

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All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at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.

4. THE IMPERFECTIVE LONG *YIQTOL(U)* IN CBH

The purpose of this chapter is to establish the independent status of the long *yiqtol* as an imperfective formation in CBH. Its place in the system of ‘consecutive tenses’ is peculiar: it is one of four primary constituents in the consecutive tenses, but it is used only in internal positions in a clause. This means that a long *yiqtol* does not normally occur with *wa-VX* word order in CBH.

The status of the long *yiqtol* as an imperfective gram in CBH is nowadays uncontroversial (Huehnergard 2017, 10; Gzella 2021, 71). The distinguishing features of the long prefix conjugation (type *yaqtulu*) seem to have been (see further §4.1):

- 1) Meanings typical of a gram on the grammaticalisation path of an imperfective;
- 2) Ability to express concomitant habitual action with past time reference;
- 3) Being a long form, in opposition to a short prefix conjugation.

4.1. The Semitic Background of the CBH Long *Yiqtol*

4.1.1. Introduction

The emergence of a new imperfective formation *yaqtulu* is commonly held to be the prime isogloss separating the Central Semitic language family from Akkadian, Ethiopic, and Modern

South Arabian (Huehnergard 2005, 157–65; Kogan 2015, 130f., 158–66). The morphology of this new imperfective is usually presented in two forms, *yaqtul-u/yaqtulū-na*. The basic idea behind this presentation is that the old perfective *yaqtul* became imperfective by the addition of a subordinating suffix *-u* on singular forms and *-na* on plural forms (Huehnergard 1991, 283; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 9).¹ Typologically, this is unexpected, because the usual grammaticalisation path of imperfective grams starts in a locative construction (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 77; Cook 2012a, 220). It is also problematic because, cross-linguistically, verbal usages in subordinate clauses do not develop into main clause formations (Kouwenberg 2010a, 98; Kogan 2015, 159–61). A third problem is the supposed shift in temporal value from perfective/past (*yaqtul*) to imperfective/present-future (*yaqtul-u*) (Kouwenberg 2010a, 231; Kogan 2015, 160).²

Nearly all progressives derive from locative constructions, and progressives in turn constitute the most frequent origin of imperfective formations.³ It would be reasonable to expect that Semitic imperfectives also have a locative origin (cf. Diakonoff 1988, 103).⁴ Another source of progressives is reduplications, which would indicate a locative origin also for the Proto-Semitic imperfective *yVqattVl* (Bybee et al. 1994, 125, 129, 131). It is therefore tempting to identify the *-u* in the Central Semitic *yaqtulu* as a locative clitic, the more so since there existed a locative marker *-u* in Proto-Semitic (Kienast 2001, 172; Hasselbach 2013b, 20; Retsö 2014, 68; Huehnergard 2019, 61).⁵ In spite of such typological observations, it is widely assumed that the pair

-u/na in CS is identical to the subordination markers -u/ni in Assyrian Akkadian (Huehnergard 2019, 72). The two functionally identical allomorphs are assumed to have been added to the perfective *yaqtul* to create a new imperfective in CS, 3ms **yaḏkur-u*, 3mp **yaḏkurū-na*.⁶ The distribution of -u in Babylonian conforms to that in Central Semitic: it cannot co-occur with other verbal suffixes such as gender-number markers or the ventive. It can be followed, though, by object suffixes, type **yaqtul-u-ka*.

The CS *yaqtulu*, as well as the CBH long *yiqṭol*, behaves like a gram on the imperfective grammaticalisation path. The imperfective aspect views a situation as unbounded from within “with explicit reference to its internal structure” (Bybee et al. 1994, 125). Imperfective verbal morphemes are typically used for setting up background situations in clauses that are simultaneous with the main line (cf. Cohen 2015, 398). An imperfective gram is “applicable to either past, present or future time” (Bybee et al. 1994, 126). The specific progressive meaning of a gram occurs early in the process of grammaticalisation. The imperfective meaning represents a generalisation, with a gradual loss of the strict progressive meaning. An imperfective gram can express ongoing progressive action, but also habitual occurrence as well as gnomic situations. It is common that the meaning of an imperfective gram includes habituality, and in such uses especially with past time reference. The situation in Kui is particularly relevant for some Northwest Semitic languages: an old present (cf. *yiqṭol(u)* in CBH) was used for habitual, progressive, and future. When a new periphrastic progressive arose, comprising the active participle and a verb ‘to live, exist’ (cf. *qoṭel* in CBH), the older

form came to signal just habitual and future actions (Bybee et al. 1994, 125–127, 133, 137, 141, 147, 151, 156, 158–160).

In order to understand the diachronic path of the CS verbal gram *yaqtulu*, it is necessary to review the repository of finite verb forms in Proto CS: an old perfective/past *yaqtul*, an old imperfective *yVqattVI* (Kuryłowicz 1949, 52; Huehnergard 2019, 62),⁷ a new emerging perfective *qatal(a)* (the characteristic innovation of West Semitic), and a new potentially imperfective formation *yaqtulu*. The old perfective *yaqtul* is step by step replaced by *qatal(a)*, and the old imperfective *yVqattVI* is gradually replaced by *yaqtulu*. The linguistic instinct for the nature of *yaqtul* as a full-blown perfective/past is weakening, except in specific functions, such as narration.⁸ There is a growing tendency to avoid *yVqattVI* because of its homonymy with the prefix conjugations in the D stem: both jussive D and imperfective D were problematic (Blau 2010, 196f.).

It is often pointed out that the Akkadian relative construction *ša iprus-u* and the Central Semitic *yaqtul-u* are cognate formations (Kuryłowicz 1949, 52; Rubin 2005, 147). The term ‘relative’ for the Akkadian *iprus-u* does not sufficiently cover the gamut of subordinate clauses with *iprus-u*. Other subordinated clauses may have the same marker, as in *aššum uštamaḥḥar-u ittika* ‘because he will rival you’ (OB Gilgameš, example quoted from Rubin 2005, 147). Rubin (2005, 147) assumes on the basis of Akkadian that there must have been a Proto-Semitic linking of the type **mutam iqabbi āmur* ‘I saw a man speaking’ (ungrammatical in Akkadian), which uses the regular imperfective *yVqattVI* to code the subordinate clause. The word order in the example is

Akkadian, so with PS word order, the example would amount to **āmur mutam iqabbi* ‘I saw a man speaking’. This is the word order to be expected in the linguistic milieu in which the CS imperfective formation *yaqtul-u* developed, replacing the old *yVqattVl*. Rubin (2005, 147) suggests that the CS imperfective *yaqtulu* developed via an analogy between two types of subordinate clauses, in (A) and (C) below:

Type (A): *O.noun yVqattVl yaqtul* (Akkadian word order)

**mutam iqabbi āmur*

‘I saw a man speaking’ (Proto-Semitic but ungrammatical in Akkadian);

Type (B): *O.noun REL-yaqtul-u yaqtul* (Akkadian word order)

mutam ša iqbû āmur

‘I saw a man who spoke’.

In type (A), the old imperfective *yVqattVl* is embedded in the main clause, whose object noun is placed first and the main verb (*āmur*) in final position. The asyndetic *yVqattVl* (*iqabbi*) has no external marker, but the Akkadian word order illustrates its status as an embedded clause. It is asyndetic, but the imperfective morphology of *yVqattVl* is itself a marker. The clause *yVqattVl* must be interpreted as a verbal description of the preceding object noun. Rubin (2005, 147) and Hamori (1973, 321) assume that the type (A) subordinate clause, though ungrammatical in Akkadian, existed in Proto-Semitic with VO word order in the main clause. In type (B), the subordinate state of the embedded clause is explicitly marked by a relative particle *ša* and the subordinating morpheme *-u*. The verb in the subordinate clause is a perfective *yaqtul* with subordinating marker (*iqbû* < **iqbi-u*).

Both types of subordinated clauses (A and B) describe an action that is concomitant with that in the main clause. Rubin and Hamori assume that a relative particle was facultative in Proto-Semitic.⁹ The final subordinating marker (-u) was itself a sufficient signal of subordination. If this is correct, we may assume a Proto-Semitic linking of type (C):

Type (C) *O.noun yaqtul-u yaqtul* (Akkadian word order)

**mutam iqbû āmur*

‘I saw a man who spoke’.

The difference in meaning between type (A) and type (C) is slight. In both cases, the verb in the subordinate clause is indicative. It is not correct to call *yVqattVl* or *yaqtul-u* ‘subjunctive’ verb forms. In a clause such as *bītum ša īmur-u* ‘the house that he saw’, the verb is indicative. It is the clause, not the verb form, that is marked for subordination (Huehnergard and Rubin 2011, 270). An imperfective such as *yVqattVl* in (A) is the typical choice in background or circumstantial clauses, where it carries over the temporal reference of the main clause. Simultaneity with a past action was an important secondary function of an imperfective in Proto-Semitic (Kuryłowicz 1962, 60; Hamori 1973, 319f.; Kouwenberg 2010a, 229). With past time reference in the main clause, the *yVqattVl* is likewise past time, often with continuative or habitual meaning. In the subordinate clause (*iqbû*) of type (C), the perfective aspect is neutralised. It is not marked for habitual or continuative action, but the perfective *iqbû* ‘who spoke’ may allow for meanings such as ‘was speaking’. Thus, while in type (A) the continuative action of the *yVqattVl* is made explicit by the

imperfectivity of the verb form, in type (C) a continuative meaning is inferred in many contexts.¹⁰

In West Semitic, the new perfective gram *qatal* step by step replaced the old perfective *yaqtul*.¹¹ When a verb was to express past time or anteriority, the linguistic instinct tended to choose *qatal*. The new perfective gram widened its semantic domain. In a sentence of type (C), *qatal* was the natural choice for expressing anteriority. The feeling for *yaqtul-u* as a past perfective was gradually lost. Instead, *yaqtul-u* could replace the old imperfective *yVqattVl*. The *yaqtulu* in a sentence like *qatal-O.noun + Ø-yaqtul-u* began to be reanalysed as an imperfective.

