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

Bo Isaksson

https://www.openbookpublishers.com

©2024 Bo Isaksson

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.

5. THE PERFECTIVE FORMATION *QAṬAL* IN CBH

5.1. The Semitic Background of *Qaṭal*

It is nowadays commonly accepted that the West Semitic *qatVl(a)* conjugation developed from a resultative construction (Kuryło-wicz 1975, 128; Cook 2012a, 203), and that the old WS languages exhibit a concurrence of the resultative and the anterior in one verb form (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988, 40–42). The starting point of the formation was a Proto-Semitic predicative construction with a verbal adjective and a suffixed subject pronoun (Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 7; Huehnergard 2019, 63), as in **k'abir-ku* (buried-1sg) 'I am/was buried' (transitive root, passive meaning), **θabir-nu* (broken-1cpl) 'we are/were broken' (passive meaning), **k'arub-ti* (near-2fsg) 'you are/were near' (stative root, stative meaning), or **wašib-a* 'he is/was seated' (intransitive root, resultative meaning; examples from Huehnergard 1987, 225, 227).[1] All these Proto-Semitic predicative *qatVl*-constructions are either passive, resultative, or stative in meaning. Such a construction "predicates the **condition** or **state** that is the result of the action of the verb" (Huehnergard 2011, 221, his emphasis).

Already in Proto-Semitic, a first step towards grammaticalisation was taken: the predicative base *qatVl*- was invariable, and did not agree with the subject pronoun.[2]

Cross-linguistically, resultative constructions are usually lexically restricted and can only be used with dynamic verbs

involving a change of a state (Dahl 1985, 135; Bybee and Dahl 1989, 69). This restriction did not exist in Proto-Semitic. With dynamic lexemes, *qatVl* signified a state that was the result of the verbal action (resultative meaning). With stativic lexemes, such as **maliʾ* 'full', *qatVl* in the same predicative construction described a state. From this perspective, the Biblical Hebrew stative *zāqēn* 'he is old' is a vestige of a Proto-Semitic usage (Huehnergard 2006, 6; Kouwenberg 2010a, 181).

There is also a predicative *qatil-* with transitive meaning. It is attested in Akkadian for some transitive roots. Huehnergard (1987, 232) prefers to call such constructions 'pseudo-verbal predications', since they are formed as an imitation of a real finite verb of the same root.[3] It seems that "the crucial step in the resultative > perfect shift" was the inferential identification of the subject of the main verb with the agent of the predicative verbal adjective (Cook 2012a, 206, referring to Haug 2008, 294). After the pattern of preterite *imḫur* 'he received' = 'he came into receipt of', an analogical *maḫir* 'he is in receipt of' was formed. After *iṣbat* 'he seized' = 'he took possession of', an analogical transitive *ṣabit* 'he is in possession of', *ṣabtāku* 'I am in possession of' was formed. Predicative constructions of the type *qatil/qatlāku* imitate the real finite verb also in their capacity to govern direct objects. Compare the English *I am in receipt of your letter*. Such pseudo-verbal constructions describe a state/condition and take a direct object. In addition to the normal passive verbal adjective *qatil-* (which may occur also in predicative constructions), there is for some verbs another base *qatil-* that is transitive and is exclusively used in the predicative construction: *ṣabit/ṣabtāku* may

be passive 'I am seized', but also transitive 'I am in possession of'. A semantically parallel English example is *I have written what was said* (with direct object), in which the word *written* is transitive, whereas in *I have what was said written*, the word *written* is passive and the predication lacks a direct object.

It is reasonable to assume that the analogical formations attested in Akkadian existed also in Proto-West Semitic, either as a parallel development, or as shared inheritance. In the latter case, we may assume that various types of pseudo-verbal predications had already developed in Proto-Semitic. In Proto-West Semitic, this construction developed into an active suffix conjugation **k'abar-ku* (bury.sc-1sg) 'I (have) buried', **ðakar-a* (invoke.sc-3msg) 'he (has) invoked',[4] which eventually replaced the inherited perfective *yaqtul* "as the basic unmarked perfective and past" (Kogan 2015, 50f. n. 127; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 7; Huehnergard 2019, 63).

As was stated above, a resultative signals a state that is the result of some action in the past, and that this state persists at reference time (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 69). The adverb 'still' is always acceptable with resultative uses of a verbal morpheme.[5] The adverb 'already' is not compatible with a resultative. This adverb is a typical rendering of an anterior (Bybee et al. 1994, 54).[6] A resultative focuses on a state that persists until something happens to change the state. An anterior focuses on the action itself (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 70). In a narrative sequence, the anterior is typically "used for events that are out of sequence" (Bybee et al. 1994, 62, 65).

An anterior has a more general meaning than a resultative. It expresses that a past action is in a general way relevant to the point of reference (often speech time). It does not require that a state exists as a result of the past action. The semantic change from resultative to anterior can be seen as a semantic generalisation (Bybee et al. 1994, 69; Cook 2012a, 204). If the resultative is used in narrative to express an introduction or background to subsequent actions, then the anterior meaning goes further, since it tends to involve not only actions that produce states but "actions that precede other actions" (Bybee et al. 1994, 69). In specific contexts, an anterior can be used with non-past reference, e.g., *Tomorrow I will already have gone*. Such uses of the anterior can be regarded as a metaphorical transposition of the present moment to some point with future time reference, which is also a common interpretation of the so-called 'prophetic perfect' for retrospective future-orientated report in Biblical Hebrew (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 74; Notarius 2013, 88).

When an anterior gram changes to include also perfective meanings (cf. Kuteva et al. 2019, 484), this development constitutes a further generalisation of meaning: there is "a loss of a specific component of meaning" (Bybee et al. 1994, 86). On the semantic level, the anterior loses the *relevance* (in the current moment) of the past action and signals only a past action. "The specification of current relevance is lost" (Bybee et al. 1994, 86). The development of a resultative/anterior morpheme to express also perfective and past meanings is well documented among the languages of the world. Such formations with several uses are more

developed, or older, than such that have only one use (Bybee et al. 1994, 80f.; Cook 2012a, 204f., figure 3.6).

Though perfectives usually describe bounded actions in the past, the typical perfective formation also has non-past uses. This fact distinguishes perfectives "from simple pasts, which tend not to have other uses. In particular, perfectives may be used in future contexts." Such perfectives may signal future anterior or immediate future. Simple pasts, on the other hand, are only used in past contexts (Bybee et al. 1994, 95).

The most frequent meanings of *qatal* in the attested West Semitic languages, anterior and perfective past, represent later stages. We have reasons to expect the earlier and prototypical uses of the *qatal* grammatical morpheme ('gram') to occur more frequently in the Archaic Hebrew texts than in CBH (cf. Dahl 2000, 10).

The *qatal* gram in Central Semitic has many meanings: gnomic present, future, irrealis wish, anterior, pluperfect, and simple past (cf. Kouwenberg 2010a, 181 n. 67).[7] This multiplicity should not force anyone to presuppose that there must be a common, or basic, meaning for *qatal*.[8] Cross-linguistically, the various meanings indicate a history, during which the verbal morpheme acquires new meanings, while the more ancient are often retained. We may "assume on the basis of our knowledge of documented cases that one use developed after, and probably out of, the other" (Bybee et al. 1994, 52f.). When we attempt to reconstruct the CBH *qaṭal* with the diachronic path of perfective verbs, "there is ample evidence for identifying the TAM of the *qatal* conjugation at each stage of its development" (Cook 2012a, 205f.).

In West Semitic, the usage of the new perfective developed in competition with the old perfective *yaqtul* (Baranowski 2017, 85). In varying degrees, depending on the individual language, *yaqtul* became syntactically restricted, and in many languages it lost the narrative role, while *qatal(a)* "gradually took over all its functions" (Notarius 2013, 86; also Kuryłowicz 1975, 106; Tropper 1998, 182; Cook 2012a, 264).

5.1.1. Gəʿəz

As usual in West Semitic, the *qatala* gram in Gəʿəz can have both past perfective and anterior meaning (Weninger 2011, 1135). An example of anterior is:

(1)   ***samāʿkəmu*** *kama tabəhʾla la-qaddamt*

    'Ihr **habt gehört**, dass zu den Vätern gesagt worden ist' (Mt. 5.21, Tropper 2002, 182)

But *qatal* can also be used with present time reference. As in other West Semitic languages, *qatala* of verbs for emotions and beliefs expresses a general present:

(2)   ***nassāḥku*** *ʾəsma ʾangaśkəwwo la-sāʾol*

    '**Es reut mich**, dass ich Saul zum König gemacht habe' (1 Kgs 15.11, Tropper 2002, 183)

    Qatala can also express a future time reference in prophetic speech.

(3)   *ḥəzb za-yənabbər wəsta ṣəlmat **rəʾəyu** bərhāna ʿabiya*

    'Das Volk, das im Dunkel lebt, **wird** ein großes Licht **schauen**' (Isa. 9.2, Tropper 2002, 185)

(4)   *wa-nāhu **maṣʼa** ba-təʼ³lfit qəddusān*

‘Und siehe, **er wird kommen** mit zehn-tausend Heiligen’ (Hen. 1.9, Tropper 2002, 185)

A future meaning is sometimes found also in non-prophetic speech:

(5)   *wa-ba-ḫaba **motki** ʼəmawwət*

‘Wo du stirbst/**sterben wirst**, will auch ich sterben!’ (Ruth 1.17, Tropper 2002, 185)

Future wishes can be expressed by *qatala*, as in:

(6)   *ʼəm-kämä **gäsäsku** ṣənfä ləbsu ʼaḥayyu*

‘if **I** only **will touch** the fringe of his garment, I shall live’ (Mt. 9.21, Weninger 2011, 1135)[9]

5.1.2. Modern South Arabian

The West Semitic *qatal* in Soqotri can be used with stative verbs. In this case, it may describe a situation in the present, as in:

(7)   *ho náʕa **nékerk** díʔjho ʔembórje*

‘**I miss** my children now’ (Kogan and Bulakh 2019, 306)

With transitive verbs, the *qatal* expresses a perfective:

(8)   ***lʲékodk** márdof di-bᵉʕer*

‘**I made** a camel saddle.’ (Kogan and Bulakh 2019, 305)

In Omani Mehri, the basic use of the West Semitic *qatal* is as a past perfective, as in (9):

(9)   ***ḳáṣṣəm** ḥərōhs*

‘**they cut off** her head’ (Rubin 2018, 163)

The Omani Mehri *qatal* can also be used for an immediate future in the first person:

(10) *hōh **səyə́rk***

'I'm off!' (Rubin 2018, 164)

The *qatal* in Mehri can express irrealis wishes in certain types of oaths:

(11) ***xályək** tēṯi, əl (t)ṭaym mən hənīn śxōf*

'**may I divorce** my wife [= I swear], you won't taste any milk from us' (Rubin 2018, 164)

5.1.3. Ancient South Arabian

According to Stein (2011, 1063f., 1066) the basic function of the suffix conjugation is to express anteriority, as in (12):

(12) *w-sṭr **sṭrk** b-ʿm rḥbm f-**mḍ**ʾ w-**rḍy***

'The letter **you have sent** (lit.: written) with RḤBM **has arrived and pleased**.' (Mon.script.sab. 68/2–7, quoted from Stein 2011, 1066)

All three *qatal* in (12) have anterior meaning: the first (*sṭrk*) in an asyndetic relative clause and the second in a resumptive clause with conjunction *f-* after a left dislocation.

With a stativic verb, *qatal* may have present tense meaning, as in (13):

(13) *šnʾ/m / ḏ-bn-hw / **šʿrw** / w-ḏ-bn-hw / ʾl / **šʿr/w***

'ein Feind, von welchem **sie wissen** und von welchem **sie nicht wissen**' (YM 438/10–12, quoted from Stein 2013, 131)

But *qatal* may also, in a narrative context, express a perfective past, as in (14):

(14) *w-ḫmr-hmw / ʾlmqh / hbʿln / hyt / hgrn / tʿrmn / w-ylfyw /*
       b-hw / mhrgtm / w-|ysbyw / kl / ʾwld / w-ʾnṯ-hw / w-ymtlyw
       / kl / ʾbʿl-hw

       '(Der Gott) ʾLMQH **gewährte ihnen**, sich jener Stadt
       TʿRMN zu bemächtigen. Und sie erlangten darin Tötungen,
       und sie nahmen alle ihre (sc. der Stadt) Kinder und Frauen
       gefangen, und sie erbeuteten all ihre Einwohner' (J 576/6f.,
       quoted from Stein 2013, 132)

The narrative in (14) starts with a *qatal* clause and continues with
w-yqtl clauses, a pattern that is frequent also in CBH (see §§7.7–
8).

