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.

6. THE CONSTRUCTION *WA-QAṬAL* IN CBH

This chapter investigates the much-discussed *wa-qaṭal* in CBH. *Wa-qaṭal* is a construction in the same sense as the English future construction *be going to*: the constituent parts are analysable, but the meanings of the construction cannot be deduced from its constituents.

6.1. The Construction Concept

The *wa-qaṭal* clause-type plays a major role in the system of consecutive tenses (see Notarius 2013, 22; Isaksson 2021, 201–4). While *wa(y)-yiqṭol* stands out in the most recent research as a relatively transparent clause-type from a Semitic typological perspective (see §3; Baranowski 2016b; Renz 2016, 439; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 7, 9; Hornkohl 2019, 556; Khan 2020, I:534; Isaksson 2021, 209), *wa-qaṭal* and its alternation with the imperfective long *yiqṭol* is commonly regarded as inexplicable. How come *wa-qaṭal* is not an anterior and past perfective formation like *qaṭal*, but instead most often expresses future, obligation, and habituality (Renz 2016, 439)?

One answer is found in the theory of constructions, worked out by Joan Bybee (2010; 2015). This solution to the enigma has been offered by Geoffrey Khan (2021a).

All comparative evidence suggests that *wa-qaṭal* as an imperfective formation belongs to the diachronic level called Classical Hebrew (CBH). In Amarna Canaanite, an apodosis *wa-qatal*

is attested, but also, less frequently, an apodosis *Ø-qaṭal*, without initial *wa* and still with future time reference (Baranowski 2016a, 174). In the Archaic Hebrew poetry, there is no securely attested formation *wa-qaṭal* with future, obligational, or habitual meaning (Notarius 2013, 288f., 304). It is not attested in the earliest Aramaic inscriptions (Renz 2016, 656). *Wa-qaṭal* as a construction in Bybee's sense outside the apodosis domain must have developed at a diachronic stage close to, or early in, what we call CBH. If we seek examples of the successive extensions of the *wa-qaṭal* construction, we should preferably search for traces of such steps in the CBH texts. The construction *wa-qaṭal* is primarily a Classical Hebrew innovation (Renz 2016, 649).[1]

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

It is the supposition of Geoffrey Khan that *wa-qaṭal* is a sequential chunk that has received increasing autonomy. *Wa-qaṭal* is not a morpheme (like English *gonna*), and absolutely not a 'tense'. But it is a construction, like the English futural phrase *be going to*. In *be going to*, the elements in the sequence are still analysable, but the futural/intentional meaning cannot be deduced

from the parts of the construction, *be + going + to*. In a similar way, the meanings of *wa-qaṭal* cannot be deduced from its original components, *wa + qaṭal*. The constituents in *wa-qaṭal* are identifiable as the usual conjunction *wa* and the morpheme *qaṭal*, but the meanings of this specific sequence have developed in several diachronic steps, and in CBH they are in living usage. "Constructions often contain explicit lexical material" (Bybee 2010, 76f.), and such is the case with *wa-qaṭal*: we can identify the conjunction *wa* and the suffix conjugation *qaṭal*. The concept of construction explains why the meanings of *wa-qaṭal* cannot be deduced from its separate elements.

In this analysis of *wa-qaṭal*, *wa-* is the invariant part and *qaṭal* is schematic, with multiple forms: *wa-QAṬAL*. This invariant conjunction *wa-* is probably the reason why *wa-qaṭal* did not develop into a verbal morpheme like *gonna* (Khan 2021a, 342). In verbal morphemes, there is usually a degree of phonetic reduction, but *wa-qaṭal* is phonetically unreduced.

The comparative Northwest Semitic evidence indicates that *wa-qaṭal* began its development as a chunk in the function of apodosis (see §6.2.2) and probably also as constituent in modal sequences (see §6.2.1). The *wa-qatal(a)* clause-type achieved considerable frequency in apodosis (Smith 1991, 7–15). In Ugaritic, a futural *qatal(a)* in apodosis is as a rule syndetic with a proclitic *wa-* (Tropper 2012, 717; Renz 2016, 442), and in Amarna Canaanite, the connective *wa-* before *qaṭal* as apodosis is a much more frequent option (Baranowski 2016a, 173–178; Renz 2016, 448f., 451). This comparative evidence suggests that *wa-qaṭal* functioning as apodosis and result clause with future meaning

had become a chunk already in early Northwest Semitic.[2] And there are indications of this chunk also in the later Iron Age Northwest Semitic (see §6.3).

On the other hand, *wa-qaṭal* as *construction* is absent in the contemporary Northwest Semitic languages of the Iron Age (Renz 2016, §2.2). And it is absent in the Archaic Hebrew poetry. This indicates that the *wa-qaṭal* construction is an internal CBH, or at least post-Archaic, development. This is the reason why we will search in the CBH texts for textual evidence of the first steps of this construction.

In the investigation of the development of the *wa-qaṭal* construction in CBH, targets of study must naturally be the conditional linkings (§6.7) and the result clauses (§§6.4–6) in CBH. The frequencies and semantic types of such sentences, especially the apodosis part, can be expected to reveal the semantic and syntactic milieu, and the initial steps, in which the construction *wa-qaṭal* developed (see §6.8).

The next natural step is an extension, a generalisation of what is permitted to precede *wa-qaṭal*: the clause preceding *wa-qaṭal* is allowed to be not only a protasis, but also a temporal or causal subordinate clause (see §§6.9–10). Thus Khan (2021a, 312): כִּי־יִרְאוּ אֹתָךְ הַמִּצְרִים וְאָמְרוּ 'When the Egyptians see you, **they will say**…' (Gen. 12.12). This is not a conditional sentence, because there is no condition. Even with future time reference, the event in the temporal clause is presupposed to take place (Khan 2021a, 311).

A third natural extension of the preceding clause is to allow a shift of status of the preceding clause: from subordinate

(protasis, temporal, or causal clause) to main clause (see §6.11). In such instances, *wa-qaṭal* has the same status as the preceding clause and is coordinated with it: אֶת־ **וְאָכַלְתָּ** לָךְ תַּצְמִיחַ וְדַרְדַּר וְקוֹץ עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה׃ 'It will yield you brambles and thistles, **and you will eat** the produce of the land.' (Gen. 3.18). In this step, if not before, the affinity between *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* becomes evident. As in the example, *wa-qaṭal* takes over from *yiqṭol(u)* the role of coding discourse continuity. In a stage when an affirmative *yiqṭol(u)* clause can only express discontinuity (clause-type *X-yiqṭol(u)*), *wa-qaṭal* steps in as its continuity counterpart—which is the essence of half of the theory of consecutive tenses.

6.2. Precursors of the CBH Construction *Wa-qaṭal* in Northwest Semitic

The Classical Hebrew verbal system developed from a Canaanite language in the Late Bronze Age. The best-attested Northwest Semitic languages of this age are Ugaritic and the Canaanite in the Amarna letters. In such early texts, there are uses of the *wa-qatal* clause-type that in certain respects show similarities with the later construction *wa-qaṭal* in CBH.

The prototypical meaning of the *qatal* gram is resultative, that is, it expresses the resulting state of a previous action. It is certainly striking that many early functions of the *wa-qatal* clause-type, a clause-type used to code a linking with the preceding clause, so often describes a result of the action in that clause. Already in the earliest Northwest Semitic sources, *wa-qatal* has this type of 'modal' meaning (with a term taken from Baranowski

2016a) in addition to the 'normal' uses as anterior and past per-fective. The modal *wa-qatal* is found in specific types of linkings, such as conditional sentences and modal series.