Summary:

1. In Proto-Semitic, the imperfective *yVqattVl* could express simultaneity with past action, even in an asyndetic clause, and the perfective *yaqtul* could express simultaneity in a subordinate (relative) clause (*yaqtul-u*) (Hamori 1973, 321f.).
2. In West Semitic, *qatal* replaced the perfective *yaqtul* in different degrees depending on the individual language (Kuryłowicz 1972c, 54; 1973, 119; Tropper 1998, 161).
3. *yaqtul-u* in a subordinate clause was reanalysed as a clause primarily expressing circumstantial action. If anteriority had to be expressed in relation to the main clause, *qatal* was used (Hamori 1973, 322).
4. *yaqtul-u* was generalised to express concomitance also with present time reference (extension of usage).
5. *yaqtulu* began to be used as an imperfective in main clauses.

6. *yaqtulu* heavily replaced the old imperfective *yVqattVl* in Proto Central Semitic.¹²

This is, by and large, the essence of Rubin's (2005, 146–48) hypothesis (partly based on Hamori 1973; see also Kuryłowicz 1949; 1962).

In the individual Central Semitic languages, the reflex of the old **yaqtulu* is usually not controversial, so the comparative sections in the present chapter can be kept relatively short.

4.1.1.1. Excursus: A Parallel Imperfective Formation (*Qoṭel*)

The hypothesis of a subordinate construction developing into a full-blown progressive verb form in main clauses is supported by the parallel development of the active participle (*qoṭel*) in Biblical Hebrew.¹³ It is an example of the renewal of the progressive, the 'old progressive' in this case being the CS *yaqtulu* formation (Rundgren 1963; Kuryłowicz 1975, 104). A semantic split is inevitable in this process, so that the old present *yaqtulu* gradually expressed a more general (not actual) present and future. The beginning of this grammaticalisation was the use of the participle as an attribute after a head noun, in the same position as an asyndetic relative clause. In such a construction, the *qoṭel* refers back to a preceding nominal head. The participle is still not predicative, but may have circumstantial meaning. This is the syntax of *qoṭel* we encounter in the Archaic Hebrew poetry, in which *qoṭel* in predicative position is consistently lacking (Notarius 2010a, 262; 2013, 285, 304).¹⁴

An example from CBH is:

(1) *wa(y)-yiqtol-O.noun-qotēl*

וַיֵּרָא אִישׁ מִצְרִי מַכֶּה אִישׁ-עִבְרִי מֵאֶחָיו:

‘and he saw an Egyptian man **attacking** a Hebrew man, one of his own people’ (Exod. 2.11)

The *qotēl* (מַכֶּה) in example (1) fills the slot of an attribute. The verbal character of the participle allows a construction where it is an attribute of an object noun. This is the “prototypical context for the process of reanalysis that resulted in the predicative use of the participle” (Notarius 2013, 286). *Ø-qotēl* in attributive position and the semiverbal character of the morpheme invite a reanalysis of it as an asyndetic relative clause. The *qotēl* refers back to the immediately preceding head noun phrase (אִישׁ מִצְרִי), and has the same syntactic function as its adjective (מִצְרִי).¹⁵

A further generalisation of the attributive function of *qotēl* is its use after an object suffix:

(2) *wa(y)-yiqtol-O.pron + Ø-qotēl*

וַיִּקְרִיבוּ אֹתוֹ הַמִּצְאִים אֹתוֹ מְקַשֵּׁשׁ עֵצִים אֶל-מֹשֶׁה וְאֶל-אַהֲרֹן וְאֶל כָּל-

הָעֵדָה:

‘Those who found him **gathering wood** brought him to Moses and Aaron and to the whole community.’ (Num. 15.33)

In (2), the *qotēl* (מְקַשֵּׁשׁ) refers back to and describes the object suffix in אֹתוֹ.¹⁶

A further generalisation is exhibited when only a first *qotēl* takes an attributive position (here after a possessive suffix), and a second (and third) *qotēl* refers back to another head in the main clause, as in (3):

- (3) *wa(y)-yiqtol-O.noun + REL-PrP + Ø-qotel + Ø-qotel + wa-qotel*

וַיִּרְאוּ אֶת-הָעָם אֲשֶׁר-בְּקִרְבָּהּ יוֹשְׁבֵת לְבֶטַח בְּמִשְׁפַּט צְדִיקִים שְׁקֵט וּבְטֹחַ

‘They observed the people in it **dwelling carefree**, after the manner of the Sidonians, (a people) **tranquil and unsuspecting**.’ (Judg. 18.7)

The first *qotel* (יוֹשְׁבֵת) in (3) is feminine and describes the immediately preceding feminine possessive pronoun (in בְּקִרְבָּהּ). The feminine pronoun refers to the city (fem.) in which the people lives. The second and third *qotel* describe the people (הָעָם, masc.). The linguistic instinct to think of *qotel* as an attribute of a head noun is loosening.

A further step in the development towards a descriptive, more general subordinate clause is taken when there is no immediately preceding head noun (or head pronominal suffix). The *qotel* is free to refer back to any constituent in the main clause:¹⁷

- (4) *wa-S.noun-qatal + Ø-qotel*

וַדָּתָן וַאֲבִירָם יֵצְאוּ נֹצְצִים פָּתַח אֹהֶלֵיהֶם וּנְשֵׁיהֶם וּבְנֵיהֶם וְטַפָּם:

‘Dathan and Abiram came out **stationing themselves** with their wives, children and little ones at the entrances to their tents.’ (Num. 16.27)

In such a construction, the *qotel* is felt as a description of the action (יֵצְאוּ) in the main clause, not a description of a head noun. The *qotel* has developed into a circumstantial clause. It is a subordinate clause: it is concomitant, but it cannot be analysed as just an attribute or as a relative clause. The *qotel* is predicative.¹⁸

A further step towards an independent clause is the introduction of a pronominal subject that clarifies the reference to a constituent in the main clause (and also the predicative function of *qoṭel* itself):

(5) *wa(y)-yiqṭol-S.noun-ADV + Ø-qoṭel-S.pron*

וַיָּבֹא גִדְעֹן הַיִּרְדְּנָה עֹבֵר הוּא וּשְׁלֹש־מֵאוֹת הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ עֵיפִים וְרֹדְפִים:

‘And Gideon came to the Jordan **crossing over**, **he** and the 300 men who were with him, exhausted yet pursuing.’
(Judg. 8.4)

In (5), the *qoṭel* is positioned asyndetically and first in the circumstantial clause.¹⁹

A further step towards independence is represented by syntactic variants where the *qoṭel* is no longer clause-initial. Such an example is (6):

(6) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-hinnē-S.noun-qoṭel*

וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־הַמִּפְתָּח וַיִּפְתְּחוּ וְהִנֵּה אֲדֹנֵיהֶם נָפַל אֶרְצָה מָת:

‘they took the key and opened, **and there lay** their lord dead on the floor.’ (Judg. 3.25)

In (6), the *qoṭel* clause can still be analysed as circumstantial and with the same temporal reference as the preceding main clauses. It functions semantically as a complement (to an understood ‘and they saw’) but possesses a greater degree of independence than in the previous examples.²⁰

From constructions such as (6) above, it is just a little step to use *qoṭel* in an independent clause in direct speech with speech time reference:

(7) *Ø-qotel-S.pron*

רָאָה אֲנִי אֶת־פְּנֵי אָבִיךָ כִּי־אֵינְנִי אֵלַי כְּתִמְלֵל שְׁלֹשָׁם

‘I see that your father’s manner toward me is not as it has been in the past.’ (Gen. 31.5)

As in most of the subordinate clauses illustrated above, the *qotel* is clause-initial and the subject pronoun follows, but the clause is now independent with progressive meaning.²¹ This independence is easy to infer from *qotel* clauses that function as full utterances in direct speech, where the independence of the sentence is clear (8):

(8) *wa(y)-yiqtol: “Ø-qotel-S.noun ...”*

וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר מְרַבִּים הָעָם לְהַבְיֵא מִדֵּי הָעֲבֹדָה לְמַלְאכָה אֲשֶׁר־
צִוָּה יְהוָה לַעֲשׂוֹת אֵת־הַ:

‘and they told Moses, “The people **are bringing much more** than is needed for the completion of the work which the LORD commanded us to do!”’ (Exod. 36.5)

In (8), the *qotel* clause can be analysed as a complement clause, marked by a quotational frame particle (לֵאמֹר). As such, it is subordinate, but within the direct speech quotation, it is perceived as an independent clause.

This digression about the Biblical Hebrew active participle is intended to illustrate that a subordinate construction may develop into a progressive/imperfective gram in main clauses in a Semitic language—as the *yaqtulu* construction possibly did.

4.1.2. Ancient South Arabian

The two prefix conjugations in Ancient South Arabian are not graphically distinguished in writing (see §3.1.4). The reflex of the Central Semitic *yaqtulu* has the same stem /qtVl/ as the short prefix conjugation (Avanzini 2015, 15).²² The reflexes of *yaqtul* and *yaqtulu* can be distinguished only on the basis of their uses for perfective and imperfective meanings. A general present meaning is found in (9):

- (9) *kl / ʾsdn / w-ʾnṭn / ʾlw / ystmynn / ʾslm / w-mlkm w-whbm w-...*

‘all men and women who **are called** ʾSLM, MLKM, WHBM, and...’ (F 76/2–3, Stein 2011, 1064; 2013, §6.3.8)

- (10) *w-kl ʾs²bm ymlk Yd^ob*

‘All the tribes on which Yd^ob **is (and will be) reigning**’ (RES 3878, 3, Avanzini 2015, 19)

The contrast between a past *qatal* and future *yqtl(u)* is illustrated in (11):

- (11) *b-kl ʾmlʾ stmlʾw w-ystmlʾnn b-ʿm-hw*

‘in all oracular fulfilments they have sought (in the past) **and they will seek** (in future) with him’ (NNAG 6 = J 627/13–14, Stein 2011, 1064)

4.1.3. Arabic

The Arabic imperfective *yaqtulu* is inherited from common Central Semitic (Huehnergard 2017, 14). In the grammars, it is called ‘imperfect’. It indicates a continuing or habitual action independent of temporal reference. “If the context does not refer to the

past, the imperfect indicates the present or future” (Fischer 2002, §184). The Arabic *yaqtulu* can also express the prototypical progressive meaning: *māḍā tafʿalu* ‘What are you doing?’ (Fischer 2002, 104). One of the typical uses of an imperfective, that of a circumstantial action in the past, is frequently found in Classical Arabic (Kuryłowicz 1949, 53; 1973, 120):

(12) *qatala* + Ø-*yaqtulu*

baʿaṭa ʾilā muʿāwiyata yaṭlubu ṣ-ṣulḥa

‘He sent (a message) to Muʿāwiyā and asked for peace.’