5.1.4. Classical Arabic

The *qatal* gram in Classical Arabic always has an *-a* ending in the
3ms form (thus 3ms *qatal-a*), a feature that may be Proto-Semitic.
The origin of *qatala* in a predicative verbal adjective can be per-
ceived in stative roots, when the *qatal* may express a present
state, and often a general truth (Bybee et al. 1994, 82). Such
meanings are primarily pre-classical:

(15) *fa-qāla lahu Baḥīrā ṣadaqta qad kāna mā taqūlu*

       'Baḥīrā answered: **You are right**, what you say has hap-
       pened' (Isḥ. 115, 19)

(16) *iḫtalafat-i l-ʿulamāʾu*

       'scholars are of differing opinions' (Fischer 2002, §181)[10]

(17)   *ʾallaḏīna kafarū*

'those who are unbelievers' (Qur. 2:6, 26, 89; Fischer 2002, §181; see Ambros 2004, 239)

(18)   *taʿālā ʿan ʾan yakūna lahu šarīkun fī sulṭānihi*

'He is elevated beyond having a companion in his sovereignty' (Ṭab. I.1:5)

(19)   *ṯumma qāla ʾayyuhā n-nāsu ʾinnahā maʿḏiratun ʾilā llāhi **ʿazza wa-ǧalla***

'Then he said: People! It is an excuse to God—**he is mighty and exalted**—' (Ṭab. II.297:18)

There are also instances of a pure resultative meaning of *qatala* in Classical Arabic, as in:[11]

(20)   *daḫalat*

'«sie ist eingetreten» = «steht da»' (Ḥam. 248, 7; Reckendorf 1895–98, 54)

(21)   *ṭaribtu*

'ich bin erregt' (Ḥam. 423, 14; Reckendorf 1895–98, 54)

A perfective may also be used in future contexts, either as future anterior, or as immediate future (Bybee et al. 1994, 95). An immediate future is found in:

(22)   *ṯumma ʾinna ʾAbā Ṭālibin ḫaraǧa fī rakbin tāǧiran ʾilā š-Šām*

'Then Abū Ṭālib was about to go out by caravan for trading to Syria' (Isḥ. 115, 4)[12]

The *qatala* is also used to express volitive meanings, as in (Wright 1896–98, II:2D):[13]

(23) *raḥimahu l-lāhu*

'May God have mercy on him!' (Fischer 2002, §182)

(24) *būrikta*

'May you be blessed!' (Isḥ. 1022, 15; Fischer 2002, §182; Reckendorf 1895–98, 55)

An example of a present anterior is (cf. Wright 1896–98, II:1A):

(25) *fa-qatala + ʾanna-S.noun-**qatal** + PrP-«REL-qatal» + wa-**qatala** + PrP-«REL-qatala»*

*fa-kataba ʾilayhi ʾArdašīru ʾanna l-lāha **ḥabānī** bi-t-tāǧi l-laḏī labistuhu wa-**mallakanī** l-bilāda l-latī ftataḥtuhā*

'Ardašīr wrote (back) to him: "God **has bestowed** on me the crown which I have assumed and **has given me** authority over the lands which I have conquered."' (Ṭab. I.818:2)

An example of both past perfective and pluperfect meaning of *qatala* is found in (26):

(26) *fa-**qatala** + wa-**qatala** + bi-mā-**qatala** + wa-**qatala***

*fa-ʾ**aǧābahu** ʾilā ḏālika wa-**kataba** bimā **saʾalahu** min ḏālika siǧillan wa-**ṣāra** bihi ʾilā Tīrā*

'He **agreed** to this and **wrote** a document about what **he had requested** about this and **took** him along to Tīrā.' (Ṭab. I.815:5)

Example (26) also illustrates how Classical Arabic makes use of two coordinating proclitic conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-* in order to create a coherent passage, in which the introductory *fa-* signals temporal succession, and the *wa-qatala* clauses describe the details

in the fulfilment of the agreement (*wa-qatala* is close to an elaboration).

5.1.5. Amorite

It is probably diachronically significant that a verbal formation *qatal* is attested in the extant names in Amorite only as a verbal adjective *qatal*, which "denotes conditions of the grammatical subject and has the same meaning as the Akkadian stative in the G-stem" (Golinets 2020, 193). This is illustrated in (27):

(27)   *ʿAṯṯar-kabar*

        'Aštar is great' (Golinets 2020, 193, 195)

        A finite verb form *qatal* is not attested in the names. And the corpus from the very early second millennium recently published by George and Krebernik contains only imperatives and various forms of prefix conjugations—not one finite *qatal* (George and Krebernik 2022, 29).

5.1.6. Ugaritic

In Ugaritic, *qatal* is gradually replacing the past perfective *yaqtul* (Fenton 1973, 35). In addition to past actions, the non-stative *qatal* can express present and future events. For verbs with stative meaning, *qatal* functionally corresponds to the Akkadian stative and has no specific temporal reference (Huehnergard 2012, 53; Tropper 2012, 717f.; Tropper and Vita 2019b, 493).

(28)   **rbt** . *ilm* . *l* **ḥkmt** /rabbātă ʾilu-mv la-ḥakamtă/

        '**you are great**, O El; **you are** truly **wise**' (KTU[3] 1.4.v:3, vocalised and translated by Huehnergard 2012, 53)

Qatal is the normal form for past actions:

(29) *aṯt . **trḫ** . w **tbˤt*** /ʾaṯṯata tarvḫa wa-tabaˤat/

'**he acquired** a wife but **she departed**' (KTU³ 1.14.i:14, vo-calised and translated by Huehnergard 2012, 53)[14]

(30) *mhy . **rgmt***

'Was **hat sie gesagt**?' (KTU³ 2.14:9, Tropper 2012, 703)

The Ugaritic *qatal* can also express a gnomic present:[15]

(31) *rġb . yd . **mṯkt** / mẓma . yd . **mṯkt***

'Dem Hungernden **reicht** sie die Hand, dem Dürstenden **reicht** sie die Hand' (KTU³ 1.15:I:1f., Tropper 2012, 715, my emphasis)

There are also volitive uses of *qatal,* uses that belong to the older poetic corpus:

(32) *Ø-S.noun-ʾal-yaqtul + Ø-S.noun-**qatal***

*šršk . b arṣ . a*l / *ypˤ . riš . ġly . bd . nsˤk*

'Deine Wurzel soll sich nicht aus dem Boden erheben! (Dein) Kopf **möge verwelken/herabfallen** in der/die Hand dessen, der dich herausreißt!' (KTU³ 1.19:III:53f., Tropper 2012, 726)

(33) *l **yrt** / b npš . bn ilm . mt .*

'May you go down [*lū/la yarattă̄*] into the throat of the son of the gods, Môt' (KTU³ 1.5:I:6–7, Sivan 2001, 98: root yrd 2ms form)

There are also examples of a futural usage of the *wa-qatal* clause-type. In (34), it follows a protasis:

(34) *wa-hm-S.noun-qatal + **wa-qatal***

w . hm . ḫt . / ʔ . **w** . ***likt*** / ʕmk .

'and if the Hittite has attacked, **then I will send** [*wa-laʔiktŭ*] (a letter) to you…' (KTU 2.30:16–18, Sivan 2001, 98)

In (35), *wa-qatal* follows as apodosis after a temporal conditional clause:

(35) [w . u]nṯ ʔinn / lhm ʕd ttṯbn / ksp . iwrkl / **w** . ***ṯb*** . l unṯhm

'and they do not have feudal obligation; as soon as they return the money of Iwirkallu, **then they will return** to their feudal obligation' (KTU³ 3.4:16–19)[16]

The *wa-qatal* clause continues the *yaqtulu* clause (with initial conjunction ʕd), and has future time reference.

5.1.7. Amarna Canaanite

In Amarna Canaanite, *qatal* is used to describe "past events without any syntactical restrictions" (Baranowski 2016a, 124).

(36) *wa-qatal*

ù ***uš-⟨ši⟩-ir-⌐ti⌐*** 3 G[IŠ].M[Á].M[EŠ *a-na*] ¹⁵*ma-ḫar* ᴵ*Ia-[an-ḫa-]mi*

'So **I sent** three ships [to] Ya[nḫa]mu' (EA 105:14–15)

(37) *ADV-qatal + wa-qatal + Ø-ADV-qatal*

*an-nu-ú i-na-na **du-bi-r**[u]* ²⁸LÚ.MAŠKIM-*ka ù **la-qú*** ²⁹URU.MEŠ-*šu a-na ša-šu-nu* ³⁰*a-nu-ma **la-qú*** URU *Ul-la-sà*

'Behold, now **they have expelled** your commissioner and **they have taken** his towns for themselves. Now **they have taken** the city of Ullasa.' (EA 104:27–30)

Anterior[17] and pluperfect meanings of *qatal* are illustrated in the following example (Baranowski 2016a, 125):

(38) […] *am-mi-nim-mì* ¹²⌜*na*⌝-*ad-na-ta* URU *Gi-ti-*⌜*pa*⌝-*da-al-la* ¹³[*i-n*]*a* ŠU *šàr-ri* EN-*ka* URU.KI ¹⁴*ša* **la-qí-mi** ᴵ⌜*La*⌝-*ab-a-yu* ᴸᵁ́*a-bu-nu*

'Why did you give the city of Gath-padalla [in]to the hand of the king, your lord, the city which Lab'ayu, our father had taken over?' (EA 250:11–14)[18]

With stative verbs, *qatal* has a general temporal reference ("across temporal spans;" Baranowski 2016a, 127), which is often best translated in the present tense (Baranowski 2016a, 127f.):

(39) *Ø-yaqtul + CONJ-**qatal***

yi-de LUGAL *be-li* ¹⁰*i-nu-ma* **da-na**-⌜**at**⌝ ¹¹*nu-kúr-tu* UGU-*ia* ¹²*ù* UGU ᴵ*Šu-wa*-⌜*ar*⌝-⌜*da*⌝-⌜*ta*⌝

'May the king, my lord, be apprised that hostility **is strong** against me and against Shuwardata' (EA 271:9–12)

(40) *Ø-qatal*

[…] **ma-ri-iṣ** *ma-gal* ⁸*a-na ia-ši*

'**It is** very **distressing** for me.' (EA 103:7–8)

(41) *IMP*[19] *+ XØ + wa-**qatal** + wa-lā-yaqtulu*

a-⌜*mur*⌝! LÚ.MEŠ *ḫa-za-nu-tu* URU.MEŠ ⁴⁶*a-na ša-šu-nu ù* **pa-aš-ḫu** ⁴⁷*ù la-a ti-iš-pu-ru-na* ⁴⁸*a-na šàr-ri*

'Look, the city rulers have cities and **they are at peace** and they don't write to the king.' (EA 118:45–48)

(42) […] ⌜*aš*⌝-⌜*ba*⌝-*ti a-na* [URU A.PÚ.MEŠ]

'while **I am dwelling** in [the city of Beirut]' (EA 138:88)

(43) *i-na* LÚ.MÁŠKIM *šàr-ri* ²⁰*ša i-šu-ú i-na* ⌜URU⌝ *Ṣu-mu-ur* ²¹ ***ba-⌜al⌝-ṭá-at*** URU ⌜*Gub*⌝-*la*

'It is through the commissioner of the king whom he has in the city of Ṣumur that the city of Byblos **is sustained**.' (EA 68:19–21)

In a past context, a *qatal* of a stative verb refers to the past (Baranowski 2016a, 130), as in (44):

(44) *Ø-yaqtul + CONJ-**qatal***

ti-i-de pa-ar-ṣa-ia ⁴⁰⌜*i*⌝-*nu-ma* ***i-ba-ša-ta*** *i-na* ⁴¹⌜URU⌝ ⌜*Ṣu*⌝-*mu-ra*

'You know my conduct when **you were** in Ṣumur' (EA 73:39–41)

Such a *qatal* of a stative verb may receive an ingressive meaning in a narrative or reportive context (Baranowski 2016a, 130):

(45) […] *i-na u₄-m[i]* ⁴⁸*pa-ṭá-ar* ÉRIN.MEŠ KI.KAL.KASKAL.KUR! *be-li-*[*ia*] ⁴⁹***na-ak-ru*** *gáb-bu*

'On the day that the expeditionary force of [my] lord withdrew, they all **became hostile**.' (EA 106:47–49)

A stative *qatal* may also extend its temporal reference into the future, describing "a state that will last in the future until the point specified" (Baranowski 2016a, 191),[20] as in the following example (Baranowski 2016a, 132f.):

(46) *yaqtul + wa-yaqtulu + "Ø-qatal"*

[*ú*]-⌈*ra*⌉-⌈*ad*⌉ *iš-tu* ²¹⌈KUR⌉ *A-mur-ri ù yi-qa \ bu* ²²*a-na ia-ši* ²³**ma-a-di** ⌈ŠE⌉.MEŠ-*mi* ²⁴*a!*(2)-*na* [KUR *A-mu*]*r-ri* ²⁵[*a-di ka₄-ša*]-*ad* ⌈LÚ⌉ GAL ²⁶[.............]⌈\⌉ EN-*ia*

'[...is] seeking to go down from the land of Amurru and he commands me, "Much grain for Amurru [until the arri]val of the senior official (great king?), my lord [......]"' (EA 178:20–26; in Baranowski's translation, '**There will be plen**[**ty** of gr]ain...')