6.2.1. The Clause-type *Wa-qatal* in Modal Series

In Amarna, the *wa-qatal* clause-type is used as second or third clause in modal series. In this function, *wa-qatal* expresses pur-pose or result, never, as is often the case in CBH, a further in-struction or command (Renz 2016, 456). An example is:

(1)   *du-ku-mi* ²⁶⌐*eṭ*⌐*-la-ku-nu* ***ù i-ba-ša-tu-nu*** *ki-ma ia-ti-nu* ²⁷⌐*ù*⌐ ***pa-aš-ḫa-tu-nu***

'Kill your 'lad' **that you become** like us, **so that you will be** at rest.' (EA 74:25–27; translation according to Renz)

The linking pattern in the modal sequence is *IMP + wa-qatal + wa-qatal*, and the meaning of the two *wa-qatal* is a result of the action in the imperative. The sense of finality can also, as in CBH, be expressed by a jussive *wa-yaqtul* clause (Renz 2016, 456), as in:

(2)   *ù uš-ši-ra* ÉRIN.MEŠ ³⁰*pí-ṭá-ti* ***ù ti-ìl-qé-šu*** ³¹*ù ta-ap-šu-uḫ* KUR LUGAL

'So send the regular army **in order that it may capture** him so that the land of the king may be at peace.' (EA 107:29–31)

In (2), the linking pattern is *IMP + wa-yaqtul*, and the jussive clause has a meaning of purpose or result. A *wa-qatal* clause can express finality also after a jussive *yaqtul* with ventive clitic ('co-hortative'), as in:

(3) *šu-te-ra a-wa-ta₅* ²⁴*a-na ia-ši ù i-pu-ša a-na-ku* ²⁵*ki-ta it-ti* ⌈Ì⌉IR-
A-*ši-ir-ta* ²⁶⌈*ki*⌉*-ma* ⌈I⌉*Ia-pa-*ᵈIŠKUR *ù* ⌈I⌉*Zi-*⌈*im*⌉*-re-*⌈*da*⌉ ²⁷*ù* ⌈*bal*⌉*-
ṭá-ti*

'Just send me the word and I myself will make a treaty with
ʿAbdi-Ashirta like Yapaʿ-Haddi and Zimredda, **and I will
stay alive**.' (EA 83: 24–27; cf. Renz 2016, 456)

The linking pattern in (3) is *IMP + wa-yaqtul-a + wa-qatal*,
where *wa-qatal* expresses the intended result of the preceding ac-
tion. A *wa-qatal* can also be a result clause after a jussive *yaqtul*
without ventive clitic (Renz 2016, 456):

(4) ⌈*ù*⌉ ⌈*ki*⌉*-tu ti-in‹-né-pu-uš›-ma* ³⁷*a-na ka-li* KUR.KUR.⌈KI⌉ ⌈*ù*⌉
pa-aš-ḫu DUMU.MEŠ ³⁸*ù* MUNUS.DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ *a‹-
na› da-ri-ti* UD.KAM.MEŠ

'and let an alliance be ‹made› for all the lands **so that** (our)
sons and daughters **will be at peace** f[or]ever more.' (EA
74:36–38)

The linking pattern is *wa-X-yaqtul-ma + wa-qatal*, where the jus-
sive *yaqtul* has been emphasised by an enclitic *-ma* (Rainey 1996,
III:229).

If two semantically *separate* commands are to be given, vol-
itive forms are used (Renz 2016, 457), as in (5):

(5) *du-ku-mi* EN-*ku-nu* ²⁸*ù in-né-ep-*⌈*šu*⌉ *a-na* ²⁹LÚ.MEŠ GAZ

'Slay your lord and join the *ʿapîru*.' (EA 73:27–29)

The pattern in (5) is *IMP + wa-IMP* (same verbs and pattern in
EA 81:12f.).

6.2.2. The Clause-type *Wa-qatal* as First Clause after Some Types of Condition

6.2.2.1. Ugaritic

In Ugaritic, a *wa-qatal* clause can introduce an apodosis in a conditional linking.

(6)   *(w . hm . ḫt . / ʿl) . **w . likt** / ʿmk . (w . hm / l . ʿl) . w . lakm / ilak*

'And if the Hittite comes up, **then I will send** to you. But if he does not come up, then surely I will send.' (KTU³ 2.30:16–20, translation Smith 1991, 8; Tropper 2012, 717, 786, my parentheses enclosing the protases)[3]

The example illustrates that, in an apodosis, *wa-qatal* is replaced by *X-yaqtulu* if a constituent must be positioned before the verb (*w lakm ilak*, *waw* + infinitive + prefix verb; Tropper 2012, §76.542; Renz 2016, 441f.).[4]

The function of an apodosis, expressing the result of the truth of the preceding clause, is semantically close to being the main clause after a temporal or causal clause, or expressing the intended result of fulfilling certain rituals, examples of which are found in Ugaritic (Tropper 2012, 716f.; Renz 2016, 441):

(7)   *w **šmʿ** [. b]ʿl . l . ṣltk[m] / ydy . ʿz . l tġrk*m [. qrd] / l *ḥmytk*m

(After commanding certain ritual sacrifices in case of an attack of the city:) 'Then Baal **will hear** yo[ur] prayer. He will drive the strong one from your gates, [the warrior] from your walls.' (KTU³ 1.119:34–36, my emphasis, translation Smith 1991, 10; Tropper 2012, 716)[5]

In case of danger, performing the correct rituals will result in the intervention of Baal. This result, which constitutes a promise about a future action, can be coded by a *wa-qaṭal* clause in Ugaritic. The condition, or instruction, starts with *k-* 'when' on line 26 (*k gr ʿz ṯġrkm…*; KTU³ 1.119:26). Similar future results of previous actions are expressed in the following examples:

(8)   ***w prʿt / hy . ḫlh***

      'Und sie (sc. die Tamariske) **wird** seine Krankheit **lösen**' (KTU³ 1.124:9f., my emphasis, Tropper 2012, 716)[6]

(9)   [w . u]nṯ inn / lḥm ʿd tṯṯbn / ksp . iwrkl / ***w . ṯb* . l unṯhm**

      'and they do not have a feudal obligation until they return the money of Iwirkallu, **then they return** to their feudal obligation' (KTU³ 3.4:16–19, my emphasis, Sivan 2001, 98; Tropper 2012, 716)

6.2.2.2. Amarna Canaanite

In conditional sentences, a relatively frequent case is *yaqtulu* in the protasis and *wa-qaṭal* in apodosis (Renz 2016, 449f.). An example is (Baranowski 2016a, 176):

(10) *(šumma-S.noun-yaqtulu) + wa-qaṭal*

      *šum-ma šàr-ru **yi-ša-i-lu** ¹⁶**ù na-ad-na** pa-ni-nu a-na ¹⁷a-ra-di-ka* […]

      'If the king **will inquire**, **then ‹we› will devote ourselves** to serving you.' (EA 89:15–17)

But in Amarna it is not absolutely necessary that *qaṭal* in a futural apodosis is preceded by *wa* (Renz 2016, 451). In some

cases, such an apodosis is asyndetic, as is illustrated in the following example (Baranowski 2016a, 174):

(11) *(šumma-qatal)* + ***Ø-qatal*** + *(šumma-XØ)* + ***Ø-qatal***

    šum-ma i-ba-aš-ši LÚ ÉRIN.MEŠ *pi-ṭa-ti* [58]*i-na* MU *an-ni-ti **i-ba-aš-ši*** KUR.ḪI.A [59]LUGAL EN‹-ia› *ù šum-ma ia-a-nu-mi* LÚ ÉRIN *pi-⸢ṭa⸣-ti* [60]⸢*ḫal*⸣-*qa-at* KUR.ḪI.A LUGAL EN-*ia*

    'If there are regular troops in this year, **there will still be** lands of the king, ‹my› lord. But if there are no regular troops, the lands of the king, my lord, **are lost**.' (EA 286:57–60, my emphasis)

6.2.3. The Clause-type *Wa-qatal* as Second Clause in Apodosis

In Amarna Canaanite, a *wa-qatal* clause is sometimes used to continue the first clause of an apodosis with futural or volitive meaning (Renz 2016, 452). In some cases, a *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* linking even constitutes the whole apodosis, as in:

(12) […] *šumma* [12]*ti-iš-mu-na a-ṣí-mi* ÉRIN.MEŠ [13]*pí-ṭá-ti **ù i-zi-bu*** URU.MEŠ-*šu-nu* [14]***ù pa-aṭ-ru***

    'If they hear of the coming forth of the regular troops **they will abandon** their towns **and desert**.' (EA 73:11–14)

In (12), the protasis has a *yaqtulu* predicate and the apodosis consists of two *wa-qatal* clauses, a type of linking that is very common in CBH.

