixes, *-u* and *-na*, which, according to most scholars, were added to the old *yaqtul* (Kouwenberg 2010a, 97f.; Blau 2010, 205; Kogan 2015, 131, 159).¹⁶⁰

3.4.1.1. The Short *Yiqtol* in the Morphology of the Strong Verb: *Hif'il*

In the strong verb, *yiqtol*(\emptyset) presents distinctively short forms only in the *hif'il* (Kummerow 2008, 71f.). When short final vowels were dropped in the early Iron Age, we would expect both **yaqtil* (the *hif'il* of the old *yiqtol*(\emptyset)) and **yaqtilu* (the *hif'il* of the imperfective *yiqtol*(*u*)) to coalesce in one form **yaqtil* (> *yaqtél*). This form was retained only as the old *yiqtol*(\emptyset), whereas **yaqtilu* was transformed by analogy with weak verbs IIwy (i.e., *hif'il* type *yāqīm*, as against *yāqém* for the short *yiqtol*). Thus, the short final vowel dropped, but the distinction between the old *yiqtol*(\emptyset) and the imperfective *yiqtol*(*u*) was upheld by a secondary lengthening of the stem vowel: *yiqtol*(\emptyset) *hif'il* became *yaqtél* and *yiqtol*(*u*) *hif'il* became *yaqtīl* (Bauer and Leander 1922, 329 a–b; Blau 2010, 235).

3.4.1.2. The Short *Yiqtol* in the Morphology of Verbs IIwy

The old *yiqtol*(\emptyset) of verbs IIw developed from a form **yāqūm*, in which the stem vowel was shortened to **yāqum* in the closed syllable. This change had occurred already in Proto-Semitic (Bauer and Leander 1922, 231b, 388j; Kummerow 2008, 73; Huehnergard 2019, 66, word stress 53).¹⁶¹ In Hebrew, the stem vowel *ú* was stressed and developed to *ó*. In the reading tradition, the prefix vowel was lengthened: *yāqóm* (יָקֹם; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416). This is the form of the short *yiqtol* with both jussive and indicative meanings in Biblical Hebrew, if not preceded by the proclitic *wa*.¹⁶² When the short *yiqtol* is preceded by *wa*, a differentiation has occurred in the reading tradition. When

wa precedes the indicative form (*wa(y)-yiqṭol*), it has developed a different stress pattern in the Tiberian tradition so that *wa-yāqóm* is changed to *wayyāqām* (וַיַּאֲקָאֵם), with the stress on the prefix syllable (Bauer and Leander 1922, 389l).¹⁶³ In pause (but in the Babylonian reading tradition also in context), stress remained on the stem vowel (Bauer and Leander 1922, 390o). The *qal yiqṭol(u)* of verbs IIw developed a form with retained long stem vowel in the open syllable, *yāqū́m* < **yaqū́mu* (Bauer and Leander 1922, 388i; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 10).

In a similar way, a morphological distinction was retained in verbs IIy: *yiqṭol(Ø)* *yāśém* (יַשֶּׁם < **yaśim* < **yaśim*) in contrast to *yiqṭol(u)* *yāśím* (יַשִּׁם < **yaśímu*).¹⁶⁴

In the *hif'il*, there was a similar shortening of the stem vowel in *yaqtul*, *yāqém* (יַקֵּם), whereas the imperfective *yiqṭol(u)* in the *hif'il* retained the long vowel, *yāqím* (יַקִּים) < **yaqímu* (Bauer and Leander 1922, 395p).

The distinctive morphology of the *yiqṭol(Ø)* forms of verbs IIwy is upheld only in the endingless forms, that is, in forms 3ms, 3fs, 2ms, 1cs, and 1cp. There is no formal distinction in verbs with object suffixes.

Morphologically 'long' forms of realis or irrealis *yiqṭol(Ø)* of verbs IIwy are rare in CBH. One such example is (87):

(87) *wa-lō-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa(y)-yiqṭol*** + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*
+ *wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וְלֹא־שָׁמְעוּ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיּוֹתְרוּ אֲנָשִׁים מִמֶּנּוּ עַד־בֹּקֶר וַיֵּרָם תּוֹלָעִים וַיִּבְאֹשׁ
וַיִּקְצֹף עֲלֵהֶם מֹשֶׁה:

‘But they did not listen to Moses; some kept part of it until morning, and **it was full of worms** and began to stink, and Moses got angry with them.’ (Exod. 16.20)

As the example illustrates, when morphologically ‘long’ *yiqtol*(\emptyset) forms occur in the Pentateuch and the Book of Judges, they are most often defectively written.¹⁶⁵

3.4.1.3. The Short *Yiqtol* in the Morphology of Verbs IIIwy

In verbs IIIwy also, shorter *yiqtol*(\emptyset) forms contrast with longer *yiqtol*(*u*) forms (Kummerow 2008, 72). This holds in all stems except *pu*^{ca}l and *hof*^{ca}l. In *yiqtol*(\emptyset) forms, we would expect residues of the Proto-Semitic stem-final diphthongs *aw*, *ay*, *iy* in some verbs (**yáštay*, **yarḏaw*, **yabniy*).¹⁶⁶ But system constraints led to a shortening of all *yiqtol*(\emptyset) forms irrespective of stem vowel and word-final consonant (Bauer and Leander 1922, 408; Birkeland 1940, 44f.; Blau 2010, 249): **yašt* > **yišt* > *yešt* (with final plosive, וַיִּשָּׁט, Gen. 9.21), **yarḏ* > **yarṣ* > *yirṣ* (וַיִּרָץ, Lev. 26.43), **yabni*(*y*) > **yabn* > **yibn* (וַיִּבֶן, Gen. 12.7; Birkeland 1940, 44; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416; Gzella 2013c, 861).¹⁶⁷

The corresponding *yiqtol*(*u*) forms all present a long ending -*ē* in the forms without another affix. This *ē* is practically always written with the vowel letter *h* in the textual tradition: *yīštē* (וַיִּשְׁתֶּה), *yirṣē* (וַיִּרְצֶה) < **yirṣayu*, *yibnē* (וַיִּבְנֶה) < **yabniyu* (Blau 1993, 27f.; Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 416). Such forms are homophonous with short *yiqtol* having a ventive/cohortative suffix.¹⁶⁸

The morphological difference between short *yiqtol*(\emptyset) and long *yiqtol*(*u*) is upheld only in the forms without affixes. A form like יִשְׁתּוּ, with plural suffix, may formally be either jussive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) or imperfective *yiqtol*(*u*). The same holds for verb forms with pronominal object suffixes.

The distinctive morphology described above is realised most consistently in the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua and Judges (Stipp 1987, 120). The examples of long forms (with $\bar{\epsilon}$ ending, written with the vowel letter *h*) intended to represent a jussive or a past perfective *yiqtol*(\emptyset) are relatively few.¹⁶⁹ One example is (88):

(88) \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + *wa*-*yiqtol*(\emptyset)-*V*

יָקוּוּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל־מָקוֹם אֶחָד וְתִרְאָה הַיַּבֶּשֶׁה

‘Let the water under the sky be gathered to one place so that dry ground appears (for me).’ (Gen. 1.9)

The clause that begins with וְתִרְאָה is obviously intended as jussive, here with a ventive suffix. What can be discussed regarding this example is whether the discourse-continuous jussive should be interpreted as a purpose clause or just a coordinated jussive (J-M §116).¹⁷⁰ *Wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* clauses with past perfective meaning may also contain verbs IIIwy with ‘long’ forms. Most such instances are in the first person singular and may hide a ventive/cohortative clitic, as in (89):

(89) *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* (‘long’)

וְאֶצְוָה אֶתְכֶם בְּעֵת הַהוּא אֶת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּן

‘So I instructed you at that time regarding everything you should do.’ (Deut. 1.18)

It is conspicuous that deviations from the short form pattern are found most prominently in the first person (Stipp 1987, 120; Revell 1988, 423–25).¹⁷¹ The first-person forms with the ending $-\bar{e}$ can, however, be intended as forms with ‘hidden’ ventive-cohortative clitic, in which case the $-\bar{e}$ in both alternatives would be regular, since the ventive/cohortative clitic $-\bar{a}$ is unattested on verbs IIIwy (Tropper 1997b, 402f.; Fassberg 2013b; Stein 2016; Sjörs 2023, §6.2; cf. J-M §79m n. 2, based on Stipp 1987, 110; see §§1.2.2, 3.4.2.3).

3.4.2. The Meanings of the Short *Yiqtol* in CBH

The short *yiqtol* displays the same double semantics in CBH as in many other Semitic languages. It is able to express a realis (mostly past perfective) and an irrealis (jussive; Bybee and Dahl 1989, 84; Palmer 2001, ch. 8).¹⁷² The two basic meanings are distributed evenly in the corpus (I have covered 871 short *yiqtol* in the database).

3.4.2.1. The Realis/Indicative *Yiqtol*(\emptyset) in CBH

Table 7: The meanings of the indicative short *yiqtol* in CBH

Resultative	2
Stative verb present	3
Stative verb past	23
Anterior	45
Pluperfect	17
Counterfactual	1
Perfective past	355
Habitual past	23
Total	469

The grammaticalisation path of a perfective verbal morpheme usually starts in a resultative construction. Prototypical resultative meanings of *yiqtol*(\emptyset) are rare in CBH, which indicates that it is a residual grammatical morpheme (Dahl 2000, 10). One of the few examples with present resultative meaning in the corpus is (86). It is retained in a relatively complex linking, in this case within a relative clause:

(90) *'al-nā-yiqtol*(\emptyset)! + «REL-PREP-VN + *wa(y)-yiqtol*»

אַל־נָא תְהִי כַמֶּת «אֲשֶׁר בָּצְאָתָו מִרְחֶם אִמּוֹ וַיֹּאכַל חֶצִי בְשָׂרוֹ»:

‘Do not let her be like a baby born dead, «which, when it comes out of its mother’s womb, then half of its flesh is **consumed!**»’ (Num. 12.12)

The relative sentence begins with the relative pronoun and an infinite subordinate clause stating the relative time of the following *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause. In this context, the *nif'al qatal* of the dynamic verb אכל expresses a resultative with focus on the state of being consumed, created by a previous action (‘consuming’), the prototypical case of a resultative meaning.¹⁷³

Another resultative *wa(y)-yiqtol* is found in (91), also in a relative construction:

(91) \emptyset -*hinnē-S.noun-DEF-qotel* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*!

הִנֵּה הָעַם הַיֵּצֵא מִמִּצְרָיִם וַיָּכֶס אֶת־עֵין הָאָרֶץ

‘Behold, a people has come out of Egypt, **and it covers** the face of the earth.’ (Num. 22.11, Budd 1984, 249)

The participle with initial article functions as a descriptive relative clause. The *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause is a constituent in this relative construction and continues the action described by the *qotel*. It is

“a situation initiated in the past but continuing until the present” (Joosten 2012, 185). Focus is on the present state.¹⁷⁴

Perfective grams usually used in past narration may retain early non-past meanings. Such grams can be used in future contexts, for example as future anterior or immediate future. With stative verbs, a perfective can signal a present state, while simple pasts have past meanings also with stative verbs. This is a proof that the indicative *yiqtol*(Ø) in CBH is not just a past tense (Bybee et al. 1994, 95; Cook 2012b, 87). An example with a stative verb and present time reference is (92) below:

(92) *gam-O.noun-«REL-qatal»-yiqtol(u) + kī-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol*

גַּם אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ אֶעֱשֶׂה כִּי־מָצָאתָ חֵן בְּעֵינַי וְאֵדַעְךָ בְּשֵׁם:

‘Indeed the very thing you have spoken, I will do: because you really have found favor in my estimation, **and I know you** by name.’ (Exod. 33.17, Durham 1987, 444)

Within the context of a complex cause/reason sentence (Dixon 2009, 6) introduced by the conjunction *kī*, a *qatal* clause (מָצָאתָ) has resultative or anterior meaning focusing on a state which is the result of a previous event (Bybee et al. 1994, 63, 65). This state persists in speech time. The following *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause also belongs to the cause/reason sentence and can be interpreted as also having resultative meaning ‘I have known you and still do’, but the stative verb יָדַע in *wa(y)-yiqtol* motivates a stative present translation.

Another example is found in (93):

- (93) *wa(y)-yiqtol* “ \emptyset -X \emptyset + *wa*-S.noun-*qatal* + ***wa(y)-yiqtol*** + *wa*-S.noun-*qatal*”

וְנֵאמָר אֶל־אֲדֹנָי יִשְׁרָאֵל אָב זָקֵן וַיֵּלֶד זָקֵנִים קָטָן וְאֶחָיו מָת וַיִּתֵּר הוּא לְבָדּוֹ
לְאִמּוֹ וְאָבִיו אֶהְבּוֹ:

‘We said to my lord, We have an aged father, and there is a young boy who was born when our father was old. The boy’s brother is dead. **He is** the only one of his mother’s sons **left**, and his father loves him.’ (Gen. 44.20)

In direct speech, in a report of previous events, a stative *qatal* clause (מָת) is followed by a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause. The most natural interpretation of this *nif'al* of the root יתר is as a stative verb with present time reference (Westermann 1982, 140; Wenham 1994, 422).¹⁷⁵

But indicative *yiqtol*(\emptyset) with stative verbs may, of course, and more frequently, according to context, have past time reference, as in (94):

- (94) *wayhī* + *kī-qatal* + ***wa(y)-yiqtol*** + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַיְהִי כִּי־זָקֵן יִצְחָק וַתְּכַהֵן עֵינָיו מִרְאֵת וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־עֵשָׂו בְּנֵוֹ הַגָּדֹל

‘When Isaac was old **and** his eyes **were dim** so that he could not see, he called Esau his older son’ (Gen. 27.1)

In (94), within a complex temporal sentence, a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause with stative verb follows a *qatal* clause with stative verb.¹⁷⁶ Both clauses have past time reference and refer to the same past state. The *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause (וַתְּכַהֵן) functions as an elaboration, supplying additional information (‘his eyes were dim’) about the state described by the *qatal* clause (Dixon 2009, 27; Ges-K §111q; Joosten 2012, 178).¹⁷⁷

In the anterior meaning, focus has shifted from a state to the action that caused the state (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 70; Bybee et al. 1994, 51–105). Such meanings of *wa(y)-yiqtol* are frequent in the corpus. They differ, however, with regard to the remoteness of the state referred to. In some cases, the action described by *wa(y)-yiqtol* is indicated to be close to speech time ('present anterior'), while other cases display actions whose temporal reference is more diffuse. In the major part of the anterior examples, a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause follows a *qatal* clause with anterior meaning. This indicates that the *qatal* morpheme has to a large extent taken over the function of expressing anterior meaning in CBH. There are, however, not a few cases when a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause describes a shift to anterior without support from preceding *qatal* clauses. In such cases, the anterior meaning must be inferred from the semantic context or is indicated by adverbs within the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause. A case where the shift to an anterior meaning must be inferred is (95):

- (95) *wayhī + kī-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol-A*¹⁷⁸ + *wa-hinnē-XØ + wa(y)-yiqtol!*

וַיְהִי כִּי־בָּאוּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ וַנִּפְתָּחָה אֶת־אֲמֻתְחֹתֵינוּ וְהָיָה בְּכַף־אִישׁ בְּפִי
אֲמֻתְחֹתוֹ כְּסָפּוֹ בְּמִשְׁקְלוֹ וַנִּשֹּׁב אִתּוֹ בְּיָדָנוּ:

'When we reached camp and opened our sacks, there was each man's money in the mouth of his sack, to the full! **So we have brought it back** with us.' (Gen. 43.21)

The passage is a report in the mouth of Joseph's brothers in front of the one in charge of his household.¹⁷⁹ The particle *kī* introduces a complex temporal sentence (*kī-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol*). The two clauses in the temporal sentence have the same TAM value,

namely, past perfective (an event that is remote from speech time). After the temporal sentence, the core of the report is coded by an initial verbless clause (with the deictic particle *hinnē*), followed by a second *wa(y)-yiqtol* describing an action that is fulfilled in speech time in front of the man in charge. This latter *wa(y)-yiqtol* (וַנִּשָּׁב) expresses an understood ‘here and now’, and this shift to another TAM value is only inferred pragmatically (not specifically coded by a syntactic marker).¹⁸⁰ The example shows that the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause by itself may introduce a shift to an anterior meaning, although this is a rare phenomenon.

In some cases, a switch from a *qatal* clause to a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause in report also signals a shift from past perfective to anterior meaning with clear reference to an action close to speech time, as in (96):

(96) *wa-O.noun-lō-qatal* + ***wa(y)-yiqtol***!

וְאֶת־הַיְבוּסִי יֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ בְנֵי בִנְיָמִן וַיֵּשֶׁב הַיְבוּסִי אֶת־בְּנֵי בִנְיָמִן
בִּירוּשָׁלַם עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

‘But the people of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites who lived in Jerusalem, **so** the Jebusites **have lived** with the people of Benjamin in Jerusalem to this day.’ (Judg. 1.21)

In this retrospective report, the *qatal* clause has perfective past meaning, but a temporal prepositional phrase (עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה) indicates that the *wa(y)-yiqtol* should be interpreted as anterior with relevance in the present.

In some cases, a past time reference and anterior meaning of *wa(y)-yiqtol* cannot be inferred from the surrounding clauses at all, as in (97):

(97) *wa-qatal* + *kī-XØ* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

והייתם לי קדושים כי קדוש אני יהוה ואבדל אתכם מן העמים להיות לי:

‘You shall be holy to me, for I YHWH am holy; **therefore I have set** you **apart** from other peoples to be mine.’ (Lev. 20.26, Milgrom 2000, 1301, my emphasis)¹⁸¹

In this part of a long utterance of YHWH, a *wa-qatal* clause expresses obligation. After that, a verbless clause states the reason for Israel to be holy. The verbless clause is then followed by a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause with anterior meaning. It is not clear if the temporal reference of the action (‘I have set you apart’) is a remote or recent action. The *wa(y)-yiqtol* must be interpreted as anterior, because it describes an action that has resulted in a state that is valid and relevant in speech time.

In the most frequent case of an anterior *yiqtol(Ø)*, a present anterior *qatal* precedes the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause. This is a sign that *qatal* is on its way to taking over as the prime anterior verbal morpheme, resulting in a diminishing use of *wa(y)-yiqtol* with this meaning. In other words, indicative *yiqtol(Ø)* is used with anterior meaning mainly in discourse-continuity clauses after an anterior *qatal* clause. A clear example is (98):

(98) *wa(y)-yiqtol*: “Ø-ADV-*qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + Ø-IMP”

וַתֹּאמֶר דְּלִילָה אֶל־שֹׁמְשׁוֹן עַד־הֵנָּה הִתְלַתְּ בִּי וַתִּדְבֹּר אֵלַי כְּזָבִים הַגִּידָה לִּי
בְּמַה תִּאָּסֵר

‘Delilah said to Samson, “Up to now you have deceived me **and told** me lies. Tell me how you can be subdued.”’ (Judg. 16.13)

The adverb (עַד־הֵנָּה) signals repeated actions and a state of deception at speech time. Focus is not on the state but on the actions that have caused this state.¹⁸²

In some cases, the anterior meaning of *wa(y)-yiqtol* has a more general temporal reference, and its relation to speech time is vague, as in (99):

(99) *kī-O.noun-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

כִּי אֶת־חֹזה הַתְּנוּפָה וְאֶת־שׁוֹק הַתְּרוּמָה לְקַחְתִּי מֵאֵת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִזִּבְחֵי שְׁלָמֵיהֶם וְאֶתֶּן אֲתָם לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן וּלְבָנָיו לְחֶק־עוֹלָם מֵאֵת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

‘For the breast of the wave offering and the thigh of the contribution offering I have taken from the Israelites out of their peace offering sacrifices **and I have given** them to Aaron the priest and to his sons from the people of Israel as a perpetual allotted portion.’ (Lev. 7.34)

The actions referred to in (99) have a more general character, since they describe decisions made by God. They have a relevance for a state in speech time but their temporal references are vague.¹⁸³

A *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause may also express an action that is anterior in relation to another past event (pluperfect), as in (100) (see also Pardee 2012, 291).

(100) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-lō-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* +
³⁴*wa-S.noun-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* +
wa(y)-yiqtol + *wa-lō-qatal*

וַיָּבֹא לָבֶן בְּאֶהֱל יַעֲקֹב וּבְאֶהֱל יֵאָה וּבְאֶהֱל שְׁתֵּי הָאִמָּהֹת וְלֹא מֵצָא וַיֵּצֵא מֵאֶהֱל יֵאָה וַיָּבֹא בְּאֶהֱל רַחֵל: וַרְחֵל לְקַחְתָּ אֶת־הַתְּרָפִים וְתִשְׁמַם בְּכֹר הַגִּמְלָה וְתִשָּׁבַע עֲלֵיהֶם וַיִּמָּשֶׁשׁ לָבֶן אֶת־כָּל־הָאֶהֱל וְלֹא מֵצָא:

‘So Laban entered Jacob’s tent, and Leah’s tent, and the tent of the two female servants, but he did not find the idols. Then he left Leah’s tent and entered Rachel’s. ³⁴(Now Rachel had taken the idols **and put them** inside her camel’s saddle **and sat** on them.) Laban searched the whole tent, but did not find them.’ (Gen. 31.33–34)

Within a complex background sentence, a *qaṭal* clause with initial subject noun (לָבָן) signals a pluperfect temporal reference, and this pluperfect meaning is continued by two *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses. The storyline is resumed by a new *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause with change of subject (וַיֵּשֶׁב לְרַחֵל; Ges-K §111q; Wenham 1994, 262).¹⁸⁴ This type of temporal ‘dependence’ on a previous pluperfect *qaṭal* clause is the most common case of linking with a pluperfect *wa(y)-yiqtol*.