5.1.8. Phoenician

As in most other West Semitic languages, *qatal* in Phoenician may express a true anterior, describing events "die in der Vergangenheit abgeschlossen sind und in ihrem Ergebnis in die Gegenwart hereinragen" (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §262; the German translations below are from the same paragraph). An example is (47):

(47) ארן . ז פעל . [א]תבעל

'Sarg, den Itbaal gemacht hat' (KAI⁵ 1:1)

The *qatal* can also be utilised as a perfective past, as in:

(48) כ שתהֿ . בעלם

'als er ihn in der "Ewigkeit" niederlegte' (KAI⁵ 1:1)

(49) **פעלן** בעל לדננים לאב ולאם

'Ba'al **made me** a father and a mother to the Danunians' (KAI⁵ 26 A I:3, Schade 2005, 40)

(50) ושברת מלצם

'And I broke the scorners' (KAI⁵ 26 A I:8, Schade 2005, 41)

The conjunction *wa* plus *qatal* of the copula verb may introduce a description of a state in the past:

(51)   וכן בימתי כל נעם לדננ(6)ם

'**Now there was** in my days every pleasure for the Danunians' (KAI[5] 26 A I:5–6, Schade 2005, 40, 48)

Performatives are also expressed by *qatal,* as in:

(52)   על צפן (3)לב | בֿרֿכתך

'hiermit erkläre ich dich als von Baal-Ṣaphon gesegnet' (KAI[5] 50:2–3)

Qatal with future time reference is rare in Phoenician. The specific case of the *wa-qatal* clause-type is attested following a *yaqtulu* clause within a complex protasis, and also as the initial clause of an apodosis (53):[21]

(53)   (*wa-ʾim-XØ* + *Ø-ʾim-XØ* + *REL-yaqtulu* + **wa-qatal** + *Ø-ʾim-ʾap-yaqtulu* + *wa-yaqtulu* + *REL-qatal* + *wa-yaqtulu* + **wa-qatal** + *Ø-ʾim-PrP-yaqtulu* + *wa-PrP-yaqtulu*) + **wa-qatal**

ואם מלך במלכם ורזן ברזנם אם א(13)דם אש אדם שם אש ימח שם
אזתו(14)ד בשער ז **ושת** שם אם אף יחמד אי(15)ת הקרת ז ויסע השער
ז אש פעל א(16)זתוד ויפעל לשער זר **ושת שם** עלי (17) אם בחמדת יסע
בשנאת וברע יסע (18) השער ז **ומח** בעל שמם ואל קן ארץ (19) ושמש
עלם וכל דר בן אלם אית הממלכת הא ואית המלך הא ואית הא (1) אדם הא
אש אדם שם

'(And if there is a king among kings and a prince among princes, if there is a ma[13]n of fame who wipes out the name of Azitawadda [14]from this gate **and puts down his own name**, even if he loves [15]this city, or he tears down this gate that Azitawadda has made [16]and makes a different gate **and puts his name** upon it, [17]whether he tears it down by love, by hatred, or he tears down [18]this gate through malice), **then** Baalshamen and El-Creator-of-the-earth [19]and Eternal-Sun and the entire pantheon of children of the Gods **shall wipe out** that kingdom and that king and that person of fame.' (KAI[5] 26 A III:12–IV:1)

In (53), a *wa-qatal* clause within the protasis twice (in both cases ושת) follows a *yaqtulu* clause with future time reference, and then a *wa-qatal* clause (ומח) introduces the apodosis with future time reference.

5.1.9. Old and Imperial Aramaic

In the *Old Aramaic* inscriptions, *qatal* usually refers to a past event.[22]

(54) *wa-qatal*

. וקם . עמי .

'Und er erhob sich mit mir.' (KAI[5] 202 A:3, Degen 1969, 106)[23]

(55) *[wa]-qatal*

. ו[.....] ושמת . קדֺם . א(14)ור [. נצבא זֺנה .

'und ich habe vor ʼlwr diese Stele errichtet' (KAI[5] 202 B:13–14, Degen 1969, 107)

(56) *wa-CONJ-qatal*

וכזי חבזו אלהן בית [אבי

'als die Götter das Haus meines Vaters geschlagen hatten' (KAI⁵ 224:24, Degen 1969, 108)[24]

A *wa-qatal* clause expresses continuity with past meaning, as is shown in (57) from Deir ʿAllā:[25]

(57) *S.noun-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal*

אֱלֹ[ה]ן . אִתֹיָֽחֹדו (6) ונצבו . שדין . מוֹעֵד . וֹאָמֹרֹוֹ . לש[מש .]

'the gods assembled, and the Shaddayin took their places as the assembly. And they said to the s[un]:' (KAI⁵ 312 I:5–6)

The Deir ʿAllā text also exhibits an example of gnomic *qatal*:

(58) *S.noun-qatal… + wa-S.noun-qatal*

. אֲרֹנֹבן . אֹכֹלֹו (10) [ע]שב ...... וקבען . שֹמעו . מוסר [.]

'Hares eat herbs… and hyenas give heed to chastisement' (KAI⁵ 312 I:9–10)[26]

A future meaning is found in the following example:[27]

(59) *… + Ø-qatal*

שקרת לכל אלהי [ע]דֹיא

'…, (so) **bist du vertragsbrüchig** gegenüber allen Vertragsgöttern' (KAI⁵ 224:14, Degen 1969, 108)[28]

In the *Imperial Aramaic* texts from Elephantine, there is a usage of *qatal* as an anterior projected into the future ('future perfect'). In the following example, *qatal* is used in both protasis and apodosis:

(60) *wa-hn-qatal + wa-ADV-qatal + wa-qatal*

והן **מאתת** ולעד **שלמת ויהבת** לך כספא זילך

'**should I die**, and (by then) **I have** not yet **paid and given** you your silver' (TAD B3.13:8 [402 BCE], Muraoka and Porten 2003, 193)

A *qatal* with future anterior meaning can be found also in a relative clause:

(61) *NP-REL-S.pron-qatal*

עבידתא זי אנת **עבדת**

'the work which **you will have undertaken**' (TAD B2.4:10 [460–459 BCE], Muraoka and Porten 2003, 193)

With verbs of knowing and mental states, a *qatal* may express a present, or even future, as in (62):

(62) *wa-PrP-REL-qatal*

ולמן זי **צבית** למנתן

'whoever **you desire** to give (it) to' (TAD B3.4:15 [437 BCE], Muraoka and Porten 2003, 194)

There are also examples of a gnomic (proverbial) *qatal* in Imperial Aramaic:

(63) *S.noun-**qatal** + wa-S.pron-REL-PP-**qatal***

מאן טב **כס[י]** מלה בלבבה והٔוֹ זٔ]י]תביר **הנפקה** ברא

'a good vessel **cover[s]** a word in its midst, but one whi[ch] is broken **lets it go out**' (TAD C1.1:93 [Aḥiqar, fifth century BCE], Muraoka and Porten 2003, 194)[29]

5.2. *Qaṭal* in the Archaic Hebrew Poetry

In the earliest Hebrew poetry, the new (West Semitic) perfective *qaṭal* still exhibits signs of a relatively new verbal formation. Its use in plain narrative, when speech time and narrator have faded away, is fairly limited (Notarius 2013, 86, 286). The impressiveness of the new perfective morpheme appears to advantage in poetic report, when the presence of the narrator shows through in an intense involvement of the speaker in the recapitulation of the events:

(64) *Ø-O.noun-qaṭal + Ø-O.noun-qaṭal + Ø-PrP-qaṭal +* [26]*Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)-N + wa-qaṭal + Ø-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal +* [27]*Ø-PrP-qaṭal + Ø-qaṭal + Ø-qaṭal + Ø-PrP-qaṭal + Ø-qaṭal + Ø-bə-«REL-qaṭal»-ADVqaṭal*

מַ֛יִם **שָׁאַ֥ל** חָלָ֖ב **נָתָ֑נָה** בְּסֵ֥פֶל אַדִּירִ֖ים **הִקְרִ֥יבָה** חֶמְאָֽה׃ 26 יָדָהּ֙ לַיָּתֵ֣ד
תִּשְׁלַ֔חְנָה וִֽימִינָ֖הּ לְהַלְמ֣וּת עֲמֵלִ֑ים **וְהָלְמָ֤ה** סִֽיסְרָא֙ **מָחֲקָ֣ה** רֹאשׁ֔וֹ **וּמָחֲצָ֥ה**
וְחָלְפָ֖ה רַקָּתֽוֹ׃ 27 בֵּ֣ין רַגְלֶ֔יהָ **כָּרַ֥ע נָפַ֖ל** שָׁכָ֑ב בֵּ֤ין רַגְלֶ֙יהָ֙ **כָּרַ֣ע נָפָ֔ל** בַּאֲשֶׁ֣ר כָּרַ֔ע
שָׁ֖ם **נָפַ֥ל** שָׁדֽוּד׃

'**He asked for** water and **she gave** him milk, **she brought** him curds in a lordly bowl. [26]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. [27]**He sank**, **he fell**, **he lay still** at her feet; at her feet **he sank**, **he fell**; on the place he sank, there **he fell** dead.' (Judg. 5.25–27, Notarius 2013, 142, 290, my emphasis)

In this emotionally charged report, the new perfective *qaṭal* expresses a simple perfective past (Notarius 2013, 289). There is no

difference in meaning between *Ø-qaṭal* and the forms with pro-
clitic *wa* (*wa-qaṭal*; J-M §119z n. 4.),[30] except that the latter in a
general sense continue the preceding clause(s). Some of the
events coded by *qaṭal* are temporally sequential, others are not
(verse 26).[31] The *yiqṭol(u)* clause with energic ending without suf-
fix (תִּשְׁלַחְנָה) expresses a historical present (Notarius 2013, 136,
142, 283f.), and a concomitant action (Müller 1983, 53).

The *qaṭal* morpheme in the Archaic Hebrew poetry may be
used as resultative,[32] as stative (with stativic verb), as expressing
the ability of the subject ('perfect of confidence'), as performa-
tive, as counterfactual irrealis ('would that'), as anterior, as ex-
pressing a new stage in storytelling, and for past simultaneous
events in storytelling. The anterior meaning of *qaṭal* may also,
when the temporal reference is clearly indicated, be transposed
into a 'prophetic' future.

The stativic *qaṭal* is illustrated in (65), where three *qaṭal*
interrupt the narrative main line.

(65) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + **Ø-qaṭal** + **Ø-qaṭal** + **Ø-***
      ***qaṭal** + wa(y)-yiqṭol-O.noun-«Ø-qaṭal» + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

      וַיִּשְׁמַן יְשֻׁרוּן וַיִּבְעָט **שָׁמַנְתָּ עָבִיתָ כָּשִׂיתָ** וַיִּטֹּשׁ אֱלוֹהַּ עָשָׂהוּ וַיְנַבֵּל צוּר יְשֻׁעָתוֹ:

      'Jeshurun grew fat, and kicked. **You are fat, thick, gorged!**
      He abandoned God who made him, and scoffed at the Rock
      of his salvation.' (Deut. 32.15, Notarius 2013, 287, 307, my
      emphasis)

The shift to second-person *qaṭal* forms involves an appeal to the
predicament of the audience at speech time, a sort of comment
to the listeners (Joosten 2012, 418), "an interpolation of the
hymnal conversational framework" (Notarius 2015, 240).[33]

In specific contexts, a *qaṭal* as a resulting state of a previous action signifies the ability of the subject to perform the action of the lexeme (Notarius 2013, 218, 288).[34] This is shown in (66).[35]

(66) *Ø-S.pron-qaṭal + wa-S.pron-qaṭal*[36]

מִי מָנָה עֲפַר יַעֲקֹב וּמִסְפָּר אֶת־רֹבַע יִשְׂרָאֵל

'Who **can count** the dust of Jacob, or **number** the dust-cloud of Israel?' (Num. 23.10a, Notarius 2013, 218, 288, my emphasis)

A performative meaning is likewise close to the resultative *qaṭal*. An example is (67):

(67) *kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + "Ø-XØ"*

כִּי־אֶשָּׂא אֶל־שָׁמַיִם יָדִי וְאָמַרְתִּי חַי אָנֹכִי לְעֹלָם:

'For I lift up my hand to heaven, **and swear**: As I live forever' (Deut. 32.40, Notarius 2013, 288, my emphasis)

In (67), *wa-qaṭal* is an archaic performative,[37] while the *yiqṭol(u)* is present progressive.[38]

Like many perfectives cross-linguistically, *qaṭal* can also be used as an irrealis expressing counterfactual wishes, but only with an initial irrealis particle, as in (68).