    In several cases, a *wa-qatal* clause expresses a direct result as a focal clause.[7] In such an apodosis, the *wa-qatal* often expresses

finality in relation to the first clause (Renz 2016, 453). This is shown in the next example:

(13) *šá-ni-tam a-wa-*[*te*] [35]*la yu-šé-bi-la be-li a-na* ÌR!-ʿ*šu*ʾ [36]*ki-ma ar-ḫi-iš a-na ṭup-pí ù na-⟨ṣa⟩-*ʿ*ri*ʾ-ʿ*šu*ʾ [37]URU-KI *a-na ša-šu* ***ù er-ri-***ʿ***iš***ʾ [38]ʿURUʾ.KI *iš-tu ša-šu* [39][*a*]-ʿ*na*ʾ *a-ša-bi-ia* ***ú bal-⟨ṭá⟩-ti***

'Furthermore, should my lord not have brought word[s], to his servant with all speed, by a tablet, and pro⟨te⟩ct the city for himself, **then I will request** from him a city for me to dwell in **so that I may l⟨iv⟩e**.' (EA 88:34–39)

In (13), an apodosis begins with *wa* + Akkadian present (*iparras*) and continues with *wa-qatal* in a final sense. There are also examples of apodoses starting with a Central Semitic *yaqtulu* and continuing with a *wa-qatal* expressing the result of the preceding action (Renz 2016, 453):

(14) ʿ*šum*ʾ-ʿ*ma*ʾ ʿŠEʾ.ʿMEŠʾ ʿ*qè*ʾ-*e-ṣí la-a yu-ši-r*[*u*] [16]LUGAL ʿÉRINʾ.ʿMEŠʾ ʿ*pí*ʾ-ʿ*ṭá*ʾ-ʿ*ta₅*ʾ *a-na* URU.KI *Gub-l*[*a*] [17]*ù la-*ʿ*qé*ʾ-ʿ*mi*ʾ *ti-ìl-qú-na-ši* [18]*ù ia-*ʿ*a*ʾ-ʿ*ti*ʾ [ÌR-*ka*] ʿ*ti*ʾ-*du-ku-na* [19]***ù gu₅-***ʿ***mi***ʾ-ʿ***ru***ʾ

'If by the time of the summer grain the king does not send regular troops to Byblos, then verily they will take it and me, [your servant] they will kill **so that they will have gained full control**.' (EA 131:15–19)

In (14), the apodosis starts with a *wa-VNabs-yaqtulu* clause (*ù la-*ʿ*qé*ʾ-ʿ*mi*ʾ *ti-ìl-qú-na-ši* 'then verily they will take it'), and after that follows one more *yaqtulu* clause (*wa-O.pron-O.noun-yaqtulu*). The apodosis ends with a *wa-qatal* in a final sense.[8]

In many cases, the apodosis begins with a *yaqtul* in the first person (1cs) with futural meaning (expressing intention) and

continues with *wa-qatal*. In such a case, *wa-qatal* may simply express a temporal succession with future time reference:

(15) *šum-ma* [42]2 ITU *ia-nu* ÉRIN.MEŠ *pí-ṭá-ti* [43]*ù i-te₉-zi-ib* URU.KI [44]***ù pa-aṭ-ra-ti ù*** [45]***bal-ṭá-at*** ZI-*ia a-⌈di⌉* [46]*i-pé-šu i-pé-eš lìb-bi-i⌈a⌉*

'If in two months there are no regular troops, then I will leave the city **and I will go away so that I will stay alive** while I do as I please.' (EA 82:41–46)

In (15), the protasis is a verbless clause and the apodosis starts with *wa-yaqtul* in the first person and continues with two sequential *wa-qatal* clauses with future time reference. It can be noted that intention in a first-person jussive easily combines with a pure futural *wa-qatal* in the first person.[9]

A *wa-qatal* may also, within an apodosis, be continued by a *yaqtulu* clause in the simple sense of future and temporal succession, as in:

(16) *šu[m-ma la yi-iš-mu]* [30]⌈LUGAL⌉ BAD-*ia a-na a-wa-te* Ì[R-*šu*] [31]⌈*ù*⌉ ***in₄-né-ep-ša‹-at›*** URU *Gub*[-la] [32]*a-na ša-šu ù gáb-bi* KUR.KI.ḪI.A L[UGAL] [33]*a-di* KUR *Mi-iṣ-ri* ***ti-né-ep-šu*** [34]*a-na* LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ

'but i[f] the king, my lord, [does not heed] the words of [his] ser[vant], **then** the city of Byb[los] **will join** him (i.e. ʿAbdi-Ashrata) **and** all the cities of the k[ing] as far as the land of Egypt **will join** the *ʿapîru* men.' (EA 88:29–34)

The linking pattern in (16) is: *(šumma-la-yaqtulu)* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-X-yaqtulu*. The meaning of both *wa-qatal* and *yaqtulu* in the apodosis is simple future.

6.2.4. Observations Regarding the Use of *Wa-qatal* in Northwest Semitic Languages in the Late Bronze Age

It stands to reason that the *wa-qatal* clause-type, side-by-side with expected meanings of anterior and past perfective, was utilised with future and modal meanings in specific domains:[10] modal sequences and apodoses. The *wa-qatal* clause-type in such domains seems to exhibit a prototypical meaning of *qatal* as an originally resultative construction. In modal series, it follows an initial volitive and describes the (intended) result of the action in the command or wish. In second- or third-clause position of a modal sequence, discourse continuity was preferred, and thus *wa-qatal* (and not *Ø-qatal*) was favoured in relation to the preceding volitive clause(s). A *Ø-qatal* clause does not seem to have been tolerated in modal series.

As apodosis also, the *wa-qatal* clause-type expresses a result, a consequence. But as the first clause in the apodosis, it does not take part in a modal sequence (in which it signals discourse continuity with its initial *wa*). The first clause in an apodosis just describes a consequence of the truth-value of the protasis. In this position, the *wa-* in *wa-qatal* would not be absolutely necessary, because *qatal* in itself was able to express result. This is shown in some examples from Amarna where a *Ø-qatal* functions as futural apodosis. In a conditional linking, the clause that begins the apodosis is the first clause in a separate domain and the coding of continuity in relation to the preceding clause (the protasis) is unnecessary. Since an apodosis is often a complex of several clauses, the second and third clauses often signal continuity, but

the first clause has no need of continuity marking (with initial *wa*).

My hypothesis is that the preponderance of *wa-qatal*, as against *Ø-qatal*, as the first clause in apodoses is due to influence from its use in modal sequences, where *wa-* before *qatal* is necessary.

The use of *wa-qatal* in both modal series and apodoses is an ancient Northwest Semitic syntactic practice. And its use as second clause in apodoses is similar to that in modal series.

Since the semantics of modal sequences is relatively limited and has few variations, I posit that the development of *wa-qaṭal* in CBH, what Bybee (2010; 2015) and Khan (2021a) call a construction process, had the conditional sentence, especially its apodosis, as its birthplace and first syntactic milieu (see further §6.8).

6.3. Parallels of the CBH Construction *Wa-qaṭal* in Iron Age Northwest Semitic

We have considered the traces of a resultative and modal *wa-qatal* in the Northwest Semitic languages of the Late Bronze Age. It is time to do the same for Northwest Semitic languages in the Iron Age, roughly contemporary with the CBH texts.