The characteristic perfective past meaning of *yiqtol*(Ø) in CBH represents a generalisation (Cook 2012a, 264). Such meanings indicate a view of a situation as a single whole (bounded viewpoint: Comrie 1976, 16). While the anterior indicates a past action “with current relevance” (Bybee et al. 1994, 61), a perfective meaning has lost the connection to speech time and expresses only the action itself. This is usually a past action (Bybee et al. 1994, 86). The perfective meaning represents a later stage in the developmental path of an anterior-perfective grammatical morpheme. Later meanings “overwhelmingly show inflectional expression” (Bybee et al. 1994, 52), which is certainly the case with the *yiqtol*(Ø) gram. The perfective meaning, especially with past time reference, is a dominant meaning of realis *yiqtol*(Ø) in CBH. While anterior expressions are not normally marked on several verbs in succession, perfectivity is “the aspect used for narrating

sequences of discrete events” (Bybee et al. 1994, 54). This is the typical usage of the realis *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause-type exemplified in all grammars for the expression of discourse continuity in narrative. One example is enough to show this:

(101) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol! + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol!*
 + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַיֵּדַע כַּיֵּן אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתַּהַר וַתֵּלֶד אֶת־חֲנוּךְ וַיְהִי בְנָה עֵיר וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם הָעִיר
 כְּשֵׁם בְּנוֹ חֲנוּךְ:

‘Cain had intercourse with his wife, and she conceived and gave birth to Enoch. He became the founder of a city and gave the city the name of his son Enoch.’ (Gen. 4.17)

“Perfectivity involves lack of explicit reference to the internal temporal constituency of a situation” (Comrie 1976, 21). A perfective grammatical morpheme may be used for situations that are internally complex, for example, lasting for a period of time, or including “a number of distinct internal phases, provided only that the whole of the situation is subsumed as a single whole” (Comrie 1976, 21). This type of perfectivity, which can involve a habitual action during a long space of time, is illustrated in (102):

(102) \emptyset -X \emptyset + \emptyset -*qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

זֶה־לִּי עֲשָׂרִים שָׁנָה בְּבֵיתְךָ עֲבַדְתִּיךָ אַרְבַּע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה בְּשִׂתִּי בְנִתִּיךָ וְשֵׁשׁ
 שָׁנִים בְּצֹאנְךָ וַתַּחַלְךָ אֶת־מִשְׁכָּרְתִּי עֲשָׂרַת מָנִים:

‘This was my lot for twenty years in your house: I worked like a slave for you– fourteen years for your two daughters and six years for your flocks, but you changed my wages ten times!’ (Gen. 31.41)

In (102), an elaboration initiated by an asyndetic *qaṭal* clause (עֲבַדְתִּיךָ) is continued by a perfective past *wa(y)-yiqtol* (וַתַּחֲלֶךְ) which explicitly describes an iterative/habitual action ('ten times'; Notarius 2010a, 260 n. 55; cf. J-M §118n).¹⁸⁵

We have already noticed the invasive nature of the new perfective gram *qaṭal* (Cook 2012a, 264). In the synchronic state of CBH, a realis *yiqtol*(Ø) is attested exclusively in discourse-continuity clauses (*wa(y)-yiqtol*).¹⁸⁶ In all other positions, the new *qaṭal* has replaced the (free-standing) realis *yiqtol*(Ø): in the beginning of new narrative units, in negative clauses, in clause-initial position in relative clauses, in clause-initial position in protases (see further §6.7.2). The realis *yiqtol*(Ø) is not even found in clauses with an initial subordinating conjunction. There is only one possible example in CBH of a short *yiqtol*(Ø) following a subordinating conjunction, and even this must be doubted. This example is (103), which exhibits a protasis with initial *kī* (as conditional conjunction) and a prefix verb form:

(103) (*kī-yiqtol* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*) + Ø-O.noun-*yiqtol*(u)

(כִּי יִבְעֹר־אִישׁ שָׂדֶה או־כָּרֶם וְשָׁלַח אֶת־בְּעִירָהּ וּבְעֹר בְּשָׂדֶה אֲחֵרָה) מִיֵּטֵב
שָׂדֶהוּ וּמִיֵּטֵב כָּרְמוֹ יִשְׁלֹם:

‘(If a man **causes** a field or vineyard **to be grazed over**, and he lets the livestock loose and they graze in the field of another man), he must make restitution from the best of his own field and the best of his own vineyard.’ (Exod. 22.4)

If *יִבְעֹר* in (103) is a *hif‘il* jussive, it would be the only jussive after *kī* or *‘im* in the whole CBH corpus, and the only example of a jussive clause starting a protasis.¹⁸⁷ The philologists have not given enough attention to the phonetic unity of *yab‘er-’iṣṣ*, in

which the first word is unstressed: *yabʿer-* < **yabʿir-* < **yabʿir-*. The form יַבְעַר is read with short stem vowel, but it is intended as a long *yiqtol* (*yiqtol(u)*). Its position after the conjunction *kī* was a sufficient syntactic signal for it to be identified as a *yiqtol(u)* form.

3.4.2.2. The Short *Yiqtol* as Irrealis in CBH

The irrealis/jussive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) clause expresses deontic modality in main clauses. Such meanings of *yiqtol*(\emptyset) are commonplace in Hebrew grammars (J-M §46; Hornkohl 2019, 549). A typical example is a clause-initial affirmative jussive clause, as in (104):

(104) \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)!

תוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה לְמִינָהּ בְּהֶמָּה וְרֶמֶשׂ וְחַיִּת־וָאָרֶץ לְמִינָהּ

‘Let the earth **bring forth** living creatures according to their kinds—livestock and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds.’ (Gen. 1.24)

It is also well known that a discourse-continuity jussive clause, type *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset), often expresses purpose meaning after a preceding volitive clause (J-M §116d):

(105) \emptyset -IMP + *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)! + *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)

נָטָה יָדְךָ עַל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּאֶרְצָהּ וַיַּעַל עַל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיֹּאכַל אֶת-כָּל-עֵשֶׂב
הָאֶרֶץ אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁאִיר הַבָּרָד:

‘Stretch out your hand over the land of Egypt for the locusts, **so that they may come** upon the land of Egypt **and eat** every plant in the land, all that the hail has left.’ (Exod. 10.12)

It is less well known that a *yiqtol*(\emptyset) clause may code a complement in relation to a previous manipulation verb. Complement clauses in CBH are often introduced by *kī* (plus a predicate other than *yiqtol*(\emptyset)), but after manipulation verbs, a *yiqtol*(\emptyset) clause may form a complement without particle marking (Givón 2001, I:152). Such clauses may be asyndetic, but are more often syndetic (the latter with the conjunction *wa-*), and they can be negated by *'al*. An example with an asyndetic *yiqtol*(\emptyset) forming a complement clause is found in (106):

(106) \emptyset -IMP + \emptyset -IMP + \emptyset -*'al-yiqtol*(\emptyset)!

לֵךְ מֵעָלַי הַשָּׁמֶר לִךְ אֶל־תִּסְקֶה רְאוֹת פָּנַי

‘Get away from me! Take care **that you do not see** my face again!’ (Exod. 10.28)¹⁸⁸

This type of complementation, without marking other than a switch from an imperative predicate to a jussive predicate, is important to recognise when the prefix verb is morphologically indistinctive. In such a case, the initial position of the *yiqtol*(\emptyset) is the decisive syntactic signal, as in (107):

(107) \emptyset -X \emptyset -«REL-*qatal* + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)» + *wa-yiqtol*!

זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה תַּעֲשׂוּ וִירָא אֵלֵיכֶם כְּבוֹד יְהוָה:

‘This is what YHWH has commanded you **to do** so that the glory of YHWH may appear to you.’ (Lev. 9.6)

In this utterance of Moses, a complex relative sentence is built up by a manipulation verb with a *qatal* verb form (צִוָּה), followed by a complement coded by an asyndetic irrealis *yiqtol*(\emptyset) (תַּעֲשׂוּ) in the second person. This תַּעֲשׂוּ is not morphologically distinctive, but the initial position of the verb and examples such as Exodus

10.28 above are helpful in the analysis. The next irrealis *wa-yiqtol!* clause (וַיִּרְא) is not part of the relative complex and expresses a purpose meaning (J-M §116d).¹⁸⁹

Complement clauses with *yiqtol*(\emptyset) may also be syndetic, as in (108):

(108) \emptyset -IMP + ***wa-yiqtol***(\emptyset)! + *wa*-O.noun-IMP + *kī-qatal*

אָמַר אֶל־אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן־אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן וַיִּרְא אֶת־הַמִּחֹתָת מִבְּיַן הַשָּׂרָפָה וְאֶת־הָאֵשׁ
זָרָה־הָלָאָה בִּי קֹדֶשׁ׃

‘Order Eleazar son of Aaron the priest **to remove** the fire-pans from the remains of the fire blaze and to scatter the incense away, for they have [both] become holy—’ (Num. 17.2, Levine 1993, 409, my emphasis)

After an initial imperative with a manipulation verb (אָמַר), a clause-initial syndetic irrealis *yiqtol*(\emptyset) (וַיִּרְא) expresses a complement to the previous clause.¹⁹⁰

3.4.2.3. The Short *Yiqtol* with Ventive/Cohortative Clitic \bar{a}

It is a well-known phenomenon in CBH that a so-called cohortative form can be unlengthened, at least in the archaic poetry (Notarius 2010b, 398, 401). The paragogic *heh* is facultative. The historical origin of the cohortative \bar{a} clitic is the West Semitic ventive/energetic morpheme added to the jussive *yaqtul* (Notarius 2010b, 407f.; Sjörö 2019, 4; 2023, ch. 6). The cohortative in CBH is not a separate ‘tense’; it is not a ‘mood’. It is just a jussive short *yiqtol* in the first grammatical person with an extra ventive/energetic clitic having a meaning of interest and involvement of the sender (Notarius 2010b, 412). The remnants of the old ventive

clitic in CBH also take the form of an energetic morpheme before an object suffix. For this reason, the clitic will be called ‘ventive/energetic’, following the terminology of Notarius (2010b, 394). In the volitive system of CBH, I thus count one modal prefix conjugation, the jussive short *yiqtol*, used with or without a ventive/energetic morpheme. The ventive/energetic clitic was not used in plural forms. Before object suffixes, the reflex of the West Semitic ventive/energetic morpheme emerges in CBH as the ‘energetic’ verb forms (Notarius 2010b, 408, 411).

In first-person forms in CBH, the ventive/energetic clitic ($-\bar{a}$) came to be added to all forms of the jussive. First-person jussives without this clitic were suppressed (Sjörs 2019, 19; 2021a, 20). This was possible because of the semantic nature of the first grammatical person (Notarius 2010b, 413f.). The clitic $-\bar{a}$, when applicable, became a marker of the first person in CBH.¹⁹¹

The West Semitic ventive/energetic morpheme could also be added to imperfective *yaqtulu* forms (in the form of $-na$, the allomorph after a vowel). So $-a(n)$ was the allomorph used after jussive *yaqtul*, and $-na$ the allomorph after *yaqtulu* (Notarius 2010b, 409).

In some III_{wy} verbs, the ventive/energetic clitic came to be ‘hidden’ in a ‘full’ prefix form, though intended as a short jussive with ventive/energetic clitic. This is the case with verbs III-ʿ, and especially verbs III_{wy} (Sjörs 2019, 14; 2021b, 276). An illuminating example is (109):

(109) (*ʿim-yiqtol(u)*) + \emptyset -*yiqtol-A* + \emptyset -*yiqtol-V*

אִם-תַּעֲשֶׂה-לִּי הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשׁוּבָה אֲרַעָה צִאֲנֶךָ אֲשָׁמְרָ:

‘If you will do this for me, I **will again pasture** your flock and keep it!’ (Gen. 30.31)

In (109), the apodosis is asyndetic and consists of two jussives with ventive/energetic suffix. The jussives are serial verbs, of which the first supplies the adverbial meaning ‘again’. As serial verbs, they are syntactically equal: a short *yiqtol* with ventive clitic. In the first verb (אָשִׁיבָה), the ventive/cohortative suffix takes the form of a lengthening with *-ā*. In the second verb (אָרְעָה), the ventive/energetic morpheme is hidden in the final long *-ē*. The example shows that a formally ‘full’ *yiqtol* of a verb IIIwy must in some instances be analysed as a jussive (short *yiqtol*) with ventive/energetic clitic.

In other instances, a jussive verb IIIwy with ‘hidden’ ventive/cohortative morpheme is syntactically equal to a verb with ‘energetic’ suffix. Both verb forms must be analysed as jussives having a ventive/energetic morpheme. An example is (110):

(110) \emptyset -IMP + *wa-yiqtol*-V + *wa-yiqtol*-N(= V)

גֹּר בְּאַרְץ הַזֹּאת [וְאֵהְיָה עִמָּךְ] [וְאִבְרַכְךָ]

‘Sojourn in this land, and I will be with you and will bless you!’ (Gen. 26.3a)

This example illustrates how a first-person ‘full’ form (וְאֵהְיָה) must be parsed as a short jussive *yiqtol* with ventive/energetic ending. The following first-person jussive with energetic suffix (וְאִבְרַכְךָ) has the same volitive meaning. The energetic verb form must also be parsed as a jussive with ventive/energetic ending plus following object pronoun. The two prefix forms in (106) cannot be ‘long’ *yiqtol*s, considering the extremely frequent pattern *IMP* + *wa-*

yiqtol(\emptyset) in a modal sequence. The example shows that a verb with ‘energetic’ object suffix may have a ventive meaning expressing involvement of the speaker.¹⁹²

3.4.3. The Distinct Identity of *Yiqtol*(\emptyset) in Contrast to *Yiqtol*(*u*): The Role of Word Order

Despite the partial loss of morphological distinctiveness, the later Canaanite languages still preserved a regular semantic distinction between the imperfective and jussive forms (Wilson-Wright 2019, 520). In CBH also, the identity of *yiqtol*(\emptyset) was retained when many forms of the two prefix conjugations became identical. We have already discussed the consequent retention of morphologically short prefix forms wherever possible, as well as the distinguishing function of the negations לֹא and אֵין in nearly complementary distribution (see §3.4.1).¹⁹³

In affirmative clauses, other signals helped to uphold the distinction between a perfective/jussive short *yiqtol* and an imperfective long *yiqtol*. The grammatical problem that had to be resolved was the morphological ambiguity, or more precisely the partial homonymy, between *yiqtol*(\emptyset) and *yiqtol*(*u*).¹⁹⁴ In most instances, these forms coalesced.¹⁹⁵ The grammatical development that could answer this problem was a refinement of word order. This refinement, or restriction, was incomplete in the archaic poetry and finished in CBH.¹⁹⁶ In the Archaic Hebrew poetry, word order is a tendency: *yiqtol*(\emptyset) forms tend to be clause-initial,¹⁹⁷ and *yiqtol*(*u*) forms are often non-initial. This is the case also in the Amarna texts (Baranowski 2016a, 202). In CBH, word order became a distinguishing feature: affirmative *yiqtol*(*u*) was placed

within a clause, while affirmative *yiqtol*(\emptyset) was used in initial position (Gentry 1998, 12).¹⁹⁸ The short *yiqtol*, irrespective of its having realis or irrealis meaning, was put in initial position, and the *yiqtol*(*u*) morpheme had to be internal (Isaksson 2015d; Driver 1892, 245; Finley 1981, 246; Revell 1988, 422; 1989, 2; Gzella 2011a, 442; 2013c, 859).¹⁹⁹ Word order became the basic signal for distinguishing *yiqtol*(\emptyset) from *yiqtol*(*u*) in affirmative clauses (Revell 1989, 21; Joosten 2011b, 214; Notarius 2013, 17 n. 53).²⁰⁰ “[T]his formal/syntactic distinction must be held to reflect a distinction in function” (Revell 1988, 422).²⁰¹ There are few exceptions in the corpus to this rule: an imperfective *yiqtol*(*u*) must have internal position in the clause (Rabin 1984, 392; Revell 1989, 1).

There was a drawback: the long *yiqtol*(*u*) could no longer be used in discourse-continuity clauses (type *wa*-VX), and had to be replaced. The substitute became the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type, an early CBH innovation (see §6).²⁰²

This word order rule was helpful for affirmative clauses.²⁰³ In negated clauses, there was no need for extra clarity because of the complementary distribution of the two negations. In negated jussive clauses, word order remained relatively free (see §3.4.4).

The linguistic instinct did not count the proclitic *wa*- as a (first) constituent, so in a *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* clause, the verb form (*yiqtol*) was perceived as clause-initial. All other conjunctions, however, were felt to occupy the first position in the clause, and therefore a **kī-yiqtol*(\emptyset) clause would have been unacceptable:

In וַיִּקְרָא (Gen. 19.20), the verb is clause-initial (short jussive *yiqtol*).

In וַתֵּהָרֶה (Gen. 4.1), the verb is clause-initial (short perfective *yiqtol*).

In בִּי-יִשְׁתָּה (Gen. 48.17), the verb is perceived as internal (long *yiqtol*).

3.4.4. When the Word Order Rule Did Not Apply in CBH

There are exceptions to the word order rule described in §3.4.3. They can be divided into cases when the word order restriction was uncalled for (negated clauses, §3.4.4.1); constructions that only appear to break the rule (§§3.4.4.2–3); an archaic use of \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* as asyndetic relative clause, rare in prose (§3.4.4.4); and a late use of \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* in Deuteronomy (§3.4.4.5). Finally, I analyse Baden's (2008) ten cases of (long) *wayiqtol* in a volitive sequence, which illustrate many apparent violations of the word order rule, and demonstrate why in most cases a distinctively long *wa-yiqtol* or \emptyset -*yiqtol* should be analysed as jussive (§3.4.4.6).

3.4.4.1. Negated Clauses

The negated clauses constitute an obvious case when word order restriction remained unneeded. Since the negations לֹא and אֵל are in complementary distribution (Kummerow 2008, 73),²⁰⁴ a word order restriction is unnecessary in order to distinguish between short and long *yiqtol*. In negated jussive clauses, the initial position of the negated verb is just a tendency, not a rule (as it is also in Amarna Canaanite and the Archaic Hebrew poetry). This is illustrated in (111):

(111) *wa-S.noun-lō-yiqtol(u)! + wa-gam-S.noun-ʾal-yiqtol(∅)! +*
∅-gam-S.noun-ʾal-yiqtol(∅)

וְאִישׁ לֹא-יַעֲלֶה עִמָּךְ וְגַם-אִישׁ אֶל-יָרֵא בְּכָל-הָהָר גִּם-הַצֹּאן וְהַבָּקָר אֶל-יָרְעוּ
 אֶל-מֹול הָהָר הַהוּא:

‘No one is to come up with you; **do not let anyone be seen** anywhere on the mountain; **not** even the flocks or the herds **may graze** in front of that mountain.’ (Exod. 34.3, Revell 1988, 422)

In (111), first a command is issued by means of a negated *yiqtol(u)* clause, which seems to express a categorical prohibition.²⁰⁵ It is followed by two more specific commands in negated jussive clauses. In both of the jussive clauses, the *ʾal-yiqtol(∅)* syntagm is clause-internal.²⁰⁶

3.4.4.2. Apparent Violations of the Rule for *Yiqtol(∅)*

The second category concerns cases where there only appears to be a violation of the rule. In such instances, the constituent before the jussive morpheme is perceived as not belonging to the clause. Some such constructions are left dislocations (extra-position constructions; for a discussion, see Khan 1988, 78–86; Gross 2013), vocatives (Hasselbach 2013b, 299), an honorary phrase, an exclamatory particle,²⁰⁷ or an introductory (*wa*)-‘*attā*. This interpretation is usually supported by the Masoretic accents: there is a distinctive accent before the jussive form. An example of both a left dislocation and an ‘*attā* before jussive forms is (112) (the left dislocation is marked by square brackets):

(112) *wa-‘attā, Ø-yiqtol(Ø)! + wa-[S.noun]-yiqtol(Ø)!*

וַעֲתָה יֵשְׁב־נָא עַבְדְּךָ תַּחַת הַנָּעַר הַזֶּה לְאֹדְנִי וְהַנָּעַר יָעַל עִם־אֶחָיו:

‘So now, please let your servant remain as my lord’s slave instead of the boy. As for the boy, let him go back with his brothers.’ (Gen. 44.33)

In (112), an introductory *wa-‘attā* is perceived as a particle signalling the start of the main message.²⁰⁸ It has the function of a colon and does not belong to the following clause. The *yiqtol(Ø)* form that follows the *wa-‘attā* is distinctively short, and the particle *nā* is a further signal that the verb is jussive. In the next clause, the *han-na‘ar* has a distinctive accent and must be regarded as a left dislocation, not part of the main sentence.²⁰⁹

Vocatives constitute a typical preposed element that does not violate the word order rule, since there is a natural pause after a vocative. An example is:²¹⁰

(113) *Ø-ADV-VOC, yiqtol(Ø)-nā*

בִּי אֹדְנִי יְדַבֵּר־נָא עַבְדְּךָ דְּבַר בְּאָזְנִי אֹדְנִי

‘Oh, my lord, please let your servant speak a word in my lord’s ears’ (Gen. 44.18)

3.4.4.3. Apparent Violations of the Rule for *Yiqtol(u)*

A corresponding violation of the word order rule for *yiqtol(u)* clauses may be caused by ellipsis: an element is understood to be placed before the verb. The long *yiqtol(u)* is only apparently clause-initial, and linguistic competence perceives the *yiqtol(u)* to be non-initial because of the understood element. An example of ellipsis with *yiqtol(u)* is (114):

(114) \emptyset -*mī-yiqtol(u)*! + *wa-yiqtol(∅)* + *wa-[mī]-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(∅)-N*

מִי יַעֲלֶה-לָנוּ הַשָּׁמַיְמָה וְיִקְחֶהָ לָנוּ וְיִשְׁמַעְנוּ אֹתָהּ וְנִשְׁעָנָהּ:

‘Who will go up for us to heaven to get it for us, and [who] will make us listen to it so that we may obey it?’ (Deut. 30.12)

(114) contains an evident ellipsis: the understood interrogative pronoun (מִי) in the third clause (וְיִשְׁמַעְנוּ). The first clause has a long *yiqtol* (יַעֲלֶה) with futural meaning, and so we can expect that the *yiqtol* in the third clause is also long.²¹¹ The second and fourth clauses are jussive *wa-yiqtol(∅)* expressing purpose, of which the last (in the first person) has a ventive/energetic morpheme (*pace* Zewi 1999, 85).²¹²

3.4.4.4. The Archaic Use of \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* as Asyndetic Relative Clause

Asyndetic relative clauses with a *yiqtol(u)* predicate may break the word order rule. In such examples, the *yiqtol(u)* usually follows a head noun in the construct state (Zewi 2020). It is reasonable to suppose that such constructions are archaic, since most examples are from poetry. A rare example in prose is (115):²¹³

(115) *wa(y)-yiqtol*: VOC-IMP-*nā bə-yad-«∅-yiqtol(u)»*

וַיֹּאמֶר בִּי אֲדֹנָי שְׁלַח-נָא בְיַד-תִּשְׁלַח:

‘But he said, O, my Lord, please send by the hand of anyone else **whom you wish to send!**’ (Exod. 4.13)

In (115), the *yiqtol(u)* verb form is nominalised (‘of anyone else whom you wish to send’) in annexation to the noun (יָד) in the

construct state (Ges-K §130d; Zewi 2020, 94, 102). Some further examples are found in prose, but they are more frequent in poetry.²¹⁴

3.4.4.5. A Late Use of \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* in Deuteronomy

One of very few clause-initial *yiqtol(u)* is found in Deut. 19.3. It represents a clear break with the word order rule found in the rest of my corpus:

(116) \emptyset -O.noun-*yiqtol(u)*! + ³ \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*! + wa-qatal + wa-qatal

שְׁלוֹשׁ עָרִים תִּבְדֹּל לָךְ בְּתוֹךְ אֶרְצְךָ אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לָךְ לְרִשְׁתָּהּ: תִּבְנֶן
לָךְ הַדֶּרֶךְ וְשִׁלַּשְׁתָּ אֶת-גְּבוּל אֶרְצְךָ אֲשֶׁר יִנְחִילֶךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְהָיָה לְנוֹס שָׁמָּה
כָּל-רֹצֵחַ:

‘you must set apart for yourselves three cities in the middle of your land that the LORD your God is giving you as a possession. ³**You shall build** a roadway and divide into thirds the whole extent of your land that the LORD your God is providing as your inheritance; anyone who kills another person should flee to the closest of these cities.’