(68) *Ø-lū-qaṭal + Ø-yiqṭol(Ø) + Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)*

לוּ חָכְמוּ יַשְׂכִּילוּ זֹאת יָבִינוּ לְאַחֲרִיתָם:

'Would that **they were wise** to understand this and to discern what their end will be!' (Deut. 32.29)

The clause linking in (68) is often understood as conditional (thus Notarius 2013, 92, 284, 288; Christensen 2002, 801). But to introduce a protasis is not the normal function of the particle *lū*, which signals a counterfactual wish, 'oh that', 'would that', 'if only!' (cf. HALOT).[39]

It is commonly held that *qaṭal* in an oath introduced by the particle *ʾim*, at least diachronically, was an irrealis usage of the verb in an imprecation (J-M §165d). An example is (69):

(69) *kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + "Ø-XØ" + Ø-ʾim-**qaṭal** + wa-yiqṭol(Ø) + Ø-yiqṭol(u)! + wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)*

כִּי־אֶשָּׂא אֶל־שָׁמַיִם יָדִי וְאָמַרְתִּי חַי אָנֹכִי לְעֹלֶם: אִם־**שַׁנּוֹתִי** בְּרַק חַרְבִּי וְתֹאחֵז בְּמִשְׁפָּט יָדִי אָשִׁיב נָקָם לְצָרָי וְלִמְשַׂנְאַי אֲשַׁלֵּם:

'For I lift up my hand to heaven, and swear: As I live forever: **I will not whet** my flashing sword, in order that my hand take hold of judgment; but I will take vengeance on my adversaries, and will repay those who hate me' (Deut. 32.40–41, Notarius 2013, 92 n. 59, my emphasis)

Example (69) is an oath by YHWH,[40] with a promise not to lift his sword with judgment against his people, but only against his enemies. The performative *wa-qaṭal* (וְאָמַ֫רְתִּי) has already been treated above. The use of the syntagm *ʾim qaṭal* without the appropriate apodosis in (69) indicates that it was already a set phrase in the archaic poetry: a solemn negative oath with future time reference.

There is only one instance of a *qaṭal* verb forming a conditional clause in a commonly accepted archaic text. It is in the Oracles of Balaam, a relatively innovative text.

(70) *Ø-hinnē-VN-qaṭal + wa-**qaṭal** + wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)-N*

הִנֵּה בָרֵךְ לָקָחְתִּי וּ**בֵרֵךְ** וְלֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנָּה׃

'Therefore I (= El) have taken (him = Balaam) to bless; **if he blesses**, I will not retract it' (Num. 23.20, Notarius 2013, 220, 289)

The function of the *wa-qaṭal* syntagm as protasis is clear in this passage, but the temporal reference of the protasis is unclear. It could be taken as a conditional anterior, 'if he has blessed', or as present tense, 'if he blesses'. Since *wa-qaṭal* as protasis is attested only in this archaic instance, it is not possible to conclude that *wa-qaṭal* is a 'category' that "is used for the conditional mood" (thus Notarius 2013, 220).[41] If we compare with the syntax of CBH, this is not the usual type of conditional clause linking (see §6.7). Protases with an initial *wa-qaṭal* are rare in CBH, and apodoses with a *yiqṭol(u)* clause are commonly asyndetic (not introduced by *wa*). We should beware of equating the syntax in Num. 23.20 with CBH syntax, and it is more cautious to suppose that *wa-qaṭal* involves a *qaṭal* with anterior aspect transferred into a condition: 'and has he blessed, then I will not retract it'.

The anterior meaning of *qaṭal* is relatively frequent in the archaic poetry. The examples exhibit two dominant uses: in main clauses with speech time included in the temporal reference, and in relative, often asyndetic, clauses. An example of an anterior with the present time of the speaker included in the meaning is (71).

(71) *kī-qaṭal + wa-lō-qaṭal*

כִּי **שָׁמַרְתִּי** דַּרְכֵי יְהוָה וְלֹא **רָשַׁעְתִּי** מֵאֱלֹהָי׃

> 'For **I have kept** the ways of the LORD, and **have** not **wickedly departed** from my God' (2 Sam. 22.22/Ps. 18.22, Notarius 2013, 168, 291, my emphasis)

Such anteriors are close to the prototypical resultative meaning of *qaṭal*, and "easily interpreted as habitual past, denoting the behavior patterns of the speaker" (Notarius 2013, 168).[42] The use of the *qaṭal* form in relative clauses is conspicuously well established in the most archaic texts. In such constructions, the anterior is more remote from the speech time and the speaker. An example is (72).

(72) *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *O.noun-«Ø-lō-qaṭal»* + *O.noun-«PrP-qaṭal»* + *«lō-qaṭal»*

יִזְבְּחוּ לַשֵּׁדִים לֹא אֱלֹהַּ אֱלֹהִים לֹא **יְדָעוּם** חֲדָשִׁים מִקָּרֹב **בָּאוּ** לֹא **שְׂעָרוּם** אֲבֹתֵיכֶם:

> 'They sacrificed to demons, not God, to deities **they had never known**, to new ones recently **arrived**, whom your ancestors **had not feared**' (Deut. 32.17, Notarius 2013, 287; 2015, 240, my emphasis)

The three *qaṭal* verbs with pluperfect meaning in (72) are all found in asyndetic relative clauses and there is no clear relation to speech time. The narrative main line in this retrospective report is coded by a clause-initial old perfective *yiqṭol(Ø)* (יִזְבְּחוּ; Notarius 2013, 79).[43]

In the possibly earliest stage of archaic narrative poetry, represented by the first part of the Song of Moses (Deut. 32.8–20), the new perfective *qaṭal* plays a minor role and is used only in relative clauses (anterior). For background and circumstantial clauses, the imperfective *yiqṭol(u)* is used (Notarius 2013, 308).

At a slightly later stage (Notarius (2013, 296f.), represented by
the first part of the Song of David (2 Sam. 22.5–20), *qaṭal* plays
a role in the narration, and may signal an introduction, a new
stage in the narrative framework, a simultaneous non-sequential
event, or a background (with or without an initial particle *kī*), as
in (73).[44]

(73) *kī-**qaṭal*** + *Ø-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ⁶*Ø-S.noun-**qaṭal*** + *Ø-*
qaṭal + ⁷*Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*
+ *wa-XØ* + ⁸*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *Ø-S.noun-*
yiqṭol(u) + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *kī-**qaṭal*** + ⁹*Ø-**qaṭal*** + *wa-*
S.noun-PrP-yiqṭol(u) + *Ø-S.noun-**qaṭal*** + ¹⁰*wa(y)-yiqṭol* +
wa(y)-yiqṭol + *wa-XØ* + ¹¹*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +
wa(y)-yiqṭol + ¹²*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ¹³*Ø-PrP-**qaṭal*** + ¹⁴*Ø-*
yiqṭol(Ø) + *wa-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + ¹⁵*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-*
yiqṭol + *Ø-O.noun*[45] + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ¹⁶*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *Ø-*
yiqṭol(Ø) + ¹⁷*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* +
¹⁸*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *kī-**qaṭal*** + ¹⁹*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +
²⁰*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *kī-**qaṭal***

כִּי **אֲפָפֻנִי** מִשְׁבְּרֵי־מָוֶת נַחֲלֵי בְלִיַּעַל יְבַעֲתֻנִי: 6 חֶבְלֵי שְׁאוֹל **סַבֻּנִי קִדְּמֻנִי**
מֹקְשֵׁי־מָוֶת: 7 בַּצַּר־לִי אֶקְרָא יְהֹוָה וְאֶל־אֱלֹהַי אֶקְרָא וַיִּשְׁמַע מֵהֵיכָלוֹ קוֹלִי
וְשַׁוְעָתִי בְּאָזְנָיו: 8 ‹וַתִּגְעַשׁ› **וַיִּתְגָּעַשׁ** וַתִּרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ מוֹסְדוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם יִרְגָּזוּ
וַיִּתְגָּעֲשׁוּ כִּי־**חָרָה** לוֹ: 9 **עָלָה** עָשָׁן בְּאַפּוֹ וְאֵשׁ מִפִּיו תֹּאכֵל גֶּחָלִים **בָּעֲרוּ** מִמֶּנּוּ:
10 וַיֵּט שָׁמַיִם וַיֵּרַד וַעֲרָפֶל תַּחַת רַגְלָיו: 11 וַיִּרְכַּב עַל־כְּרוּב וַיָּעֹף וַיֵּרָא עַל־
כַּנְפֵי־רוּחַ: 12 וַיָּשֶׁת חֹשֶׁךְ סְבִיבֹתָיו סֻכּוֹת חַשְׁרַת־מַיִם עָבֵי שְׁחָקִים: 13
מִנֹּגַהּ נֶגְדּוֹ **בָּעֲרוּ** גַּחֲלֵי־אֵשׁ: 14 יַרְעֵם מִן־שָׁמַיִם יְהֹוָה וְעֶלְיוֹן יִתֵּן קוֹלוֹ: 15
וַיִּשְׁלַח חִצִּים וַיְפִיצֵם בָּרָק ‹וַיְהֻמֵּם› **וַיָּהֹם**: 16 וַיֵּרָאוּ אֲפִקֵי יָם יִגָּלוּ מֹסְדוֹת
תֵּבֵל בְּגַעֲרַת יְהֹוָה מִנִּשְׁמַת רוּחַ אַפּוֹ: 17 יִשְׁלַח מִמָּרוֹם יִקָּחֵנִי יַמְשֵׁנִי מִמַּיִם
רַבִּים: 18 יַצִּילֵנִי מֵאֹיְבִי עָז מִשֹּׂנְאַי כִּי **אָמְצוּ** מִמֶּנִּי: 19 יְקַדְּמֻנִי בְּיוֹם אֵידִי
וַיְהִי יְהֹוָה מִשְׁעָן לִי: 20 וַיֹּצֵא לַמֶּרְחָב אֹתִי יְחַלְּצֵנִי כִּי־**חָפֵץ** בִּי:

'For the waves of death **have encompassed me**, the torrents of perdition assailed me; [6]the cords of Sheol **entangled me**, the snares of death **confronted me**. [7]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. [8]Then the earth reeled and rocked; the foundations of the heavens trembled and they quaked, because **he had become angry**. [9]Smoke **went up** from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth; glowing coals **flamed forth** from him. [10]He bowed the heavens, and came down; thick darkness was under his feet. [11]He rode on a cherub, and flew; he was seen upon the wings of the wind. [12]He made darkness around him a canopy, thick clouds, a gathering of water. [13]Out of the brightness before him coals of fire **flamed forth**. [14]The LORD thundered from heaven; the Most High uttered his voice. [15]He sent out arrows, and scattered them—lightning, and routed them. [16]Then the channels of the sea were seen, the foundations of the world were laid bare at the rebuke of the LORD, at the blast of the breath of his nostrils. [17]He reached from on high, he took me, he drew me out of mighty waters. [18]He delivered me from my strong enemy, from those who hated me; for **they were too mighty** for me. [19]They came upon me in the day of my calamity, but the LORD was my stay. [20]He brought me out into a broad place; he delivered me, because **he finds delight** in me' (2 Sam. 22.5–20, Notarius 2013, 163f., my emphasis and added verse numbers)

The *qaṭal* clauses in vv. 5–6, together with the past iterative *yiqṭol(u)* clauses in v. 7,[46] shape an introduction or preamble to the narrative.[47] The *qaṭal* forms render "different sides of the

same situation without sequential meaning" (Notarius 2013, 164; 2015, 240f.). The temporal reference is present anterior. The narrative main line is coded by the old perfective *yiqṭol(Ø)*, asyndetic or syndetic (with proclitic *wa*).[48] In this narrative frame, the two *qaṭal* clauses in v. 9 mark "a new stage in storytelling" (Notarius 2013, 167, 287).[49] This beginning of a new narrative, which must be regarded as part of the main line, is followed by twenty past perfective *yiqṭol(Ø)* clauses, the last one in v. 20. The main line is interrupted in v. 13 by a *qaṭal* clause (בְּעֵרוּ), denoting a "simultaneous non-sequential event within the past narrative framework" (Notarius 2013, 165).