6.3.1. The Clause-type *Wa-qatal* in Modal Series

6.3.1.1. Pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions

The following example of a letter from the end of the sixth century displays modal series starting with an imperative:

(17) ^{2}*Ø-IMP* + ^{3}*wa-qaṭal* + ^{5}**wa-qaṭal** + ^{7}*wa-IMP* + ^{8}**wa-qaṭal**

ועת (2) תן מן היין 1 1 1 ב\ (3)ו(4)צוך חנניהו על ב)אר שבע עם משא

צ(5)מד חמרם **וצררת**̊ (6) אתם בצק̊ ו(7)ספר החטם והל(8)חם̊ **ולקח̊ת**

(9)אֿלֿכֿם]   [

'And now, ^{2}give from the wine 3 *baths*. ^{3}Hananiah com-
mands you to ^{4}Beersheba with the load of a ^{5}pair of don-
keys, **and you shall pack** ^{6}them with dough. ^{7}Then count
the wheat and the ^{8}bread **and take** ^{9}for yourself…' (HI
Arad 3:1–9)

Example (17) exhibits two modal series with at least two *wa-qaṭal*
clauses that follow imperatives. The *wa-qaṭal* clauses express ad-
ditional (obligatory) instructions in relation to the preceding im-
perative (Gogel 1998, 266; Renz 2016, 649).[11]

6.3.1.2. Edomite

An ostracon in Edomite script reveals a modal series of the type
IMP + *wa-qaṭal*. It was found in Ḥorvat ʿUzza and dated to the
beginning of the sixth century BCE:

(18) *IMP* + *REL-XØ* + **wa-qaṭal**

ועת . תן . את . האכל (4) אשר . עמד . אחאמה . [   ] (5) **והרם שאל**

[על מז]בח קוס .

'And now give the food (bread) which is with ^{ʾA}ḥîʾimmô^h
[…] **and** Šaʾul **shall offer** (it) on the al[tar of Qaws/Qōs]'
(Aḥituv 2008, 351–54)

The *wa-qaṭal* clause in (18) describes an additional instruction
related to the preceding imperative.

6.3.2. The Clause-type *Wa-qatal* as First Clause in an Apodosis

6.3.2.1. Samalian

Samalian is nowadays classified as a separate Northwest Semitic language (Huehnergard and Pat-El 2019, 3). Tropper's study (1993b, §43.211.3) has one instance of a futural *qatal* in apodosis:

(19) *Ø-yaqtul(u) + wa-yaqtul(u) + wa-gam-qatal*

תשמ[ו](?)] [(5) חרב בביתי ותהרגו חד בני ואגֹם הוית חרב בארק יֹאדי

'Shall you set […] [5] the sword against my house, and slay one of my sons? Then also I will cause the sword to fall upon the land of Yaudi.' (KAI[5] 215:4–5)

If the interpretation is correct, then in Samalian a *qatal* morpheme in an apodosis may have future time reference even in clause-internal position (preceded by *wa-gam*).[12]

6.3.2.2. Phoenician

In the following example, the protasis starts with a quantifier instead of a conditional particle, a construction that is found also in CBH:[13]

(20) *kōl-S.noun-REL-qatal + **wa-qatal***

[כ]ל משאת אש איבל שת בפס ז **ונתן** לפי הכתבת אש [כתב

'was jede Abgabe angeht, die man nicht auf diese Tafel gesetzt hat, **so wird sie gegeben werden** gemäß den Aufzeichnungen, die…' (KAI[5] 69:18, Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §324.2)

In (20), a *wa-qatal* introduces the apodosis with future time reference. A similar example from the same text is:

(21) *kōl-S.noun-REL-qatal* + **wa-qatal**

[**שׁ**וענ ז בספר שׁת לאשׁ בדק משׁאת יקח אשׁ כהן כל

'was jeden Priester angeht, der eine Abgabe nimmt entgegen dem, was in diesem Texte festgesetzt ist, **so wird er bestraft** [werden]' (KAI[5] 69:20, Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §324.2)

6.3.2.3. Pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions

(22) *Ø-VNabs* + *wa-IMP* + *Ø-ʾal-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-ʾim-XØ* + **wa-qaṭal**

300 (4)ו [ ] הימם ארבעת(3)ל . יין 1 1 . ב/ . כתים(2)ל נתן . ועת
. עוד . ואם(7) . תאחר אל . מחר סבת(6)וה . יין החמר . מלא(5)ו לחם
. להם . ת(8)**ונת** . חמץ

'And now, give to the Kittim two *baths* of wine for the four days… and 300 (loaves of) bread. And fill with fermenting wine and turn (it) over tomorrow; do not be late. And if there is still sour wine, **you shall give** (it) to them.' (Arad 2:1–8, HI 13)

Example (22) illustrates a simple conditional sentence with a verbless clause as protasis and *wa-qatal* as apodosis. The meaning of the *wa-qatal* is an obligation (instruction). The example also contains a modal sequence with initial infinitive absolute as imperative (נתן) and following *wa-qatal* (והסבת) expressing a further instruction, not a result (cf. Renz 2016, 650).

6.3.3. *Wa-qatal* as Second Clause in Protasis or Apodosis

6.3.3.1. Phoenician

A *wa-qatal* clause as the second within a protasis is attested in (23):

(23) ^{12}*(wa-ʾm-S.noun-REL-yaqtul(u)* + ^{14}***wa-qatal*** + *Ø-ʾm-ʾp-yaqtul(u)* + ^{15}*wa-yaqtul(u)* + ^{16}*wa-yaqtul(u)* + ***wa-qatal*** + ^{17}*Ø-ʾm-PrP-yaqtul(u)* + *Ø-ʾm-PrP* + *wa-PrP-yaqtul(u))* + ^{18}***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
> אם 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 (1)
> אדם הא אש אדם שם

> 'And if any king or any prince or ^{13}a person who is a person of name who effaces the name of Azitawadda ^{14}from this gate **and places** his own name (upon it), if he even claims ^{15}this city, or tears out this gate which Azitawadda has made ^{16}and makes a different gate **and places** his own name upon it, ^{17}whether he tears it out through love or hatred or tears out this gate through malice, ^{18}**then** Baal-samem and El-Creator-of-the-Earth ^{19}and Eternal Samas and the entire pantheon **shall wipe out** that kingdom or that king or that ^{1}person who is a person of name!' (KAI^{5} 26A III:12–IV:1, translated according to Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §§266.2, 324.1b, and Renz 2016, 462; cf. also Krahmalkov 1986, 9f.)

Of the three *wa-qatal* clauses with future time reference in (23), two occur within the protasis and the third initiates the apodosis.

In the next example of a complicated conditional linking, the *wa-qatal* clause is used with future time reference after a *yaqtul(u)* clause in a text that appears to be an instruction with many subcases:

(24) *ʾm-XØ + wa-PrP-yaqtul(u) + **wa-qatal***

> (3) באלף כלל אם צועת אם שלם כלל לכהנם כסף עשרת 10 באחד
> ובֿכלל יכן לם עלת פן המשאת ז ש]אר משקל שלש מאת 300] (4)
> ובצועת קצרת ויצלת **וכן** הערת והשלבם והפעמם ואחרי השאר לבעל
> הזבח

> 'In case of a bull, an expiatory sacrifice: if (it is) a commu-nal offering or a holocaust, the priests (shall get) ten silver pieces for one, and in case of holocaust belongs to them in addition to this payment [meat at a weight of 300 (sekel)]. ⁴And in case of communal offering the neck and shoulder joint. But the hide and the entrails and the legs and the rest of the meat **will belong** to the sacrificer.' (KAI⁵ 69:3f., re-ferred to by Friedrich and Röllig 1999, §266.2)

The syntax in (24) is similar to a conditional linking in which the first clause of the apodosis has a *yaqtul(u)* predicate and the sec-ond is a *wa-qatal* clause (Renz 2016, 462).[14]

6.4. Survey of Modal Sequences with Internal *Wa-qaṭal* in CBH

As we have seen already in Amarna (§6.2.1), *wa-qatal* clauses in a modal sequence are utilised to express meanings of finality and intended result (Renz 2016, 456). And when *wa-qatal* is part of a

modal series, there seems to have been no alternative: it must signal discourse continuity (type *wa-Verb*; Hornkohl 2019, 555). A *Ø-qatal* in this function seems to have been intolerable. The ancient *wa-qatal* in a modal sequence with (intended) result meaning and discourse-continuity syntax probably settled *wa-qatal* as a chunk in this type of domain. This function of *wa-qatal* is preserved, but also extended, in CBH modal sequences.