The distinctively long \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* clause in (116) supplies a further detail in the same action, about how to allocate and organise the three cities (elaboration). The asyndetic *yiqtol(u)* functions as an elaboration of the preceding *yiqtol(u)* clause in the context of an instruction.

3.4.4.6. Baden's Supposed Cases of *Wa-yiqtol(u)* Expressing Result

Baden (2008) has identified ten unambiguous examples of *wa-yiqtol(u)* in the corpus from Genesis to 2 Kings. The examples are worth examining, because the forms are morphologically distinguishable as 'imperfects' and seem to violate the word order rule discussed above. Baden (2008, 158) argues that such clauses have a distinct purpose or result meaning, in contradistinction to the more general meaning of a jussive *wa-yiqtol(Ø)*. This conclusion is unconvincing, and I agree with Joosten (2009, 497), who maintains that the cases discussed by Baden "appear to belong with the volitives," except in one case, which will be evident below.

(1) Genesis 1.9 (Baden 2008, 152)

Baden's parade example of "*wəyiqtol* in a volitive sequence" is (117) below.

(117) \emptyset -*yiqtol(Ø)* + ***wa-yiqtol(Ø)*-V**

יָקוּוּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל־מָקוֹם אֶחָד וַתֵּרָאֵה הַיַּבֶּשֶׁה

'Let the water below the sky be gathered into one area, **so that** the dry land **appears (for me/us)**.' (Gen. 1.9)

The long *yiqtol* in the second clause (וַתֵּרָאֵה) can be analysed as a jussive with ventive ending. The ventive of verbs IIIwy coincides with the long *yiqtol* in the third person (Sjörs 2023, 105). At some point in the development of the Canaanite languages, the paragogic *heh* became nearly exclusively restricted to the first person

(Kogan 2015, 135 n. 369). However, this type of ventive morpheme is sometimes also added to third-person forms (Sjörs 2023, 113f.).²¹⁵ In (117), the verb in the second clause marks the speaker (God the creator) as beneficiary of the action, so the ‘long’ *yiqtol* (וְתִרְאֶה) should be analysed as short with a ventive morpheme.²¹⁶

(2) Exodus 2.7 (Baden 2008, 152)

(118) Ø-INT-*yiqtol*(u) + *wa-qatal* + ***wa-yiqtol*(Ø)-V**

הֲאֵלֶךְ וְקִרְאֹתִי לְךָ אִשָּׁה מִיִּנְקָת מֶן הָעִבְרִיּוֹת וְתִינֶק לְךָ אֶת-הַיֶּלֶד:

‘Shall I go and call you a nursing woman for you from the Hebrews, **so that she may nurse the child for you?**’

In Baden’s second example, a clearly long volitive *yiqtol* in the third person has a volitive, seemingly subordinate, meaning. This is the typical syntax of a subordinate jussive expressing purpose. The problem is the unexpected morphologically long form in the third person singular feminine (וְתִינֶק). This is not a verb IIIwy, as in Baden’s first example (117), but my thesis is that this form is also a jussive with ventive marking. I will start by discussing similar first-person forms, then continue with third-person forms, as in (118).

In the archaic language type, there are examples of the ventive-cohortative without the suffix *-ā* (paragogic *heh*). In such cases, the long form that is used before the paragogic *heh* is retained even without the *heh*; the forms used in the first person are either the full form *with* paragogic *heh* or the full form *without* this morpheme (Notarius 2010b, 401, 413):

(119) \emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset) + **\emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset)** + \emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset) + \emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset) +
 \emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset) + \emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset)

אָמַר אוֹיֵב אֶרְדֹּף אֲשִׁיג אֲחַלֶּק שְׁלָל תִּמְלֹאמוּ נַפְשֵׁי אֶרְיִק חֲרָבִי תוֹרִישְׁמוּ
 יָדִי:

‘The enemy said, “Let me pursue, **overtake**, divide the spoil, so that my desire shall have its fill of them. **Let me draw** my sword, so that my hand shall destroy them.”’
 (Exod. 15.9, Notarius 2013, 122, my emphasis in text and translation)

In this archaic series of volitives, four forms are in the first person and of them two are long. Semantically, the first-person forms are ventive-cohortative in meaning, but none exhibits a paragogic *heh*. If the verb forms are to be analysed as cohortatives, it seems that the ventive-cohortative suffix can be left out, and when it is left out, the resulting verb form remains long, as is shown in אֲשִׁיג and אֶרְיִק. The principle indicated in this example is that a long first-person *yiqtol* without paragogic *heh* can sometimes, in a proper modal setting, be identified as a cohortative with the paragogic *heh* left out.²¹⁷ That this syntax is retained in CBH is confirmed in (120):

(120) \emptyset -IMP-A-*nā* + *wa*-yiqtol(\emptyset)-A + ***wa*-yiqtol(\emptyset)-V**

לְכֵה-נָא וְנַסְיֹרָה אֶל-עִיר-הַיְבוּסִי הַזֹּאת וְנָלֵץ בָּהּ:

‘Come please, and let’s turn to this Jebusite city, **that we may spend the night** there.’ (Judg. 19.11)

In this modal sequence, the first two volitives are marked by ventive-cohortative endings (paragogic *heh*). But in the third vol-

itive (וְנָלִין), the paragogic *heh* is left out. Revell (1989, 18) expected a paragogic *heh* here and concluded that the paragogic *heh* is facultative. With paragogic *heh*, the form would have been וְנָלִינָה; without paragogic *heh*, וְנָלִין. The remaining ventive marking is a ‘long’ form of the *yiqtol*, which should be analysed as a volitive (jussive) with ventive marking.

The following are my examples of ‘long’ first-person *yiqtol* forms that are to be analysed as jussives with ventive marking and meaning, some of them mentioned by Revell (1989) as cohortatives with paragogic *heh* left out (R):²¹⁸ Judg. 19.11 (וְנָלִין); 1 Sam. 12.3 (וְאֶשְׁיב and וְאֶעֱלִים; R 18); 12.19 (וְאֶל־נָמוּת; R 18); 2 Sam. 19.38 (וְאֶמָּת; R 18); 1 Kgs 12.9 (וְנֶשְׁיב; R 18); 2 Kgs 4.10 (וְנֶשִׁים; R 18); Zech. 1.3 (וְאֶשְׁוֵב); Ps. 12.6 (אֶשְׁיֵת); 46.11 (אֶרְוֶם); 55.3 (אֶרְדֵּי); 55.8 (אֶרְחִיק and אֶלִּין); 59.17 (אֶשִׁיר); 71.16 (אֶזְכִּיר); 95.2 (נִקְדָּמָה...); 142.3 (אֶגִּיד).

In Ancient Canaanite, the jussive with ventive was used in the first and third persons, and less frequently in the second person because the imperative was used uniquely in that person. In CBH, the ventive-cohortative is mostly, but not always, used in the first person. One example has already been treated (Baden’s first example: Gen. 1.9). Another is:

(121) \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)-*V*

וְתֹאמַר אֶל־אָבִיהָ יַעֲשֵׂה לִי הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה

‘She then said to her father, “Please grant me this one wish!...”’ (Judg. 11.37)

The jussive in (121) is ‘long’, but obviously volitive and speaker-benefactive, and the same must be said of (122) below:

(122) \emptyset -yiqtol(\emptyset)-V + wa-yiqtol(\emptyset) + CONJ-yiqtol(u)-N

יָקֻם אָבִי וַיֹּאכַל מִצֵּיד בְּנוֹ בְּעֵבֹר תְּבָרַכְנִי נַפְשֶׁךָ:

‘Let my father sit up and eat of his son’s game, so that you may give me your blessing!’ (Gen. 27.31)

The initial volitive in (122) has a long form (*yāqūm*), which can be analysed as a jussive with ventive marking to express that the father is the beneficiary of the action of sitting up.²¹⁹

Even second-person long jussives are sometimes to be analysed as having ventive marking. An example is (123):

(123) \emptyset -IMP + \emptyset -’al-yiqtol(\emptyset)-V + wa-’al-yiqtol(\emptyset) + \emptyset -ADV-IMP + pen-yiqtol(u)!

הַמָּלָט עַל-נַפְשֶׁךָ אֶל-תִּבֵּיט אַחֲרֶיךָ וְאַל-תַּעֲמֹד בְּכָל-הַכְּבֹר הַהֵרָה הַמָּלָט פֶּן-תִּסָּפֶה:

‘Run for your lives! **Don’t** look behind you or stop anywhere in the valley! Escape to the mountains or you will be destroyed!’ (Gen. 19.17)

The action expressed by the negated jussive with ventive marking is obviously beneficial for the receivers of the message, Lot and his family. So the long *yiqtol* form is not a mistake. It is a proper expression of a volitive, the obedience of which is beneficial for Lot.²²⁰

The following are my examples of ‘long’ second- and third-person jussives that should be analysed as jussives with ventive marking and meaning:²²¹ Gen. 1.9 (וַתִּרְאֶה, 3fs); 19.17 (אַל-תִּבֵּיט, 2ms); 27.31 (יָקֻם, 3ms); 41.34 (יַעֲשֶׂה, 3ms); Exod. 2.7 (וְתִינֶק, 3fs); Josh. 1.7 (אַל-תִּתְּקֹר, 2ms); Judg. 6.18 (אַל-תִּנָּא תִמָּשׁ, 2ms); 11.37 (אַל-תַּעֲשֶׂה, 3ms);²²² 1 Sam. 25.25 (אַל-תִּנָּא יִשָּׂים, 3ms); 2 Sam. 13.12 (אַל-

תַּעֲשֶׂה, 2ms); 14.17 (יִהְיֶה-נָא, 3ms); 1 Kgs 15.19 (וַיַּעֲלֶה, 3ms); 2 Kgs 6.17 (וַיִּרְאֶה, 3ms); 18.29 (אֶל-יִשְׂרָאֵל, 3ms); Zech. 9.5 (וַתִּחַלֵּי, 3fs); Ps. 51.20 (תִּבְנֶה, 2ms); 68.2 (יָקוּם, 3ms); 90.16 (יִרְאֶה, 3ms); 121.3 (אֶל-יְנוּם, 3ms).

(3) Deut. 13.12 (Baden 2008, 153)

(124) *wa-S.noun-yiqtol(u) + wa-[]-yiqtol(u)-Npar*

וְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁמָעוּ וַיִּרְאוּן

‘Thus all Israel will hear and be afraid.’

The paragogic *nun* in the second clause clearly indicates a long *yiqtol*. The two long *yiqtol* in the example are indicative with future meaning and the same subject. It is a matter of ellipsis: the subject in the first clause is understood in the second. This means that the word order rule for long *yiqtol* is not violated. For the same reason, the word order rule is not violated in Baden’s (2008, 153) added parallels, Deut. 17.13; 19.20; 21.21. In all of them, the two *yiqtol* are long with future time reference, and the subject is understood in the second clause.²²³

(4) Judg. 19.11 (Baden 2008, 153)

This example involves a ventive marking in the first person, as has already been explained above after (120).

(5) 1 Sam. 12.3 (Baden 2008, 153f.)

This example contains two jussives with ventive marking in the first person, as explained and enumerated after (120).

(6) 2 Sam. 19.38 (Baden 2008, 154)

This example involves a ventive marking in the first person, as explained and enumerated after (120).

(7) 1 Kgs 12.9 (Baden 2008, 154)

This example involves a ventive marking in the first person, as explained and enumerated after (120).

(8) 1 Kgs 15.19 (Baden 2008, 154)

This example involves a ventive marking in the third person, as explained and enumerated after (123).

(9) 2 Kgs 4.10 (Baden 2008, 154)

This example contains two forms with ventive marking in the first person, as explained and enumerated after (120).

(10) 2 Kgs 6.17 (Baden 2008, 154)

This example involves ventive marking in the third person, as explained and enumerated after (123).

My conclusion is that, in one of Baden's examples, the *yiqtol* is actually long and indicative (ellipsis in Deut. 13.12 with three added parallels in Deut.), and in nine examples, the *yiqtol* is a jussive with ventive marking.

3.4.5. How the Two Meanings of *Wa-yiqtol*(Ø) Were Distinguished in CBH

In Amarna Canaanite and Archaic Hebrew, the two meanings of a free-standing *yiqtol*(Ø) were distinguished by the domain type: in a narrative or reportive domain, a *yiqtol*(Ø) was automatically identified as a perfective (usually past) verb form; in a modal domain, the linguistic instinct identified *yiqtol*(Ø) as jussive.

In the synchronic state of CBH, however, the free-standing indicative *yiqtol*(Ø), in all its various uses, had been replaced by *qatal*. This means that a *yiqtol*(Ø) without proclitic *wa-* must be jussive in CBH. With this change, one potential obscurity was remedied, but another remained. Since the gemination of the prefix consonant (*way-yiqtol*) is a later, probably Second Temple, innovation in the reading tradition (see §1.2.5), the syntagm *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) could still have both realis and irrealis meaning in the actual classical language (homonymy), and had to be identified with the help of the domain. A *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) in narrative was perfective, a *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) in a modal domain was identified as jussive. This was facilitated by the discourse function of the *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) clause-type, which signalled pragmatic continuity: *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) always followed after another clause that determined the temporal reference and the modality of the clause. Traditionally, the *wa-* in a jussive *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) clause is called ‘copulative’, whereas the *wa-* in an indicative (perfective) *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) has been termed ‘consecutive’. But both signal discourse continuity. A jussive *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) practically always comes as part of a modal series, an example of which is (125):

(125) \emptyset -PP + *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)! + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset)! + *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset) + *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset)!

ברוך יהוה אלהי שם ויהי כנען עבד למו: יפת אלהים ליפת וישכן באהלי-
שם ויהי כנען עבד למו:

‘Blessed be the LORD, the God of Shem; and let Canaan be his servant. May God enlarge Japheth’s territory, and let him dwell in the tents of Shem, and let Canaan be his servant!’ (Gen. 9.26–27)

The example shows two separate modal series (two modal domains), the first of which begins with a passive participle clause (PP), and the second with an asyndetic jussive *yiqtol*(\emptyset) (יפת). In both domains, the initial volitive clause is continued by *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset) clauses, the identification of which poses no problem to the listener. In one of the *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset) clauses, the verb is non-distinctive (וישכן) but its jussive meaning is evident semantically and syntactically (clause-initial).²²⁴ All *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset) clauses in the example signal discourse continuity (*wa-VX*) in relation to the preceding clause (see §1.2.6).²²⁵

In a narrative domain, a discourse-continuous *wa-yiqtol*(\emptyset), that is, *wa(y)-yiqtol*, is easily identified as an indicative perfective. But the beginning and end of a narrative domain are often more complicated to identify than those of a modal series, because the historical setting and temporal reference is presupposed and the narration just continues with new *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses. An example of an easily identifiable beginning of a narrative domain is (126).

- (126) *wa-S.noun-lō-qatal* + *wa-XØ* + ²*wa(y)-yiqtol* + “...” +
wa(y)-yiqtol + ³*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + ⁴*wa(y)-*
yiqtol + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

וְשָׂרַי אִשְׁתְּ אַבְרָם לֹא יָלְדָה לוֹ וְלֹה שְׁפָחָה מִצְרַיִת וְשֵׁמָּה הֵגָר: 2 וְתֹאמַר
 שָׂרַי אֶל-אַבְרָם הִנֵּה-נָא עֲצָרָנִי יְהוָה מִלְּדֹת בָּאֵנָּה אֶל-שְׁפָחָתִי אוּלַי אֲבִנָּה
 מִמֶּנָּה וַיִּשְׁמַע אַבְרָם לְקוֹל שָׂרַי: 3 וְתִקַּח שָׂרַי אִשְׁתְּ-אַבְרָם אֶת-הֵגָר
 הַמִּצְרַיִת שְׁפָחָתָהּ מִקֵּץ עֶשְׂרֵי שָׁנִים לְשִׁבְתָּ אַבְרָם בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן וַתֵּלֶךְ אִתָּהּ
 לְאַבְרָם אִשָּׁה לוֹ לְאִשָּׁה: 4 וַיְבֹא אֶל-הֵגָר וַתַּהַר וַתֵּלֶךְ וַתֵּרָא כִּי הָרְתָה וַתִּקַּל
 גְּבֻרָתָהּ בְּעֵינֶיהָ:

‘Now Sarai, Abram’s wife, had not given birth to any children, but she had an Egyptian servant named Hagar. ²So Sarai said to Abram, “Since the LORD has prevented me from having children, have sexual relations with my servant. Perhaps I can have a family by her.” Abram did what Sarai told him. ³So after Abram had lived in Canaan for ten years, Sarai, Abram’s wife, gave Hagar, her Egyptian servant, to her husband to be his wife. ⁴He had sexual relations with Hagar, and she became pregnant. Once Hagar realised she was pregnant, she despised Sarai.’ (Gen. 16.1–4)

The domain starts with a background section involving a *qatal* clause and a verbless clause. This states the historical setting and the temporal reference. Narration continues with *wa-yiqtol* clauses. The point here is that perfective *wa-yiqtol* clauses are easily identifiable in a narrative domain, even though the *wa-yiqtol* syntagm is homophonous with a jussive *wa-yiqtol(Ø)* syntagm.

3.5. Summary: The Independent Status of the Short Yiqṭol

In this chapter, I have shown that the short *yiqṭol* is inherited from Proto-Semitic. It has a dual character as both past perfective and jussive. This is a property that the short *yiqṭol* shares with its cognate *yaqtul* in other ancient Semitic languages, like Akkadian (*iprus*), Amorite, Ugaritic, Amarna Canaanite, and the most ancient inscriptions of Aramaic. Even in the Archaic Hebrew poetry, the short *yiqṭol* could function as a ‘free’ narrative verb form without being restricted to the *wa-yiqṭol* (short) clause-type.

The indicative short *yiqṭol* in CBH is used only in the clause-type *wa-yiqṭol*, with normal *wa-* and short *yiqṭol*. This clause-type is mainly used in narration. In the present book, it is written *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, because the Second Temple reading tradition after the CBH era introduced a gemination of the prefix consonant in order to make a distinction in the reading between the indicative (perfective past) *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* and the jussive *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*.

The jussive short *yiqṭol* in CBH was less restricted. It could be used with or without a preceding *wa-*. With a preceding *wa-*, that is, as the clause-type *wa-yiqṭol*, it often expresses purpose.

Both the indicative short *yiqṭol* and the jussive short *yiqṭol* are restricted as to word order; they are used in initial position of the clause: the indicative short *yiqṭol* in the clause-type *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, and the jussive short *yiqṭol* with a restriction to initial position in affirmative clauses. The reason for the more restricted syntax of the indicative short *wa-yiqṭol* in CBH was the ongoing intrusion of the new powerful anterior/perfective formation *qaṭal* (see §5). The new *qaṭal* took over more and more functions from

the indicative short *yiqṭol*, also in narrative. In CBH, only the discourse-continuous past perfective *wa-yiqṭol* (here written *wa(y)-yiqṭol*) was left to the indicative short *yiqṭol*. The rest of the uses had been taken over by *qāṭal*.

The restricted word order of the non-negated jussive is of great help when distinguishing jussive forms from the (partly) homophonous imperfective long *yiqṭol* forms (see §4), which are used in internal position.