(13) *qatala* + Ø-*yaqtulu*

ḡalasa n-nāsu yaṣrabūna l-ḥamra

‘The people were seated and drank wine.’

The *yaqtulu* clauses in (12) and (13) are subordinate, and concomitant with the action in the *qatala* clause, but they cannot be analysed as relative clauses. In (12), there is no head noun to which such a clause would refer. The clauses refer back to the subject in the main clauses, and must be analysed as circumstantial with past time reference (Arabic *ḥāl*). The switch to the imperfective *yaqtulu* clause indicates simultaneity and subordination in relation to the preceding *qaṭal* clause.²³

4.1.4. Amorite

Research on the proper names of Amorite origin has previously not been able to prove the existence of the Central Semitic imperfective formation *yaqtulu* in Amorite. Its existence has just been a plausible hypothesis (thus Baranowski 2017, 87). Recently, however, this gap in our knowledge has come to an end

with the publication of two southern Old Babylonian tablets from the very beginning of the second millennium BCE (George and Krebernik 2022). The left column contains phrases in an Amorite language, including instances of a *yaqtulu* conjugation, and the forms are translated in the right-hand column by Akkadian present tense forms (*iparras*). This can be regarded as decisive proof of the existence of *yaqtulu* in the Amorite verbal system. It “expresses incomplete and future actions” (George and Krebernik 2022, 29). It can express a progressive present, as in (14):

(14) *an-ni-a-ki-an* ʾ*ta*ʾ-*li-ku*

‘Where **are you going?**’ (1:10, George and Krebernik 2022, 5, 19, my emphasis)²⁴

(15) *ra-ḥa-a-a a-li-ʾku* *el*ʾ-*kum* *la ta*[*aḥ-ni-ši*]-ʾ*ia*ʾ

‘My friends, **I am going off** to my woman.’ (2:16, George and Krebernik 2022, 5, 22, my emphasis)²⁵

Two *yaqtulu* clauses may be connected with *wa*; in (16), they have future time reference:

(16) *a-li-ku-na* *wa pa-aḥ-ma-{x}-a* *ma-li-kum* *am-si-qu*

‘**I shall come** and **kiss** the king’s feet.’ (2:24–25, George and Krebernik 2022, 6, 24, my emphasis)²⁶

4.1.5. Ugaritic

As in Arabic, *yaqtulu* in Ugaritic is an imperfective form, the temporal reference of which must be inferred from context. It can refer to the present or future or be past habitual (Huehnergard 2012, 55; Tropper 2012, 685–689). It is also used to express obligation.

(17) is an example of a present progressive meaning in a question:

(17) *O.pron-yaqtulu*

mh . taršn / l bilt . ‘nt

‘Was **wünschst du**, Jungfrau ‘Anatu?’ (KTU³ 1.3:V:28f., Tropper 2012, 685, §76.322, my emphasis)

A circumstantial use of *yaqtulu* with past reference is illustrated in (18):

(18) *PrP-yaqtul + Ø-yaqtulu! + wa-yaqtulu*

ql / abh . y‘rš²⁷ . ybky / w yšnn

‘Er trat vor seinen Vater, **wobei er weinte und mit den Zähnen knirschte**’ (KTU³ 1.16:I:11–13, Tropper 2012, 906, §97.71, my emphasis)

In (18), the two coordinated *yaqtulu* clauses form a subordinated complex describing two circumstantial actions concomitant with the action in the main clause.

An example with obligational meaning is (19):

(19) *wa-yaqtulu*

w tšu . lpn . ql . t‘y

‘und **du mußt hinausgehen** vor/bei der Stimme des Beschwörers’ (KTU³ 1.169:2, Tropper 2012, 734, §77.51, my emphasis)

4.1.6. Amarna Canaanite

Yaqtulu in Amarna Canaanite describes actions that are “ongoing at the moment of speaking” (Baranowski 2016a, 140), or habitual, continuative, frequentative, and future. A habitual or frequentative *yaqtulu* with past reference “includes the reference time given by another verb that refers to a past, temporally contained event, or by the time of an adverbial” (Baranowski 2016a, 153; also Moran 2003, 214).

An example of present progressive, not expressed in a question, is (20), quoted by Baranowski (2016a, 140, his emphasis):

(20) *ADV-yaqtul + REL-yaqtul + S.pron-ADV-yaqtulu*

a-nu-ma iš-te₉-me ²²*gáb-bi a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} ²³*ša yi-iq-bi* ²⁴¹*Ma-ia*
 LÚ.⟨MÁ⟩ŠKIM LUG[AL] ²⁵*a-na ia-ši a-nu-ma* ²⁶*i-pu-šu gáb-ba*
 ‘now I have heard all the words that Maya, the ⟨com⟩missioner of the ki[ng] said to me. Now **I am carrying out** everything.’ (EA 328:21–26)

The *yaqtulu* in Amarna could also express a habitual action in the past. In the following example, the past temporal reference is established by adverbs (Baranowski 2016a, 145):

(21) *ADV-yaqtulu + wa-ul-yaqtulu + ... lā-yaqtulu*

pa-na-nu aš-pu-ru a-na LUGAL ú-ul yi-iš-mu ⁹⁵*a-wa-ti a-nu-*
ma i-na-na a-na URU A.PÚ.⟨MEŠ⟩ ⁹⁶*aš-ba-ti ki-i₁₅* UR.GI₅ *la-a*
tu-uš-mu ⁹⁷*a-wa-ti [...]*

‘Formerly, I wrote to the king; he did not listen to my word. Right now, I am dwelling in Beirut like a dog (and) my word is not heeded.’ (EA 138:94–97)²⁸

An example of *yaqtulu* expressing an obligatory action is:

(22) *yaqtul*²⁹ + *wa-lā-yaqtulu*

[...] *ti-de i-[nu]-ʿmaʿ gáb-bu* ²⁶*ša-ru* *ù ʿla-ʿmiʿ(?) ʿti-ša-lu-ni* ²⁷*a-na LÚ ʿa₄-ia-bi-ʿiaʿ*

‘Know that all of them are traitors, so **don’t ask me** about my enemies!’ (EA 102:25–27)³⁰

4.1.7. Phoenician

In Phoenician, the long form of the prefix conjugation is morphologically distinguished in the second- and third-person masculine plural, where the verb forms have a final *-n*. Each type of prefix conjugation “has its own functional range and should be treated separately” (Gzella 2012, 67). The reflex of *yaqtulu* is used for present-future and progressive aspect, and, in addition, nuances of obligation. The difference between future and obligation is sometimes difficult to define (Gzella 2012, 67). The 2fs long form is not attested (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, 82). A 3mp form is attested in (23) and (24):

(23) אף אם אדם ידברנך

‘Even if people **persuade you**.’ (KAI⁵ 14:6)

In (23), the verb is used in a type of protasis, with present tense meaning projected into a future case. An example with future time reference is (24):

(24) ויסגרום האלנים הקדשם את ממלכ <ת> אדר

‘The holy gods **will deliver** them to a mighty king.’ (KAI⁵ 14:9)³¹

The word order in (24) is *w-yqtl(u)*, with clause-initial verb.

4.1.8. Aramaic

As has been observed above (§3.1.11), there was an imperfective *yaqtulu* in Old Aramaic and Imperial Aramaic. It could be used for present and future actions (Degen 1969, §75; ‘long imperfect’, Muraoka 2003, 195–98). Some of its forms are morphologically distinctive (Degen 1969, §§49–50; Voigt 1987, 6; Kogan 2015, 162). The prototypical progressive meaning is found in questions, such as (25) (KAI⁵ 312 I:4):³²

(25) *ADV-yaqtulu + [] yaqtulu!*

לם . תצם . [ול]ם . תבכה .

‘Why do you fast [and why] do you weep?’

There are also examples of a long prefix conjugation with past reference describing a circumstantial action in relation to a narrative main line (KAI⁵ 312 I:3–4):

(26) *wa-yaqtul*³³ + *wa-lā-qatal-VN* + *wa-yaqtul* + *wa-VN-yaqtulu!*³⁴

ויקם . בלעם . מן . מחר [..] ---[...] ל . ימן . -[.....]ה . ול]כ . ל . אכל
 . ויצ[ם [.] ובב(4)ה . יבכה .

‘And Balaam arose the next day³⁵ [...] but he was not ab[le to eat and he fasted] **weeping** grievously.’

In (26), the circumstantial clause is syndetic with initial *wa*, as is often the case in Classical Arabic, and emphasis is achieved by means of a preceding (‘absolute’) infinitive.

4.2. The Long *Yiqtol* in the Archaic Hebrew Poetry

The imperfective *yiqtol(u)* in the archaic poetry attests to the typical functions of an imperfective formation: present progressive, historical present, past progressive, past simultaneous, and immediate future, meanings that are rare in CBH (Notarius 2013, 150, 282f.). Some of these uses were taken over step by step by the active participle (*qotel*) in CBH, but in the archaic poetry, the meanings of *yiqtol(u)* suggest a broader imperfective usage. The archaic present progressive *yiqtol(u)* (Notarius 2013, 150) is illustrated in (27), which exhibits a clause-initial *yiqtol(u)*, an archaic syntactic feature:³⁶

(27) Ø-ADV-*yiqtol(u)* + Ø-*yiqtol(u)*

הֲלֹא יִמְצְאוּ יַחֲלֻקוּ שְׁלָל רַחֵם רַחֲמָתִים לְרֹאשׁ גִּבֹּר שְׁלָל צְבָעִים לְסִיסְרָא
שְׁלָל צְבָעִים רַקְמָה צָבַע רַקְמָתִים לְצוּאֲרֵי שְׁלָל:

‘Surely **they are finding and dividing** the spoil: a girl or two for every man; spoil of dyed stuffs for Sisera, spoil of dyed stuffs embroidered, two pieces of dyed work embroidered for the neck as spoil’ (Judg. 5.30, Notarius 2013, 282)

The two *yiqtol(u)* in (27) are used in a main clause in direct speech. It is not a question, as is often the case when present progressive meanings of *yiqtol(u)* are found in CBH.