Renz (2016, 651–54, 659) perceives in the pre-exilic Hebrew inscriptions a semantic development from the old Canaanite function of *wa-qatal* to express finality, down to the the sixth-century BCE *wa-qatal* expressing an additional command. This range of meanings can be detected also in the CBH modal sequences.

Examples of a result meaning of *wa-qatal* often occur at the end of a modal sequence, as in (25):

(25) *Ø-IMP + wa-qatal +* **wa-qatal**

הַקְרֵב אֶת־מַטֵּה לֵוִי וְהַעֲמַדְתָּ אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן **וְשֵׁרְתוּ** אֹתוֹ׃

'Bring the tribe of Levi and station them in the presence of Aaron the priest, **so that they may serve** him.' (Num. 3.6; Levine 1993, 152)

In (25), the first *wa-qatal* in the sequence is an additional instruction (obligation) of an intended action, while the second has a sense of finality.[15] Such meanings of finality are easily construed as expressing a complement in certain contexts, as in (26):

(26) *Ø-PREP-VN-IMP +* **wa-qatal**

בְּלֶכְתְּךָ לָשׁוּב מִצְרַיְמָה רְאֵה כָּל־הַמֹּפְתִים אֲשֶׁר־שַׂמְתִּי בְיָדֶךָ **וַעֲשִׂיתָם** לִפְנֵי פַרְעֹה

'When you go back to Egypt, see **that you do** before Phar-
aoh all the wonders I have put under your control.' (Exod.
4.21)

In (26), the *IMP* + wa-*qaṭal* 'see… so that you do' must be trans-
lated as a complement.[16]

The probably later usage of *wa-qaṭal* as an additional in-
struction after the volitive in modal sequences is much more fre-
quent in CBH. In such cases, it carries connotations different from
the initial volitive (Revell 1989, 23). The *wa-qaṭal* clause is not
perceived as subordinate, but there remains in many cases a sense
of intention, expressing the goal of the action in the initial voli-
tive(s). An example is (27):

(27) *Ø-O.noun-IMP* + ***wa-qaṭal*** + ***wa-qaṭal*** + ***wa-qaṭal***

כָּל־הַחַיָּ֨ה אֲשֶֽׁר־אִתְּךָ֜ מִכָּל־בָּשָׂ֗ר בָּע֧וֹף וּבַבְּהֵמָ֛ה וּבְכָל־הָרֶ֛מֶשׂ הָרֹמֵ֥שׂ עַל־
הָאָ֖רֶץ הוֹצֵ֣א אִתָּ֑ךְ **וְשָֽׁרְצ֣וּ** בָאָ֔רֶץ **וּפָר֥וּ וְרָב֖וּ** עַל־הָאָֽרֶץ׃

'Bring out with you every living thing that is with you of
all flesh—birds and animals and every creeping thing that
creeps on the earth—**they shall swarm** on the earth, **and
be fruitful and multiply** on the earth.' (Gen. 8.17)

In (27), the *wa-qaṭal* clauses follow after a pausal stop and express
the intended result of the command in the imperative. However,
they can also be analysed as additional instructions.[17]

Baranowski (2016a, 160) observes a relative rarity of *wa-
qaṭal* in modal sequences in Amarna. This is not the case in CBH.
Wa-qaṭal is frequent. And while the choice of *wa-qaṭal* in a modal
sequence in Amarna may be due to the lexically stative meaning
of the verbs (Baranowski 2016a, 162), in CBH all lexical types
are represented. In this respect, the frequency of *wa-qaṭal* in

modal sequences, together with its wide semantic range, represents an extension compared to Ancient Canaanite, and traces of the same development can be detected in the pre-exilic Hebrew inscriptions (Renz 2016, 649).

My data indicate that a very frequent function of *wa-qaṭal* in modal series is to express instructions that are additional but still semantically related to the initial volitive (see also Renz, 2016, 639).[18] The first command in the series is most often an imperative, and the second might be a jussive (if in the first person, usually with a ventive/cohortative clitic). This is shown in (28):

(28) *Ø-IMP + wa-IMP + wa-yiqtol(Ø)-V +* [10]***wa-qaṭal** + wa-qaṭal*

לֶךְ־נָא אֶל־הַצֹּאן וְקַח־לִי מִשָּׁם שְׁנֵי גְּדָיֵי עִזִּים טֹבִים וְאֶעֱשֶׂה אֹתָם מַטְעַמִּים לְאָבִיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר אָהֵב: וְהֵבֵאתָ לְאָבִיךָ וְאָכָל

'Go to the flock and bring me two good young goats, so that I may prepare from them delicious food for your father, such as he loves. [10]**And you shall bring** it to your father to eat.' (Gen. 27.9–10a)

In (28), the modal series is fourfold: first two imperatives, then a jussive with ventive/cohortative clitic, and then two *wa-qaṭal* clauses. All clauses except the first signal discourse continuity (clause-type *wa-Verb*). The discourse-continuity jussive clause with ventive clitic (וְאֶעֱשֶׂה) expresses the personal purpose of the two imperatives ('so that I may prepare'), while the two *wa-qaṭal* clauses describe additional instructions.[19]

Another example of additional instructions expressed by *wa-qaṭal* is (29):

(29) *Ø-IMP + Ø-hinnē-qoṭel + **wa-qaṭal** + wa-O.noun-yiqtol(u)*
    + ¹⁶***wa-qaṭal***

לֵ֣ךְ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה֮ בַּבֹּקֶר֒ הִנֵּה֙ יֹצֵ֣א הַמַּ֔יְמָה **וְנִצַּבְתָּ֛** לִקְרָאתֹ֖ו עַל־שְׂפַ֣ת הַיְאֹ֑ר וְהַמַּטֶּ֛ה אֲשֶׁר־נֶהְפַּ֥ךְ לְנָחָ֖שׁ תִּקַּ֣ח בְּיָדֶֽךָ׃ **וְאָמַרְתָּ֣** אֵלָ֗יו יְהֹוָ֞ה אֱלֹהֵ֤י הָעִבְרִים֙ שְׁלָחַ֤נִי אֵלֶ֙יךָ֙ לֵאמֹ֔ר

‘Go to Pharaoh in the morning, as he is going out to the water. **You shall stand** on the bank of the Nile to meet him, and take in your hand the staff that turned into a serpent. ¹⁶**And you shall say** to him The LORD, the God of the Hebrews, has sent me to you, saying…’ (Exod. 7.15–16a)

In (29), the *qoṭel* clause is subordinated (circumstantial clause) and embedded in the imperative clause. The first *wa-qaṭal* (וְנִצַּבְתָּ) after the imperative expresses an added instruction about how to perform the task. Interestingly, the next instruction has a focused element (הַמַּטֶּה אֲשֶׁר־נֶהְפַּךְ לְנָחָשׁ) in clause-initial position, in which case the verb form to be used is a long *yiqtol* (תִּקַּח). A further added instruction in the form of a *wa-qaṭal* clause (וְאָמַרְתָּ) then follows at the beginning of verse 16.[20]

    The extended meaning of additional instruction, and not only finality, gives *wa-qaṭal* a sense of future obligation, which is a meaning close to that of the imperfective gram long *yiqtol*. A long *yiqtol* is a relatively infrequent phenomenon in modal series, but when it occurs in CBH, it replaces a *wa-qaṭal* with a focal element (*wa-X-yiqtol(u)*) or as negated clause (*wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*).[21]

    A *wa-qaṭal* in a modal series can also, but less frequently, express added information *about* the commanded action, as in (30):

(30) *Ø-IMP-nā + Ø-IMP + wa-yiqtol(Ø) +* **wa-qaṭal** *+* **wa-qaṭal**

לִינוּ-נָ֠א הִנֵּ֨ה חֲנ֣וֹת הַיּוֹם֮ לֵ֣ין פֹּה֒ וְיִיטַ֣ב לְבָבֶ֔ךָ **וְהִשְׁכַּמְתֶּ֤ם** מָחָר֙ לְדַרְכְּכֶ֔ם **וְהָלַכְתָּ֖** לְאֹהָלֶֽךָ׃

'Please, spend the night, because the day draws to its close. Lodge here and enjoy yourself! **Then you can get up early** tomorrow for your journey **and go** home.' (Judg. 19.9)

In (30), the two *wa-qaṭal* clauses do not constitute additional instructions, but a reminder of suitable times to return home.[22]

My conclusion is that *wa-qaṭal* clauses in modal sequences seem to be more frequent in CBH than in Amarna. As an extension in CBH, such clauses frequently express additional instructions related to the initial volitives (IMP and/or jussives). The sense of obligation and sometimes future pushes *wa-qaṭal* semantically closer to the imperfective formation *yiqtol(u)*.