Word order is of paramount importance in the syntax of the two *yiqṭol*, the short and the long. Word order makes it easy to distinguish the two.

The impression given by the theory of consecutive tenses that there is only one *yiqṭol* is false. It is typologically false and it is false in the synchronic state of CBH.

Past perfective *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*, written *wa(y)-yiqṭol* in this book, and jussive *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* were homophonous in CBH, seemingly without causing any problems. Other Semitic languages solved this potential problem of homophony by using a proclitic precative particle (PS **la-*) before the jussive *yaqtul*. But Hebrew never came to use this particle.

¹ Huehnergard (1983, 575): “**yaqtul* in PS was both injunctive (jussive) and preterite.”

² Similar conclusions are expressed by Bloch (2013) and Baranowski (2016b, 1).

³ Unfortunately “the data do not allow a confident etymological reconstruction” (Cook 2012a, 220, 263). A resultative signals that “a state exists as a result of a past action;” completive means “to do something thoroughly and to completion” (Bybee et al. 1994, 54). Past tenses do not arise directly, but have a long history (Givón 1991, 305; Bybee et

al. 1994, 51–105). Huehnergard and his followers reject the idea of grammaticalisation paths (and thus the empirical results of the investigations of Joan Bybee and Östen Dahl). Without this theoretical foundation, it is impossible to make any statement about the origin of *yaqtul*. Huehnergard instead supposes that it was “unmarked for TAM categories” (Huehnergard 2019, 62).

⁴ For the term prototypical, see §1.2.1.

⁵ This is true of Aramaic except for the earliest inscriptions, where a narrative *yaqtul* is retained, as in the Tel Dan inscription. Muraoka (1995b, 114): “all that can be claimed with certainty is that both idioms attest to an ancient preterital prefix conjugation.”

⁶ In West Semitic, the extended use of the new perfective *qatal* gradually reduced the application field of *yaqtul*, which came to be limited to special text-types or specific syntactic contexts (Tropper 1998, 162). But the volitive use of *yaqtul* (‘jussive’) was not affected by the intrusion of *qatal*, which only took over the indicative functions of *yaqtul*.

⁷ For discussion, see Bergsträsser (1918–29, II, §3b); Kuryłowicz (1949, 48f.); Rainey (1986, 5); Tropper (1998, 161, 167); Gzella (2011a, 441); Cook (2012a, 96 n. 26); Kossmann and Suchard (2018, 47). For the concepts of realis and irrealis, see Bybee et al. (1994, 236–240). *Yaqtul* “was a single morpheme, perfective in meaning, that occurred both in statements and in injunctions” (Huehnergard 1988, 22; see also Blau 2010, 195). A short survey (without attempt at an explanation) of the perfective with both past and jussive meanings in the classical Semitic languages is found in Gai (2000). Kuryłowicz (1972a, 64) compares the Semitic ‘preterite’ *yaqtul* with the modern European languages, in which the indicative preterite is used to express an irrealis: English *if he wrote*, French *s’il écrivait*, Russian *esli by (na)pisal*. Fleischman (1989, 2–3) adds to this discussion the notion of temporal distance from the speaker: the past tense expresses a distance from the speaker that may be used to express irrealis nuances. The past, with its high degree of remoteness, is used as a “metaphorical vehicle for the expression of other linguistic notions” such as non-reality and non-actuality (Fleischman 1989, 3).

⁸ See also Diakonoff (1988, 103): “the Jussive was originally a special application of the Old Perfective;” also Palmer (2001, ch. 8); Gzella (2012b, 229; 2018, 23).

⁹ Some scholars maintain that *yaqtul* was originally two conjugations with different stress, the preterite with stress on the prefix (*yáqtul*) and the jussive with stress on the verbal stem (*yaqtúl*): see Hetzron (1969); Lipiński (1997, §§25.8, 38.2); Muraoka (1998, 77). But Hetzron is wrong (thus Goerwitz 1992; Garr 1998, lxxvii n. 240). Word stress seems to have been non-phonemic in Proto-Semitic: it was “assigned automatically (i) to the rightmost nonfinal heavy syllable (CV: or CVC), or (ii) in words having only nonfinal light syllables, to the initial syllable” (Huehnergard 2008, 232; also 1983, 587 n. 165; 2019, 53). In Proto-Hebrew as well, stress was not phonemic, “rather, it was automatic” (Blau 2010, 145, 150). At Blau’s (2010, 150) stage iii, when final short vowels had dropped, stress became phonemic, but it did not distinguish irrealis *yiqtol* from realis *yiqtol*. According to Blau (2010, 150–51), stress created a distinction between the short *yiqtol* form **yíšmor* and the long *yiqtol* form **yīšmór* (example forms from Blau); later, however, stress shifted to the ultima also in the short prefix form, so that both *yiqtol* and *yiqtol(u)* converged. In Blau’s (2010, 151) view, the penultimate stress was retained in some occurrences of realis *wa(y)-yiqtol* where the penultimate syllable was open, as in *wayyāšāb*. Rainey (1996, II:221) separates an indicative ‘preterite’ *yaqtul* from an injunctive ‘jussive’ *yaqtul* in Amarna Canaanite, so that “a certain symmetry may be observed” between three conjugations in each mood: the indicative has three, *yaqtul*, *yaqtulu*, and *yaqtulun(n)a*; and the injunctive has three, *yaqtul*, *yaqtula*, and *yaqtulan(n)a*. But symmetry is not something that must be expected in a verbal system; such an idea can instead be deceptive (Cook 2012a, 104; similarly also Dallaire 2014, 169). Similarly Korchin (2008, 325): Rainey is “influenced by a desire for symmetry.”

¹⁰ A first step is to use the past tense to mark a low certainty in conditional clauses (a phenomenon attested also in Semitic ‘if-clauses): “If you **told** them the real story, they **would** understand.” Second, there is a historical shift of using past forms in non-past (present) volitive use:

“I **should** return soon.” Such subjunctives of lower certainty may develop to deontic modals, as in the English “You **should** go” (Givón 2001, I:363).

¹¹ Bybee (1995, 514): “it is not the past tense alone that is contributing the hypothetical meaning, but rather the past in combination with a modal verb, a subjunctive mood, a hypothetical marker (such as *if*), or, in some cases, the imperfective aspect.”

¹² This form shows a reflex of the asseverative PS proclitic particle **la-*; see Huehnergard (1983, 592; 2019, 68).

¹³ “The distribution of the precative *lamedh* between East and West Semitic indicates that it was common to the entire Semitic language group” (Garr 1985, 118). For the development of the clitic *l-* to mark the modal meaning of the perfective in Akkadian, see Kouwenberg (2010a, 130ff.). The particle *lu* (< **law*) is obligatory in Old Assyrian as a proclitic particle before *iprus* (Kouwenberg 2017, 633f.). In first-millennium Northwest Semitic, the particle is attested only in Samalian and Fekheriyeh, i.e., in the eastern Aramaic area. “In later times, this feature became characteristic of eastern Aramaic as a dialect group” (Garr 1985, 119).

¹⁴ The particle *li-* is usually not omitted in Classical Arabic prose, but in poetry its use is free (Wright 1896–98, II:35D; Huehnergard 1983, 578).

¹⁵ Such durative examples of *iprus* are found also in Old Assyrian (Kouwenberg 2017, 616).

¹⁶ Lexicostatistics unambiguously points to a rather close genealogical relationship between the dialects of Ethiopian Semitic (Kogan 2015, 449, 465).

¹⁷ This is a disputed position. For a survey of research, see Kogan (2012, 314f.). Many scholars regard the optative *yəngər/yəlbās* as a residue of both the Proto-Semitic perfective *yaqtul* and an (possibly Proto-Semitic) imperfective *yaqtulu*, while the imperfective *yənaggər* is analysed as an inner Ethiopic development, diachronically unrelated to Akkadian *ipar-ras* (thus Rundgren 1959, 50, 54; also Knudsen 1998; Stempel 1999, 133). Avanzini (2009, 209 n. 11) remarks: “maybe Marrassini is right

that ‘one has got rid too hastily [*sic*] of the Rundgren hypothesis on the *réemploi de l’insensif* (Rundgren 1959).” In Rundgren’s (1959, 44f.) own words: “Es kann daher wirklich keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass das akk. Präsens *iparras* eine urakkadische Neuerung darstellt, die als ein Fall vom *réemploi de l’insensif* zu beurteilen ist.” Kouwenberg (2010a, 95–123), with many references to Rundgren, even regards the Akkadian imperfective *iparras* as an innovation from a Proto-Semitic ‘pluractional’ conjugation. In a review of Kouwenberg’s position, Kogan (2012, 315) remains “sceptical about the possibility of a peaceful coexistence of *yaqtulu* and *iparras* in PS,” and maintains that “the fundamental structural parameters of the PS verbal system should be broadly identical to what we observe in its most archaic daughter tongues” (that is, the *iparras* should be regarded as Proto-Semitic), the more so since corresponding imperfective formations are found in Berber and Beja (Kogan 2012, 316). Kogan’s scepticism seems to be well-founded, and if so, an enigma remains to be explained: the complete morphological correspondence between the Akkadian subjunctive *iprusu* and the Central Semitic imperfective *yaqtulu*.

¹⁸ There is a restricted usage of realis *yaqtul* after *’em-qedma* ‘before’ and *(za)’enbala* ‘before’ (Nebes 1994b, 67; cf. Smith 1991, 12f., who refers to private communication from J. Huehnergard). Schramm (1957–58, 5) and Hetzron (1969, 6–8; 1974, 189) identify the irregular past tense form *yābē* ‘he spoke’ (of the root **bhl*) as a survival of realis *yaqtul* (see also Tropper 1997a, 39).

¹⁹ In eastern Gurage, the short “jussive template” is used with negated perfective verbs (Meyer 2011b, 1245).

²⁰ Kogan (2012, 320): “I am confident that ‘South Semitic’ is a mythic concept which has to be abandoned as soon as possible.” Similarly Huehnergard and Rubin (2011, 262f.), but cf. Blau (2010, 17).

²¹ This is the term used by Simeone-Senelle (2011, 1092). The imperfective formation with a bisyllabic stem is often regarded as a retention from Proto-Semitic *yVqattVl* (Huehnergard 2005, 157f.). Other scholars regard the MSA *yāsṣfar* and the Ethiopic *yānāggār* as internal innovations

(*réemploi de l'intensif*), independent from the Akkadian *iparras* (Cohen 1984, 67; Avanzini 2015, 7).

²² The dialectal distribution of this *l* clitic is complicated. It is not found at all in Harsusi, while in Soqotri and the Mehri of Qishn it is used also in the third-person masculine forms, where the initial *y* is realised as vocalic [i] (Simeone-Senelle 2011, 1093, 1095).

²³ Avanzini (2009, 216; 2015), on the other hand, suggests that there is a closer genealogical affinity between Ancient South Arabian and MSA than generally thought. The Modern South Arabian dialects have not developed directly from Sabaic, but “these languages could derive from the archaic linguistic substratum of Yemen” (Avanzini 2015, 7). At the heart of the matter lies the question as to why the geographically remote Ancient South Arabian exhibits prototypical features that correspond to the Central Semitic languages in the northern part of the Semitic linguistic area. The answer of a majority of scholars has been a supposed migration of groups of speakers of Central Semitic, at least of speakers of Proto-Sabaic, from the southern Levant to the southernmost area of the Arabian Peninsula in the early first millennium BC (thus Nebes 2001; Kottsieper and Stein 2014, 85). Avanzini on this point argues that there are no archaeological or textual traces of such a migration, and that it is more probable that the Ancient South Arabian languages developed within Southern Arabia. According to Avanzini (2015, 4, 6), recent archaeological research provides an overall picture of an “endogenous formation process of settlements on the plateau.”

²⁴ Avanzini (2015, 9, 33) maintains that this is just a hypothesis because of the defective writing system, and that an imperfective *yVqattVl* in Ancient South Arabian is still another possible working hypothesis, since there are a few possible traces of a geminated second radical in verbs IIy: the *y* is written plene in the imperfective example *ḏt s²ym w-ys²ymn wfy...* ‘that He has set up and will set up the well-being of...’ (München VM 91–315, 336, quoted from Stein 2011, 1061), which could possibly indicate a geminated consonant *y*, but defectively in the jussive example *l-ys²mn wfy...* ‘may He set up the well-being of...’ (Ja 611, 16–17, quoted from Stein 2011, 1061). In Avanzini’s (2015, 33)

opinion, the arguments that Ethiopian *yəṇaggər* represents an innovation independent from Akkadian *iparras* (= Rundgren's hypothesis) are convincing (and so also the corresponding formations in MSA).

²⁵ The distinction between short and long prefix conjugations does not refer to the endings with *-n* in Ancient South Arabian, for which earlier research used the 'short/long' terminology (*yf^lln* = 'long' form, *yf^l* = 'short' form). It is to be presumed that the *-n* endings in Ancient South Arabian are reflexes of the 'energetic' endings attested in Central Semitic. The *yf^lln* form seems to occur in all syntactical uses, except that the past tense narrative *w-yf^l* tends to be used without *n* (Stein 2013, 77, 80). It must be pointed out that Stein's terminology presupposes only one prefix conjugation ("Die Präfixkonjugation (PK)", Stein 2013, 79). This does not prevent him from talking about "eine morphologische Kurzform" in the case of the jussive, while rejecting the idea that the *w-yf^l* in past narrative contexts might be derived from the Proto-Semitic realis **yaqtul* that corresponds to the Akkadian *iprus*. According to Stein (2013, 132f.), the general meaning of the PK in Sabaic is to express "Sachverhalte, die gleich- oder nachzeitig zum jeweiligen Relationswert liegen," and therefore it can also "Fortschreiten der Verbalhandlung (Progreß)," and "[d]iese Verwendung entspricht ganz und gar dem sogenannten Konsekutiv-Imperfekt oder ‚Narrativ‘ (*way-yiqtol*) im Hebräischen." The idea of a Biblical Hebrew 'imperfect' *yiqtol* that is somehow turned into a narrative tense is nowadays generally discarded by Biblical Hebrew scholarship (which derives it from the old Semitic 'preterite'). Only the unhappy terminology ('imperfect consecutive') is retained, and this unfortunate terminology becomes an argument in the discussion about the prefix conjugation(s) in Ancient South Arabian. Avanzini (2009, 212–216; see also Tropper 1997a) identifies the Ancient South Arabian prefix form in past narrative with the Proto-Semitic 'preterite' (Akkadian *iprus*), but this standpoint is cautiously rejected by Stein (2013, 165), since it "durchaus im Sinne eines Progresses (und damit nachzeitig) erklärt werden kann."

²⁶ Huehnergard refers to Voigt (1987) and Nebes (1994b), but neither of these authors argues for a reflex of *yaqtulu* in Ancient South Arabian.

²⁷ According to Multhoff (2019, 332, also 334), “a morphological differentiation between indicative (IND) and jussive (JUSS) forms can be deduced from some roots II w/y.” Tropper (1997a, 36, 43f.) detects the following meanings for the ‘Ø-Form’ (without *n*-suffix) in main clauses: (a) “Gegenwart und Zukunft,” (b) “Vergangenheit im Sinne des ‘Progresses’ in der Vergangenheit,” (c) “Modale Aussagen.” Such meanings of the ‘Ø-Form’ and comparative reflections on the existence of two prefix conjugations lead Tropper (1997a, 39) to conclude that it is “nicht nur möglich, sondern geradezu zwingend, daß Reste des Präteritums auch im Sabäischen, insbesondere in dessen älteren Sprachschichten, nachweisbar sind.”

²⁸ Example quoted from Stein (2011, 1064, my emphasis on presumably short perfective *yaqtul* forms), cf. Avanzini (2006, 259). Avanzini (2006) maintains that the verbal forms in such examples must be regarded as reflexes of the old Semitic past tense *yaqtul* (thus also Nebes 1994b, 68; Kottsieper 1999, 71).

²⁹ A corresponding Arabic negated (with *lam*) clause is: *fa-lam-yaqtul*.

³⁰ Thus Qatabanic has achieved a morphological distinction between three prefix forms: past tense *yf^ll/yf^llw*, jussive *l-yf^ll/l-yf^llwn*, and imperfective *b-yf^ll/b-yf^llwn*. It seems that the distinguishing clitic *l* in Qatabanic caused a morphological merger in the (originally short) jussive: in the jussive, the speakers could dispense with the morphological opposition between a short plural form (exhibited in *yf^llw*) and a long plural form (*yf^llwn*).

³¹ Avanzini (2009, 215) goes so far as to describe the Proto-Ancient South Arabian verb system as “a protowestern not only a proto-north-western verb system.”

³² The differentiation is easier to work out in Qatabanic and Minaic, where the expression of the imperfective has been renewed by a *b*-prefix, as in the modern Syro-Palestinian Arabic dialects (Avanzini 2009, 212f.). This *b*-prefix is not found in Sabaic.

³³ It is strange that this indicative use of the perfective *yaqtul* is called ‘jussive’ in Arabic grammars (thus Fischer 2002, §194). From a scientific standpoint, this represents a ‘dead end’ terminology, blocking further thoughts.

³⁴ *lm yfʿl* is also a feature of the North Arabian dialect Safaitic (Huehnergard 2017, 25).

³⁵ It is Marmorstein’s emphasis in the transcription but mine in the translation.

³⁶ The stem vowel of the *iprus* of verbs *Ilwy* was conspicuously long in Old Assyrian *imūt*, 2ms *tamūt* (Kouwenberg 2017, 562), and Old Babylonian *imūt*, *iqīp* (Soden 1969, §104f.; Kouwenberg 2010a, 476). It is strange that Kouwenberg (2010a, 476) maintains that the Akkadian perfective *imūt* agrees “perfectly... with the Arabic Pfv (usually jussive) *yamūt*, -ū,” without noticing that the Arabic jussive/perfective has a short(ened) form *yamut* (Wright 1896–98, I:82C).

³⁷ Brockelmann (1908, 620, 627f.) regards this shortening of a final vowel, in Classical Arabic as well as in Biblical Hebrew, as a secondary phenomenon that developed by analogy with verbs *Ilwy* (*yaqum* as against *yaqūmu*). But such a shortening is found also in Akkadian, preterite *ibni* ‘he built’ instead of *ibni*; and Amarna Canaanite, optative *ia-aq-bi* ‘may he speak’ (Lipiński 1997, §39.14).

³⁸ The verb is to be analysed as *elʾakunn-anni* < **yilʾakun-*, a *yaqtul* ‘preterite’ with ventive/energetic clitic; the verb has the same root as *malʾakum* ‘messenger’.

³⁹ *DĠIR* is the only logogram used in the left-hand column and should probably be identified with the proper name of the senior deity, *El* (George and Krebernik 2022, 15).

⁴⁰ The verb is a 3ms *yaqtul* with precativ particle from the root *ḥwy* in the causative stem.

⁴¹ The verb is a 2ms jussive *yaqtul* without precativ *la* from the root *ʾmr*.

⁴² For another view, see Knudsen (1982, 9).

⁴³ Another Northwest Semitic group is Aramaeo-Canaanite (Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 5). Huehnergard (1991, 284, 292) posits Northwest Semitic as a subbranch of Central Semitic, the innovative feature of which is the specific distribution of the *a*-insertion in the plural stem of *qatl* (example of plural marking: **malak-ūma* ‘kings’, **malak-ātu* ‘queens’), *qitl*, and *qutl* forms, together with the external plural marker (thus having a double marking of the plural), and to this short list Kogan (2015, 228) adds the shift of word-initial **w* into *y*, and the pattern **qattil-* (instead of **qattal-*) in the D-stem suffix conjugation. According to Huehnergard (1991, 285f.), common Northwest Semitic shared the following features: (1) lack of a (graphically explicit) definite article; (2) “the relic consecutive prefix conjugation for past tense;” (3) preservation of final *-t* in the 3fs form of the suffix conjugation; (4) the N-stem; (5) the 2fs suffix pronoun *kī*; (6) the infinitive *daʿt* ‘to know’; (7) the imperative *likū* ‘go!’. Kogan (2015, 240f., 601), however, finds little evidence, if any, for a Northwest Semitic speech community as a historical reality. If such a community existed, it must have been “a very short-lived and amorphous one,” since they might not have shared grammatical or lexical innovations that would justify the supposition of a Northwest Semitic genealogical unity (Kogan 2015, 240, 600f.). Kogan concludes that the subdivision of Northwest Semitic (within Central Semitic), comprising Canaanite and Aramaic, is hard to maintain; and thus also Blau (2010, 22): “Perhaps there existed no period in which the speakers of the languages that we call Northwest Semitic lived together.”

⁴⁴ Thus also, in the main, Sivan (1997, 99, 103; 2001, 96–102), who follows the scheme of Rainey (1996, II:221–64). Some Ugaritologists regard the past tense use of *yqtl* in the poetic corpus to be a usage of the imperfective *yaqtulu*; for this view, see especially Greenstein (1988, 13; 2006), who has been followed by Bordreuil and Pardee (2009, 46). They see in the use of past *yqtl* in poetry a “free variation with the /YQTLu/ forms,” and Greenstein (1988, 17) extends this scepticism to Canaanite in general: “It may well be that in earlier Canaanite, in dif-

ferent stages and/or dialects, prefixed verb forms indicated both narrated past and present-future;” but cf. the critique by Smith (1991, 66f.), and Bloch (2009, 39 n. 20); see also Greenstein’s (2006, 81) step back on this point. Against this view, Huehnergard refers to the counter-evidence by Hackett (2012). It is clear that Greenstein (2006) managed to show that *yaqtulu* is extensively used as a historical present in the epic poetry. His corpus is this poetry (Baal, Aqhat, Kirta), but his claim concerning the Ugaritic language at large that it has no *yaqtul* preterite is unproven and remains unconvincing. Greenstein’s (2006, 81) view of linguistic change seems to be one of a sudden innovation and substitution of verbal forms (a view criticised also by Hackett 2012, 112): “Nevertheless, one does not expect to find an extensive use of *yaqtul* preterite in Ugaritic, or in any other Semitic language, in which suffixed *qatala* regularly expresses past (or completed) action.” But Greenstein (2006, 81) also adds, “[t]he development of the *qatala* as past tense (or perfect) eventually supplants that function of the *yaqtul* form,” thus it is a step-by-step process. The period of Greenstein’s “eventually” may represent more than a thousand years. In the meantime, there were two competing forms with past time reference (*yaqtul* and *qatal*), as can be seen in Amarna and CBH. Greenstein’s most important contribution in his 2006 article is a clarification of the lack of certainty about the identification of many past perfective *yaqtul* in Ugaritic epic (Hackett 2012, 111). But he has not shown that there is no ‘*yaqtul* preterite’ in Ugaritic at all (Renz, 2016, 440; Andrason and Vita 2017; also Gzella 2018, 23 n. 7).