The historical present in the archaic poetry is attested in intensive passages, as in (28).

(28) \emptyset -O.noun-PrP-**yiqtol(u)**-N + wa-qatal + \emptyset -qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal

יָדָהּ לִיתֵד תְּשֻׁלָּחָנָה וַיְמִינָהּ לְהִלָּמוֹת עַמְלָיִם וְהִלָּמָה סִיסְרָא מִחֶקֶה רֹאשׁוֹ
וּמִחֲצָה וְחִלָּפָה רִקְתּוֹ:

‘**She puts** her hand to the tent peg and her right hand to the workmen’s mallet; she struck Sisera a blow, she crushed his head, she shattered and pierced his temple’ (Judg. 5.26, Notarius 2013, 142, 283)

The *yiqtol(u)* form (תְּשֻׁלָּחָנָה) is one of the very few *yiqtol(u)* forms with a ventive/energetic ending and no suffix pronoun (J-M §119z n. 4; Notarius 2013, 284).³⁷ This energetic ending, together with the word order, is a strong indication that the verb is a long prefix form (Notarius 2013, 136, 142). The intense narrative clause in (28) is continued by past perfective *qatal* forms (with or without proclitic *wa*).³⁸

The past progressive meaning is found when the temporal reference of the imperfective *yiqtol(u)* is located in the past, for example in retrospective report:

(29) \emptyset -PrP-**yiqtol(u)** + wa-PrP-**yiqtol(u)** + wa(y)-*yiqtol*(\emptyset)

בְּצָרָלִי אָקְרָא יְהוָה וְאֶל־אֱלֹהֵי אֶקְרָא וַיִּשְׁמַע מִהִיכָל קוֹלִי וַשׁוּעָתִי בְּאַזְנוֹ:

‘In my distress **I was calling upon** the LORD; to my God **I was calling**. From his temple he heard my voice, and my cry (came) to his ears.’ (2 Sam. 22.7, my emphasis; concerning v. 7a, see Notarius 2013, 169, 283)

In (29), the verb form switch is marked in the reading tradition by a *wa(y)-yiqtol* form with gemination of the prefix consonant. In Ps. 18.7, the corresponding verb lacks the proclitic *wa*.³⁹ The past progressive meaning of *yiqtol(u)* is lost in CBH.

The archaic poetry also attests to semantically similar functions of *yiqtol(u)* that are typical in CBH, “iterative and habitual aspect” (Notarius 2013, 283). The past simultaneous meaning involves a linking with another clause. In relation to this clause, it is often circumstantial. A good example is:

- (30) \emptyset -*qatal* + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*-*Npar* + ¹⁵*āz-qatal* + \emptyset -(*O.noun*)-*yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -*qatal*-*S.noun*

שָׁמְעוּ עַמִּים יִרְגָּזוּן חֵיל אֶחָז יִשְׁבִּי פְלִשְׁתִּי: 15 אֶז נִבְהָלוּ אֱלֹפֵי אֱדוֹם אֵילֵי
מוֹאָב יֵאָחֲזוּמוּ רָעַד נִמְגּוּ כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּנַעַן:

‘The peoples heard, **they trembled**; pangs seized the inhabitants of Philistia. ¹⁵Then the chiefs of Edom were dismayed; trembling **seized** the leaders of Moab; all the inhabitants of Canaan melted away’ (Exod. 15.14–15, Notarius 2013, 283, my emphasis)

The יִרְגָּזוּן and יֵאָחֲזוּמוּ in (30) are examples of the past circumstantial function of the imperfective *yiqtol(u)*, a function that is relatively frequent in the archaic poetry, but rare in CBH texts, where it is substituted by the *qotel*. The first *yiqtol(u)* is clause-initial, in contradiction to the rule in CBH. The second *yiqtol(u)*, in verse 15, is also clause-initial, since there precedes it a left dislocation not properly belonging to the clause (‘the leaders of Moab, trembling seized them’). Both *yiqtol(u)* clauses code actions that are simultaneous with the action of the preceding *qatal* clause. In

both cases, the switch to a *yiqtol(u)* clause signals an action that is circumstantial in relation to the previous *qatal* clause.⁴⁰

The *yiqtol(u)* expressing the immediate future in the archaic poetry is illustrated by (31):

(31) *kī-lō-XØ + wa-lō-XØ + Ø-ADV-yiqtol(u)*: “O.pron-*qatal*”

כִּי לֹא-נִחַשׁ בְּיַעֲקֹב וְלֹא-קָסַם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּעַתָּה יֹאמַר לְיַעֲקֹב וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִה-פָּעַל
אֵל:

‘Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, no divination against Israel; now **it shall be said** of Jacob and Israel, “See what God has done!”’ (Num. 23.23, Notarius 2013, 283)

There is no enchantment or divination in Israel. “The deictic כְּעַתָּה creates ST reference” (Notarius 2013, 222). The idea is that, after Balaam’s blessing, Israel will immediately be spoken of with astonishment about what God has done with them (Notarius 2013, 222).⁴¹ The *yiqtol(u)* is amply used with a more general future time reference in the archaic poetry, as it is also in CBH (Notarius 2013, 283).

The imperfective *yiqtol(u)* in the archaic poetry tends to be non-initial in the clause, but there are many cases when *yiqtol(u)* is clause-initial (Notarius 2013, 283).⁴² It has a wide range of functions and meanings, wider than in CBH. In CBH, the active participle has taken over the meanings of “present progressive, past progressive, and immediate future, and perfect קָטַל is used for past simultaneous and circumstantial acts/events/states, particularly in narrative” (Notarius 2013, 284 n. 16).

4.3. The Long *Yiqtol* in the Pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions

For the distinction between *yiqtol(u)* and *yiqtol(∅)* in the inscriptions, see §3.3. Only a few morphologically distinctive long *yiqtol* are attested (IIIwy verbs, Gogel 1998, 95), and no *yiqtol(u)* with progressive meaning. Since most of the inscriptions are letters, future and obligatory meanings are common. Sometimes a general present may have the nuance of ability:

- (32) *wa-yiqtol(∅) + kī-PrP-S.pron-qoṭel + REL-qataḏ + kī-lō-yiqtol(u)!*

וידע כי אל . משאת לבש . נח(3)נו שמרם ככל . האתת אשר נתן (4)
אדני . כי לא נראה את עז(5)קה

‘And let him know that for the fire-signal of Lachish we are keeping watch according to all the signals which my lord gave, because **we cannot see** Azekah.’ (HI Lachish 4:2–5 reverse)

For the writer of this Lachish letter, it was natural to express a habitual present with the active participle in a main clause (נחנו). The *yiqtol(u)* verb is used for (‘we do not see’ =) ‘we cannot see’ in a general present subordinate clause introduced by *kī* (reason; Gogel 1998, 96).

A general present *yiqtol(u)* can also be found in a relative clause, as in (33):

- (33) *PP + REL-yiqtol(u)!*

ארר . אשר . ימחֵה

‘Cursed be whoever **wipes out...**’ (HI EnGd 2:1)

An obligation can be expressed by *yiqtol(u)*, as in a relative clause in a Lachish ostrakon (34):

(34) *IMP + REL-yiqtol(u)!*

הַשָּׁ[ב] (5) [אֵל] עֲבֹדְךָ דָּ(6) בֵּר בִּ(1) יָדְ שְׁלֹמִיָּהוּ . א(2) שֶׁר נַעֲשֶׂה .
מ(3) חָרָה

‘Answer your servant a word through Shelemiah what **we are to do** tomorrow.’ (HI Lachish 9:4–6 obverse, 1–3 reverse, my translation)

4.4. The Meanings of the Long *Yiqtol* in CBH

Table 8: The meanings of long *yiqtol* in CBH

Past progressive	20
Habitual past	56
Present progressive	14
Progressive in future	4
General present	26
Habitual present	19
Future	436
Future in protasis	325
Future in apodosis	22
Obligation	563
Obligation in apodosis	95
Past obligation	1
Future intention	12
Permissive	36
Ability	26
Diegetic present (?) ⁴³	1
Future past	7
Volitive	4
Total	1790

As was stated in §4.1.1, simultaneity with a past action is an important secondary function of an imperfective (Kuryłowicz 1962, 60; Hamori 1973, 319f.; Kouwenberg 2010a, 229). In the supposed Proto-Semitic example with Akkadian vocables **āmur mutam iqabbi* ‘I saw a man speaking’ (Rubin 2005, 147), the imperfective *iqabbi* (yVqattVI) functions as a subordinate clause that describes the object noun (*mutam*) and has the same past reference as the main clause. Such functions of the Hebrew *yiqtol(u)* are archaic (Notarius 2010a, 248; 2013, 300), as in (35):

(35) \emptyset -qatal-S.noun + \emptyset -yiqtol(u)-Npar

שָׁמְעוּ עַמִּים יִרְגְּזוּן

‘The peoples heard (while) **they trembled.**’ (Exod. 15.14)

Compared to the Proto-Semitic example, in (35), *qatal* has replaced the past perfective short *yiqtol(∅)* (PS **yaqtul*) in the main clause. It is important to observe both the simultaneity of יִרְגְּזוּן and its progressive action. The *yiqtol(u)* could be interpreted as a relative clause (of the type that in Akkadian is marked by an initial *ša* and an *-u* subordinative marker), but it is more natural to apply the terminology of Arabic grammar and classify the *yiqtol(u)* as a circumstantial clause (*hāl*; Tropper 1998, 169 n. 59; Notarius 2010a, 248; 2013, 116, 118–120, 283). In CBH, such a clause would have been ungrammatical, because of the initial position of the *yiqtol(u)*. A more likely choice in CBH is a *qotel* clause, as in (36):

(36) \emptyset -hinnē-qatal-O.noun + \emptyset -qotel

הִנֵּה שָׁמְעָתִי אֶת־אֲבִיד [מִדְבַּר אֶל־עֶשׂוֹ אֲחִיד לְאִמָּר]:

‘Listen! I heard your father **telling** Esau your brother:...’
(Gen. 27.6)

So in CBH, *qoṭel* has taken over most circumstantial uses from *yiqṭol(u)*. A corresponding *yiqṭol(u)* clause in CBH must use another syntax to express a progressive meaning, for example with a subordinating conjunction, as in (37):

(37) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + kī-yiqṭol(u)! + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיֵּרָא יוֹסֵף כִּי-יָשִׁית אָבִיו יָדֵימִינוֹ עַל-רֹאשׁ אֶפְרַיִם וַיֵּרַע בְּעֵינָיו

‘Joseph saw that his father **was placing** his right hand on Ephraim’s head, and this displeased him.’ (Gen. 48.17)

In (37), the *yiqṭol(u)* is non-initial and the clause is introduced by a subordinating conjunction (כִּי). The temporal reference is past, and the meaning is progressive. *Yiqṭol(u)* can no longer be placed in initial position (see §3.4.3).⁴⁴ Another example with past continuative meaning is (38):

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

וַיְהִי קוֹל הַשּׁוֹפָר הוֹלֵךְ וְחֹזֵק מְאֹד מִשָּׁה יִדְבָּר וְהָאֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֶנּוּ בְקוֹל:

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

It can be argued that the initial *yiqṭol(Ø)* וַיְהִי in this example is a focus marker (cf. Khan 2019, 19), and that the real main clause is the active participle (הוֹלֵךְ). But with this analysis also, the two *yiqṭol(u)* verbs function as circumstantial clauses with progressive action and past reference.⁴⁵ They display the standard word order for long *yiqṭol* in CBH.