6.5. Result Functions of *Wa-qaṭal* in Other Domains in CBH

In the previous sections, we have identified some early Northwest Semitic functions of *wa-qaṭal*, and we have identified these early meanings of *wa-qaṭal* in modal sequences in CBH, that is, the sense of finality or result in modal sequences. It is therefore feasible to search for traces of early functions in other domains. Early functions of *wa-qaṭal* are important because they formed part of the initial linguistic context in which the construction *wa-qaṭal* started to extend its semantics and functional range. In this section, we shall investigate other domains in search of the early construction *wa-qaṭal*.

6.5.1. The Instructional Domain and *Wa-qaṭal*

In instructional domains, the dominating clause-types are long *X-yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal*. The meanings expressed are modal, but there is no immediate connection with initial volitives. If volitives can be identified in preceding textual units, they have no direct relation with the clauses in the instructional domain.

The dominant meaning expressed in instruction is obligation, but future is also frequent. The two meanings are closely related. Obligation always concerns a future action, and a statement about the future is easily perceived as obligatory.

In the text-types extant in my corpus, instruction dominates side-by-side with narration. It is plausible that the instructional domain types in CBH have developed from modal series. As we have seen, in modal series, additional instructions are expressed by *wa-qaṭal* and *yiqṭol(u)* clauses. In complicated instructions, it is easy to imagine that the connection with a preceding volitive fades away and *wa-qaṭal* and *X-yiqṭol(u)* take over as the backbone of the instruction. It is also reasonable that this is the linguistic milieu where *wa-qaṭal* became the discourse-continuity alternative to *yiqṭol(u)* when *wa-yiqṭol(u)* clauses had become intolerable in the Iron Age (see §3.4.3). If this supposition is true, this constitutes one of the beginnings of the 'alternation' between *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal*.

In this type of domain also, the old final function of *wa-qaṭal* can be detected. Frequently it occurs at the end of a sequence of instructional *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* clauses, as in (31):

(31) *wa-'aḥar yiqtol(u)* + [20]*wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + **wa-qaṭal**

וְאַחַר יִשְׁחַט אֶת־הָעֹלָה: וְהֶעֱלָה הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הָעֹלָה וְאֶת־הַמִּנְחָה הַמִּזְבֵּחָה וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן **וְטָהֵר**:

'After that he is to slaughter the burnt offering, [20]and the priest is to offer the burnt offering and the grain offering on the altar. Thus the priest is to make atonement for him, **so that he will be clean**.' (Lev. 14.19b–20)

In (31), a *wa-qaṭal* clause appears at the end of a sequence of instructions. The meaning is most easily interpreted as a result, the result of the priest's fulfilling the proper ritual of atonement. As (31) exemplifies, the function of *wa-qaṭal* to express a result occurs at the end of a clausal sequence, in which other *wa-qaṭal* clauses may have other meanings, usually obligation.[23] A clear example in direct speech is (32):

(32) *Ø-X-yiqtol(u)* + **wa-qaṭal** + *wa-X-yiqtol(u)* + **wa-qaṭal** + *Ø-raq, yiqtol(Ø)-A*[24]

אֹכֶל בַּכֶּסֶף תַּשְׁבִּרֵנִי וְאָכַלְתִּי וּמַיִם בַּכֶּסֶף תִּתֶּן־לִי וְשָׁתִיתִי רַק אֶעְבְּרָה בְרַגְלָי:

'You shall sell me food for cash **so that I can eat** and give me water **to drink**. Just allow me to go through on foot!' (Deut. 2.28)

The meaning of *wa-qaṭal* in such positions is a semantic subordination, a usage probably inherited from earlier stages when *wa-qaṭal* was a subordinate clause in modal series.

6.5.2. Future Time Reference and *Wa-qaṭal*

The early sense of finality also occurs in linkings with futural *yiqtol(u)* clauses. An example in direct speech is (33):

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

אָנֹכִ֗י אֲשַׁלַּ֣ח אֶתְכֶם֮ **וּזְבַחְתֶּ֗ם** לַיהוָ֤ה אֱלֹֽהֵיכֶם֙ בַּמִּדְבָּ֔ר

'I will let you go, **so that you can sacrifice** to the Lord your God in the desert.' (Exod. 8.24)

In (33), a *wa-qaṭal* clause expresses a result, but in this example the result meaning does not appear in a modal sequence. The preceding *yiqṭol(u)* has future time reference.[25]

A future-time clause can easily express the ability to perform the action. In this case also, a *wa-qaṭal* clause can follow to express a result:

(34) *Ø-INT-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + **wa-qaṭal** + *Ø-ʾim-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + **wa-qaṭal**

הֲצֹ֨אן וּבָקָ֜ר יִשָּׁחֵ֤ט לָהֶם֙ **וּמָצָ֣א** לָהֶ֔ם אִ֣ם אֶֽת־כָּל־דְּגֵ֥י הַיָּ֛ם יֵאָסֵ֥ף לָהֶ֖ם **וּמָצָ֥א** לָהֶֽם׃

'Could enough flocks and herds be slaughtered **to suffice** them? Or could even all the fish of the sea be caught for them **to suffice** them? (Num. 11.22)

In (34), both *yiqṭol(u)* clauses express ability, while the *wa-qaṭal* clauses express result.[26]

6.5.3. Result *Wa-qaṭal* within a Protasis

The result meaning of *wa-qaṭal* also often occurs within complex protases, as in (35):

(35) *(kī-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + **wa-qaṭal** + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u))* + *Ø-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal*

(וְכִֽי־יִנָּצ֣וּ אֲנָשִׁ֗ים וְנָ֨גְפ֜וּ אִשָּׁ֤ה הָרָה֙ **וְיָצְא֣וּ** יְלָדֶ֔יהָ וְלֹ֥א יִהְיֶ֖ה אָס֑וֹן) עָנ֣וֹשׁ יֵעָנֵ֗שׁ כַּאֲשֶׁ֨ר יָשִׁ֤ית עָלָיו֙ בַּ֣עַל הָֽאִשָּׁ֔ה וְנָתַ֖ן בִּפְלִלִֽים׃

'(If men strive together and hit a pregnant woman, **so that** her children **come out**, but there is no harm), the one who hit her shall surely be fined, as the woman's husband shall impose on him, and he shall pay as the judges determine.' (Exod. 21.22)

In (35), in the domain of a complex protasis, *wa-qaṭal* as the third clause has result meaning.[27]

6.5.4. Result *Wa-qaṭal* within an Apodosis

Within the domain of an apodosis also, a *wa-qaṭal* often has result meaning as the second or third clause.

(36)   *(wa-ʾim-O.noun-qaṭal   +   Ø-lō-qaṭal)   +   [21]wa-qaṭal   +   wa-qaṭal   +   **wa-qaṭal**   +   kī-qaṭal   +   wa-qaṭal*

(וְאִם־אֱמֶת הָיָה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה לֹא־נִמְצְאוּ בְתוּלִים לַנַּעֲרָ): וְהוֹצִיאוּ אֶת־הַנַּעֲרָ אֶל־פֶּתַח בֵּית־אָבִיהָ וּסְקָלוּהָ אַנְשֵׁי עִירָהּ בָּאֲבָנִים **וָמֵתָה** כִּי־עָשְׂתָה נְבָלָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל לִזְנוֹת בֵּית אָבִיהָ וּבִעַרְתָּ הָרָע מִקִּרְבֶּךָ:

'(But if the accusation has turned true, the young woman was not a virgin), [21]the men of her city must bring the young woman to the door of her father's house and stone her **to death**, for she has done a disgraceful thing in Israel by behaving like a prostitute while living in her father's house. In this way you will purge the evil from among you.' (Deut. 22.20f.)