⁴⁵ Tropper (1998, 162). The short form was pronounced *wa-ya‘ni* (Huehnergard 2012, 57). The corresponding ‘long’ imperfective *yaqtulu* would have been written *y‘ny.

⁴⁶ The form *td‘* (3mp, perhaps **tada‘ū*) is distinctive, since the subject is the plural *šmm* (Tropper 2012, 634, 701).

⁴⁷ Non-negated jussive *yaqtul* is more frequently attested in the third person than in the second person. In the letter corpus, the imperative is practically always used instead of the second-person *yaqtul*. The second-person *yaqtul* is used in connection with a vocative, after the affirmative

particle *l*, and after an imperative in a modal sequence (Tropper 2012, 722, 810).

⁴⁸ Huehnergard (2012, 56): /ʔilūma taḡḡurū-kā tvšallimū-kā/.

⁴⁹ This usage is not disputed (Hackett 2012, 112).

⁵⁰ As for verbs IIwy, Tropper (2012, 643f.) alleges a short vowel in the endingless forms—as Gzella (2011a, 443) also suggests—but unfortunately the orthography is not distinctive on this point, which Gzella (2011a, 444) admits: “The situation in Ugaritic and other epigraphic languages is unknown.” Thus *tud* (KTU³ 2.26:19, √wd): Tropper *taʾud* < **taʾūd* (2ms); *yʾn* (KTU³ 1.3:I:23, etc., √yn): Tropper *yaʾin* < **yaʾin* (3ms). It is possible, even probable, that verbs IIIwy exhibited a secondary shortening of the endingless forms, as is attested in Akkadian (*ibni* < **ibniy*), Hebrew (*yigel* < **yigl* < **yigli* < **yigliy*), and Arabic (*yarmi* < **yarmiy*), but this cannot be substantiated in the Ugaritic orthography (Tropper 2012, 656).

⁵¹ It is disputed whether there were two homographic particles *l* in Ugaritic (*la* and *lū*), or only one (thus Tropper 2012, 810). Huehnergard (2012, 78) supposes only one “asseverative or topicalizing particle” *l*, which he transcribes *la* (with question mark).

⁵² This is a misprint for KTU³ *ḥtt* (*ḥittata*); the same misprint for *ḥittata* is found in example (35) (KTU³ 1.14.iv.10); the word is *ḥittatu* ‘wheat’.

⁵³ KTU³ 1.14.iv.12: m[ḡ]d ‘food’.

⁵⁴ Huehnergard (1991, 285f., 291): “By about 1400 we may also isolate a sub-group we will call Canaanite, which has likewise separated itself from the rest of Northwest Semitic.” Proto-Canaanite shared a number of linguistic innovations that distinguished Canaanite from the rest of Central Semitic (and also from the rest of Northwest Semitic): (1) the D and C stem suffix conjugation forms **qittila* and **hiqtila* (thus in at least one Amarna dialect but not in Ugaritic) in contrast to Proto-Northwest Semitic **qattila* and **haqtila*; (2) 1cs pronoun ʾ*anōkī* (dissimilation from **anōkū*), and the concomitant change of 1cs suffix conjugation ending **tū* > -*tī*; (3) generalisation of the 1cp suffix to -*nū* in all positions (levelling).

⁵⁵ On the methodological problems of drawing comparative linguistic data from the texts in the Amarna letters, see Baranowski (2016b, 2–3).

⁵⁶ Knudtzon (1915, 543) translates this as jussive: “daß sie verbrennen die Länder [mi]t Feuer.”

⁵⁷ There is no evidence of the West Semitic *wa* in the Amarna letters, which must have been the form of the conjunction in the native language of the scribes (Rainey 1996, III:97). The conjunction is practically always written as the Akkadian *û*. The conjunction *u* is not necessary before a realis *yaqtul*, which shows “daß die Progreßmarkierung durch die Konjunktion *û* und nicht durch die verbale Kategorie selbst bezeichnet wird” (Tropper 1998, 163).

⁵⁸ Baranowski (2016a, 139), translates: ‘Şumur is now raided up to its city gate. **They have been able** to raid it, but **they have not been able** to capture it.’

⁵⁹ Baranowski (2016a, 161), translates: ‘Send me a large archer host so that it may drive out the king’s enemies from his land and so that all lands **be joined** to the king.’

⁶⁰ This is also noted by Rainey (2007, 77) with an example from EA 245:16–18.

⁶¹ The translation follows EA, but *ia-dî-na* is third person: ‘so that he will give me’.

⁶² As for verbs IIwy, it is not possible to discern whether the perfective *yaqtul* has a short vowel or a long one: *ti-din* (EA 73:4) and *ti-di-in₄* (EA 108:4); cf. Baranowski (2016a, 74). In verbs IIIwy, the final root vowel seems to be preserved: *ia-aq-bi* (EA 83:34) and *yi-iq-bi* (EA 85:32), as against the imperfective *yi-iq-bu* (EA 129:84; Rainey 1996 II:245).

⁶³ Baranowski (2016b, 10) translates ‘and (it was) Zurata (who) took Lab’ayu’, which seems to assume a cleft sentence.

⁶⁴ See also Amadasi Guzzo (1997, 318). As for the verbal system, Röllig (2011, 474, 477) states that Biblical Hebrew “bore a close resemblance to the language spoken in Tyre,” and in spite of the highly official style of the inscriptions and the limited text corpus, he thinks it is possible to

distinguish two prefix conjugations, corresponding to the short Proto-Semitic *yaqtul* and the Central Semitic long *yaqtulu*. Greenstein (1988, 14) denies any trace of a “preterite in Phoenician.”

⁶⁵ The 2fs long *yqtl* form is not attested.

⁶⁶ Friedrich and Röllig (1999, §§135a, 264); Krahmalkov (2001, 183); Gzella (2012a, 66); Chatonnet (2020, 312); *pace* Segert (1976, §64.522). Hackett (2008, 96) adduces *yaqtul* jussive *tntn* /tantinī/ ‘may you (fs) give!’ (KAI 50:3), in contrast to *yaqtulu yqšn* ‘they (mp) will cut off’ (KAI⁵ 14:22, root *qsy*). However, this reading of a distinctively short fs jussive *tntn*, though supported in Hoftijzer and Jongeling (1995, 479), is no longer maintained in KAI⁵ 50:3, which reads *tntw*.

⁶⁷ Friedrich and Röllig (1999, §177a) give some examples of a ‘Kurz-imperfekt’ that should be morphologically distinctive in verbs IIIw of the type 3ms **yābni* > **yabni* > *yabn* in old Byblian. This is shown by the example *yḥ* = *yāḥū* < **yaḥw* in the name *yḥmlk* ‘Milk has shown himself living’ (KAI⁵ 4:1, Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §§174bis, 264); the corresponding long form should have been written *yḥw* = *yaḥwī*. The *ygl* in KAI⁵ 1:2 should accordingly be read *yagl* (but this is disputed; see Smith 1991, 18). Unfortunately, there are no corresponding distinctive long forms (such as *yḥw*) in the Byblian inscriptional material.

⁶⁸ Segert (1976, §§64.444, 77.63) calls the *w-yqtl* a “consecutive imperfect following a perfect” and translates both *qtl* and *w-yqtl* with present tense: “and if a king... goes up (perf.) against Byblos and uncovers (consecutive imperfect, cf. 64.444) this sarcophagus.” But Friedrich and Röllig (1999, 229) call it “wohl Kurzimpf.”

⁶⁹ Num. 5.27 *וְאִם-בְּכֶלֶךְ בְּרָגַל וְתִמְעַל מַעַל בְּאִשָּׁהּ* ‘if she has defiled herself and behaved unfaithfully toward her husband’; Num. 35.16 *וְאִם-בְּכֶלֶךְ בְּרָגַל וְיָמָת* ‘But if he has struck him down with an iron object, and he died’; Num. 35.17 *וְאִם בְּאֶבֶן יָד אֲשֶׁר-יָמוּת בָּהּ הִכָּהוּ וְיָמָת* ‘And if he struck him down with a stone tool that could cause death, and he died’. Gzella (2009, 64 n. 5) adduces “eine paar wenige Belege” for the construction (Num. 5.27; Job 9.16), and calls the *w-yqtl* forms “einfache ‘w-Imperfekta’ (*imperfecta copulativa*), die erst sekundär als *imperfecta consecutiva*

vokalisiert worden sind, nachdem der eigentliche Gebrauch dieser Form längst in Vergessenheit geraten war?” Referring to Gibson (1982, 15–16), Gzella (2009, 65 n. 5) expresses scepticism “an der tiberischen Lesung.” As can be seen, the examples are not so few as Gzella asserts and his doubts about the textual tradition appear unfounded.

⁷⁰ Instead of this simple solution, Gzella (2009, 65f.), interprets *ʿly gbl* as a background clause and *wygl* as ‘Langimperfekt’ (against Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §177a), and translates: ‘if someone, having conquered (*ʿly*) Byblos, uncovers (*wygl*) this sarcophagus: the sceptre of his kingship may wither away’ (same in Gzella 2013b, 179).

⁷¹ “[B]oth these verbal forms are projected into the future” (Segert 1976, §64.444). Bron (1973–79, 608) concludes concerning this passage: “Là non plus, on ne peut guère parler purement et simplement de temps converti.” He is right.

⁷² “Das (Kurz-)Imperfekt mit Waw consecutivum, das der Erzählung vergangener Tatsachen im Hebräischen ein charakteristischen Gepräge gibt, kommt in den phönizischen und punischen Texten, wenn überhaupt, dann nur selten vor” (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §266). Similarly Amadasi Guzzo (1997, 321). According to Smith (1991, 18), “Phoenician generally replaced the converted imperfect with the infinitive.”

⁷³ This text is dated to 800 BCE based on the palaeography. The reading accords with the interpretation of Dupont-Sommer (1972, 292–94). In an earlier publication (Amadasi Guzzo and Karageorghis 1977, III D 21:1, pp. 149–55), the reading of the first line is “]kr mlš ‘r z p̄lb wypḡ/d̄[‘š]trt w‘ [” and the translation is “En souvenir. Voici un pétrissage de genévrier et un gâteau; et (l’) a offert[. . . Š] TRT et [.”

⁷⁴ Krahmalkov (2001, 7, 11, 13, 180) maintains that some *wyqtl* examples “express past perfective action” and adduces three Phoenician texts to prove this. The first text is an inscription from Cyprus (ninth century BCE) and I presume Krahmalkov has line 3 in view, which exhibits the verbal clause ויאבד (KAI⁵ 30:3). This verb is interpreted by Donner and Röllig (1971–76 II, 48) as a *yifil* imperfective ‘and he destroys’, but by Friedrich and Röllig (1999, §146) as possibly jussive, “sie mögen

zugrunderichten.” Krahmalkov takes the verb as past perfective short *yaqtul*. The text is extremely fragmented and the context does not confirm that a narration is intended. Krahmalkov’s second example is from Sakkāra (sixth century BCE), a letter with many imperatives. Nothing invites an interpretation of a prefix verb as past tense. There is a \emptyset -*yqtl* form *יפעלך שלם* ‘May they give you peace!’ (KAI⁵ 50:3). In the same text, there is a possible (jussive) *wyqtl* clause, *ותנתו לי משקל*, ‘and you must give me the weight’ (KAI⁵ 50:3–4). But *ויתת* (KAI⁵ 50:5) must be interpreted as a suffix conjugation 1cs **yatattī* < **yatantī* ‘I gave’ (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §§155, 158; Donner and Röllig 1971–76 II, 67). Krahmalkov’s third example is CIS I 5510. In this case, the context is narrative or reportive and the only *w-yqtl* clause is *w-ylk* on line 9: *וילך רבם אדנבעל בן גרסכן הרב וחמלכת בן חנא הרב עלש* ‘Et venerunt rabim Adoniba’al filius Gersaconis, ó rab,¹⁰ et Himilco filius Hannonis, ó rab isti...’ (text and translation CIS I 5510, 9–10); ‘**And** the *rbm* Adnibaal son of Gescon the *rb* and Himilco son of Hanno the *rb* **went to** (*H*)*alaisa*’ (English translation Schmitz 1994, 11, my emphasis). This interpretation of *wylk* is adduced also by Février (1971, 193) and Korchin (2008, 339 n. 23), but the other narrative forms in the passage, before and after *ylk*, are past time *wqtl* (suffix conjugation: *wtnt*, *wtmk*, *wšt*), so it is reasonable to expect *wylk* to be a form of the suffix conjugation (*yif’l*) as well, and that the suffix conjugation was conjugated as the root *ylk* (thus Garbini 1967, 10; Bron 1973–79, 609; Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §§158, 163). Since the root is *hlk*, we would expect a 3mp suffix form to be *hlk*, but cf. the 3ms suffix form *ytn* ‘he gave’ in KAI⁵ 24:8. Friedrich and Röllig (1999, §§158, 163) regard **hlk* in Phoenician as forming the suffix conjugation from a root **ylk*. Krahmalkov (2001, 11, 187), however, vocalises *weyelekū* (‘they proceeded’) and regards it as a sentence-initial past perfective *yqtl*. In sum, the example from the historiographic text CIS I 5510 seems to be Krahmalkov’s prime example of a past perfective *wyqtl* clause; all the others are jussives or imperfectives. This is not enough to prove the existence of a past perfective *wyqtl* in a separate Punic dialect, even if it “showed divergences from standard Tyro-Sidonian” (Krahmalkov 2001, 10). According to many scholars, there is no evidence in

Phoenician or Punic that a *w-yqtl* was used as a realis past perfective clause-type in narrative (Schmitz 1994, 11). Olmo Lete (1986, 44) says that “un imperfecto narrativo... no se comprueba en fenicio,” and perhaps the cautious position of Friedrich and Röllig (1999) is the most reasonable to adopt in the present state of research.

⁷⁵ Thus also Segert (1976, §64.533); Kienast (2001, 266). Krahmalkov and Segert quote the example from Berthier and Charlier (1952–55, 32:3). The example *lypṭḥ* from KAI³ 27:22–24 (Arslan Taş, seventh century BCE) quoted by Segert (1976, §57.4, with hesitation; see also KAI³ II:42) is dubious and should probably be read *lpṭhy* (thus KAI⁵). Segert (1976, §§64.533, 57.4) seems to identify the “desiderative particle” *l* with *lū*.

⁷⁶ The only longer text is the Mēša‘ inscription (KAI⁵ 181), of which 34 lines are preserved.

⁷⁷ It is quite possible that we are “dealing with a dialect continuum rather than with three ‘national languages’” (Hasselbach 2013a; also Parker 2002, 44). All three appear to be closely similar to the Standard Hebrew we know from the Bible. There are some attested dialectal isoglosses that separate the Trans-Jordanian languages from CBH, but these differences do not seem to concern the usage of the verb forms.

⁷⁸ One is from Ḥorvat ‘Uzza, dated to the beginning of the sixth century, and the other from Tell el-Kheleifeh, dated to the seventh or sixth century (Ahituv 2008, 351–56).

⁷⁹ The most interesting verb form in the corpus is *w-hbrktk* ‘Now I have blessed you’ (clause-type *wa-qatal*), an example of an epistolary blessing formula (Ahituv 2008, 351f.).

⁸⁰ Lemaire (2004, 368) dates it to about 810 BCE. An up-to-date collection of all Moabite texts is found in Ahituv (2008, 387–431; cf. Fassberg 2013a).

⁸¹ For the syntax, see Schüle (2000, 164–72).

⁸² It is obvious that the vertical strokes mark off meaningful small sections in the text. They “indicate the end of a syntactic and/or semantic unit” (Niccacci 1994, 234); *pace* Andersen (1966, 88), who calls this

“parallelism,” and Segert (1961, 235) who proposes, “dass diese Satz-trenner die Ausbildung von zu grossen Sätzen verhüten sollten.”

⁸³ The Mēša‘ inscription, with its first-person narrative clauses, is not a genuine narrative, in which we would expect a third-person account of the events and an absent narrator. The genre is close to Phoenician and Old Aramaic ‘dedicatory inscriptions’, in which five elements are usually found: (1) object dedicated (line 3, ‘I have made this high place for Kemosh in Qerihoh’), (2) name of official dedicating, (3) position of official, (4) patronym, (5) deity to whom the object is dedicated, ‘dedicatory inscription’. It has also an element that belongs to the genre of ‘memorial’: “[m]ajor events, especially military victories, and building projects” (Drinkard 1989, 135, 140).

⁸⁴ Thus also Schniedewind in the Accordance translation (Schniedewind and Abegg 2005–2007).

⁸⁵ Muraoka (2001, 391). Other graphically short perfective forms in the Mēša‘ inscription are: *w-ʾr* (l. 7), *w-ʾbn* (l. 9 twice), *w-ʾś* (l. 9), *w-ybn* (l. 10). A special problem concerns verbs IIIw which seem to retain the third radical in the short prefix form (Donner and Röllig 1971–76, II:172): *w-yʾnw* ‘he oppressed’ (l. 5), and the first-person jussive *ʾnw* ‘I want to oppress’, which means that Moabite has retained the distinction between verbs IIIw and IIIy, a difference that is not upheld in Phoenician (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §175a). Segert (1961, 214, 227), instead, without convincing arguments, reads the -w as -ū.

⁸⁶ The *qatal* can also be translated with the English perfect: ‘But Israel has been utterly destroyed for ever:...’.

⁸⁷ But Segert (1961, 223): “Imperfectum consecutivum 33mal.”

⁸⁸ Also semantically evident but morphologically inconclusive is the Ammonite *ygl wyśmḥ bywmt rbm wbśnt rhqt* (KAI⁵ 308:6–8), with clear jussive meaning and syntax (verb in clause-initial position)—‘May he rejoice and be happy for many days and in years far off’—reminiscent of CBH (Ahituv 2008, 363; cf. Jackson 1983, 36).

⁸⁹ Features of Proto-Aramaic that constitute innovations shared by all Aramaic dialects are (Huehnergard 1991, 289): (1) change of *ḥ to *r* in

the words for ‘son’, ‘daughter’, and ‘two’; (2) levelling of the 1cp ending **-nā* in all environments (as against the Proto-Canaanite levelling to **-nū*); (3) a new Ct-stem **hittaqtal*; (4) loss of the N-stem. Later Aramaic shared innovations are (Huehnergard 1991, 288): the 3fp form *yīqtālān* (also 2fp *tiqtālān*), the feminine noun plural ending in *-ān*, the G-stem infinitive *miqtal*, and the definite article **-aʾ*.

⁹⁰ There was most probably a regional diversity already in Old Aramaic. I follow Fales (2011, 555, 558; see also Folmer 2012, 130; Gzella 2015, 53) concerning the chronology of Old Aramaic down to the beginning of the Assyrian imperial system of provinces in the last half of the eighth century BCE. An overview of the diversity in early Aramaic is found in Gzella (2015, ch. 2; 2017). Two Aramaic texts from a transition period between Old and Imperial Aramaic are the Nērab inscriptions (KAI⁵ 225–26) from about 700 BCE (seven kilometres south-east of Aleppo). For an analysis of these texts and a discussion of the transition from Old to Imperial Aramaic, see Yun (2006, 40).

⁹¹ Bron (1973–79, 607) quotes Cohen (1976) and maintains concerning this verbal usage that “il s’agit d’inaccompli convertis. D’après D. Cohen, l’accompli converti serait une forme plus récente.” This is an unfortunate conclusion, since the past verbal usage of *yaqtul* is a retention from PS. There is no necessity of a conversion.

⁹² Degen (1969, 114) identifies this *w-yqtl* as a ‘Kurzipf.’ in the function of the ‘Erzählform’, always at the beginning of the clause. The dominant opinion about the *w-yqtl* forms in the Zakkūr inscription, before the appearance of the Tel Dan inscription, was that they represented very special cases, solemn expressions, Canaanite dialectal influence, or a deviant Aramic dialect. For an overview of the previous scholarly opinions, see Degen (1969, 114f. n. 21). Degen’s conclusion in his footnote is: “Es gibt m.E. keine schwerwiegenden Gründe gegen die Annahme, daß die *wayiqtol*-Konstruktionen auch im Aa. geläufig war. Die bisher geringe Zahl an Belegen ist bloß durch die Text-Gattung der uns bekannten Denkmäler bestimmt; in weiteren erzählenden Texten können jederzeit neue Belege auftreten.” Emerton (1994, 258) evaluates the *wyqtl* examples in the Zakkūr text in the light of the Tel Dan and

Deir ‘Allā inscriptions, and concludes that “the presence of *waw* consecutive with the imperfect does not tell against its identification with a form of Aramaic.”

⁹³ For example, Segert (1975a, §§5.6.4.1.6; 6.6.3.3.2): “Man darf in diesem »imperfectum consecutivum« einen Hebraismus bzw. Kanaanismus sehen.”

⁹⁴ Thus Lipiński (1994, 87); Kottsieper (1999, 55f.); Gzella (2004, 322); Renz (2016, 631f.). For a discussion of dating, see Fales (2011, 558f.), who follows Athas (2003). Lemaire’s (2004, 369) dating is the second half of the ninth century BCE. For a survey of research on the Tel Dan inscription, see Hagelia (2006).