At the stage of the archaic poetry represented by 2 Sam. 22.5–20, in which the scope of the new perfective *qaṭal* "is a bit broader than in Deut. 32.8–20," on a continuum between narrative and report (Notarius 2013, 307, 311), *qaṭal* clauses have entered the narrative framework to signal introductory clauses, to signal a new beginning, and to denote backgrounded events, the latter function side-by-side with past habitual or progressive *yiqṭol(u)* clauses.[50]

The relatively later stage of the archaic poetry represented by the oracles of Balaam exhibits a prophecy with *Ø-qaṭal* and *wa-qaṭal* clauses having future time reference:[51]

(74) *Ø-yiqṭol(u)-N + wa-lō-ADV + wa-lō-XØ + Ø-**qaṭal** + wa-**qaṭal** + wa-**qaṭal** + wa-**qaṭal**[52] + [18]wa-**qaṭal** + wa-**qaṭal** + wa-S.noun-qoṭel + [19]wa(y)-yiqṭol! + wa-**qaṭal***

אֶרְאֶ֫נּוּ וְלֹא עַתָּה אֲשׁוּרֶ֫נּוּ וְלֹא קָר֑וֹב **דָּרַ֨ךְ** כּוֹכָב מִֽיַּעֲקֹב וְ**קָם** שֵׁ֫בֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵ֗ל וּ**מָחַץ** פַּאֲתֵ֣י מוֹאָב וְ**קַרְקַר** כָּל־בְּנֵי־שֵֽׁת׃ 18 וְ**הָיָה** אֱד֜וֹם יְרֵשָׁ֗ה וְ**הָיָ֤ה** יְרֵשָׁה שֵׂעִיר אֹיְבָ֑יו וְיִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל עֹ֥שֶׂה חָֽיִל׃ 19 וְיֵ֖רְדְּ מִֽיַּעֲקֹ֑ב וְ**הֶֽאֱבִ֥יד** שָׂרִ֖יד מֵעִֽיר׃

'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. [18]Edom **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, vv. 17–18 translation by Notarius 2013, 220, v. 19 my translation)[53]

The temporal reference is indisputable because of the adverbs supplied in v. 17, 'I see him, but not now' (וְלֹא עַתָּה). In relation to speech time, the events that are described by *qaṭal* clauses occur in the future. It is a prospective report and there is no difference in temporal reference between the initial asyndetic *Ø-qaṭal* verb (דָּרַךְ) and the *wa-qaṭal* clauses that follow.[54] In this prophecy, a "prophetic perfect is interpreted as a simple past that requires future interpretation due to the metaphorical relocation of ST to future" (Notarius 2013, 217, 219 n. 29, 220, 268 n. 6).[55]

5.3. *Qaṭal* in the Pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions

There is ample evidence of an anterior meaning of 'epistolary' *qaṭal* in the letters, but the interpretation is disputed.[56] One example is (75):

(75) *Ø-qaṭal*

. השב . עבדך . הספר(7)ם . אל אדני .

'Your servant **has returned** the letters to my lord.' (HI Lachish 5: 6–7)[57]

A certain anterior meaning of *qaṭal* is found in (76):

(76) *wa-ʿattā-qaṭal*

[רת]אמֹ אשר . אל (5) ה[בֹּל]ך[דֹֹבּ[ע] **הטוֹ** ועת

'And now, your [se]rvant **has inclined** his [h]eart to what [you have] sai[d]' (HI Arad 40:4–5)[58]

A straightforward narrative (past perfective) *qaṭal* that initiates a new paragraph (with following *wa(y)-yiqṭol*) is attested in (77) (Gogel 1998, 279, 282; Rainey 2001, 424):[59]

(77) *wa-PrP-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

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

'At the time 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)

A performative *qaṭal* with *piʿel* of *brk* is attested in several inscriptions, as in (78):

(78) *Ø-S.noun-qaṭal + Ø-qaṭal*

אחך . חניהו . שלח לשל(2)ם . אלישב . ולשלם ביתך בר(3)**כתך** ליהוה

'Your brother Hananiah greets Eliashib and your house. **I bless you** by YHWH.' (HI Arad 16:1–3)

The blessing formula with *qaṭal* (ברכתֹך) has a performative meaning—the action is executed by uttering the words—and cannot be interpreted as a Hebrew epistolary convention.[60]

5.4. The Meanings of *Qaṭal* in CBH

With *qaṭal*, Classical Hebrew inherited from West Semitic a full-blown perfective formation. The only step not yet taken on its diachronic path is the change to a simple past, and that step can be seen completed in Postbiblical Hebrew (Cook 2012a, 208). In CBH, *qaṭal* still applies to stative predicates, often with the effect of signalling a present state. But *qaṭal* with stative verbs may in other instances signal the beginning of a state (cf. Bybee et al. 1994, 92).[61] The CBH *qaṭal* is a perfective gram, and exhibits the expected range of historical meanings.[62] The statistics from my corpus are given in Table 9.

Table 9: The meanings of *qaṭal* in CBH

Resultative present	1
Stativic	154
Anterior	308
Perfective past	584
Pluperfect	135
Habitual past	19
Performative	32
Modal, volitive (?)[63]	1
Counterfactual	23
Future	13
As wa-qaṭal	8
Total	**1278**

As can be seen from Table 9, the dominant meanings of *qaṭal* in CBH are perfective (past) and anterior, which can be expected of a relatively old perfective gram. The usage of *qaṭal* with stativic verbs, with present or past temporal reference, is also frequent.

A pure resultative is a rare phenomenon in CBH, with only one certain example in the corpus.

5.4.1. The Resultative Meaning of *Qaṭal*

Resultative is the prototypical meaning of *qaṭal* and describes, with dynamic verbs, a condition or state that is the result of the action. The focus is on the result of an action, not on the action itself. Such meanings are easily confused with an anterior aspect. I have been restrictive on this point and found only one secure instance:

(79) *Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u) + kī-PrP-**qaṭal***

לְזֹאת יִקָּרֵא אִשָּׁה כִּי מֵאִישׁ **לֻקֳחָה**־זֹּאת׃

'This one will be called woman, for **she was taken** out of man.' (Gen. 2.23)

In (79), the action of *qaṭal* (לֻקֳחָה) describes a state, the situation of the woman being taken out of man. Focus is not so much on the action but on the state that has resulted from the action.

5.4.2. *Qaṭal* with Stativic Verbs

The usage of *qaṭal* with stativic verbs is inherited in CBH from the earliest stage of its formation. In total, 154 stativic *qaṭal* are registered in my database. Past temporal reference is frequent (101 ×; J-M §112a), but so is reference to speech time (48 ×; J-M §112b); see Table 10.

Table 10: Stativic uses of *qaṭal*

Stativic *qaṭal*	
Stativic verb past	59
Stativic copula verb past	42
Stativic verb present	48
Stativic in protasis	4
Stativic in apodosis	1

Stativic verbs include mental states, an example of which is (80):

(80) *wayhī Ø-CONJ-**qaṭal** + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר **יָרֵא** אֶת־בֵּית אָבִיו וְאֶת־אַנְשֵׁי הָעִיר מֵעֲשׂוֹת יוֹמָם וַיַּעַשׂ לָיְלָה׃

'Because **he was afraid** of the men in his father's household and those from the city, so he did it at night.' (Judg. 6.27)

Copula verbs with *qaṭal* can be either stativic ('was') or perfective ('became'; see below). A stativic example is:

(81) *wa-S.noun-**qaṭal***

וְהָאָרֶץ **הָיְתָה** תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ

'The earth **was** unformed and void' (Gen. 1.2)

But stativic verbs with *qaṭal* frequently have present time reference. This is illustrated in (82):

(82) *Ø-S.noun-qoṭel + kī-**qaṭal***

קֵץ כָּל־בָּשָׂר בָּא לְפָנַי כִּי־**מָלְאָה** הָאָרֶץ חָמָס מִפְּנֵיהֶם

'The end of all living beings is coming before me, for the earth **is filled** with violence because of them.' (Gen. 6.13)

In the direct speech in (82), the *qaṭal* (מָלְאָה) has speech time reference.

Qaṭal can also be used with the same stativic meanings in protases and apodoses. In a conditional linking, the temporal reference becomes future, as in (83).

(83)   *(wa-S.pron-CONJ-**qaṭal**)* + *Ø-**qaṭal***

וַאֲנִ֕י כַּאֲשֶׁ֥ר שָׁכֹ֖לְתִּי שָׁכָֽלְתִּי׃

'As for me, if **I am bereaved** (of children), **I am bereaved**.' (Gen. 43.14)

In (83), *qaṭal* clauses constitute both the protasis and the apodosis. The asyndetic *qaṭal* in the apodosis has a future time reference (Gropp 1991, 47; Cook 2012, 207 n. 46).[64] The meaning of both *qaṭal* is close to a prototypical resultative.

5.4.3. *Qaṭal* as Anterior

In the anterior meaning, focus has shifted to the action itself, and this action is still relevant for the situation at reference time. The most frequent case is when reference time coincides with speech time. The statistics are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11: *Qaṭal* as anterior in CBH (registered cases in the database)

Anterior *qaṭal*	
Present	228
Present, copula verb	10
Present in protasis	9
Present in apodosis	1
Future	9
Future in protasis	42
Future in apodosis	9
Pluperfect	135

A present anterior *qaṭal* describes an action in the past that is relevant at speech time ('recent past'; J-M §112c). An example is:

(84) *Ø-kī-qaṭal + Ø-XØ*

כִּי **עָשִׂיתָ** זֹּאת אָרוּר אַתָּה מִכָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּמִכֹּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה

'Because **you have done** this, cursed are you above all the wild beasts and all the living creatures of the field!' (Gen. 3.14)

The action, what the snake has done, is in focus, and this sin, which is highly relevant in speech time, is coded by a *qaṭal* verb.

A present anterior can also occur in a conditional linking, of which the use in protases seems to be more frequent. It can be noted that *qaṭal* in protases has the same range of meanings as in other domains, only that the reference time is future and the truth value is not settled. An example of a present anterior in a protasis is given in (85):[65]

(85) *(Ø-ʾim-lō-qaṭal + wa-ʾim-lō-qaṭal) + Ø-IMP*

(אִם־לֹא **שָׁכַב** אִישׁ אֹתָךְ וְאִם־לֹא **שָׂטִית** טֻמְאָה תַּחַת אִישֵׁךְ) הִנָּקִי מִמֵּי הַמָּרִים הַמְאָרֲרִים הָאֵלֶּה:

'If no man **has gone to bed** with you, if **you have not gone astray** to make yourself unclean while under your husband's authority, then be free from this water of embitterment and cursing.' (Num. 5.19)

A present anterior *qaṭal* may occur also in an apodosis. There is only one example in the database:

(86) *(wa-yēš-XØ) + wa-ADV-qaṭal*

(וְיֵשׁ יְהוָה֙ עִמָּ֔נוּ) וְלָ֥מָּה מְצָאַ֖תְנוּ כָּל־זֹ֑את

'(But if the LORD is with us,) why has such disaster over-
taken us?' (Judg. 6.13)

The action of the *qaṭal* (מְצָאַ֖תְנוּ) lies in the past, but its relevance
is in speech time.

The anterior aspect may be transferred into the future in
certain syntactical constructions, for example with a temporal
conjunction. In such a case, the action described by *qaṭal* is al-
ready finished, but still relevant at reference time. An example
is:

(87) *Ø-PrP-yiqtol(u) + Ø-ʿaḏ-ʾim-qaṭal*

גַּ֥ם לִגְמַלֶּ֖יךָ אֶשְׁאָ֑ב עַ֥ד אִם־**כִּלּ֖וּ** לִשְׁתֹּֽת׃

'I'll draw water for your camels too, until **they have drunk**
as much as they want.' (Gen. 24.19)

In (87), *qaṭal* (כִּלּ֖וּ) is used in a temporal subordinate clause. The
conjunction clearly indicates futural temporal reference, and the
action has already occurred at reference time.[66]

A special case is the examples of the verb נָתַן with God as
subject. In such cases, *qaṭal* expresses a decision already made by
God, as his promise, which will be fulfilled in the future:

(88) *Ø-ʾal-yiqtol + kī-PrP-qaṭal*

אַל־תִּירָ֣א אֹת֗וֹ כִּ֤י בְיָדְךָ֙ **נָתַ֣תִּי** אֹת֔וֹ וְאֶת־כָּל־עַמּ֖וֹ וְאֶת־אַרְצֽוֹ

'Do not fear him, for **I have given** him into your hand, and
all his people, and his land.' (Num. 21.34)

In (88), God describes the giving, the handing over of the land, as already accomplished, though the fulfilment of the action lies in the future.[67]

An anterior *qaṭal* with (eventual) future time reference can be found also in a protasis domain, a fairly frequent case. An example is:

(89) *(Ø-ʾim-qaṭal) + Ø-XØ;*

אִם־זָרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עָלָיו) דָּמִים לֹו)

'(If the sun has risen on him,) then there is blood guilt for him.' (Exod. 22.2)

The conditional *qaṭal* in (89) still has an anterior meaning—this is not something that its use in a protasis domain changes—but this anterior is transposed into the future and the eventuality of a protasis.[68]

A future anterior *qaṭal* may also occur as apodosis. An example is:

(90) *(wa-NP-REL-yiqtol(u)) + Ø-O.noun-**qaṭal** + Ø-VNabs-yiqtol(u) + Ø-XØ*

וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב אֶת־זָכָר מִשְׁכְּבֵי אִשָּׁה) תּוֹעֵבָה **עָשׂוּ** שְׁנֵיהֶם מוֹת יוּמָתוּ)
[דְּמֵיהֶם בָּם:]

'If a man has sexual intercourse with a male as one has sexual intercourse with a woman, the two of them **have committed** an abomination. They must be put to death; their blood guilt is on themselves.' (Lev. 20.13)

The action expressed by *qaṭal* in (90) is something that has already happened when the condition is fulfilled. It is a past event with relevance in the reference time of the apodosis (future).[69]

The pluperfect *qaṭal* is a commonplace in CBH (see J-M §112c). It codes an action that is past in relation to another past action, and still relevant to this action. An example is:

(91) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-hinnē-qaṭal + kī-qaṭal*

וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְהִנֵּה נִשְׁחָתָה כִּי־**הִשְׁחִית** כָּל־בָּשָׂר אֶת־דַּרְכּוֹ עַל־הָאָרֶץ:

'And God saw the earth, and behold, it was corrupt, for all flesh **had corrupted** their way on the earth.' (Gen. 6.12)

In (91), God looked at the earth. This action is past (perfective). The pluperfect *qaṭal* (הִשְׁחִית) is past in relation to God's looking in the main clause (וַיַּרְא) and still relevant to it.