In this relatively long apodosis, the third *wa-qaṭal* 'so that she dies' is so frequent that the meaning is practically adverbial. It has the old subordinate result sense. In such cases, the accent before *wa-qaṭal* is usually not a pause. In (36), the *wa-qaṭal* after

the pause (וּבֵעַרְתָּ֖) is a focal clause presupposing the preceding actions: 'in this way you will purge the evil' (see §2.3.8).[28]

6.5.5. Result *Wa-qaṭal* in a *Pɛn*-domain

Complexes of clauses with an initial conjunction *pɛn* constitute well demarcated domains that often end with a *wa-qaṭal* clause with result meaning. An example is:

(37) *kī-lō-yiqtol(u)! + kī-XØ + Ø-XØ + *[15]*pɛn-yiqtol(u) + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + **wa-qaṭal** + *[16]*wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + **wa-qaṭal***

כִּ֣י לֹ֤א תִֽשְׁתַּחֲוֶה֙ לְאֵ֣ל אַחֵ֔ר כִּ֤י יְהוָה֙ קַנָּ֣א שְׁמ֔וֹ אֵ֥ל קַנָּ֖א הֽוּא׃ 15 פֶּן־תִּכְרֹ֥ת בְּרִ֖ית לְיוֹשֵׁ֣ב הָאָ֑רֶץ וְזָנ֣וּ ׀ אַחֲרֵ֣י אֱלֹֽהֵיהֶ֗ם וְזָבְחוּ֙ לֵֽאלֹ֣הֵיהֶ֔ם וְקָרָ֣א לְךָ֔ **וְאָכַלְתָּ֖** מִזִּבְחֽוֹ׃ 16 וְלָקַחְתָּ֥ מִבְּנֹתָ֖יו לְבָנֶ֑יךָ וְזָנ֣וּ בְנֹתָ֗יו אַחֲרֵי֙ אֱלֹ֣הֵיהֶ֔ן וְהִזְנוּ֙ אֶת־בָּנֶ֔יךָ אַחֲרֵ֖י אֱלֹהֵיהֶֽן׃

'You shall not worship any other god, for the LORD, Jealous is his name, is a jealous God—[15]lest you make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land and they play the harlot with their gods, and sacrifice to their gods, and someone invite you **to eat** of his sacrifice; [16]and you take some of his daughters for your sons, and his daughters play the harlot with their gods, **so that they cause** your sons also to play the harlot with their gods.' (Exod. 34.14–16)

In (37), the *pɛn* domain follows after a *yiqtol(u)* clause with obligational meaning. The *pɛn* complex of clauses consists of an initial *yiqtol(u)* clause and seven following *wa-qaṭal* clauses, which describe two scenarios, one concerning making a covenant with the inhabitants and one concerning the sons playing the harlot

with their gods. Both scenarios end with a *wa-qaṭal* having a result meaning.[29]

6.5.6. Result *Wa-qaṭal* in Counterfactual Domains

The result meaning of *wa-qaṭal* can be detected also in some counterfactual sequences. Counterfactual meanings of *wa-qaṭal* are attested in Amarna.[30] It is reasonable to suppose that such uses are inherited in CBH.

(38)   *INT-qaṭal* + **wa-qaṭal**

הֶחֳדַלְתִּי אֶת־דִּשְׁנִי אֲשֶׁר־בִּי יְכַבְּדוּ אֱלֹהִים וַאֲנָשִׁים וְהָלַכְתִּי לָנוּעַ עַל־הָעֵצִים:

'Have I ceased making my oil, whereby gods and men are honored, **that I should go** to sway of the trees?' (Judg. 9.9, Boling 1975, 166)

In (38), the agent looks with contempt on the proposal. "The picture is that of the king who nods, sitting above his subjects" (Boling 1975, 173).[31]

6.6. The Significance of the Result Meaning in the Development of *Wa-qaṭal* in CBH

My hypothesis is that the result meaning of *wa-qaṭal* in CBH is inherited from Northwest Semitic. Since the result *wa-qaṭal* was very often used together with the imperfective gram *yiqṭol(u)* in modal series, as well as in instruction and in prediction, the semantic range of *wa-qaṭal* was gradually extended to future and obligation. The result meaning of *wa-qaṭal* was retained occasionally in CBH, especially at the end of sequences, but the dominant

meanings of *wa-qaṭal* became future and obligation, meanings which the long *yiqṭol* could also express.

This process went hand-in-hand with the need to replace the no longer tolerable **wa-yiqṭol(u)* (see §3.4.3). The *wa-qaṭal* clause-type signalled discourse continuity and could easily be used instead of **wa-yiqṭol(u)*. The latter clause-type is attested in Amarna, but became intolerable in most positions in CBH because of its (partial) homonymy with *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*, jussive or preterite.[32]

It remains to explain the habitual meaning of *wa-qaṭal*. I have found few early examples of the result meaning in sequences expressing habituality. The few examples may support, but cannot prove, the hypothesis that the meanings of habituality developed in sequences where, in earlier Northwest Semitic, *wa-qaṭal* had result meaning. If I am right, the meanings of habituality in CBH developed in sequences within which *wa-qaṭal* was originally used to express result. The habituality became an extension of the semantics of *wa-qaṭal*. In this case too, the old meaning of finality was retained in some positions. One example is:

(39) *Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* + **wa-qaṭal**

עַל־כֵּן יַעֲזָב־אִישׁ אֶת־אָבִיו וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ **וְהָיוּ** לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד:

'That is why a man leaves his father and mother and is united to his wife, **so that they become** one flesh.' (Gen. 2.24)

This editorial aetiological comment (Westermann 1976, 317) explains a custom, and the meaning of both *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal*

is a present habituality, practised at the time of writing. The be-
coming one flesh is the result of the preceding actions (Garr 1998,
lxxxiii). An example with past time reference is (40):

(40)   *Ø-S.noun-qaṭal + CONJ-yiqṭol(u) + **wa-qaṭal***

הַנְּפִלִ֞ים הָי֣וּ בָאָרֶץ֮ בַּיָּמִ֣ים הָהֵם֒ וְגַ֣ם אַֽחֲרֵי־כֵ֗ן אֲשֶׁ֨ר יָבֹ֜אוּ בְּנֵ֤י הָֽאֱלֹהִים֙ אֶל־
בְּנ֣וֹת הָֽאָדָ֔ם וְיָלְד֖וּ לָהֶ֑ם

'The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also
afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters
of man **so that they bore children** to them.' (Gen. 6.4)

In (40), a complex subordinate sentence starts with a *yiqṭol(u)*
clause describing a habitual sequence of events in the past. The
most natural interpretation of *wa-qaṭal* (וְיָלְד֖וּ) is as a result of the
habitual action. The example illustrates that a result clause after
a habitual clause is easily interpreted as being itself habitual.

In (39) and (40), an initial imperfective *yiqṭol(u)* clause de-
termines the intended habitual action.

In Northwest Semitic, the result meaning of *wa-qatal* could
also be used as the first clause in an apodosis. Very early *wa-qatal*
was used to code the expected result when the condition (the
protasis) was fulfilled. As such, *qatal* itself was able to express
this result, as the Amarna examples with *Ø-qatal* apodoses with
future time reference show. But the dominance of the continuity
clause-type *wa-qatal* was so overwhelming in modal series and
other types of sequences that *wa-qatal* became a more natural
choice than *Ø-qatal* for apodosis.