⁹⁵ Gzella (2015, 81) admits that this is “a consensus view,” although he argues against it.

⁹⁶ The alternative interpretations—for example, as a circumstantial *Ø-yqtlu* like in Arabic or a purpose clause or “consecutive imperfects” (thus Athas 2003, 202, 205, 213; 2006, 251, but he analyses *yhk* as jussive: 2003, 207)—are all less convincing (see Muraoka 1995a, 20 n. 4; 2001, 389).

⁹⁷ This interpretation rests on an identification of the clausal boundaries, which cannot be established with certainty because of the damaged text. In Rainey’s (2003a, 405) interpretation, the two *yaqtul* without preceding *waw* are clause-initial ([...]’by *ysq* ‘[...] my father, went up’; *wyškb* ’by ‘and my father passed away, he went ...’). Lipiński (1994, 89) restores the text before *yhk* and arrives at ‘[he went] out agai[nst] my father, so as to go up [to]’, which means that *ysq* is analysed as clause-initial, introducing a purpose clause.

⁹⁸ The asyndesis in *wyškb* ’by ***yhk*** is certainly noticeable. If the two clauses are both main line, we would expect syndesis in both. The reason could be that the ‘(and) **went** to [his ancestors]’ is an elaboration, being a more explicit expression of the same event. Tropper (1996, 641) argues that the lack of *wa* before *yhk* must mean that there is no temporal succession between the two events, and that one of the possibilities is that the two clauses are paratactically connected, “wobei *yhk*

logisch gleichbedeutend ist mit (w)yskb.” Hagelia (2006, 154) suggests that *yhk* could be “an epexegetic explanation” (thus close to an elaboration). The other possibility for Tropper (1996, 641) is that *yhk* is a subordinate clause expressing “eine Begleit- oder Folgehandlung zu wyskb.” Muraoka (1995a, 20) is decidedly for an interpretation of both *yhk* and *ysq* as “preterit prefix conjugations,” and thus also Halpern (1994, 64), Müller (1995), and Kottsieper (1998, 61). In all these interpretations, the *yhk* is supposed to be the old perfective *yaqtul*. Lipiński (1994, 91; see also Gzella 2004, 323 n. 65) has argued in favour of a ‘long’ imperfective (*yaqtulu*) interpretation of *yhk* (also of *ysq*): “It is an imperfect that expresses the finality or the consequence of the action signified by the preceding verb, without the use of any coordinating conjunction” (but cf. J-M §116h-i and Ps. 13.6).

⁹⁹ It is quite possible that this inscription—as well as the Samalian (KA1⁵ 214–15; cf. Gianto 2008, 12)—should not be classified as Aramaic, since it does not contain enough of the features that are commonly regarded as constitutive of the Aramaic language group. Huehnergard (1995, 281f.) suggests the term ‘Proto-Aramaoid’ (without being happy with it), and this is a type of classification that Kogan (2015, 600) arrives at in his conclusions: the ‘Aramaoid’ branch of Central Semitic comprises, according to him, the three groups Deir ‘Allā, Samalian, and Aramaic. Lemaire (1991, 49; 2004, 371) classifies it as “araméen archaïque” (also Pardee 1991, 105). For the purpose of the present book, it is not of decisive importance whether to classify the Deir ‘Allā text as Aramaoid or Aramaic or even Canaanite. Huehnergard and Pat-El (2019, 5), whom I as a rule follow, classify Deir ‘Allā as Canaanite of the Aramaeo-Canaanite branch of Northwest Semitic. However, the proposal that the past narrative usage of *yaqtul* might be a southern (or southwestern) early Aramaic dialectal feature cannot be easily dismissed (Tropper 1993a, 404f.; Schniedewind 1996; Kottsieper 1998, 73; Rainey 2007, 81). Rainey (2007, 81) speaks of “Transjordanian languages,” among which he includes the language(s) of the Zakkūr, Tel Dan, and Deir ‘Allā inscriptions as well as Moabite and Biblical Hebrew; and Kaufman (2002, 303) regrets the rigidity of the classification models and says,

“[t]he language of Deir ‘Alla is what it is; it is what it should be, something in between Hebrew, Aramaic, and Ammonite. What it is not is an example of linguistic interference.” The position of Rainey and Kaufman is close to the opinion of Parker (2002, 46), who prefers to name the language after the geographical location of Deir ‘Allā: “It is not a priori necessary that the Deir ‘Allā plaster texts should have been written in any other than the local dialect... we should be content simply to classify them as written in a Deir ‘Allā dialect.” But the problem with only a geographical designation is the giving up of a genetic classification.

¹⁰⁰ The dating of the Deir ‘Allā inscription is based on ¹⁴C samplings and concerns the physical painting on the wall, which means that the (probably papyrus) original text may be from an earlier date (Fales 2011, 559, who refers to Lemaire 1991, 45). The inscription was initially classified as Aramaic (thus the *editio princeps*: Hoftijzer and Kooij 1976, 183), but later on, many scholars, with Hackett (1984), have argued that the language is South-Canaanite with an Ammonite type of script. Against this, Lipiński (1994, 109) maintains that the script “is typologically Aramaic, with no peculiar features that might be termed ‘Ammonite’.” Folmer (2012, 131), on the other hand, argues that the inscription is “difficult to classify as Aramaic at all.” Gzella (2013a) expresses extreme scepticism as to the Aramaic nature of the inscription and puts forward the suggestion that it constitutes “the transformation and expansion of a Canaanite original by speakers of Aramaic.” Moreover, in Gzella (2017, 23), he suggests “that the text goes back to a local, and perhaps oral, tradition in a Trans-Jordanian language that was then recorded in a basically Aramaic grammatical code or literally translated into Aramaic after the shift from a Canaanite to an Aramaic literary culture as a result of political developments.”

¹⁰¹ Thus Lipiński (1994, 105f.). Lemaire (1991, 44; 2004, 371) maintains that the plaster writing was copied from an older scroll (quoting Millard 1978, 25). The arguments of Lemaire and Millard are based on palaeographic data, and these data are confirmed by the linguistic arguments of McCarter and Pardee, who maintain that the language of

the Deir 'Allā inscription, with its numerous Northwest Semitic retentions, is “typologically a very archaic form of Aramaic” (Pardee 1991, 105), and “much older than the particular copy of the text that was made at Deir 'Alla” (McCarter 1991, 95, who is hesitant as to the purely Aramaic affiliation). Schniedewind (1996, 82) writes concerning the *yqtl* preterites: “this new evidence suggests that in the earliest period a *yaqtul* preterite survived in southern Aramaic dialects.” And he argues that “[i]t is no longer possible to posit a sharp break between Canaanite and Aramaic until a later period.” According to Rainey (2007, 81), “we now have enough evidence (three inscriptions) in Southern Old Aramaic to show that the prefix preterite narrative sequences were common to that dialect just as in Hebrew and Moabite.” The natural conclusion is that the *w-yqtl* sequences in narrative represented a survival from Proto-Northwest Semitic (McCarter 1991, 93, referring to Garr 1985, 186). McCarter's (1991, 93) conclusion is that ‘consecutive imperfect’ is not an appropriate term from a comparative Semitic perspective. More appropriate is Pardee's (1991, 101) term “*w + yaqtul* preterite... [a] proto-Northwest Semitic retention attested in both Canaanite and Aramaic.”

¹⁰² Pardee (1991, 101f.) on the ‘*w + yaqtul* preterite’: “it remains indisputable that this feature is present in one Old Aramaic inscription, the Zakkur inscription (KAI⁵ 202), and this fact makes the appearance of the feature in another dialect of Aramaic plausible” (see also Emerton 1994). The attested cases are: Combination I: *wy'tw* (line 1), *wy'mrw* (line 2), *wyqm* (line 3), *wy'l* (line 4), and *wy'mr* (line 4–5). A probable additional instance is *wy[]h bl'm brb'r* ‘and [they said to] him: Balaam, son of Beor’ (line 4 in the text by Hackett 1984, 25, which differs somewhat from Ahituv 2008, 435). Lipiński (1994, 162, 166) counts as many as “seven or eight” instances and describes them as “the ancient Semitic preterit *yiqtul/iprus*.”

¹⁰³ Huehnergard (1991, 289) maintains that the words *brB'r* ‘son of Beor’ belong to the name and therefore the construction (with the typical Aramaic word *bar* ‘son’) “is external to the dialect in which the text was written.” For this reason, he reckons that the word *br* ‘son’ is unattested

in the dialect and that the text therefore lacks any typical Aramaic feature. For the opposite view, see McCarter (1991, 89). In this connection, it should be observed that the name in the corresponding Biblical narrative (Num. 22–24) is given as *Bil‘ām ben-Bə‘ōr* (Num. 22.5), with the Hebrew word for ‘son’ (Pardee 1991, 103 n. 7).

¹⁰⁴ There is no certain example of a distinctively short realis *yaqtul* (Garr 1985, 138).

¹⁰⁵ A jussive with the prefix *l* is attested in Mesopotamian Old Aramaic (Folmer 2012, 146), for example, Tell Fekheriyeh *lhynqn* ‘may they suckle’, but this is probably an Akkadianism (Fales 2011, 568; against him, Garr 1985, 118f.).

¹⁰⁶ According to Gzella (2004, 272), the syntagm *’al yaqtul* is a retention from Proto-Semitic.

¹⁰⁷ The imperfective form *w-yhkn* depends on the conditional particle *hn* in line 4, and is part of a complex protasis construction.

¹⁰⁸ These examples are from the Tell Fekheriyeh inscription (KAI⁵ 309) with optative particle *l* before *yaqtul* (the example is adduced by Folmer 2012, 146). As for Imperial Aramaic, Muraoka and Porten (2003, 129f.) suppose that there was a shortening of the jussive in verbs *Ilw*: *Ilw táqom* and *Ily táśim*. Concerning the accent in Aramaic, Beyer (1984, 142) proposes that from the tenth century there was a shift to stress on the final syllable of endingless forms of the long prefix conjugation, as against stress on the initial syllable in the short *yaqtul* forms: thus KAI⁵ 309 has in line 11 a jussive short *yaqtul* /láśem/ ‘er setze!’, but in line 12 a long imperfective /yaśím/ ‘er setzt’. According to Beyer, this difference in stress prevailed in Aramaic until the seventh century BCE. Segert (1975a, §6.6.6.3.1) suggests that it is “nicht ausgeschlossen” that a verb *Ilw* with defective spelling, as in Dan. 4.11 𐤀𐤏𐤍 ‘let her (the animals) flee’, reveals a distinctive spelling of the short jussive; however, as the reduced prefix vowel shows, the accent lies on the stem in the Masoretic text. There are some seeming counterexamples in the Aḥiqar proverbs, such as [ʿl] ʾnpy m[l]k ʾl tqwm ‘Before the king you should not stand up!’ (TAD1 A1.1:85), possibly because of “occasional failure of

the author (or redactor) of the Proverbs of Ahiqar to keep the indicative and jussive apart” (Muraoka and Porten 2003, 130).

¹⁰⁹ Segert (1975a, §§5.6.5.2.3, 5.7.8.3.1) says instead that $y = \bar{i} < *iy$ in the jussive; and $h = \bar{e} < *ay$ in the long form, as in Dan. 6.8 *ybnh = yibnē < *yibnay*.

¹¹⁰ There are very few examples of this distinction in Biblical Aramaic: Dan. 5.10 אַל־יִפְתָּן וְאַל־יִשָּׁתֵּן ‘and do not let your face be so pale!’ (Rosenthal 1995, §152).

¹¹¹ יִסַּךְ . אֲבִי . בָּרְחָדָד [ב]־[ה]־[ד] ‘Barhadad my father went up’ (KAI⁵ 310:2) might be a counter-example, but it is difficult to determine the beginning of the clause.

¹¹² This is also the case in Imperial Aramaic (Muraoka and Porten 2003, 104, 322; Rosenthal 1995, §108).

¹¹³ Muraoka and Porten (2003, 199) give the following distinctive example (3mp short form and not initial): אֱלֹהִים כָּל יִשְׁאָלוּ שְׁלָמֶיךָ בְּכָל עֵדן ‘May all gods seek after your welfare at all times!’ (TAD1, p. 40: A3.7, 1).

¹¹⁴ The distinction was upheld in Egyptian Aramaic and Biblical Aramaic, and in some inscriptions from the fifth century BCE, but, since most of the paradigmatic forms were identical, the morphological distinction was lost in later Aramaic dialects (Bauer and Leander 1927, §30n; Segert 1975a, §§5.6.5.2.3, 5.7.8.4.4).

¹¹⁵ ‘Energicus’ is the usual designation of this morpheme in Semitic linguistics, but *n* in Aramaic seems unlikely to possess such a connotation (Degen 1969, 80).

¹¹⁶ For a discussion of the concept of Archaic Biblical Hebrew, see Patel and Wilson-Wright (2013); Gianto (2016). My intention is to give a contrasting survey of *yiqtol*(\emptyset) in the archaic texts on points that are of interest in relation to its use in CBH. I follow mainly the results presented in Notarius (2013; 2015), and my examples will be taken from the poems that are most archaic: the Song of Moses (Deut. 32), the Song of Deborah (Judg. 5), the Song of the Sea (Exod. 15.1–18), and the epic

poetry in the Song of David (2 Sam. 22/Ps. 18. 5–20, 33–46); cf. Notarius (2013, 296; 2015, 238).

¹¹⁷ The initial distinctively short *yiqṭol(Ø)!* of the copula verb (יְהִי) is problematic and possibly diachronically innovative, with a semantic merging between volitive and non-volitive (thus Notarius 2013, 205, 299f. and §§13.1.10, 13.3.2). According to Joosten (2012, 187), it is jussive; according to Tropper (1998, 174), future. Westermann (1982, 267) designates יְהִי “eine Jussivform mit indikativer Bedeutung... keinesfalls kann es den Spruch als einen Wunsch bestimmen oder als futurisch.”

¹¹⁸ According to Joosten (2012, 187), the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* continues a relative participle. Notarius (2013, 197): “The whole passage is generally held to have habitual semantics and there is no way to interpret v. 17b as a retrospective report.” The *wa(y)-yiqṭol* “comes in clear syntactic and semantic connection to the preceding circumstantial participial phrase” (Notarius 2013, 197); it is “a sequential form that does not have any past tense reference” (Notarius 2013, 197). It “rather represents a generalizing sentence” (Notarius 2013, 60, 195). Examples of generalising present-time *wa(y)-yiqṭol* are sometimes found in texts that are usually regarded as CBH, and often in linkings with a preceding *qoṭel*-clause. Some such cases are:

1 Sam. 2.6 (Ø-*qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol!*)—thus Ges-K (§111u); Gross (1976, 111); J-M (§118r); Notarius (2010a, 260), who calls this “generic;” Joosten (2012, 187). This passage is commonly regarded as archaic, but, considering the use of *qoṭel* in predicative position and the following general present *wa(y)-yiqṭol* “used in the same syntactic slot as the participle with *waw*... namely without any past-time reference,” the syntax is probably late; *qoṭel* and *yiqṭol(u)* are interchangeable with *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (Notarius 2013, 256 n. 15, 259).

1 Kgs 19.14 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*).

Isa. 3.16 (Ø-CONJ-*qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*)—according to J-M (§118p), “After a stative *qatal* with a present meaning.” See also Driver (1892, 40 §36); Gross (1976, 126).

Isa. 24.6 (\emptyset -ADV-S.noun-*qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*)—according to Watts (2007a), present: “Therefore a curse devours the land, and inhabitants in her are held guilty;” *pace* Wildberger (1978, 912), who considers it anterior: “mußten es büßen, die auf ihr wohnten.”

The Book of Amos has several passages with a *qotel* and following gnomic *wa(y)-yiqtol*: 5.8 (Ges-K §111u; Gross 1976, 99; J-M §118r; Joosten 2012, 187); 6.3 (Hoftijzer 1985, 4; Notarius 2007, 266; Joosten 2012, 187); 9.5 (Ges-K §111u, Gross 1976, 102; J-M §118r; Joosten 2012, 187); 9.6 (Gross 1976, 89).

¹¹⁹ Bergsträsser (1918-29, II, §34h); Gross (1976, 144); Rainey (1986, 15); Waltke and O’Connor (1990, 498); Sáenz-Badillos (1993, 58); Tropper (1998, 170); Notarius (2007, 23; 2013, 280, 307; 2015, 239); Joosten (2012, 417).

¹²⁰ It is a special problem if this morphologically short *yiqtol* should be analysed as clause-initial, or not. It is preceded by two infinitive clauses, and infinitive construct morphemes are normally perceived as constituents in another verbal clause. But in forming a separate hemistich, the VN clauses have a more independent status, marked by the *atnāh*; it is possible they are to be interpreted as verbless clauses, in which case the *yiqtol*(\emptyset) form is clause-initial. This is indicated by \emptyset - before the form in the pattern. If the infinitives are analysed as constituents in the *yiqtol*(\emptyset) clause, the pattern for verse 8 is: \emptyset -PREP-VN-PREP-VN-*yiqtol*(\emptyset)!; in this case, the short *yiqtol* is one of very few past perfective *yiqtol*(\emptyset) that are clause-internal.

¹²¹ For this interpretation, see Isaksson (2017, 244 n. 25).

¹²² In this instance, the presence of ‘energetic’ suffixes indicates that the verbs are imperfectives (long *yiqtol*).

¹²³ This translation by Notarius is semantically attractive, but presupposes an emendation to a *hif’il* form. An interpretation that retains the text with its change of subject, e.g., ‘and he ate of the produce of the fields’ (NET), does not affect the presentation of the short *yiqtol*.

¹²⁴ All three are ‘preterites’ according to Rainey (1986, 16); Notarius (2015, 240).

¹²⁵ For a relative diachronic evaluation of the archaic poems, see Notarius (2013, 296f.).

¹²⁶ וַיְהִי is “consistent with classical usage,” and so are five more *wa(y)-yiqtol* in the Blessing of Moses (Notarius 2013, 240f.).

¹²⁷ Bybee and Dahl (1989, 74) give the example “*Morgen bin ich schon abgefahren*, ‘Tomorrow I will already have gone.’” See also Ges-K (§106n); J-M (§§112h, 118s). According to Notarius (2013, 88 n. 49), “the prophetic perfect and historical present are cognate pragmatic phenomena, but opposite semantic categories. The historical present is based on a metaphorical transmission of ST into the narrative past, while the events are simultaneous with this metaphorically transmitted ST. The prophetic perfect demands that ST be metaphorically transmitted into the future, while the events occurred before this metaphorically transmitted ST.” Cf. Cook (2012a, 216).

¹²⁸ The temporal interpretation of the passage is disputed. See the discussion of alternatives in Notarius (2013, 87–89).

¹²⁹ On this point, I slightly disagree with Notarius (2013, 87), though she is open to an anterior interpretation in n. 42 (“anteriority/simple past”).

¹³⁰ Notarius (2013, 225 n. 43), against tradition, interprets מָתָהוּ as referring to ‘the death of righteous ones’. Other examples of clause-initial jussive *yiqtol*(Ø) in affirmative clauses: Gen. 49.8b; 49.26; Exod. 15.9; Num. 24.7; Deut. 32.1 (Ø-IMP + *wa-yiqtol*(Ø)-A + *wa-yiqtol*, probably not purposive, *pace* Notarius 2013, 101); 32.2; 32.38; 33.6 (Ø-*yiqtol*(Ø)! + *wa-ʾal-yiqtol*(Ø)! + *wa-yiqtol*!); 33.10 (Ø-*yiqtol*(Ø) + Ø-*yiqtol*(Ø), jussives; Notarius 2013, 248); 33.24; Judg. 5.21b (Ø-*yiqtol*(Ø), archaic second-person jussive; Notarius 2013, 140, 147, 292; Ges-K §118m).

¹³¹ The verb form וַיִּשָּׂא is regarded as a (distinctive) short *yiqtol* by most scholars. See further Finley (1981, 246); Waltke and O’Connor (1990, 558); Tropper (1998, 170); Notarius (2013, 78, 240, 286; 2015, 240).

¹³² Another example is Gen. 49.4 (Ø-VN-ʾ*al-yiqtol*(Ø)! + *ki-qatal* + ʾ*āz-qatal*), where VN is adverbial (Notarius 2013, 191: ‘Unstable as water’).

¹³³ According to Notarius (2013, 293f.), “volitive forms are commonly non-initial in the clause.” Examples: Judg. 5.2 (*bə-VN-bə-VN-IMP*); 5.3b (*Ø-S.pron-PrP-S.pron-yiqtol(Ø)-A + Ø-yiqtol(Ø)*; Notarius 2013, 140, 145f. n. 86, 292); 5.9 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-VOC-IMP*); 5.10 (*Ø-VOC-VOC-VOC-IMP*); Ps. 18.50 (*Ø-ADV-yiqtol(Ø) + wa-PrP-yiqtol(Ø)-A*); but 2 Sam. 22.50 (*Ø-ADV-yiqtol(Ø) + wa-PrP-yiqtol(Ø)*)—pace Notarius (2013, 153, 169), who analyses the two prefix forms as “present progressive for immediate future use,” in spite of the ventive/cohortative clitic (with *-ā*) in Ps. 18.50.

¹³⁴ Notarius’ (2013) translations generally conform to the NRSV, and this is the case here.

¹³⁵ Gibson (1994, §129) writes: “Consequence may be expressed by simple *Vav* with jussive.” See also J-M (§§116e, 169b). Other *wa-yiqtol* clauses expressing various shades of purpose or consequence in archaic poetry: Deut. 32.1 (*Ø-IMP + wa-yiqtol(Ø)-A + wa-yiqtol(Ø)*), possibly with purpose meaning; Notarius 2013, 101); 32.38 (*Ø-yiqtol(Ø) + wa-yiqtol(Ø) + Ø-yiqtol(Ø)!*); 32.41 (*Ø-ʾim-qatal + wa-yiqtol(Ø)*), jussive with future purposive force; Notarius 2013, 293).