5.4.4. *Qaṭal* as Perfective

With perfective meanings, *qaṭal* loses its relevance in the current moment. A typical perfective describes bounded actions, usually in the past. A perfective past meaning of *qaṭal* is by far the most frequent in the corpus. An example is:

(92) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-PrP-qaṭal*

וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים ׀ לָאוֹר יוֹם וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ **קָרָא** לָיְלָה

'And God called the light Day, and the darkness **he called Night**.' (Gen. 1.5)

In (92), the *qaṭal* clause is bounded as much as the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* is. The action has no relevance to a current moment. Both actions are remote; the difference is that, while the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* signals discourse continuity and a succession in relation to the preceding clause, the *qaṭal* clause describes an action that can be regarded as parallel or complementary in relation to the *wa(y)-yiqṭol*. No

temporal succession is signalled by the *qaṭal* clause (type *wa-XV*; see §§1.2.6, 7.11–12). On the other hand, it is not natural to regard the *qaṭal* clause as background. Both clauses in (89) are main-line (foregrounded), but only the first signals discourse continuity (type *wa-VX*).

A bounded action can also have future time reference (so-called 'immediate future'; Bybee et al. 1994, 83; Isaksson 2009, 134). There are a few examples in my corpus. One is:

(93) *PrP + kī-qaṭal*

בְּאָשְׁרִי [כִּי **אִשְּׁרוּנִי** בָּנֹות]

'How happy I am, for women **will call me** happy!' (Gen. 30.13)

In (93), Leah expects the praise of the women to be imminent, which is expressed by a *qaṭal* clause (Ges-K §106n; Westermann 1981, 574).[70]

5.4.5. *Qaṭal* as Performative

As a perfective gram, *qaṭal* can also be used for performative meanings (J-M §112f.).[71] This is a fairly frequent usage of *qaṭal* in CBH.

(94) *Ø-VNabs-qaṭal*

הַקְדֵּשׁ **הִקְדַּשְׁתִּי** אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף לַיהוָֹה מִיָּדִי לִבְנִי לַעֲשֹׂות פֶּסֶל וּמַסֵּכָה

'**I solemnly dedicate** this silver to the LORD for my son to make a carved image overlaid with silver.' (Judg. 17.3)

In (94), the solemnity of the act is strengthened by an infinitive absolute placed before *qaṭal*.

In some cases, especially when first-person (referring to God) *qaṭal* of the lexeme נָתַן is used, a performative could also be interpreted as a present anterior, coding a decision already made within the Godhead.[72] Linguistic indications of a performative meaning are the adverbials *hinnē*, *rəʾē*, and *hay-yōm*. An example is:

(95) *Ø-rəʾē-qaṭal*

רְאֵה **נָתַ֤תִּי** לְפָנֶ֨יךָ֙ הַיּ֔וֹם אֶת־הַֽחַיִּ֖ים וְאֶת־הַטּ֑וֹב וְאֶת־הַמָּ֖וֶת וְאֶת־הָרָֽע׃

'See, **I set** before you (today) life and good, death and evil.' (Deut. 30.15)

In (95), the choice between life and good, death and evil, is set before the people of Israel in the moment it is uttered. The present time reference is emphasised by the adverbs *rəʾē* and *hay-yōm*.[73]

5.4.6. Virtually Habitual Perfective *Qaṭal*

Several past perfective uses of *qaṭal* describe actions that are habitual, repetitive, or continuative. Usually, this is indicated by adverbs in the clause. The action is seen as a whole, with a bounded aspect. An example is:

(96) *wa-S.noun-qaṭal + Ø-O.noun-qaṭal*

וּבְנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֗ל **אָֽכְל֤וּ** אֶת־הַמָּן֙ אַרְבָּעִ֣ים שָׁנָ֔ה עַד־בֹּאָ֖ם אֶל־אֶ֣רֶץ נוֹשָׁ֑בֶת אֶת־הַמָּן֙ **אָֽכְל֔וּ** עַד־בֹּאָ֕ם אֶל־קְצֵ֖ה אֶ֥רֶץ כְּנָֽעַן׃

'Now the Israelites **ate** manna forty years, until they came to a land that was inhabited; **they ate** manna until they came to the border of the land of Canaan.' (Exod. 16.35)

In (96), the eating of the manna is seen from a distance, with perfective aspect. Both *qaṭal* clauses are perfective; they do not in themselves signal habituality. The habitual action is implied by the long temporal distance ('forty years').[74]

5.4.7. Irreal *Qaṭal*

Apart from the use of *qaṭal* in conditional linking, which is very similar to the realis meanings, *qaṭal* can be used to express irrealis meanings, commonly signalled by specific particles. I have found no directly volitive meaning of *qaṭal* in my corpus,[75] but there are counterfactual uses, relating to what has not happened, hypothetical assertions, wishes for the unexpected, and surprised questions (Waltke and O'Connor 1990, §30.5.4b; J-M §112j).

The counterfactual constructions are conditional in nature. A positive protasis contains a *lū-qaṭal* phrase, and a negative protasis, a *lūlē-qaṭal* phrase. A positive apodosis usually starts with *kī-ʿattā-qaṭal*, and the negated equivalent is phrased with *Ø-lō-qaṭal*. An example of a negative protasis with an affirmative apodosis is:

(97) *(kī-lūlē-**qaṭal**) + kī-ʿattā-**qaṭal***

(כִּי לוּלֵא הִתְמַהְמָהְנוּ) כִּי־עַתָּה שַׁבְנוּ זֶה פַעֲמָיִם:

'If we had not delayed, we would now have returned twice.' (Gen. 43.10)

Both clauses contain a counterfactual *qaṭal*, but only the first is marked with the particle *lū* (negated *lūlē*; J-M §167f.). An example with negated apodosis is:[76]

(98) *(Ø-lū-qaṭal) + Ø-lō-qaṭal*

לֹא הָרַגְתִּי אֶתְכֶם: (לוּ הַחֲיִתֶם אוֹתָם)

'If you had saved them alive, **I would** not **kill** you.' (Judg. 8.19)

A hypothetical assertion is not formulated as a condition with result (Bybee et al. 1991, 20). An example with *qaṭal* and two *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses is the following:

(99) *kī-ʿattā-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

כִּי עַתָּה שָׁלַחְתִּי אֶת־יָדִי וָאַךְ אוֹתְךָ וְאֶת־עַמְּךָ בַּדָּבֶר וַתִּכָּחֵד מִן־הָאָרֶץ:

'For by now **I could have put out** my hand and struck you and your people with pestilence, and you would have been cut off from the earth.' (Exod. 9.15)

Example (99) shows that *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses may follow a hypothetical *qaṭal* without changing the hypothetical meaning.[77]

Wishes for something unexpected may also be expressed by *qaṭal*, as in (100):[78]

(100) *Ø-lū-qaṭal + ʾō-PrP-lū-qaṭal*

לוּ־מַתְנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אוֹ בַּמִּדְבָּר הַזֶּה לוּ־מָתְנוּ:

'Would that **we had died** in the land of Egypt! Or would that **we had died** in this wilderness!' (Num. 14.2)

Finally, a counterfactual intention can be formulated as a surprised question (J-M §112j):[79]

(101) *Ø-INT-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*

הֶחֳדַלְתִּי אֶת־מָתְקִי וְאֶת־תְּנוּבָתִי הַטּוֹבָה וְהָלַכְתִּי לָנוּעַ עַל־הָעֵצִים:

'**Should I give up** my fruit, so good and sweet, to hold sway over the trees?' (Judg. 9.11)

5.4.8. *Qaṭal* Functioning as *Wa-qaṭal*

In a few cases, *qaṭal* has the same meaning as the construction *wa-qaṭal* (see §6), that is, it functions as an imperfective formation. In most such cases, the *qaṭal* clause follows a *wa-qaṭal* clause, and is connected by the disjunctive conjunction ʾō. This is illustrated in (102):

(102) *(kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + ʾō-qaṭal) + Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)*

(כִּֽי־יִגְנֹֽב־אִישׁ שׁ֤וֹר אוֹ־שֶׂה֙ וּטְבָח֔וֹ **אֲוֹ מְכָר֑וֹ**) חֲמִשָּׁ֣ה בָקָ֗ר יְשַׁלֵּם֙ תַּ֣חַת הַשּׁ֔וֹר
וְאַרְבַּע־צֹ֖אן תַּ֥חַת הַשֶּֽׂה:

'(If someone steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters **or sells it**), he must pay five oxen for an ox and four sheep for a sheep.' (Exod. 21.37)

There are only a few (8×) records in the database where ʾō-qaṭal has similar meanings to a *wa-qaṭal* clause. It is surprising that the disjunctive ʾō-qaṭal can express the same meanings as *wa-qaṭal*. The disjunctive clause-type ʾō-qaṭal is not a construction in Bybee's (2010; 2015) sense. After an anterior *qaṭal*, the disjunction ʾō-qaṭal has anterior meaning (Lev. 15.3; Num. 30.11). The pattern that can be discerned is that the meaning of the preceding clause determines the meaning of ʾō-qaṭal:

qaṭal + ʾō-qaṭal = anterior;
wa-qaṭal + ʾō-qaṭal = imperfective;
yiqṭol(u) + ʾō-qaṭal = imperfective (Lev. 25.49).

It is possible that this extended functionality of ʾō-qaṭal as disjunctive clause to both *qaṭal* and *wa-qaṭal* is a heritage of the early developmental stage when *wa-qaṭal* emerged as a construction in Bybee's sense (see §6).[80]

5.5. Why *Qaṭal* Came to Alternate with *Wa(y)-yiqṭol*: *Qaṭal* as Intruding Morpheme in CBH

The extant usage of *qaṭal* in CBH cannot be fully understood without its competition and interaction with the old perfective gram *yiqṭol(Ø)* (Isaksson 2014b). The coexistence of two perfective forms is attested already in Amarna Canaanite, a "coexistence of a newly emerged perfective (*qatal*) with the original perfective (*yaqtul*)" (Baranowski 2016a, 208). In CBH, the new perfective (*qaṭal*) has taken over all the earlier perfective functions of *yiqṭol(Ø)*, except its use in affirmative continuity clauses (clause-type *wa(y)-yiqṭol*). This development must be characterised as an invasive process, and a renewal of the expression of the perfective aspect (Smith 1991, 6; Joosten 2012, 75). As is commonly recognised, this process started at an early stage of West Semitic. Already in the Amarna letters from Canaan, "the original perfective *yaqtul* and the newly emerged perfective *qatal* were coexistent" (Baranowski 2016a, 215, also 188).

The replacement basically occurred in discontinuity clauses. In continuity clauses, an old clause-type for narrative action was retained during the whole CBH period: *wa(y)-yiqṭol*. It did a good job and was retained. In the storyline, a replacement was necessary only in negative continuity clauses, since the old *wa-lā-yaqtul*, in full use in Amarna Canaanite, was suppressed in Proto-Hebrew because of its word order and the risk of confusion with the old *wa-lā-yaqtulu* (Joosten 2012, 43). The expansion of the new perfective in the syntax of CBH resulted in a conspicuous alternation between short *yiqṭol* in affirmative continuity clauses

(type *wa(y)-yiqṭol*) and *qaṭal* in other clause-types with perfective and anterior meanings. In this respect, CBH is a conservative West Semitic language: an old PS perfective **yaqtul* is retained side-by-side with a new perfective. In many of the other first-millennium WS languages, indicative *yaqtul* clauses are practically absent.

This is the reason why *qaṭal* came to interchange with *wa(y)-yiqṭol*. In all *X-verb* positions, including where *X* is just a negation, *qaṭal* became the verb form to be used instead of the old short *yiqṭol*. In Amarna, the realis sequence *u-yaqtul* may be broken by a negation, an adverb, or a subject (Baranowski 2016a, 207), but not in CBH. In Amarna and Archaic Hebrew, a realis *yaqtul* may occur at the beginning of a clause without the conjunction *wa*, in asyndesis, but not in CBH. "[T]he *yaqtul* in Canaanite was used as an unrestricted preterite, capable of both initiating and continuing a narrative" (Baranowski 2016a, 207). No longer so in CBH, which permits only the sequence *wa-yaqtul* (*wa(y)-yiqṭol*). Initiating a narrative, even in main line and not only in background, is done mainly by *qaṭal* clauses (for further details see §§7.7–8).