The typical imperfective function of *yiqtol(u)* expressing a habitual past remained in living usage in CBH.⁴⁶ This is illustrated in (39):

- (39) *wayhī-PrP + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-S.pron-lō-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol + ⁴⁰Ø-ADV-yiqtol(u)*

וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ | שְׁנַיִם חֳדָשִׁים וַתָּשָׁב אֶל-אָבִיהָ וַיַּעַשׂ לָהּ אֶת-נִדְרוֹ אֲשֶׁר נָדָר וְהָיָא
לֹא-יָדְעָה אִישׁ וַתְּהִי-חֹק בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל: מִיָּמִים | יָמִימָה תִּלְכְּנָה בְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל
לְתַנּוֹת לְבַת-יִפְתָּח הַגִּלְעָדִי אַרְבַּעַת יָמִים בַּשָּׁנָה: ס

‘After two months she returned to her father, and he did to her as he had vowed. She had never known a man, and this became a custom in Israel. ⁴⁰Every year Israelite women **went** to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite for four days.’ (Judg. 11.39–40)

In (39), verse 40 is an asyndetic *yiqtol(u)* clause that is linked to the last *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause in verse 39. The linking is an elaboration: the details of what became a custom in Israel. It is clear that the meaning of the *yiqtol(u)* clause is habitual past.

The prototypical present progressive meaning of *yiqtol(u)* is relegated to questions and some subordinate clause-types in CBH, because of the competition with the new progressive (*qotel*). An example of a progressive *yiqtol(u)* in a question is:⁴⁷

- (40) *Ø-ADV-yiqtol(u)-Npar + Ø-ADV-yiqtol(u)-Npar*

מִה-תִּרְיֹבֹן עִמָּדִי מִה-תִּנְסֹן אֶת-יְהוָה:

‘Why **do you quarrel** with me? Why **do you put** the LORD **to the test**?’ (Exod. 17.2)

An expression of the progressive is easily generalised to a general present (Haspelmath 1998, 55; Cook 2012a, 221f.). This usage of *yiqtol(u)* seems to be productive in CBH.⁴⁸ An example is (41):

(41) Ø-*S.pron-qatāl* + 'ō *S.pron-yiqtol(u)!* + Ø-*INT-XØ*

מִי שֶׁם פֶּה לֹא־דָם אִו מִי־יָשׁוּם אֵלֶם אִו חֲרָשׁ אִו פֶּקֶחַ אִו עִוֵּר הֲלֹא אֲנֹכִי
יְהוָה:

‘Who has made man’s mouth? Who **makes** him mute, or deaf, or seeing, or blind? Is it not I, the LORD?’ (Exod. 4.11)

The imperfective *yiqtol(u)* can also express a habitual present, where the habitual action includes the present moment, as in (42):⁴⁹

(42) Ø-*ADV-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-O.noun-yiqtol(u)!*

פֶּה אֶל־פֶּה אֲדַבֵּר־בּוֹ וּמִרְאָה וְלֹא בְחִידָת וּתְמִנָּת יְהוָה יִבְיֹט

‘With him **I speak** mouth to mouth, clearly, and not in riddles, and **he beholds** the form of YHWH.’ (Num. 12.8)

The long *yiqtol* also often expresses future meaning: “a general present imperfective... can also be used for future time reference in a future context” (Bybee et al. 1994, 275–77). And because of the new competing progressive *qotel* (Cook 2012a, 230), future became the dominating meaning of *yiqtol(u)* in CBH, together with obligation (Bybee et al. 1994, 277–79; Notarius 2010a, 243). The *yiqtol(u)* gram can be called an ‘old present’ in the terminology of Haspelmath (1998, 35f.; Cook 2012a, 221, 233).⁵⁰ An example is:

- (43) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “ \emptyset -INT-S.noun-*yiqtol(u)*” + \emptyset -‘attā-*yiqtol(u)*! + \emptyset -INT-*yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -‘im-lō”

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה הֲיָד יְהוָה תִּקְצָר עֲתָה תִּרְאֶה הֲיָקֵרָךְ דְּבָרִי אִם־לֹא:

‘And the LORD said to Moses, “Is the LORD’s hand shortened? **Now you will see** whether my word to you will come true or not!”’ (Num. 11.23)

Obligation is a meaning close to and sometimes difficult to distinguish from future. Future grams tend to have modal uses, and some of them are obligation, ability, and permission (Bybee et al. 1991, 22–24).⁵¹ Obligation reports the existence of external social conditions compelling an agent to complete the predicate action (Bybee et al. 1994, 177). Future and obligation are the dominant meanings of *yiqtol(u)* in my corpus, partly because of the legal and instructional character of many texts. A futural *yiqtol(u)* uttered by God or a high official tends to be perceived as an obligation.⁵² An example is:

- (44) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “ \emptyset -X \emptyset + \emptyset -lō-*yiqtol(u)*” + *kī*-‘im-S.noun-*yiqtol(u)*!” + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַיֹּאמֶר־לּוֹ אֱלֹהִים שְׁמֶךָ יַעֲקֹב לֹא־יִקְרָא שְׁמֶךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב כִּי אִם־יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה
שְׁמֶךָ וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל:

‘God said to him, “Your name is Jacob, but your name **will no longer be called** Jacob; Israel **will be** your name.” So God named him Israel.’ (Gen. 35.10)

An example of *yiqtol(u)* expressing obligation in instruction is (45):

(45) *wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)! + wa-qatal + wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)!*

וְלִבְנֵי אַהֲרֹן תַּעֲשֶׂה כִּתְנֹת וְעִשִׂיתָ לָהֶם אֲבִגָּיִים וּמִגְבָּעוֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה לָהֶם לְכָבוֹד
וּלְתִפְאָרֶת:

‘And for Aaron’s sons you shall make tunics, and make sashes for them; and you shall make turbans for them for dignity and beauty.’ (Exod. 28.40)

(45) shows two obligational *yiqṭol(u)* clauses in instructional discourse. It also illustrates a typical alternation with a *wa-qatal* clause, also expressing obligation.⁵³ For the linking, see further §6.11 and §7.2.2.

In a few cases, usually in the first person, the future meaning of *yiqṭol(u)* has a nuance of intention, as in (46):⁵⁴

(46) *Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u) + kī-ʾim-PrP-yiqṭol(u)*

לֹא אֵלֶךְ כִּי אִם-אֶל-אֶרֶץ וְאֶל-מוֹלְדֵי אֵלֶיךָ:

‘No, I will not go, but I will go instead to my own land and to my kindred.’ (Num. 10.30)

A future with reference point in the past can be expressed by a long *yiqṭol* (Brockelmann 1956, §42g). In such cases, the *yiqṭol(u)* has past time reference. An example is (47):

(47) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + kī-lō-PrP-yiqṭol(u)!*

וַיֵּדַע אֹנָן כִּי לֹא לוֹ יִהְיֶה הַזָּרַע

‘But Onan knew that the child would not be considered his.’
(Gen. 38.9)

The long *yiqṭol* in (47) has past time reference, but refers to a point in time that is future in relation to the narrative reference point.⁵⁵

In not a few cases, the long *yiqtol* has a shade of permission, which means that the future action is permitted, but not obligatory, as in (48):⁵⁶

(48) \emptyset -PrP-VNabs-*yiqtol*(u)

מִכָּל עֵץ הָגֵן אֲכַל תֹּאכֵל:

‘You may eat from every tree of the orchard.’ (Gen. 2.16)

The long *yiqtol* may also express the ability of the actant to perform the action, as in (49):⁵⁷

(49) \emptyset -INT-lō-*qatal* + *kī*-VNabs-*yiqtol*(u)

הֲלוֹא יִדְעֲתֶם כִּי־יִנְחֹשׁ אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר כְּמֹנִי:

‘Don’t you know that a man like me can indeed practice divination?’ (Gen. 44.15)

Finally, long *yiqtol* can also, in special constructions, express a direct volitive; one of few examples is (50):⁵⁸

(50) \emptyset -lū-S.noun-*yiqtol*(u)!

לֹו יִשְׁמַעֵאל יַחֲיֶה לְפָנֶיךָ:

‘O that Ishmael might live before you!’ (Gen. 17.18)

4.5. Summary: The Independent Status of the Long *Yiqtol* (< **yaqtulu*)

This chapter has established the long *yiqtol* as a separate verbal morpheme in CBH, distinct from the short *yiqtol*. While the short *yiqtol* is a verbal formation inherited from Proto-Semitic **yaqtul* with two basic meanings, past perfective and jussive (see §3.1), the long *yiqtol* is a common innovation in Central Semitic. The

long *yiqṭol* is an old imperfective formation in CBH, with the prototypical meanings, such as progressive and past circumstantial, retained in relatively rare cases. The majority meanings in CBH are obligation and future. Many of the earlier imperfective functions of the long *yiqṭol* have been taken over by the active participle (*qoṭel*) in CBH, in a process of renewal of the expression for the progressive and imperfective aspect (§4.1.1.1). This takeover by the *qoṭel* is relatively late: it is not attested in Archaic Hebrew. In spite of the new *qoṭel*, the early function of the imperfective *yiqṭol(u)* to express the habitual past remained in living usage in CBH (§4.4).