¹³⁶ It is to be regretted that Notarius uses imprecise terminology on this point. She employs the term “conditional mood” (Notarius 2013, 220), disregarding the fact that the syntaxes of protasis and apodosis are different and must be held distinct from one another, since they constitute separate domains (see §1.2.4).

¹³⁷ I use the imprecise term ‘sentence’ (with hesitation) when it is obvious that it involves several clauses. The term ‘conditional clause’ referring to the linking of protasis and apodosis (thus Notarius 2013, 99, 116) is not appropriate, since the term clause should be confined to a syntagm with one predication.

¹³⁸ Notarius (2008, 83) says this is a jussive used in “conditional or rather subjunctive mood.” Her translation (Notarius 2013, 220) is neither conditional nor subjunctive: ‘The one who will rule out of Jacob will destroy the survivors of Ar’.

¹³⁹ Unfortunately, Ges-K (§§109h–k) makes no attempt to classify the examples diachronically. The adduced passages are (in order):

- (1) Ps. 45.11–12 has the pattern ¹¹Ø-IMP + *wa*-IMP + *wa*-IMP + ¹²*wa-yiqtol*(Ø)! + *ki*-XØ + *wa*-IMP. The *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) clause expresses a logical consequence or purpose after the IMP clauses in verse 11. The *wa-yiqtol*(Ø) concludes the first hemistich in verse 12, and there then follows a *ki*-clause, so this cannot be a protasis. NET takes the *wa-yiqtol* as a volitive consequence: ‘Listen, O princess! Observe and pay attention! Forget your homeland and your family! **Then** the king **will be attracted** by your beauty. After all, he is your master! Submit to him!’. Kraus (1978, 486) takes יִתְּנָהּ as a *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* clause, ‘Und er begehre deine Schönheit’.
- (2) Ps. 104.20 is as dubious as Ps. 45.12. The pattern Ø-*yiqtol*(Ø)! + *wa-yiqtol*(Ø)! represents a late usage of the short prefix form to express a general present, in the same way as in Gen. 49.17 (Notarius 2013, 197, 205f., 299f.; thus also Westermann 1982, 267), a stage with a semantic merging between volitive and non-volitive moods of the prefix conjugation, in such a way that clause-initial forms are represented as morphologically short and non-initial forms are written long.
- (3) Exod. 22.4; see §3.4.2, example (103).
- (4) Lev. 15.24 has the pattern (*wa*-^{’im}-VNabs-*yiqtol*(*u*) + *wa-yiqtol*(Ø)!) + *wa-qatal*, where the protasis is set within parentheses. It is introduced by a ^{’im}... *yiqtol*(*u*) construction and the internal *wa-yiqtol*(Ø)! constitutes a result clause *within* the protasis. This is a possibility that Milgrom (1991, 940) is open to, but Driver (1892, §172) argues that in this case an infinitive *lihyōt* ‘might be substituted for the jussive,’ which semantically means a consequence clause within the protasis. Milgrom (1991, 941) falsely concludes that, since ‘MT’s *ūtēti* rather indicates a consequence,’ it must belong with the apodosis. If the *wa-yiqtol*(Ø)! in Lev. 15.24 belongs to the protasis, it is certainly not a good example of a short *yiqtol*(Ø) expressing a condition.

- (5) Isa. 41.28 (with preceding verse) shows the pattern ²⁷ \emptyset -ADV-PrP-*wa-PrP-O.noun-yiqtol(u)* + ²⁸*wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)!* + *wa-X\emptyset* + *wa-X\emptyset* + *wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)* + *wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)*, and the distinctively short *wa-yiqtol* (וַיִּקְטֹל) is best interpreted as a purpose clause, as are also the two concluding *wa-yiqtol* in the verse (וַיִּשְׁבּוּ דְבָרַי: וַיִּשְׁאַלְם וַיִּקְטֹל), as Elliger (1978, 171) translates: “daß ich sie fragte und sie Antwort gäben.” My translation: ²⁷‘I first sent a message to Zion, and a herald to Jerusalem, ²⁸ **to look**, but there was no one, among them there was no one who could serve as an adviser, so that I might ask questions and they give me answers’; the introductory *wə-’ēre* is never interpreted as a condition, but sometimes, without support in the text, as a temporal clause, as in Watts (2007b, 645), ‘When I looked, there was no one’. Elliger (1978, 175f.), on the other hand, emends the text, deleting the initial *wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)!* clause.
- (6) Ezek. 14.7 is LBH and the pattern is conditional linking: (*kī-S.noun-REL-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)!* + *wa-O.noun-yiqtol(u)!* + *wa-qatal*) + \emptyset -S.pron-yiqtol(u)!. The short *wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)!* (*wə-ya’al*) is an internal part of the complex protasis, but does not initiate the protasis. It has the same meaning as the preceding *wa-yiqtol(u)* and shows that the writer’s linguistic competence did not correctly perceive the difference between short and long *yiqtol*.
- (7) Job 34.29 is late, probably from the Persian period (Horst 1974, xii). The verse is constructed by two conditional linkings, in which the first protasis has the structure *wa-S.pron-yiqtol(u)!*, and the second protasis, apparently parallel, has the pattern *wa-yiqtol(\emptyset)!* In this stage of the language, the semantic distinction between the two prefix forms has been lost. What remains of the old distinction is that clause-initial forms are short and, in non-clause-initial position, long forms are used (Joosten 2015, 33f.).
- (8) 2 Kgs 6.27: this is not CBH proper, and belongs to a linguistic state later than the Pentateuch. The adduced form is not morphologically distinctive, but the classification as short *yiqtol(\emptyset)* is seemingly se-

cured by the preceding negation (אֵין לֹא יִשְׁעֶךָ יְהוָה). Ges-K (§109h) interprets the utterance erroneously as a negative protasis, possibly presupposing an emendation to אֵין לֹא (thus also HALOT). But, according to HALOT, the particle *’al* may also be an emphatic negation ‘no!’, which yields the plausible translation ‘No, let the LORD help you!’ (thus NET, NRSV). If the text is emended (אֵין לֹא יִשְׁעֶךָ יְהוָה), the verb must be interpreted as *yiqtol(u)* and is no longer a proof of a *yiqtol(Ø)* starting a protasis.

¹⁴⁰ On this point, it reflects the usage of the equivalent form in Ugaritic poetry: “Ugaritic *y’n*, for example, means ‘he replied’, whether preceded by *w*, *wy’n* ‘and he replied’, or used alone” (Fenton 1973, 32).

¹⁴¹ There are few, if any, traces in the Hebrew inscriptions of the so-called *nun paragomicum*, which in other Northwest Semitic languages may distinguish a long imperfective form *yaqtulūn* (3mp, similarly 2fs and 2mp) from a short perfective (usually jussive) *yaqtulū*. A possible but unclear example of *nun paragomicum* is Kuntillet ‘Aḡrūd 15:2 ¹]wbzrh . l . br[²]wysn hrm[¹] and when God shone forth ... [²] and the mountains melted’, where *wysn* is seemingly a *nif’al wa(y)-yiqtol* clause with *nun paragomicum*, a combination that occurs now and then also in CBH (Deut. 1.22; 4.11; 5.23; Judg. 8.1; 11.18; see also Amos 6.3). This example from the early eighth century is quoted from Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 287); cf. Renz and Röllig (1995–2003, I:59 n. 3)

¹⁴² Pace Gogel’s (1998, 95 n. 51) estimation of the IIwy *hif’il* jussive form, *y’r* ‘may he cause to shine’ (root *’wr*), which he puts on a par with the morphologically distinctive ‘short’ IIIwy forms that will be quoted below (*yhy*, *y’r*, *ykl*). It does not help that Gogel quotes parallel uses of *y’r* in BH. He is right that the *y’r* in Ketef Hinnom 2:8 is a jussive, but it must be stated emphatically that *y’r* is not morphologically distinctive. It is also strange that Gogel (1998, 95) calls *ykl* a “jussive” in *wykl* ‘and he finished’ (Mešad Ḥashavyahu 1:5). For a critique of Gogel’s morpho-syntactic analyses, see Rainey (2001).

¹⁴³ The text of the Hebrew inscriptions in this section follows Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005 = HI).

¹⁴⁴ The example יהוה ישאל לשלמך (Arad 18:2), which Gogel (1998, 288) translates as jussive, is probably an expression of assurance with long *yiqtol*: ‘YHWH will concern himself with your well-being’.

¹⁴⁵ I follow HI’s (14) interpretation of the 2ms *hif’il* והסבת as ‘hand over’, but I prefer not to translate it with an imperative.

¹⁴⁶ This example is datable to the late seventh/second half of the seventh century BCE (Gogel 1998, 24). My translation follows in the main that of HI (p. 359).

¹⁴⁷ This hypothesis is attractive because of the frequency of the verb in BH. See, for the scholarly discussion, Renz and Röllig (1995, I:325 n. 1), Gogel (1998, 95 n. 52), and Schade (2006, 272).

¹⁴⁸ The translation is Gogel’s (1998, 92). The context is פני-יקרה את ה 17 ‘lest something happens to the ¹⁷ city’.

¹⁴⁹ The translation is Gogel’s (1998, 92). The (rather fragmentary) context is: ארר-אשר-ימחה ‘Cursed be the one who effaces...’.

¹⁵⁰ The context is fragmentary and we do not know what precedes the verb: 3 ימנה שערם 3 [---], but it is reasonable to translate as an obligation ‘he shall count out three (seah-measures) of barley’.

¹⁵¹ Thus convincingly Schüle (2000, 173f.), HI (360f.), and Aḥituv (2008, 161).

¹⁵² The syntagm ואסם is commonly analysed as a *wa-qatal* clause with the same meaning as the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses. Renz and Röllig (1995, I:325 n. 2) suggest instead that it serves “zur Kennzeichnung der Umstände der mit Impf. consec. bezeichneten Haupthandlung,” but prefer to interpret ואסם as “Inf. absol. als Fortführung der beiden vorangehenden Impf. consec.” The syntagm ואסם could theoretically also be analysed as a 1cs *wa(y)-yiqtol* form with weak pronunciation of the first root consonant (J-M §§73a, g), if a switch to first person would be acceptable in this type of context (cf. Schade 2006, 272). However, at the time of this ‘letter’ (the genre is disputed by Dobbs-Allsopp 1994), we may expect *wa-qatal* to regain the temporal value of a *qatal* in some positions, for example after a *qatal* clause, as can be seen in Isa. 40.12

(*qāṭal* + *wa-O.noun-qāṭal* + *wa-qāṭal* + *wa-qāṭal*), which is an example of transitional Hebrew syntax (Hornkohl 2016a).

¹⁵³ This loss of final short vowels occurred both in Canaanite and in Aramaic (Hasselbach and Huehnergard 2008, 412, 414; Baranowski 2016b, 11).

¹⁵⁴ An early résumé of the main arguments for a separate origin of the *yiqṭol* part in *wa(y)-yiqṭol* as opposed to the long *yiqṭol* is found in Finley (1981, 242). The dropping of final vowels is Blau's stage iii. According to Blau (2010, 150f.), long and short prefix forms were first distinguished by stress, short form **yíqṭol*, long form *yiqṭól* < **yiqṭólu*. Later, stress shifted to the ultima also in the short prefix form, *yiqṭól*, so that the two converged in most paradigmatic positions.

¹⁵⁵ Hans Bauer was the first to argue that *yaqtul* was the more ancient form; see Cook (2012a, 102). Contra my false position in Isaksson (1986), Bauer's arguments for the priority of *yaqtul* (the "Kurz-Aorist") were weak, but his position was correct.

¹⁵⁶ On this point, I follow Brockelmann (1908–13, I, §260g); see also Huehnergard and Pat-El (2019, 7). Bauer and Leander (1922, 297c) propose 3fp **yaqtulā* and 2fp **tVqtVlā*.

¹⁵⁷ The prefix *t-* developed by analogy with the singular feminine form.

¹⁵⁸ The *lā yaqtul* clause-type is attested at Amarna, but is not found in Biblical Hebrew, not even in the archaic language. In Biblical Hebrew, **lō yiqṭol(Ø)* has been replaced by *lō qāṭal*.

¹⁵⁹ Bauer and Leander (1922, 300o); Voigt (1987, 8); Garr (1998, xlviiif.); Hasselbach and Huehnergard (2008, 416); Kummerow (2008, 76); Bloch (2009, 41 n. 31); Blau (2010, 152, 205); Gzella (2011a, 442; 2013c, 859; 2018, 27); Kogan (2015, 162f.). Sjors (2023, 114 n. 51) also concludes that paragogic *nun* may reflect the imperfective morpheme **-nV*, since "[t]he 'function of paragogic *nun* of the imperfective has proven difficult to determine.'" There are also some rare cases where the *nun paragogicum* is added to a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* syntagm (Deut. 1.22; 4.11 twice; 5.23; Judg. 8.1; 11.18; Isa. 41.5; Ezek. 44.8; Amos 6.3), or to a *qāṭal* form (Deut. 8.3; 8.16).

¹⁶⁰ The problem with this hypothesis (an imperfective built on the old *yaqtul*) is that “there is no attested grammaticalization path between the resultative-perfect-perfective path with which **yaqtul* is associated (based on its *iprus* Akkadian reflex) and the progressive-imperfective path with which **yaqtulu* is usually associated” (Cook 2012a, 220). The alternative that offers itself is to recognise the apparent morphological affinity between the infinitive, the imperative, the short *yiqtol*, and the long *yiqtol*, and to consider the infinitive to have been an original building block of both short and long *yiqtol* (and the imperative). As for the long *yiqtol*, its origin is then “fully in keeping with a common lexical source of progressives: locative constructions involving infinitives” (Cook 2012a, 220, 263 n. 98, referencing Bybee et al. 1994, 128; Heine and Kuteva 2002, 202).

¹⁶¹ I follow Bauer and Leander (1922, 231b, 388i), who regard this shortening of the long stem vowel in closed syllables to be Proto-Semitic, but this is not certain. The shortening seems to be supported, however, by the data in Central Semitic.

¹⁶² The free-standing indicative short *yiqtol* is attested in the archaic poetry (see §3.2).

¹⁶³ Blau (2010, 151) instead regards the stress pattern in מִקְטֹל as a retention of the general penultimate stress of the short prefix form in stage iii.

¹⁶⁴ The latter form in Proto-Hebrew according to Blau (2010, 196).

¹⁶⁵ Other examples of ‘long’ *yiqtol*(Ø) forms in the Pentateuch and Judges: Gen. 19.17 (2ms irrealis, unusual plene writing); 27.31 (3ms irrealis, defective writing); Exod. 2.7 (3fs irrealis purpose, defective); 19.4 (1cs realis, defective); Lev. 20.23 (1cs realis, defective); 20.26 (1cs realis, defective); Judg. 6.18 (Ø-ʾal-nā-*yiqtol*(Ø) ‘long’, 2ms irrealis, defective).

¹⁶⁶ Third radicals w/y were preserved in Proto-Semitic. They were elided in the individual Semitic languages (Blau 2010, 249).

¹⁶⁷ It seems that the shortening of the *yaqtul* forms of verbs IIIwy was a development after the Proto-Semitic stage, and for this class of verbs

the term ‘apocopation’ is appropriate. Historically, it is a false conclusion to regard this as an apocopation of the *yiqṭol(u)* form. The *yiqṭol(u)* form is not involved at all. The shortening concerns the expected result of the original endings *aw*, *ay*, *iw*, *iy*, *uw*, *uy* in the short *yiqṭol*. In some lexical cases, the root may also have been biradical (Blau 2010, 249, 251).

¹⁶⁸ For the short *yiqṭol* with the ventive/cohortative clitic *-ā*, see §1.2.2 and §3.4.2.3.

¹⁶⁹ According to J-M (§79m n. 2), “In the OT there are altogether 1,300 properly apocopated forms of Lamed-He verbs as against 110 non-apocopated ones, of which only three occur in the Pentateuch, all 1 sg. (see Stipp 1987). The non-apocopated 56 cases of 1sg. may be interpreted as cohortative in form.” See also Ges-K (§49e); Stipp (1987); Tropper (1998, 164f.).

¹⁷⁰ Ges-K (§75t); Gross (1976, 41: “wohl... koordinierter Injunktiv”); Stipp (1987, 138); Waltke and O’Connor (1990, 566); J-M (§79m, and p. 376, n. 1); Diehl (2007, 36). Robar (2014, 80) regards it as a long *yiqṭol* with jussive meaning. I prefer the reading as purpose clause, as in Westermann (1976, 107, 167): “daß das Trockene sichtbar werde.”

¹⁷¹ Tropper (1998, 165) suggests that this is due to a slackening of awareness of the distinction between the short and long prefix form and that “das Wissen um die unterschiedliche Herkunft und Funktion von PK^L und PK^K im Laufe der hebr. Sprachgeschichte offenbar bereits früh im Schwinden begriffen war.” The data given by Stipp concern primarily indicative, not jussive, long *wa(y)-yiqṭol* forms. The other instances of indicative *yiqṭol* (mostly *wa(y)-yiqṭol*) forms in the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges are: Gen. 24.48 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, long 1cs); Deut. 1.16 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol*, long 1cs); Josh. 9.24 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, long 1cp); 10.40 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* (long) + *Ø-lō-qatal*, 3ms); 19.50 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* (long) + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, 3ms); Judg. 2.1 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* (long) + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (long), 1cs)—this is a disputed past perfective without proclitic *wa*, thus Tropper (1998, 16), but Joosten (1999, 24; 2012, 117), regards it as *yiqṭol(u)*, and J-M (§113g) alleges

“Durative action,” while, according to Bloch (2009, 46 n. 49), it is a scribal mistake due to the following ‘long’ form *wā-’ābī*; 12.3 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* (long), 1cs); 19.2 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* (long) + *wa(y)-yiqtol*, 3fs).

¹⁷² For realis, I also use the term indicative.

¹⁷³ Joosten (2012, 184) translates: ‘whose flesh is half consumed when it comes out of its mother’s womb’.

¹⁷⁴ Ges-K (§111u) describes this as a present action.

¹⁷⁵ Of the six attested examples of *nif^{al} wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses of this root in the Hebrew Bible, three are part of a narrative chain and have stative past reference (‘was/were left over’: Gen. 32.25; Josh. 18.2; Judg. 9.5), but three are in direct speech report and best interpreted as stative presents: Gen. 44.20; 1 Kgs 19.10; 19.14 (De Vries 2003, 232, 233, 236). Only one additional example of a stative *wa(y)-yiqtol* with present meaning is found in my corpus: Deut. 22.16, best interpreted as a stative verb with present meaning, as in Christensen (2002, 513) ‘and he hates her’. Outside my corpus, there are only a few cases in probable CBH texts: 1 Sam. 2.29 (Ges-K §111r; J-M §118q; Waltke and O’Connor 1990, §33.3.3c); 14.28 (Driver 1913, 114); 2 Sam. 1.27, in poetry, translated by Anderson (1989, 11) as ‘How are the warriors fallen! Lost are the weapons of war!’.

¹⁷⁶ It must be admitted that *יָבֵשׁ* is ambiguous and can be an adjective. This does not affect the analysis of the following *wa(y)-yiqtol*.

¹⁷⁷ Wenham (1994, 197) translates, ‘When Isaac was old and his eyesight was too poor for him to see’. Westermann (1981, 525) translates, ‘und seine Augen erloschen waren’. Other examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses with stative verbs and past reference: Gen. 2.25; 6.6, 11 (Joosten 2012, 168); 25.28, 34; 27.1 (Wenham 1994, 197); 29.18; 34.7; 35.16 (Joosten 2012, 169 n. 24); 39.2; 46.12; Exod. 20.11; 38.24; Num. 3.17; 11.26 (within a series of *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses: ‘and the spirit rested upon them’; Budd 1984, 123); Judg. 3.11, 30; 4.21—the accents support Sasson (2014, 251, 269), that PP and the first *wa(y)-yiqtol* belong together in the description of a state; 5.31; 8.28; 18.31; 19.2; 20.46.

¹⁷⁸ For the ventive meaning of this paragogic *heh*, see Sjörs (2023, ch. 6).

¹⁷⁹ I am aware that the particle *kī* can be interpreted as a general deictic subordinator ‘that’, as in Brockelmann’s (1956, §159a) translation: ‘und es geschah, daß wir in das Nachtquartier kamen’. This does not alter the interpretation of the last *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause.

¹⁸⁰ LXX translates with aorist and *νῦν*. Westermann (1982, 125) translates with present tense, ‘Dies bringen wir hiermit zurück’. Wenham (1994, 414) translates, ‘so we have brought it with us’.

¹⁸¹ According to Milgrom (2000, 1762), “Whereas holiness is God’s *nature* and is apprehensible solely from his selfrevelation, separation is the result of his *act*.”

¹⁸² Other examples of anterior *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause(s) after anterior *qāṭal* clause(s): Gen. 19.9 (Gross 1976, 125; Joosten 2012, 191; Bergström 2014, 127); 19.19 (Bergström 2014, 127); 24.35 (Joosten 2012, 182; Bergström 2014, 128); 27.36; 27.36; 30.6; 32.5b–6 (Joosten 2012, 185); 32.29; 32.31; 33.10 (Westermann 1981, 636, but close to stative present); 45.8; Exod. 1.18 (Joosten 2012, 180, 182); 3.8a (preceded by both present anterior *qāṭal* and present stative *qāṭal*); 31.3; 32.8; 35.31 (*rəʾū Ø-qāṭal* + ³¹*wa(y)-yiqṭol*); Num. 14.24a; 23.4; Judg. 6.13c; 10.10b (Butler 2009, 253); 16.10 (Boling 1975a, 246; Joosten 2012, 182).