In affirmative discourse-continuity clauses in narration, the storyline, the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause-type has maintained its dominance. In my corpus of CBH, no affirmative *qaṭal* clause is attested in the same function as a narrative *wa(y)-yiqṭol*.

In negative continuity clauses in narration, in the storyline, *qaṭal* has crept in. The new negative discourse-continuity clause-type in CBH is *wa-lō-qaṭal*. Such a clause, with no other clausal

constituent placed before the verb, signals discourse continuity, coded with the clausal pattern *wa-NEG-V* (see §7.12).

5.6. Summary: The Identity of *Qaṭal* as Perfective Gram in CBH

This chapter has established *qaṭal* as a perfective gram in CBH and its origin as a resultative construction in West Semitic.

In its relation to the perfective short *yiqṭol* of Proto-Semitic origin, it is new (see §3.1). But considered on its path of grammaticalisation from a resultative construction, it is old (§5.4). The traces of the prototypical resultative meanings exhibited in the corpus are rare. The anterior and past perfective uses dominate in the corpus.

Proto-Hebrew resultative uses of the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type— in modal sequences and as apodosis—probably became the basis for the new construction *wa-qaṭal*, a distinguishing feature of CBH (see §6). *Qaṭal* is also one of four basic constituents in the theory of consecutive tenses.

---

[1] This type of suffixed construction is an Afro-Asiatic inheritance and basically an "expression of state/result" (Kouwenberg 2010a, 189–91; Rubin 2010b, 49; Gragg 2019, 33; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 18 n. 6).

[2] At the early stage of such a formation, grammatical agreement persists between the affix (the affected entity) and the adjective/passive participle in number and gender, and presumably also case. At a later stage of grammaticalisation, "the participle loses its adjectival nature and becomes part of the verb" (Bybee et al. 1994, 68). At this later stage, the participle constitutes the stem in a verbal formation and this "is reflected in the loss of agreement on the participle" (Bybee et al. 1994, 68).

[3] The description of pseudo-verbal predications in Akkadian is based on Huehnergard (1987).

[4] Development from a passive to an active construction is not unprecedented typologically (Huehnergard 2006, 6 n. 28); thus also Kouwenberg (2010a, 181, 186). For the short *-ă* in *qatal-a*, see Huehnergard (1987, 222 n. 14); Kouwenberg (2010a, 183, 187–189).

[5] A "resultative points to the state resulting from the action while the anterior points to the action itself" (Bybee et al. 1994, 63, 65; see also Dahl 1985, 134).

[6] 'He is still gone' is an acceptable sentence with resultative meaning, and 'He has gone already' would perfectly fit an anterior meaning (Dahl 1985, 134; Bybee and Dahl 1989, 69).

[7] For definitions of the terms, see §1.2.2. For 'anterior', many scholars use 'perfect' (cf. Bybee and Dahl 1989, 55). I prefer anterior in order to avoid a confusion between perfect (often used to refer to the verbal morpheme *qaṭal*) and perfective.

[8] The term 'verbal (grammatical) morpheme' is used in the sense of 'gram', discussed by Bybee and Dahl (1989, 51f.) as a term wider than 'inflectional category' and narrower than 'grammatical category'. The term 'gram' includes both bound and periphrastic expressions. It is understood that gram is a category which has both certain meaning(s) and a certain expression. Thus grams are language-specific. They belong to "a small set of cross-linguistic **gram-types**, identifiable by their semantic foci and associated with typical means of expression" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 52). Grams such as the Hebrew *qaṭal* "develop out of lexical material by a gradual generalization of meaning which is paralleled by a gradual reduction in form" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 56). An anterior gram "tends to develop into a past or perfective" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 56). When I use a term such as 'the new perfective *qatal*', it is understood that the term involves a diachronic history along the usual path from resultative to anterior and further to perfective. This is one of three major paths of development of a verbal grammatical morpheme

('gram'). A universal theory of tense and aspect always includes a dia-chronic dimension, so that "the paths along which grams develop may be the same or similar across languages" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 57). The evaluation of a verbal grammatical morpheme, such as the Hebrew *qaṭal*, should include an evaluation of the location this "particular gram occupies along one of these universal paths at a particular time" (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 57; see also 59). Its location on the universal path should not be expected to be the same in, say, the Archaic Hebrew po-etry, and in CBH. See also Dahl (2000, 7). The first and oldest stage in the development of a gram can be called 'prototypical'. In the process of generalisation in several respects ('semantic bleaching'), the proto-typical use of the gram may become less salient (Dahl 2000, 10). In the case of the *qaṭal* formation in CBH, the resultative uses have become less salient than the anterior and perfective meanings.

[9] The vowel of the first order is transcribed as *ä* by Weninger, but as *a* by Tropper. I have decided to quote the authors exactly on this point.

[10] See also Reckendorf (1895–98, 54), who translates *iḫtalafū* 'sie sind verschiedener Meinung'.

[11] In Reckendorf's (1895–98, 54) wording, "Sie bezeichnet so scheinbar eine noch immer in der Verwirklichung begriffene Dauer, ruft aber die Erinnerung an das Entstehung dieser Dauer wach."

[12] The action of *qatala* has not taken place at reference time and Abū Ṭālib is still in Mecca, but he is expected to go out in the immediate future (Isaksson 2009, 134).

[13] This volitive meaning of *qatal* is attested also in Taymanitic: **rḍw ṣlm** '**May** Ṣalm **be pleased**' (Esk 013; Kootstra 2016, 91).

[14] The last clause is interpreted as passive by Tropper (2012, 708): "aber sie wurde hinweggerafft."

[15] According to Tropper (1998, 183), the gnomic meaning of *qatal* is attested in practically all West Semitic languages.

[16] The translation follows Tropper (2012, 798). For the interpretation of *w ṯb* [*wa-ṯābū*] as apodosis, see also Sivan (2001, 98). The conditional construction has the pattern *ʿd-yaqtulu + wa-qatal* with initial temporal

conjunction ʿd, where *tttbn* is *yaqtulu* 3mp ([*tutatẗbūna*]; Tropper 2012, 651).

[17] Cook (2012a, 207) maintains that the anterior meaning of *qatal* is statistically dominant in Amarna Canaanite. According to Moran (1950, 30), the basic function of *qatal* is "a narrative preterite."

[18] Baranowski (2016a, 125) translates: 'Why **have you handed** Gittipa-dalla to the king, your lord, a city that Labʾayu, our father, **had taken**?'

[19] Knudtzon (1915, 514) has instead *a-na*.

[20] For a discussion of other interpretations of the passage, see Baranowski (2016a, 132f.).

[21] Karatepe, ca 720 BCE (Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §266). Krahmalkov (1986, 9) uses the terms 'anticipatory clause' and 'resumptive clause' and translates 'As for any king or any prince or a person who is a person of name…'. According to Krahmalkov (1986, 10) "the presence of the conjunction is purely stylistic, serving the sole function of co-ordinating the clauses. That is, there is no inherent syntactic force in W- that 'converts' a perfect (past) into an imperfect (future)."

[22] Fales, in addition, alleges an optative sense (2011, 568), *pace* Gzella (2004, 322).

[23] Gzella (2004, 322): "Die übliche Erzählform bildet, wie im Phönizischen, das 'Perfekt' mit und ohne *waw*."

[24] For an anterior meaning of *qatal* in Imperial Aramaic, see Gzella (2004, 162f.).

[25] See also Tel Dan (KAI[5] 310, 1, 8).

[26] Hackett (1984, 25, 29) reads אֹב[ ] (10) . אכלו . ארנבן, and translates 'hares eat (10) [a wo]lf', which gives better sense.

[27] All futural examples adduced by Degen (1967, 108) are found in an apodosis. The apodoses in his examples are asyndetic. For a future meaning of *qatal* in Imperial Aramaic, see Gzella (2004, 232–37).

[28] The *qatal* (שקרת) in KAI[5] 224:14 can of course be regarded as an anterior projected into the future. Donner and Röllig (1971–76, II:265)

translate, 'Wenn (du) das jedoch nicht (tust), (dann) bist du vertrags-brüchig geworden gegenüber allen [Ve]rtragsgöttern'. In Imperial Aramaic, the use of *qatal* in apodosis seems to be a rare phenomenon (Muraoka and Porten 2003, 326).

[29] TAD3 (Porten and Yardeni 1993, 37) translates with past tense ('A good vessel cover[ed] a word in its heart…'), which does not suit a proverbial saying.

[30] In the traditional terminology, the *wa* in such syntagms is called '*waw* copulativum' (Ges-K §154a; Bergsträsser 1918–29 II, §9n).

[31] "קטל marks temporal sequence, especially with the conjunction *waw*" (Notarius 2013, 134).

[32] By this term I refer to the prototypical state that is the result of a previous action. With a stativic verb, it expresses a stative, and with a dynamic verb, it can often be translated with the English perfect. It seems to me that Notarius uses the term 'gnomic' for both, and with present tense translation.

[33] Other examples of stativic and, rarely, resultative *qatal* (also called 'gnomic' by Notarius) in the archaic poetry: Gen. 49.7a (Notarius 2013, 193); 49.11 (*Ø-qatal*, resultative with dynamic verb, a present state of having washed his clothes; cf. Notarius 2013, 194, 268 n. 5); 49.15 (*wa(y)-yiqtol + kī-qatal + wa-O.noun-kī-qatal*; Notarius 2013, 193)—though the *qatal* forms could be taken as adjectives; 49.26 (Notarius 2013, 193)—*qatal* is part of a relative clause, 'blessings of your father (that) are stronger than the blessings of the eternal mountains'; Num. 24.5 (Notarius 2013, 211, 217); 24.9 (dynamic verb)—"The characterization of the lion's behavior in its symbolic application is expressed by the resultant perfect, which under these discourse conditions acquires a certain generic nuance" (Notarius 2013, 218); Deut. 33.9 (Notarius 2013, 238; verbs of cognition with present and past temporal references); 33.12 (stativic verb; Notarius 2013, 238, 269); 33.20 (*Ø-PP + Ø-PrP-qatal + wa-qatal*, where *qatal* is stative, while *wa-qatal* has a dynamic verb and resultative meaning; Notarius 2013, 238); Judg. 5.17 (stativic verbs; Notarius 2013, 268 n. 5, 269); 1 Sam. 2.1 (*Ø-qatal + Ø-*

qaṭal + Ø-qaṭal + kī-qaṭal; Notarius 2013, 258); 2.4 (dynamic verb with resultative meaning); 2.5 (several dynamic verbs with resultative meaning; cf. Notarius 2013, 258, 268 n. 5); Ps. 18.20/2 Sam. 22.20 (*Ø-kī-qaṭal*, stativic verb)—Notarius (2013, 164 n. 49, 167) translates, 'because he finds delight in me'; Ps. 18.44/2 Sam. 22.44 (an asyndetic relative clause, «*Ø-lō-qaṭal*», cognitive lexeme).

[34] According to Ges-K (§106n), this case involves "facts that are undoubtedly imminent." J-M (§112j) explains this meaning instead as a case of "future perfect."

[35] I know of only one more *qaṭal* clause signifying ability in the archaic poetry: Num. 23.21 (*Ø-lō-qaṭal + wa-lō-qaṭal*, resultative *qaṭal* as perfect of confidence; Notarius 2013, 218, 288).

[36] I accept, with Notarius (2013, 218 n. 23), the suggestion by BHS to read a *qaṭal* clause *mī sāp̄ar* instead of MT *mispār* in the second hemistich.

[37] It is not a 'perfect consecutive'.

[38] This *yiqtol(u)* (אֶשֵּׁא) is not performative, since it is not identical with the expressed action. Instead, it is present progressive (Notarius 2013, 95, 96, 282; *pace* Tropper 1998, 172). Other examples of performative *qaṭal* in the archaic poetry: Gen. 49.18 (Notarius 2013, 194); Deut. 32.26 (Notarius 2013, 102); 32.37 (Notarius 2013, 92).

[39] Notarius (2013, 95) regards the *yiqtol* clauses as long, and as imperfectives expressing simultaneous circumstantial actions.

[40] Its nature as an oath is emphatically stated by Lehmann (1969, 83f.).

[41] Notarius' terminology concerning conditional linkings is imprecise. A sharp distinction should be drawn between the syntaxes of protasis and apodosis. Notarius also exaggerates the frequency of the *wa-qaṭal* syntagm in conditional linkings, since her next example (with *wa-qaṭal* as apodosis) is not a conditional linking (Num. 24.19). See §3.2 on Num. 24.17–19 and my critique there.