Early CBH (after the archaic stage) was able to cope with the partial homonymy between the short *yiqṭol* and the long *yiqṭol* by means of a restriction of word order (described in §3.4.3). A word order that was a tendency in Amarna Canaanite and the Archaic Hebrew poetry—the long *yiqṭol* usually being used in non-initial position—became stricter in CBH. In this way, the identity of the long *yiqṭol* as an old imperfective (‘old present’ < **yaqtulu*) was preserved, as also the identity of the short *yiqṭol* (< **yaqtul*) as a separate verbal morpheme.

In the theory of consecutive tenses, the long *yiqṭol* is described as alternating with another equivalent ‘tense’, *wa-qāṭal*. Something has changed in CBH compared to the archaic stage: the long *yiqṭol* can no longer form discourse-continuity clauses (type **wa-VX*), and the *wa-qāṭal* clause-type has entered onto the scene as its substitute (see §6).

¹ According to Kuryłowicz (1972c, 54 n. 3), “[i]t is misleading to call Akk. *iprusu* etc. a ‘subjunctive’.” There is a morpheme *-u* also in certain

Cushitic and Chadic languages, which was added to the verbal base to mark subordination. This *-u* could express an indicative in some Chadic languages (Bole, Kwami, and Tangale) “où *-u* est utilisé pour marquer l’indicatif et le subjonctif” (Jungrathmayr 2005, 80).

² As for the assumption that *-u* was a nominal marker, see Kouwenberg (2010a, 230 n. 65).

³ Progressives view an action as ongoing in the here and now of reference time (often speech time). They give the location of an agent as in the midst of an activity. That is why a locative construction easily develops into an expression of a progressive meaning. “The locative notion may be expressed either in the verbal auxiliary employed or in the use of postpositions or prepositions indicating location—‘at’, ‘in’, or ‘on’” (Bybee et al. 1994, 129f.). The meaning of the locative that gives rise to a progressive “is probably ‘be in the place of verbing’ or ‘be at verbing’” (Bybee et al. 1994, 136). In the development of a progressive, its use in habitual contexts is earlier than its use with stative verbs (Bybee et al. 1994, 148). In CBH, for example, *yiqtol(u)* is often used with past habitual meaning, but when the stative verb *יָדַע* is used to express present time, *qatal* is used, not *yiqtol(u)*.

⁴ The locative is, however, only one of thirteen possible sources of progressives, according to Kuteva et al. (2019, 486).

⁵ If such was the case, the locative *-u* attached to the CS finite prefix formation (thus **yaqtul-u*) could possibly yield a meaning such as: ‘he (is) in (that) he kills’, which presupposes that the CS *yaqtul* would be an old present (‘imperfect’) in need of renewal (thus Retsö 2014, 68), which is problematic in view of the comparative Semitic evidence. Kienast (2001, 179) assumes that the nominative ending *-u* itself is an old “Agentiv/Lokativ.” If the hypothesis of a locative *-u* in *yaqtul-u* is correct, the *-na* ending on the plural forms in CS must be regarded as diachronically later. An assumption put forward by Diem (1975, 242, 256) is that the *-n* ending on the plural forms was a nunation taken over from the plural endings of the noun at a stage when those endings had

still not changed to *-m*, as was later the case in Amarna and Proto-Hebrew. Compare the state in Amarna, with *-m* in the plural and dual nominal inflection but *-n* in *yaqtulū-na*, and the same holds for Ugaritic (Tropper and Vita 2010, 49, 59; Baranowski 2016a, 83; Tropper and Vita 2019b, 490, 495). It is difficult to explain the *-na* by influence from the nominal inflection; it must have been effective in a linguistic state where the masculine plural of the noun had nunation. If there was such an influence, it must have been operative close to the common Central Semitic stage, since such a development is absent in Akkadian and Amorite (Diem 1975, 251, 256).

⁶ In Assyrian, suffixed forms typically take *-ni*, but this *-ni* is attached to the whole verbal phrase after verbal suffixes and the ventive. If there are no other suffixes, the *-ni* is attached directly to *-u*: *-u-ni*. It is also unclear why the two morphemes *-u* and *-na* should be regarded as identical, since *-ni* is absent in Eblaite and Babylonian Akkadian (see Bjøru and Pat-El 2020, 71). It is clear that, in Old Assyrian, the distribution of *-u* and *-ni* is not phonologically conditioned. The two morphemes do not belong to the same grammatical category and are diachronically unrelated: “*-u* is a verbal inflectional suffix, while *-ni* is a clause-domain clitic” (see Bjøru and Pat-El 2020, 75). The scope of *-ni* is the clause rather than the verb, because it is always positioned at the end of the clause (Bjøru and Pat-El 2020, 72, 75f., 78). The conclusion of Bjøru and Pat-El’s study is that, in Assyrian, *-ni* is a clause-level clitic and *-u* a verbal suffix. This would indicate that *-u* lost its independent status during the history of Assyrian and represents an internal Assyrian development. If such is the case, we should not expect *-ni* to be reflected in the Central Semitic imperfective formation *yaqtul-u*, and the suffix *-na* in the CS plural verb form *yaqtul-ūna* remains unexplained.

⁷ For the *-a*- vowel, see Kogan (2015, 164).

⁸ Kuryłowicz (1973, 119): “There must have been a period when the functions β and γ were distributed between the two forms; β = *qatala* (*passé indéfini*), γ = *yaqtul* (*passé défini* or narrative tense).”

⁹ For Babylonian Akkadian, see Pat-El (2020, 320).

¹⁰ “The functions of *yaqattal* and *yaqtulu* show a clear overlap” (Hamori 1973, 322).

¹¹ Rubin (2005, 148) writes that “*yaqtul* had already been supplanted by the verbal adjective *qatala*” in West Semitic. This is an exaggeration. The substitution was gradual, “reached by stages” (Kuryłowicz 1973, 119). The perfective *yaqtul* was retained in many West Semitic languages, at least in their early stages (see §3.1).

¹² This replacement has left no attested traces of a *yVqattVI* formation in Central Semitic, and this is a potential counter-argument against the mainstream hypothesis (Fenton 1970, 41). On the absence of such traces, see Bloch (1963) and Fenton (1970). Kogan (2015, 166) calls the absence of *yVqattVI* in CS “a shared loss.” For Ugaritic, see Tropper (2012, 460f.). Vernet’s (2013) attempt to explain the absence is not convincing.

¹³ Another example is the verbal prefix *ḏ-* + imperfect in Omani Mehri (Rubin 2018, 187f.). It is a relative clause construction that has been reinterpreted as a simple circumstantial clause “referring to either the subject or object of the main verb” (Rubin 2018, 188).

¹⁴ The predicative *qoṭel* is not attested in Amarna Canaanite (Notarius 2010a, 262).

¹⁵ There is a slight generalisation: the head noun can be definite without the *qoṭel* having the definite article. Other examples of attributive *qoṭel*: Gen. 3.5; 3.8 (definite head); 27.6 (definite head); 49.14 (archaic); Exod. 5.10 (definite head); 14.30 (probably definite head); Num. 11.10; 22.23; 24.2 (definite head); Deut. 4.33 (definite head).

¹⁶ An archaic example is Deut. 33.12 (Notarius 2010a, 261; 2013, 238). There is a parallel in Omani Mehri: *mayt hámak tī ḏ-ōmər* ‘when did you hear **me** singing?’ (Rubin 2018, 188).

¹⁷ An analogical example in Omani Mehri is: *aǵáyg rədd təwōli sékənəh ḏə-yəktōməh wə-ḏə-yəxtəyūb* ‘the man returned to his settlement, despairing and disappointed’ (Rubin 2018, 188).

¹⁸ Other examples of circumstantial predicative *qoṭel*: Gen. 21.9; Exod. 26.15; 36.20; Deut. 31.20.

¹⁹ Similar examples are: Exod. 26.5; 36.12.

²⁰ An analogical example in Omani Mehri is: *xəṭərāt ġayg ḏə-yəghōm bə-ḥōrəm* ‘once there was a man who was walking on the road’ or ‘once there was a man walking on the road’ or ‘once a man was walking on the road’ (Rubin 2018, 188).

²¹ Some other examples are: Exod. 36.5; Num. 10.29; Judg. 19.18. An analogical example in Omani Mehri is: *ənḥāh ḏə-nḥəwrūd* ‘we are taking (our) animals to the water’ (Rubin 2018, 188).

²² Stein (2020, 339) supposes that *yaqtulu* must have existed in Sabaic.

²³ For more examples, see Isaksson (2009, 91f.).

²⁴ This example features a long 2ms prefix form *taliku* from the root *hlk*; cf. Hebrew *yēlēk*.

²⁵ This example features a long 1cs prefix form *ʾaliku*, which is progressive with a nuance of immediate future.

²⁶ This example features two *yaqtulu* with futural intentional meaning: *a-li-ku-na*, with ventive/energetic clitic, from root *hlk*; and *am-si-qu* < *ʾanšiqu from root *nšq*.

²⁷ To be read *yʿrb* (KTU³ 44f.).

²⁸ Baranowski (2016a, 145) translates: ‘Previously, I would write to the king: he would not heed my word. Now I am living in Beirut like a dog, and my word is (still) unheeded.’

²⁹ This is a 2ms form of the jussive (Baranowski 2016a, 74).

³⁰ Baranowski (2016a, 151) translates: ‘Know that all are traitors, and [y]ou must no[t] inquire about me from my enemies.’

³¹ But a nuance of obligation is also possible: ‘They shall deliver them’ (Gzella 2012, 67).

³² For the classification of the Deir ‘Allā inscription, see §3.1.11. Kogan (2015, 600) classes it as belonging to the ‘Aramaoid’ branch of Central Semitic.

³³ Hackett (1984, 36) identifies this as “*waw* consecutive.”