¹⁸³ Thus Milgrom (1991, 381, 432). Other examples of a more general anterior expressed by *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses: Gen. 30.27; Num. 11.20; Deut. 4.33 (with ‘double-duty’, elliptic, interrogative particle; Joosten 2012, 191 n. 70).

¹⁸⁴ I disagree with Moshavi (2010, 113), who assumes that the two *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses that follow *וַיְהִי לָקֵחָהּ* do not share its pluperfect meaning. Other *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses with pluperfect meaning: Gen. 26.18 (within a relative clause: «*REL-qāṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*»; Ges-K §111q); 28.6, 7 (both Ges-K §111q); 31.19 (Ges-K §111q); 39.13 (Wenham 1994, 371); Exod. 2.11 ‘Moses had grown up’; 12.35; Num. 14.36 (within a complex relative sentence; Ges-K §111q); 21.26; 26.19; Judg.

1.16; 3.26; 4.11 (*nīṣrād* is a *nif'al* participle, so this pluperfect *wa(y)-yiqtol* does not succeed a pluperfect *qatal*); 18.22 (part of background).

¹⁸⁵ Other examples of perfective *wa(y)-yiqtol* with a meaning that includes iterative action or extends over a period of time: Gen. 30.30 (extended period); 30.39 (iterative; Joosten 2012, 174); 31.40 (iterative; Joosten 2012, 182); 33.3 (iterative; Joosten 2012, 174f.); 35.3 (*DEF-qotel* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*, habitual past in discourse; Joosten 2012, 185); 37.2 (iterative and part of background; Joosten 2012, 174, 178); 50.3 (parade example of extended period); Exod. 16.21 (iterative; Joosten 2012, 174); Num. 14.22 (iterative; Joosten 2012, 185); Deut. 2.12—iterative, with an unusual switch from past habitual *yiqtol(u)* to perfective *wa(y)-yiqtol*: in this case, Joosten (1999, 24) regards *yiqtol(u)* *yīrāšūm* as “anomalous;” Judg. 4.5 (with a switch from *qotel* to perfective and implicitly iterative *wa(y)-yiqtol*; Joosten 2012, 174); 6.4 (with a switch from habitual *wa-qatal* to perfective *wa(y)-yiqtol* and back to habitual *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*; Joosten 2012, 177); 9.25, iterative (Joosten 2012, 174); 16.16.

¹⁸⁶ Realis uses of ‘waw-less’ *yiqtol(Ø)* verbs are attested in the Archaic Hebrew poetry; see §3.2. Unfortunately, Tropper (1998, 169f.) does not distinguish diachronic layers in BH. His examples of “PK^K (allein)” are mostly archaic poetry (Exod. 15.5; Judg. 5.26; Ps. 18.4–20; Deut. 32) or other poetic texts that are usually notoriously difficult to evaluate diachronically (Ps. 47; 68; 90; 107; Job). His analysis of the long form *ʾaʿālē* in Judg. 2.1 as narrative *yiqtol(Ø)* is possible, but difficult to prove (Gzella 2021, 75, 81), though it might involve a ventive clitic. And *yaʿāšē* in 1 Kgs 7.8 is probably a relative clause with *yiqtol(u)*. His example from Isa. 12.1 might be CBH, but the adduced short forms (יָשַׁב and יִתְנַחֵם) are jussives (Wildberger 1972, 477: ‘so wende sich dein Zorn, daß du mich tröstest’; Watts 2007a, 218: ‘May your anger turn that you may comfort me’). Finally, Tropper’s Isa. 42.6; Hos. 6.1; 11.4; and Dan. 8.12 do not represent CBH syntax (for Hosea, see Notarius 2007, 201–211). The examples of waw-less *yiqtol(Ø)* forms with past meaning mentioned by Bloch (2009) are either archaic poetry or late texts with an archaizing style (Isa. 41.1–5; Ps. 44).

¹⁸⁷ This example is mentioned as jussive in Ges-K (§§53n, 109h); Bauer and Leander (1922, 333z); Bergsträsser (1918–1929 II, §19i*). According to Tropper (1998, 174), short prefix conjugation forms in a protasis should be interpreted as indicative (not jussive). His examples are from Akkadian and Arabic. The only Hebrew example he adduces is quoted from Ges-K (§109h), Ps. 104.20a, and he admits that J-M (§167a) has another interpretation of the two jussives ('Make darkness and let the night come'). Driver (1892, §171) regards the form in Exod. 22.4 as a problematic jussive. There are lots of examples of morphologically distinctive initial *kī-yiqṭol(u)!* in protases in CBH, but no *kī-yiqṭol(Ø)!*: Exod. 12.48; 21.14; 21.20; 21.33; 23.05; Lev. 1.2; 2.1; 2.4; 11.39; 12.2; 13.16; 13.31; 15.25; 19.33; 25.25; 25.35; 25.39; 25.47; 27.2; Num. 5.12; 6.2; 6.9; 9.10; 9.14; 19.14; 27.8; Deut. 4.25; 13.2; 19.16; 21.22. Similarly, there is no *'im-yiqṭol(Ø)!* in CBH. Examples of distinctively long *'im-yiqṭol(u)!* introducing a protasis in CBH: Gen. 4.7 (2 ×); Exod. 18.23; 21.11 (*wa-'im-O.noun-lō-yiqṭol(u)!*); 21.19; 21.23; 21.27; 40.37; Lev. 2.14; 4.32; 5.1; 5.7; 5.11; 13.7; 13.22; 13.27; 13.35; 13.53; 13.57; 14.44; 27.10; 27.16; 27.17; 27.18; 27.22; Num. 12.6; 20.19; 30.7; 30.9; 30.15; 36.4; Deut. 20.12; 30.4; 30.17; Judg. 11.10; 13.16. See also 1 Sam. 1.11; Amos 3.6.

¹⁸⁸ Codex Leningradensis reads *לֹא־יִשְׁׁרְרָא*, but most other MT MSS read the expected *לֹא־יִשְׁׁרְרָא* (Propp 1999, 307).

¹⁸⁹ Another possible example of asyndetic complement clauses, albeit in archaic poetry, is Deut. 32:29 (*lū-qatal + Ø-yiqṭol(Ø) + Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)*): 'Would that they were wise, **that they understood** this, **that they would discern** their future!'.¹⁹⁰

¹⁹⁰ Other examples of syndetic irrealis *yiqṭol(Ø)* complement clauses: Gen. 41.34 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø) + wa-yiqṭol(Ø)!*) 'Let Pharaoh proceed to appoint' (NRS)—but Westermann (1982, 95) has only coordination with the same subject; Exod. 8.4 (*Ø-IMP + wa-yiqṭol(Ø)!*)—pace Qimron (1986–87, 152), who regards it a purpose clause; Lev. 10.17 (*Ø-IMP + wa-IMP + wa-yiqṭol(Ø)!*); 16.2 (*IMP + wa-'al-yiqṭol(Ø)*); Judg. 13.4 (*wa-'attā-IMP-nā' + wa-'al-yiqṭol(Ø) + wa-'al-yiqṭol(Ø)*); 14.15 (*Ø-IMP + wa-yiqṭol(Ø)!*; Stipp 1987, 137).

¹⁹¹ It is not easy to find first-person jussive forms without the clitic in CBH: Gen. 24.57 (\emptyset -*yiqtol*), 58; 30.32; 33.15; 38.16 (but possibly a long *yiqtol*; Joosten 2012, 319 n. 22); Exod. 15.9 ($3\times$, but archaic); Deut. 10.2; Judg. 16.20 ($2\times$).

¹⁹² Examples in the corpus of ‘full’ IIIwy forms that represent jussives with ‘hidden’ ventive/energetic morpheme: Gen. 1.26 (Sjörs 2019); 2.18; 6.7; 11.4 ($2\times$; Sjörs 2019, 14); 16.26 (*wa-yiqtol*-(\bar{a} = V) + *wa-yiqtol*-(L = V)); 18.21; 19.32 ($2\times$); 19.34; 24.14, 49; 26.3 (above); 27.9; 30.3 (ventive in the first-person form); 30.31 (above); 31.3; 35.3 ($2\times$); 37.10; 42.2; 43.8 (*wa-yiqtol*-(\bar{a} = V) + *wa-yiqtol*-(\bar{a} = V) + *wa-yiqtol*-(L = V)); 46.31; 47.19 ($2\times$); 50.5; Exod. 3.3; 4.18; 17.2; 32.10 ‘from you I will make <me> a great nation’; 32.13; Num. 11.15 וְאֶלְאֶרְאָה (Dallaire 2014, 116); 14.12; 16.21; 17.10; Deut. 3.25; 9.14; 12.30 (Joosten 2012, 146); Judg. 6.39 (Zewi 1999, 155); 11.37a (third-person passive with preposition *li*: לִי יַעֲשֶׂה); 11.37b; 18.9.

¹⁹³ This holds also for Old Aramaic, where the negation *’al* became a signal of a short *yaqtul* (Kottsieper 1999, 68 n. 57). Morphologically ‘short’ *yiqtol(u)* forms are rare in CBH: Gen. 24.8 וְלֹא יִשָּׁב (Ø-ADV-*O.noun-lō-yiqtol(u)* [short])—thus Ges-K (§109k), but Tropper (1998, 177) regards it a jussive with negation *lō*; and Deut. 7.16 וְלֹא תִהְיֶה (lō-*yiqtol(u)* [short])—a variant *yiqtol(u)* form, according to Bauer and Leander (1922, 399h); Bergsträsser (1929, 2, §28d).

¹⁹⁴ In Old Aramaic also, the loss of final vowels and the subsequent coalescence of most *yaqtul* and *yaqtulu* forms was the driving force behind the transformation of the verbal system (Kottsieper 1999, 73). But developments in Aramaic took another direction. Instead of a retention of the different prefix conjugations, as in CBH, the *qatal* morpheme took over completely as the narrative form, except in the most ancient inscriptions (see §3.1.11).

¹⁹⁵ Many scholars have concluded that “*yaqtulu* and *yaqtul* have merged in Hebrew to form a (nearly) common conjugation” (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 469; this seems to be the position also of the authors themselves). The problem with such a position is the impreciseness of the

term ‘Hebrew’. Waltke and O’Connor indicate that this merger occurred in Proto-Hebrew, not in the extant biblical texts. The position held in the present book is that the distinction is still upheld in Archaic Biblical Hebrew and CBH (the classical language corresponding to my corpus; see §1.2.3). The steps to a merger can be observed in LBH.

¹⁹⁶ For the cases of irregular word order in CBH, see §3.4.4.

¹⁹⁷ This tendency is found also in Old Aramaic (Kottsieper 1999, 68).

¹⁹⁸ For the (relatively late) history of this idea in Hebrew research, see Joosten (2011b, 213).

¹⁹⁹ Gzella (2012c, 101): “so word-order constraints to some extent restore the functional differentiation.” A similar position is taken by Gentry (1998, 12): “The earlier framework was preserved and problems occasioned by loss of final vowels were offset by reworking the system through sequencing and word order.” Some scholars consider the rule to concern all volitive forms, including the imperative (Joosten 2011a, 500 n. 30). I am at variance with many scholars who argue that *wə-yiqtol* is a long *yiqtol* (for example, Robar 2013, 33 n. 17) and that the significance of the *wə/wa* difference is one between a short *yiqtol* and long *yiqtol* (an alleged indicative *wə-yiqtol(u)* in CBH). Robar (2013, 40) also suggests that, at some point in the history of early Hebrew, *wa(y)-yiqtol* came to contain a long *yiqtol*.

²⁰⁰ This holds until a later diachronic stage when the distinction between short and long *yiqtol* was no longer part of the linguistic instinct of Hebrew speakers (Qimron 1986–87, 151; Smith 1991). None of Qimron’s purported realis (indicative) *wə-yiqtol* forms (with long *yiqtol*) are found in my corpus, and most are from texts commonly accepted as LBH.

²⁰¹ This view “has become part of scholarly consensus” (Notarius 2013, 17 n. 54).

²⁰² The other side of the coin is that a perfective *wa-qatal* did not replace narrative *wa(y)-yiqtol* for the expression of perfective continuity, as was the case in other Northwest Semitic languages like Aramaic. The realis

wa(y)-yiqtol clause-type was retained in CBH and became the only realis usage of *yiqtol*(\emptyset).

²⁰³ In the long run, this resulted in a reanalysis of the correct classical language and a new orthographic rule: a form of the (only existing) prefix conjugation is to be (written) shortened in clause-initial position, and long otherwise. In this way, the syntax of CBH was imitated in some LBH texts at the same time as a new linguistic instinct was incorporated in the written language (Joosten 2015, 33).

²⁰⁴ I have no explanation for the short prefix form in Gen. 24.8 (וַיִּשָּׁק), which should be interpreted semantically as a long *yiqtol*; for various solutions, see Ges-K (§109k); Tropper (1998, 177); Dallaire (2014, 134).

²⁰⁵ Thus Dallaire (2014, 99), who regards the negated jussive as describing “a specific command for a specific occasion.”

²⁰⁶ Other examples of clause-internal negated jussives in the corpus: Gen. 37.22 (*wa-O.noun-ʾal-yiqtol*(\emptyset)); 37.27 (*wa-S.noun-ʾal-yiqtol*(\emptyset)!; Joosten 2012, 316); 45.20 (*wa-S.noun-ʾal-yiqtol*(\emptyset)!); Exod. 8.25 (\emptyset -ADV-ʾal-yiqtol(\emptyset)); 16.19 (\emptyset -S.noun-ʾal-yiqtol(\emptyset)!); 23.7 (*wa-O.noun-ʾal-yiqtol*(\emptyset)); 36.6 (\emptyset -S.noun-ʾal-yiqtol(\emptyset)); Lev. 10.6 (\emptyset -O.noun-ʾal-yiqtol(\emptyset)); 10.9 (\emptyset -O.noun-ʾal-yiqtol(\emptyset)!); Num. 14.9 (\emptyset -ʾak-PrP-ʾal-yiqtol(\emptyset)); Judg. 13.14 (*wa-O.noun-ʾal-yiqtol*(\emptyset)!); 19.20 (\emptyset -ADV-PrP-ʾal-yiqtol(\emptyset)!). Some instances have the entreating particle *nā* attached to the negation, which causes the verb to occupy the third position in the clause: Gen. 13.8; 18.3 (apodosis); 18.30; 19.7; 47.29. Cf. also the Archaic Hebrew example Gen. 49.4 (Notarius 2013, 202).

²⁰⁷ An example is Gen. 30.34: הֲלוֹ יְהִי כְדִבְרְךָ: ‘Good! Let it be as you have said’ (ESV; Joosten 2012, 336). Pace Gentry (1998, 36), who regards the word order as problematic, and J-M (§163c), which says “וְיִ is doubtful.”

²⁰⁸ Other instances of *wa-‘attā* with jussive: Gen. 41.33; 47.4; 50.5 (with ‘hidden’ ventive morpheme); Num. 14.17.

²⁰⁹ Other examples of left dislocations before jussive clauses: Gen. 1.22; 43.14 (with *rəḥīʿ*)—Westermann (1982, 131) calls this a “Wunsch” and translates ‘Gott möge ihnen sein Erbarmen zuwenden’; Deut. 1.11—but

this is an uncertain case: see Nyberg (1972, §51j), who regards the *yōsēp̄* as a long *yiqtol*; 15.3 (the relative clause is a left dislocation; Steuernagel 1900, 55–56; Christensen 2001); Judg. 13.8 (first a polite vocative and then a left dislocation).

²¹⁰ Gen. 44.18 and Judg. 13.8 are the only examples of a vocative followed by jussive in the corpus. Outside the corpus, there is also, for example, 1 Kgs 17.21 and Ps. 40.18.

²¹¹ Other examples of *(wa)-[-]yiqtol(u)* clauses with an understood elliptic element extant in the preceding clause (the ellipsis is indicated by ‘[-]’): Gen. 15.15 (poetic ellipsis; Joosten 2005, 330; 2011a, 215, 217; 2012, 266, 315 n. 19, 429); Exod. 19.3 (Ø-ADV-*yiqtol(u)* + *wa-[-]yiqtol(u)!*)—according to Joosten (2005, 330; 2012, 309, 429), poetic ellipsis, and according to Blum (2008, 112), ellipsis, *pace* Gropp (1991, 48), who calls it *yiqtol(u)* without ellipsis, and Blau (2010, 194), who calls it jussive; 23.8 (poetic ellipsis; Joosten 2011a, 215, 217; 2012, 309, 429), *pace* Gropp (1991, 48 n. 9), and Diehl (2007, 40), who calls it futural ‘Leerlauffunktion’; 23.12 (ellipsis of *lāma‘an*; Joosten 2012, 429); 24.7—*pace* Waltke and O’Connor (1990, 653), who identify this as an instance of ‘epexegetical’ *waw*; and Joosten (2012, 311), who calls it one of “only two undoubted cases of non-volitive *w*³ + *YQTOL*,” 26.24 וְיִהְיֶה (obligation with ellipsis); Deut. 13.12 (with *nun* paragogicum)—Baden (2008, 153) takes it as a long *yiqtol* and result, not as ellipsis, *pace* Gropp (1991, 48); 16.19 (ellipsis of *S.noun*, *pace* Gropp 1991, 48); 17.13—according to Baden (2008, 153), long *yiqtol* as result, not ellipsis, and according to Joosten (2015, 31), a possible *wa-qatal*; 19.20—again, according to Baden (2008, 153), long *yiqtol* as result, not ellipsis, and according to Joosten (2015, 31), a possible *wa-qatal*; 21.21 (Baden 2008, 153)—according to Joosten (2015, 31), a possible *wa-qatal*; 30.13 (see the analysis of Deut. 30.12 above, *pace* Zewi 1999, 85); Judg. 6.5—the analysis depends on the interpretation of *kī*: I prefer to take *kī* as emphatic adverb, in which case Ø-*[hēm]-yiqtol(u)* (thus *kethiv*) is elliptic, but if *kī* is a temporal conjunction, it is not ellipsis, as in ZUR: ‘Wenn sie mit ihren Herden und Zelten heranzogen, kamen sie so zahlreich wie Heuschrecken’.

²¹² The four clauses in Deut. 30.13 may be interpreted in the same way: \emptyset -*mī-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(∅)* + *wa-[mī]-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(∅)-N*.

²¹³ Possible but uncertain examples in prose: Gen. 22.14 בָּהֶרַ יְהוָה יֵרָאֶה: (cf. ZUR ‘Auf dem Berg, wo der HERR sich sehen lässt’; thus also, with some hesitation, Ges-K §130d n. 2); Lev. 25.10.

²¹⁴ In prose, we find also Lev. 25.11, where the head noun is not in the construct state. Examples in archaic poetry: Gen. 49.27 (Notarius 2013, 198)—this example is not mentioned by Zewi (2020); Deut. 32.35 לָעַתָּה תִּמְוֹט רִגְלֶם (with distinctive morphology; Notarius 2013, 97; Isaksson 2017, 257; Zewi 2020, 96); 33.22 (Notarius 2013, 244); Ps. 18.3 (Notarius 2013, 168f.). Some other poetic examples: Ps. 12.6 יִפְיֶיךָ לוֹ; 61.3 יִעֲוֶי יוֹמָם; 91.5 יִעֲוֶי יוֹמָם.

²¹⁵ Sjörs (2023, 114) refers to the two third-person jussives with ventive clitic in the CBH text of Isa. 5.19: וְתִקְרַב [לְמַעַן נִרְאֶה] וְתִבְּרָא עֲצַת קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל [וְנִדְעָה]: ‘May his (sc. the Lord’s) work hurry up, may it hasten hither, so that we can see it. May the plan of Israel’s Holy approach, may it come hither, so that we may know (it)’. Stein (2016, 159 n. 11) sees no reason to question the third-person forms in CBH with paragogic *heh*, including Isa. 5.19.

²¹⁶ Most scholars analyse וְתִבְּרָא as jussive, in spite of the long form: Stipp (1987, 138); Waltke and O’Connor (1990, 566); J-M (376 n. 1); Diehl (2007, 36).

²¹⁷ Notarius (2010b, 414) has a morphological discussion of this long form of the cohortative without ending: “Two variants have been formed in the first person for the volitive—*ʾaqtūl* (with *malra*‘ accent after the fall of final vowel) and *ʾaqtūlāh* (with secondary lengthening of the final vowel)” (my translation). Sjörs (2023, 106) restricts the discussion to verbs IIIʔ, which recur relatively frequently in the examples (cf. Revell 1989, 13, 17f.).

²¹⁸ I leave out the many ‘long’ ventive forms of verbs IIIʔw, which are less controversial in the first person (see Sjörs 2023, 105f.); for example, Gen. 11.4 (וְנִבְנֶה and וְנִבְנֶשָׁה).

²¹⁹ Joosten (2012, 434) analyses this as a long *yiqṭol* in clause-initial position with volitive meaning.

²²⁰ Kuriakos (1973, 181) and Stipp (1987, 135f.) analyse this as a jussive with long form.

²²¹ Many of the examples are recognised as jussives with long form, for example by Kuriakos (1973, 181) and Stipp (1987, 135f.). I am aware that there are more examples, especially in LBH texts.

²²² The beneficiary is the daughter. Revell (1989, 18) expected a short form.

²²³ Other cases when *wā-yiqṭol(u)* is to be analysed as ellipsis in my corpus are: Exod. 19.3 (poetic ellipsis; Joosten 2005, 330; 2012, 309, 429)—but according to Blau (2010, 194), jussive 2ms; 23.8, 12 (ellipsis of *lāmaʿan*; Joosten 2012, 429); Deut. 16.19; 30.12 וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ; 30.13.

²²⁴ This is the ‘consecutive tense’ that the theory of ‘consecutive tenses’ forgot to recognise. The clause-type *wā-yiqṭol* disturbed the symmetry, and the *wā-* did not ‘convert’ anything.

²²⁵ This is not the place to elaborate on modal sequences. For further studies on this topic, see Dallaire (2014) and Baranowski (2016a, 153–173).