[42] Other examples of main-line *qaṭal* forms with present anterior meaning: Gen. 49.9 (Notarius 2013, 200); Num. 23.19—Notarius (2013, 217,

223f.) regards both *qaṭal* and *wa-qaṭal* as expressing anterior meaning, thus also Budd (1984, 252); 23.20 (a situation simultaneous with the speech moment; Notarius 2008, 72; 2013, 217); 23.23 (Notarius 2013, 222); Deut. 33.23—Notarius (2013, 236f.) regards יְרֵשָׁה as an anterior *qaṭal* 3ms with anaphoric 3fs suffix pronoun written without *mappīq* (Ges-K §61i; J-M §58); Ps. 18.5/2 Sam. 22.5 (Notarius 2013, 164, 167; 2015, 240f.).

[43] Other examples of anterior *qaṭal* in relative clauses: Exod. 15.13a (Notarius 2013, 113, with the archaic *REL zū*); 15.16b, 17 (Notarius 2013, 113f.; 2015, 243f.); Num. 23.8 (Notarius 2013, 218); 24.6b (Notarius 2013, 218); Deut. 32.6b; 32.15b (Notarius 2015, 240); 32.18a; 33.8 (Notarius 2013, 237f., with *REL* אֲשֶׁר and *qaṭal* close to a simple past); 33.29a (Notarius 2013, 238). Anterior *qaṭal* is also sporadically found in other non-main clauses: a protasis construction (Deut. 32.30), a subordinate complement clause (with *kī*, Deut. 32.36b), and a cause/reason clause (with *kī*, Ps. 18.8b/2 Sam. 22.8b).

[44] It is sometimes difficult to distinguish the emphatic, adverbial, function of *kī* from its use as conjunction. In v. 5, the initial *kī* is analysed as adverbial, 'therefore', or emphatic, 'indeed'.

[45] The isolated object noun (בָּרָק) in v. 15 indicates an ellipsis of the initial *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (וַיִּשְׁלַח).

[46] The first-person *yiqṭol(u)* forms in v. 7 code a past progressive within the introductory part of the narrative (Notarius 2013, 163, 165, 169f., 283, 308; 2015, 240).

[47] In Ps. 18.5, the *kī* particle is dropped and the *qaṭal* (אֲפָפוּנִי) occupies an initial position.

[48] In Ps. 18.7b, the main line starts with asyndesis (יִשְׁמַע), while the form in 2 Sam. 22.7b has proclitic *wa* (וַיִּשְׁמַע).

[49] The *yiqṭol(u)* clause in v. 9 is circumstantial in relation to the first *qaṭal* clause (Notarius 2013, 164f., 170, 283, 308).

[50] The imperfective *yiqṭol(u)* codes simultaneous progressive or iterative action in v. 5 (יְבַעֲתֻנִי), v. 7 (אֶקְרָא twice), v. 8 (יִרְגָּזוּ), v. 9 (תֹּאכֵל), and v. 14 (יִתֵּן); cf. Notarius (2013, 163–65, 167, 169f., 283, 307f.; 2015, 240).

[51] There is an even more archaic attestation of future 'prophetic' *qaṭal*, in Deut. 32.22, but in that passage the prospective report is constructed as *kī-qaṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol*, where the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses also have future reference (Notarius 2013, 88 n. 49, 268 n. 6, 282).

[52] This is a *pilpel* form and thus a *wa-qaṭal* syntagm; see HALOT and Notarius (2013, 220): 'and ruin'.

[53] For the interpretation of the jussive *wa-yiqṭol!* in v. 19 (וְיֵרְדְּ), and my criticism of the common hypothesis that it constitutes a protasis (thus Notarius 2013, 220, 293), see §3.2, example (77).

[54] In the traditional terminology, the *waw* in all *wa-qaṭal* clauses in vv. 17–19 is 'conjunctive' or 'copulative' (Notarius 2013, 217). I propose that *wa-qaṭal* in v. 19 is also 'prophetic perfect' with future time reference, *pace* Notarius (2013, 220, 293), who regards the clause as an apodosis.

[55] See also Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 490, §30.5.1), who call this "a metaphorical use of the past tense," and Rogland (2001, 100). According to Notarius (2013, 220), the *wa-qaṭal* clauses express a "temporal text-progression." Other possible examples of *qaṭal* forms with future time reference in the archaic poetry: Num. 24.24 (*wa-S.noun + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*, with an initial left dislocation); Deut. 32.35—in this example, שִׁלֵּם is probably a noun, 'recompense' (Notarius 2013, 90), while the reading of וְחָשׁ as a future time *wa-qaṭal* is correct: the verse is a late addition (Isaksson 2017, 264); 32.43—also a late text, "[t]he clearest case of a *waw*-consecutive perfect" and "a very complex text-critical history" (Notarius 2013, 93): it is possible that the original verb form was instead ויכפר, attested in 4QDeut^q (see Kooij 1994, 99).

[56] The 'epistolary perfect' is regarded by some scholars as a convention in ancient letters (Pardee 1983), by others as a case of performative usage of *qaṭal* (Gogel 1998, 278).

[57] But Gogel (1998, 278) translates 'Your servant (now) returns the letters' (the final prepositional phrase אל אדני is not translated by Gogel).

[58] Gogel (1998, 279): '… has applied himself…'.

[59] An evident anterior meaning is found also in HI Lachish 3:9 אם . נסה אםׂ . לקרא לי . ספר 'no one has tried to read a letter to me'.

[60] But Pardee (1983, 35) understands שלח (line 1) and ברׂכתך (lines 2–3) as 'epistolary perfects'. The blessing formula occurs also in HI KAjr 18:1–2 (ברכת אתכם ליהוה) and HI KAjr 19:5–6 (ברכתך לׂ]י[הוה); see Schüle (2000, 141–42) and HI (33, 294).

[61] Since the new perfective *qaṭal* in CBH exhibits nearly all the expected meanings found on the grammaticalisation path of a perfective, it has a relatively high semantic age. If we call such a semantic age perfage, it can be estimated as perfage 4. For LBH, we should possibly assign 'perfage 5', which would include the change to a simple past (Bybee et al. 1994, 105). The data available to Bybee et al. (1994, 105) show only four "resultative grams that do not have other uses," which means that there is not evidence enough to assign resultatives a perfage 1. The other perfages are: perfage 2: young anteriors, perfage 3: old anteriors, perfage 4: perfectives, perfage 5: simple pasts.

[62] Cook (2012a, 207ff. and 210ff.) gives an exposé of such meanings in CBH.

[63] *Qaṭal* in Gen. 40.14 is volitive and possibly counterfactual; see §5.4.7.

[64] For the transitivity of the stativic verb ('of children'), see Ges-K (§117aa). But J-M (p. 610 n. 1) expected a *wa-qaṭal*: "the same form was preferred for the sake of assonance." This is my only example of a stativic *qaṭal* in an apodosis. In protases, there are three more: Gen. 47.6; Lev. 5.3; 5.4, all with ידע.

[65] Other examples of present anterior *qaṭal* in protasis, of which many exhibit a variant of the politeness phrase אִם־נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן: Gen. 18.3; 47.29; 50.4 (Ges-K §159o); Exod. 33.13; 34.9; Num. 5.13 (not first clause in protasis); 5.19, 20 (Ges-K §159aa); Judg. 11.36 (Ø-VOC-*qaṭal*).

[66] More examples of futural anterior *qaṭal* in subordinate clauses: Gen. 24.33 עַד אִם; 28.15 עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם (Fenton 1973, 37; Cook 2012a, 207); Lev. 25.49 (within an apodosis domain); Num. 32.17 עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם (Cook 2012a, 207 n. 46); Deut. 15.6 כִּי (Steuernagel 1900, 56; Ges-K §106o).

[67] Similar examples with נתן: Gen. 24.17—but Schulz (1900, 32) regards the *qaṭal* as futural, and Westermann (1981, 304) translates as future; Deut. 8.10 (relative clause!); Judg. 1.2.

[68] Other examples of (future) anterior *qaṭal* in protases: Exod. 22.2, 7; Lev. 6.21; 13.3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 17, 25, 32, 34, 36, 51, 55, 56; 14.3, 39, 44, 48; 15.3, 29; 25.28; 27.20 (the second condition); Num. 5.13, 14, 27, 28; 30.6, 11, 12; 35.16, 17, 21, 22; Deut. 20.5f. (Ferguson 1882, 77). Gen. 43.9 is a special case. It is not legal code, but concerns one specific (eventual) action in the future. Most scholars take this *qaṭal* (הֲבִיאֹתִיו) as a present: 'If I do not bring him to you' (thus Ges-K §159o; Garr 1998, lxxxiii; Rainey 2003b, 27), but the *qaṭal* is a (futural) anterior in protasis, 'If I have not brought him to you'; the following *wa-qaṭal* construction (see §6) is future, 'and (so that) I place him here before you'.

[69] Other examples of future anterior *qaṭal* in apodoses: Exod. 22.14; Lev. 13.37; 20.18, 20; Num. 16.29 'then the LORD has not sent me' (Ges-K §159p); 19.13; 32.23 (Ges-K §159p); Deut. 19.18.

[70] Other examples of *qaṭal* expressing immediate future: Gen. 4.14 'today'; 18.27, 31 (not performative); 35.18 (*kī-qaṭal*); 42.36 אֹתִי שִׁכַּלְתֶּם; Exod. 10.7; Lev. 9.4 (*kī-ADV-S.noun-qaṭal*) 'for today the LORD is going to appear to you'; Num. 17.27 (J-M §112g).

[71] "[I]n languages where tense is grammaticalized, a present-tense form is used (e.g., English), but in languages where aspect is grammaticalized, perfective aspect grams are used" (Cook 2012a, 208, 213).

[72] E.g., Gen. 1.29; 17.5; 41.41 (with Pharaoh as subject); Exod. 7.1.

[73] The performative *qaṭal* clauses (not only *ntn*) registered in my database are: Gen. 1.29; 9.3, 13, 17; 14.22 (Brockelmann 1908–13, II: §76b; Cook 2012a, 207 n. 46); 15.18 (Dobbs-Allsopp 2004–2007, 47)—*pace* Brockelmann (1908–13, II: §76bs), who regards it as a future; 17.5 (Westermann 1981, 303, 314); 17.20 (Cook 2012a, 214); 19.21; 20.16; 22.16 (Cook 2012a, 207 n. 46); 23.11 (Cook 2012a, 214; Joosten 2012, 120); 23.13; 41.41; 45.19; 47.23; 48.22; Exod. 7.1; Num. 3.11; 14.20; 18.21; Deut. 2.31; 4.26 (as apodosis); 8.19 (as apodosis; Rainey 2003b,

11–12; Cook 2012a, 207 n. 46); 26.3 (Rainey 2003b, 11); 26.10; 30.15, 18 (as apodosis); 30.19; Judg. 2.3 (Ges-K §106n); 17.3.

[74] Other 'habitual' past perfective *qaṭal*: Gen. 7.19; 31.40; 38.9 (temporal clause, which is not a protasis, *pace* Ges-K §159o); Exod. 16.35 (2×); 36.3; Num. 2.34 (2×); 11.8 (*Ø-qaṭal*, elaboration of preceding *XØ* in 11.7)—but according to Joosten (2012, 218), the syntax is completely irregular; 14.22 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-lō-qaṭal*, both clauses perfective and repetitive); Deut. 2.20; 9.9 (*Ø-qaṭal* is an elaboration of *wa(y)-yiqṭol*); Judg. 2.18 (temporal clause, 'when', not a protasis); 6.2, 3 (temporal clause); 16.16 (*kī-qaṭal*).

[75] Joseph's volitive *qaṭal* in Gen. 40.14, expressing a (counterfactual?) wish in his prison (כִּי אִם־זְכַרְתַּנִי אִתְּךָ), is probably the second part of an exception, '(I desire nothing else) except that you remembered me', with future time reference (Ges-K §163d n. 1). According to Rainey (2003, 27), this is a phrase used instead of the imperative for politeness.

[76] Other counterfactual *qaṭal* in the corpus: Gen. 31.42 (negative–positive); Num. 22.29 (positive–positive); 22.33 (negative–positive); Judg. 13.23 (positive–negative); 14.18 (negative–negative).

[77] Other hypothetical *qaṭal*: Gen. 26.10 (Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 494); and possibly also Gen. 22.12—thus Givón (2001, I: 364), 'would not have spared'.

[78] There is also an example outside the corpus: Josh. 7.7.

[79] Other examples: Gen. 18.12; 21.7; Judg. 9.9, 13.

[80] The eight records showing one or more disjunctive *ʾō-qaṭal* having the same meaning as a *wa-qaṭal* clause are: Exod. 21.37, in protasis (Bergsträsser 1929, §9m); 22.9f., 13 (both in protasis); Lev. 4.23, 28 (both in protasis); 25.49 (in apodosis, after *yiqṭol(u)*); Num. 5.14 (in protasis); 11.8 (*Ø-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + ʾō-qaṭal*)—background with habitual past, where *Ø-qaṭal* introduces an elaboration, habitual seen with perfective aspect, and the following *wa-qaṭal* are habitual, as is also *ʾō-qaṭal*. The disjunctive *ʾō-qaṭal* with the same meaning as *wa-qaṭal* is discussed also by Kawashima (2010, 32).