³⁴ Hackett (1984, 37): “The obvious interpretation of this phrase is that it is an infinitive absolute plus a finite verb of the root *bkh*, coupled for emphasis.”

³⁵ Hackett (1984, 36): “There must have been some mention in the following words of Balaam’s refusal to eat.”

³⁶ While Deut. 32 (which is more archaic) exhibits clause-initial *yiqtol(u)*, 2 Sam. 22 does not (a relative innovation); see Notarius (2013, 166). Other examples of present progressive in the archaic poetry, many of them showing a clause-initial *yiqtol(u)*: Num. 23.9 (Notarius 2013, 221, 282); 24.17 (\emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 221, 224 n. 42); Deut. 32.40 (Notarius 2013, 95, 96, 282); Ps. 18.2 (\emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*-VOC)—but not in 2 Sam. 22.2; 18.47—Notarius (2013, 162) takes the יִקְטֹל as a modal form, possibly because it is written defectively in the presumably older 2 Sam. 22.47 (for this interpretation, cf. §3.4.1.2).

³⁷ According to Freedman (1960, 102), *tišlahnā* “is anomalous” and should be read *tišlahanna*, with an energetic ending like Arabic *-anna*. The energetic ending in Amarna Canaanite was, according to Rainey (1996, II:234), “*-una*, perhaps *-unna*.” For the connection between *yiqtol(u)* and the ventive/energetic endings, cf. Rainey (1996, II:234–36) and Zewi (1999).

³⁸ Other cases of diegetic present in the archaic poetry: Exod. 15.1 (ʾāz-yiqtol(u) !; Brockelmann 1956, §42a; Rundgren 1961, 97, 99)—pace Joosten (2012, 108–11), who says “the syntagm is not explained;” 15.7 (*wa*-PrP-*yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 116 n. 29, 118, 119, 120, 283); 15.17 (\emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 116, 118, 283; 2015, 243–44); Num. 23.7 (Notarius 2008, 79; 2013, 222); Judg. 5.29 (Notarius 2013, 135f., 142, 283)—Notarius (2013, 284) is open to the possibility that תַּעֲיִיבָה has an energetic ending, as also suggested by Zewi (1999, 108); Ps. 18.4/2 Sam. 22.4 (Notarius 2013, 181); 18.37/2 Sam. 22.37 (\emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*! + *wa-lō-qatal*), clause-initial historical present according to Notarius (2011, 276; 2013, 174 n. 69, 283; 2015, 245), but Joosten (2012, 432) takes the long prefix form as “preterite *YIQTOL*,” 18.38 (\emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-lō-*

yiqtol(u)!; cf. Notarius 2011, 273; 2013, 172, 283 for 2 Sam. 22.38); 18.40/2 Sam. 22.40—the syntax in Ps. 18.33–46 is deviant and the old reading tradition seemingly had problems with the innovative differentiation between the *wa* and *wə* readings of the conjunction, a differentiation which required an exegetical analysis of the text (cf. Notarius 2013, 160, 175): according to Notarius (2011, 262, 276; 2013, 175f.), this is a historical present based on the imperfective *yiqtol(u)*, but against the view of Notarius, see Bloch (2009, 47–54); 18.42/2 Sam. 22.42 (\emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*, historical present or habitual present; Notarius 2013, 176, 283; 2015, 245); 18.43/2 Sam. 22.43 (*wa-yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -*PrP-yiqtol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 175, 283).

³⁹ Examples of past progressive *yiqtol(u)* in the archaic poetry: Exod. 15.6; Deut. 32.12 (Notarius 2013, 80, 83, 94, 307); 32.14 (Notarius 2013, 80, 83, 85, 307; 2015, 240); Ps. 18.7a (2 Sam. 22.7a has *wa(y)-yiqtol* instead of \emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset); Notarius 2013, 165, 169; 2015, 240).

⁴⁰ Notarius (2013, 116–120, 283) analyses the prefix forms as imperfective *yiqtol(u)* and past simultaneous/circumstantial. According to Zewi (1999, 139), this is one of few examples of a prefix form with -Npar and past time reference. Other examples of past simultaneous *yiqtol(u)* clauses:

Exod. 15.5 (\emptyset -*S.noun-yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -*qatal*; Notarius 2013, 118–20, 283; 2015, 243)—König (1897, III, §152) translates, ‘[indem] Fluthen sie bedeckten’, Moomo (2003, 73) ‘The deep was covering them’, and Shreckhise 2008, 293 ‘The deeps were covering them, they went down into the depths like a stone’.

15.12 (\emptyset -*qatal* + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 116, 118, 120, 283);

Deut. 32.10 (\emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*-N + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*-N; Notarius 2013, 307)—יִמְצְאוּהוּ is a ‘preterite’ according to Notarius (2013, 78, 280), but *pace* Moomo (2003, 76), who translates ‘He usually/used to meet him’. Considering the function of יִצַּב in verse 8, it is plausible that יִמְצְאוּהוּ is a realis past *yiqtol*(\emptyset) and codes a main line. A main point in Notarius’ (2013, 94 n. 67) discussion is the presence of energetic suffixes on the three *yiqtol(u)* clauses and that the energetic *nun* in יְבוֹנְנֶהוּ is left out by haplography, ‘if one

- accepts Lambert's and Rainey's opinion that the energetic nun is obligatory in this form" (cf. also Notarius 2013, 94–95, 283, 307; 2015, 239f.; similarly Rainey 1986, 16; Joosten 2012, 418);.
- 32.16 (\emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + \emptyset -PrP-*yiqtol*(*u*); Notarius 2013, 83, 283)—both verbs are *yiqtol*(*u*), but Notarius (2015, 239f.) analyses the first verb as *yiqtol*(\emptyset) and the second as *yiqtol*(*u*), while, according to Joosten (2012, 417), both are *yiqtol*(\emptyset).
- 33.3 (\emptyset -*aḇ*-VOC-*X* \emptyset + *wa-qatal* + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(*u*); Notarius 2013, 214 n. 47, 239, 242).
- 33.7 (\emptyset -IMP + *wa-PrP-yiqtol*(*u*)-N; Notarius 2013, 242f., 294)—but Gzella (2004, 85–86) calls this a volitive *yiqtol*(*u*).
- 33.8 (\emptyset -*X* \emptyset + «REL-*qatal* + \emptyset -*yiqtol*(*u*)»; Notarius 2013, 240 n. 47, 241f. n. 53, 300)—but Bergsträsser (1918–1929 II, §34h) calls this a 'preterite'.
- 33.9 (*kī-qatal* + *wa-O.noun-yiqtol*(*u*); Notarius 2013, 242 n. 55, 300).
- Judg. 5.6 (\emptyset -PrP-PrP-*qatal* + *wa-S.noun-yiqtol*(*u*))—past iterative according to Notarius (2013, 133, 135, 142), who says it is "at work in the background for past iterative and habitual action" (Notarius 2015, 242), *pace* Müller (1983, 54), who considers it a consequence-result and translates 'die Wege lagen still, so daß die Pfadwanderer krumme Wege gingen'.
- Ps. 18.5/2 Sam. 22.5 (*qatal* + *wa-S.noun-yiqtol*(*u*); Notarius 2013, 163, 167, 283, 307)—"with circumstantial simultaneous force in reference to simple past ִּקַּל" (Notarius 2013, 165).
- Ps. 18.7 (\emptyset -*yiqtol*(\emptyset) + *wa-S.noun-PrP-yiqtol*(*u*)).
- Ps. 18.8a/2 Sam. 22.8a (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-S.noun-yiqtol*(*u*); Notarius 2013, 164f., 170, 283; 2015, 240).
- Ps. 18.9/2 Sam. 22.9 (\emptyset -*qatal* + *wa-S.noun-PrP-yiqtol*(*u*) + \emptyset -S.noun-*qatal*; Notarius 2013, 164, 165, 170, 283, 308; 2015, 240).
- Ps. 18.14 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-S.noun-yiqtol*(*u*); Notarius 2013, 164, 165, 170, 283; 2015, 240)—but Notarius (2007, 24) analyses the *yiqtol*(*u*), יִקַּל, in 2 Sam. 22.14 as 'preterite'.
- Ps. 18.34/2 Sam. 22.34 (\emptyset -*qotel* + *wa-PrP-yiqtol*(*u*); Notarius 2013, 172, 175).

⁴¹ Levine (2000, 186) argues that the *qaṭal* in the relative clause has future reference, which is improbable. There is no example of a *qaṭal* in a relative construction referring to the future. The natural interpretation is anterior. Levine's reference to the Deir 'Allā inscription, *šbw w'ḥwkm mh šdyn [p'lw]* (Combination I, line 5) is pointless, since there is a lacuna where the verb is expected. Num. 23.23 is probably the only example of *yiqṭol(u)* with immediate future reference in the archaic poetry.

⁴² There are about 26 clause-initial *yiqṭol(u)* forms in the archaic poetry, including their use in asyndetic relative clauses, here marked by «Ø-*yiqṭol(u)*» (cf. §3.2). In the following list, I have excluded the much-discussed 'Ugaritic type' of poetry in Ps. 18.33–46/2 Sam. 22.33–46; cf. Notarius (2011; 2013, 171): "the verbal tenses here deserve separate investigation. The main challenge is the formal status of the prefix conjugation." Gen. 49.27 ("heads an asyndetic relative clause," Notarius 2013, 198; see also Nyberg 1972, §94m); Exod. 15.7 (possibly with ellipsis of the initial PrP; Notarius 2013, 116, 118, 119, 120, 283); 15.12 (Ø-*qaṭal* + Ø-*yiqṭol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 116, 118, 120, 283); 15.14a (Ø-*qaṭal* + Ø-*yiqṭol(u)*-Npar; Notarius 2013, 116, 118); 15.17 (Ø-*yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-yiqṭol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 116, 118, 283; 2015, 243–44); Num. 24.17 (Notarius 2008, 67; 2013, 221, 224 n. 42); Deut. 32.10 (Ø-*yiqṭol(Ø)* + Ø-*yiqṭol(u)*-N + Ø-*yiqṭol(u)* + Ø-*yiqṭol(u)*-N; Notarius 2013, 94 n. 67, 95, 280, 283, 307; 2015, 239; Rainey 1986, 16; Joosten 2012, 418); 32.23 (Ø-*yiqṭol(u)* + Ø-*O.noun-yiqṭol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 94f., 294); 32.39 (Ø-*S.pron-yiqṭol(u)!* + *wa-yiqṭol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 94, 97, 294); 32.41b–42a (⁴¹Ø-*yiqṭol(u)!* + *wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + ⁴²Ø-*yiqṭol(u)!* + *wa-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)*; Notarius 2013, 95); 33.3 (Notarius 2013, 214 n. 47, 242)—the *qaṭal* is analysed as *wa-qaṭal* according to Notarius (2013, 236); 33.8 (Ø-*XØ* + «REL-*qaṭal* + Ø-*yiqṭol(u)*»); 33.22 (*XØ*-«Ø-*yiqṭol(u)*»; Notarius 2013, 244); Judg. 5.8 (Ø-*yiqṭol(u)* + 'āz-*qaṭal*, possibly an initial temporal clause; Notarius 2013, 133, 135, 142f.; also Bergsträsser 1918–29 II, §7b; Gibson 1994, 74 §63a; Waltisberg 1999, 224)—but the form can be a past perfective *yiqṭol(Ø)*, and in such a case it is "the sole, more or less plausible case of *waw*-less

preterite *yqtl* in the text” [i.e. in the Song of Deborah] (Notarius 2013, 135; 2015, 241); 5.30 (\emptyset -ADV-*yiqtol(u)* + \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*; Notarius 2012, 195; 2013, 141, 282); Ps. 18.2 (\emptyset -*yiqtol(u)*); 18.3/2 Sam. 22.3 (NP-« \emptyset -*yiqtol(u)!*»; Notarius 2013, 168f.); 18.47 (\emptyset -X \emptyset + *wa*-X \emptyset + *wa-yiqtol(u)!*)—thus Joosten (2012, 434), but Notarius (2013, 162), seems to regard the *yārūm* as a modal passive participle, in accordance with Dahood (1965a, 118; 1965b, 323).

⁴³ Gen. 37.7 הָהָה תִּסְבִּינָה אֶלְמִתִּיָּם ‘and your sheaves surrounded my sheaf’ (thus NET); it is a possible diegetic present in a dream report which also makes use of *qoṭel* clauses in main line.

⁴⁴ Other examples of past progressive meanings of *yiqtol(u)* in CBH: Gen. 2.5 (background, complicated syntax); 2.10 (after *qoṭel*, both in background); 2.25 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*; Brockelmann 1908–13, II, §321b; Nyberg 1972, §86t, *pace* Joosten 1999, 24); Exod. 8.20 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-PrP-yiqtol(u)*); 36.29 (*wa-qatal* + *wa-ADV-yiqtol(u)*, both in background with past reference); Num. 9.15 (*wa-PrP-VN-qatal* + *wa-PrP-yiqtol(u)!*); 9.18. Outside the corpus, there is 1 Sam. 13.17 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + \emptyset -S.noun-*yiqtol(u)*; Driver 1892, §163; Joosten 2012, 133).

⁴⁵ Zewi (1999, 108) calls this an energetic form with continuous action in past tense, but Joosten (1999, 24) calls it “iterative.”

⁴⁶ I have more than 50 examples of past habituality expressed by *yiqtol(u)*: Gen. 2.19; 6.4; 29.2; 30.38, 42; 31.8 (in temporal clause); 31.39 (\emptyset -O.noun-*qatal* + \emptyset -S.pron-*yiqtol(u)-N* + \emptyset -PrP-*yiqtol(u)-N*); Exod. 1.12, in comparative linking (Dixon 2009, 35); 13.22; 17.11; 18.26 (*wa-qatal* + \emptyset -O.noun-*yiqtol(u)* + *wa-O.noun-yiqtol(u)*, asyndesis and elaboration)—Zewi (1999, 119, 139) calls it continuous past; 33.7, 8, 9; 34.34; 40.32, 36, 37 (in temporal clause); 40.38; Lev. 26.41; Num. 8.19; 9.16 (with ellipsis of *yiqtol(u)* in the last clause); 9.17–23; 10.36; 11.5, 9; Deut. 2.12, 20; Judg. 2.18, 19; 6.4, 5; 11.40; 12.5 (in temporal clause); 12.6; 14.10; 17.6 (Isaksson 2009, 92); 21.25.

⁴⁷ Examples of present progressive *yiqtol(u)* in questions: Gen. 32.18, 30; 37.15 (*pace* Joosten 2012, 62); 42.1; Exod. 2.13; 5.4; 16.7; 17.2;

Judg. 17.9; 19.17. Examples not in questions: Gen. 31.35; Exod. 9.30 (in complement); Deut. 3.28 (in relative clause); Judg. 17.3 (close to performative); 21.22 (stative verb). The long *yiqtol* can also express a progressive in the future, three of my cases being in temporal clauses (T): Gen. 45.28 (T); Exod. 8.5; 23.23 (T); Lev. 15.25 (T).

⁴⁸ Examples in my corpus: Gen. 18.14, 28b (both questions); 41.27; 50.3; Exod. 4.11; 11.7 (in complement); 23.7, 8 (*kī-S.noun-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-yiqtol(u)*, with ellipsis of *S.noun* before the second long *yiqtol*; Joosten 2012, 309, 429)—identified as long *yiqtol* also by Gropp (1991, 48); 33.11; 34.7; 36.29; Lev. 4.22 (relative clause); 17.11; Num. 11.14; 11.23; 18.7; 21.14; 22.38; Deut. 1.44; 16.19 (same as Exod. 23.8 with ellipsis); Judg. 10.4; 11.35; 20.16.

⁴⁹ Other examples of *yiqtol(u)* with habitual present meaning: Gen. 2.24 (custom); 10.9; 22.14 (asyndetic relative clause); 32.33 (explanation of a custom; Childs 1963, 281, 283, 288; Westermann 1981, 634); 43.32; Exod. 1.19; 8.22; 18.15; Lev. 4.10; 21.10 (relative construction); Num. 11.13; 12.6 (in apodosis); 12.8; Deut. 2.11, 20; 3.9; 7.10; Judg. 7.5 (in comparative clause).

⁵⁰ I have 435 examples of clear future *yiqtol(u)* in CBH, obligations not included. In addition, there are 325 in protasis and 22 in apodosis. Ten are listed here: Gen. 1.29; 3.4; 3.16; 3.19; 4.12; 8.21; 9.5; 16.10; 17.20; 17.21. In several cases, the distinction between future and obligation is unclear, as in Deut. 13.12 (*wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*); 31.7 (*wa-S.pron-yiqtol(u)-N*)—for the NN-form, see Zewi (1999, 101).

⁵¹ The agent-oriented sense of an obligation marker like *yiqtol(u)* can also be used for an imperative: *You will go to bed!*, *You must call your mother* (Bybee et al. 1991, 28; 1994, 211).

⁵² About 250 *yiqtol(u)* have obligatory meaning in the corpus, including commandments by God. Only a few need be given here: Gen. 44.2 (¹Ø-IMP + *wa-IMP* + ²*wa-O.noun-yiqtol(u)!*); Exod. 13.7 (Ø-*S.noun-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)!* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)!*); 20.3–9 (commandments); Lev. 1.3 (legal discourse).

⁵³ Obligation with past time reference expresses a conditional mood in Lev. 10.18 אָכַלְוּ תֹאכְלוּ אֹתָהּ בְּקֹדֶשׁ ‘You should certainly have eaten it in the sanctuary!’.

⁵⁴ Long *yiqtol* expressing future intention is also found in: Gen. 19.9; 24.58 (2fs); 32.21 וְאַחֲרֵיכֵן אָרְאָהּ בְּנִי (after a ventive-cohortative); 47.19; Lev. 22.29 (2mp, in protasis); Deut. 1.41; 15.16; 18.16—Khan (2021, 337) argues that it is a short jussive *hif’il*, but morphologically it could be a *qal* long *yiqtol* (Huehnergard 2005, 467–68); 20.8 (3ms); Judg. 11.23 (2ms); 12.1.

⁵⁵ Other examples of long *yiqtol* expressing a future in the past (often with the conjunction *terem*): Gen. 41.50 בְּטָרֵם; 43.25 (future of pluperfect); Exod. 10.14; Num. 15.34; Deut. 1.18 (relative clause); 2.12—Joosten (1999, 24) regards *yiqtol(u)* here as “anomalous,” while according to Cook (2012, 260 n. 94), it is a free-standing preterite *yiqtol(Ø)*; Judg. 21.22.

⁵⁶ Long *yiqtol* expressing permission is also found in: Gen. 3.2; 38.16; 42.37 (in apodosis; Ges-K §159r); 44.26; Exod. 10.24 (last clause); 12.44; 22.10, 12; 23.11; Lev. 6.11; 7.6, 16, 19, 24; 11.3, 9; 13.36 (in apodosis); 16.28; 22.7, 11 (apodosis); 22.13 (apodosis); 22.23; 25.10; 25.46 לְעֵלֶם בָּהֶם תַּעֲבֹדוּ; Num. 6.20; 8.15, 26; 12.14; 18.13; 19.7; 35.28; Deut. 12.15, 22; 23.12.

⁵⁷ Other examples of long *yiqtol* expressing a shade of ability or potentiality: Gen. 15.2; 16.2, 10; 17.17; 19.22; 31.43; 43.5; 44.1 (verb *ykl*); 44.8, 16; Exod. 3.11; 4.14; 18.18 (verb *ykl*); 28.32; 33.20—Ges-K (§159gg) translates ‘for a man doth not see me and live’; 39.23; Num. 23.13; 30.14; Deut. 4.28; 18.16 (Christensen 2001, 401); 30.12 מִי יַעֲלֶה; 30.13; Judg. 6.15; 16.10, 13 (both as complements).

⁵⁸ Other examples of volitive long *yiqtol*: Exod. 32.32 אִם-תִּשָּׂא חַטָּאתָם ‘Oh, that you would forgive’; Num. 11.4 מִי יֹאכְלֵנוּ בָּשָׂר: ‘If only we had meat to eat!’ (NET); Judg. 9.29 וְיִתֵּן אֶת-הָעָם הַזֶּה בְּיָדִי ‘If only these men were under my command’ (NET). It seems that *mī-yiqtol(u)*, from being a question about the future, in some contexts receives a volitive nuance.