As apodosis, *wa-qaṭal* had its own unique development in
CBH. The extensive use of *wa-qaṭal* in modal sequences and other
types of sequences, together with its use as apodosis, settled *wa-*

qaṭal as construction in CBH, in the sense described by Bybee (2010)—a construction that had completely different semantics compared to the original gram *qaṭal*. This will be the theme for the following sections.

6.7. Survey of Conditional Sentences with *Wa-qaṭal* as Apodosis in CBH

6.7.1. The Types of Apodoses in CBH

In an assessment of the role of *wa-qaṭal* as apodosis, it is pertinent to investigate all types of apodoses in CBH. The result is displayed in Table 12.

Table 12: Statistics of apodosis types in CBH[33]

Ø-X-yiqṭol(u)	117	25.3%
Ø-yiqṭol(u)[34]	3	0.6%
Ø-(X)-qaṭal	17	3.7%
Ø-(ʾal)-yiqṭol(Ø)[35]	13	2.8%
Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)-A	4	0.9%
Ø-(X)-IMP	18	3.9%
Ø-(X)-qoṭel[36]	9	1.9%
Ø-VN (Gen. 4.7)	1	0.2%
Ø-XØ	32	6.9%
wa-X-yiqṭol(u)[37]	2	0.4%
wa-X-qaṭal (Judg. 6.13)	1	0.2%
wa-yiqṭol(Ø)[38]	4	0.9%
wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A[39]	12	2.6%
kī-ʿattā-qaṭal[40]	4	0.9%
wa-haya[41]	4	0.9%
wa-qaṭal	221	47.8%
Total apodoses	**462**	**100%**

Table 12 shows that, apart from the *wa-qaṭal* type of apodoses, an initial *wa* is rare (in total 19×, or about 4% of all apodoses). In CBH, the rule is asyndesis for an apodosis, if we disregard the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type. As for the second most frequent apodosis type, that with a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate, only two instances have a connective *wa*. The rest of the *yiqṭol(u)* (25% of all apodoses) are asyndetic. The table shows that there was no need of a '*waw* of apodosis' in CBH (cf. J-M §176), since such a *waw* would nearly exclusively be confined to one construction, *wa-qaṭal* (*pace* Khan 2021a, 315).

A typical example of an asyndetic apodosis is (41). It represents the second most frequent apodosis type, with a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate.

(41) *(Ø-ʾim-lō-yiqtol(u)) + Ø-lō-yiqtol(u)-Npar*

אִם־לֹא יֵרֵד אֲחִיכֶם הַקָּטֹן אִתְּכֶם לֹא תֹסִפוּן לִרְאוֹת פָּנָי׃

'Unless your youngest brother comes down with you, you shall not see my face again.' (Gen. 44.23)

The apodosis in (41) has a future time reference, which is a very frequent meaning of an apodosis (more on this later on). The example is typical also in the respect that the protasis has a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate, which is the most common protasis type in CBH (see below).

Since the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type is constructed from the elements *wa* and *qaṭal*, it is pertinent to investigate also the use of the *qaṭal* morpheme in apodoses, apart from the *wa-qaṭal* construction. *Qaṭal* (apart from *wa-qaṭal*) occurs in about 4% of all apodoses. The statistics show that *qaṭal* apodoses mostly express

an anterior aspect (projected into the future), an example of which is displayed in (42):

(42) *(wa-ʾim-PrP-qaṭal + wa-S.noun-qaṭal) + Ø-qaṭal*

(וְאִם־בְּעֵינָיו֙ עָמַ֣ד הַנֶּ֔תֶק וְשֵׂעָ֥ר שָׁחֹ֛ר צָֽמַח־בּ֖וֹ) נִרְפָּ֥א הַנֶּ֖תֶק

'If, as far as the priest can see, the scall has stayed the same and black hair has sprouted in it, the scall has been healed' (Lev. 13.37)

As can be seen in (42), an asyndetic clause-initial *qaṭal* is fully productive as apodosis. The meaning in the example is anterior-future. Anterior-future seems to be the default interpretation of *qaṭal* when used as predicate in an apodosis, if the linguistic coding does not indicate otherwise.[42]

The meanings of the *qaṭal* morpheme in apodoses are displayed in Table 13.

Table 13: Frequencies of *qaṭal* meanings in apodoses in corpus

	qaṭal	*qaṭal* %
Anterior-future	9	41%
Anterior-pre-sent[43]	1	5%
Counterfactual	7	32%
Future	1	5%
Performative	3	14%
Stativic (future)	1	5%
Total	**22**	**100%**

As can be seen from Table 13, anterior projected into the future is the most frequent meaning of *qaṭal* in an apodosis. Also a common meaning is the counterfactual, usually signalled by specific particles. An example of this is (43):[44]

(43) *(lūlē-S.noun-qaṭal) + kī-ʿattā-ADV-qaṭal*

(לוּלֵ֣י אֱלֹהֵ֣י אָבִ֡י אֱלֹהֵי֩ אַבְרָהָ֨ם וּפַ֤חַד יִצְחָק֙ הָ֣יָה לִ֔י) כִּ֥י עַתָּ֖ה רֵיקָ֥ם שִׁלַּחְתָּֽנִי

'(If the God of my father, the God of Abraham and the Fear of Isaac, had not been on my side,) surely now you would have sent me away empty-handed' (Gen. 31.42)

In (43), not only is the *qaṭal* in the apodosis counterfactual (marked by the phrase כִּי עַתָּה), but so is the *qaṭal* in the protasis (marked by the preposed particle לוּלֵי).

    In elevated speech, *qaṭal* can be used with performative function in CBH, and this usage is found also in certain apodoses, as in (44):[45]

(44) *(wa-ʾim-yiqṭol(u) + wa-lō-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal) + [18]Ø-qaṭal*

(וְאִם־יִפְנֶ֣ה לְבָבְךָ֮ וְלֹ֣א תִשְׁמָ֑ע וְנִדַּחְתָּ֗ וְהִֽשְׁתַּחֲוִ֛יתָ לֵאלֹהִ֥ים אֲחֵרִ֖ים וַעֲבַדְתָּֽם:) הִגַּ֤דְתִּי לָכֶם֙ הַיֹּ֔ום כִּ֣י...

'(But if your heart turns away, and you will not hear, but are drawn away to worship other gods and serve them,) [18]I declare to you today, that…' (Deut. 30.17–18)

    Of special interest are the rare cases of futural *qaṭal* in an apodosis. An example is (45):

(45) *(Ø-ʾim-yiqṭol(u)-Npar) + kī ʾim-qaṭal*

(אִם־תַּעֲשׂ֣וּן כָּזֹ֑את) כִּ֥י אִם־נִקַּ֖מְתִּי בָכֶ֑ם וְאַחַ֖ר אֶחְדָּֽל:

'If this is the sort of thing you do, I will certainly be vindicated against you! Only after that I will quit.' (Judg. 15.7; cf. Boling 1975, 234)

In this oath formula, the temporal reference of *qaṭal* is future.[46] It is probable that a solemn oath reveals an old usage of *qaṭal*, in which future is a tolerable meaning of a *qaṭal* apodosis, even *Ø-qaṭal*, a clause-type attested in Amarna (Baranowski 2016a, 174). In CBH, a possible future time reference is also found in the stativic *Ø-qaṭal* in (46):

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

וַאֲנִ֕י כַּאֲשֶׁ֥ר שָׁכֹ֖לְתִּי) שָׁכָֽלְתִּי׃

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

The temporal reference of the stativic *qaṭal* is future, even if the natural English translation is in the present.[47]

My conclusion concerning *qaṭal* in apodoses is that, in a few cases of archaic syntax, a future (result) time reference is attested in CBH. This usage points to a stage when *qaṭal* could more freely refer to the future, especially, as in Amarna, in the case of stativic verbs (Baranowski 2016a, 173).

An important issue is the connection between *wa-qaṭal* and long *yiqṭol(u)*. The theory of consecutive tenses suggests that there is a special relationship between *yiqṭol(u)* clauses and *wa-qaṭal* clauses. This is confirmed by the frequencies of both *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* in apodoses. They exhibit practically equivalent meanings, as is shown in Table 14.

Table 14: Meanings of *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* apodoses in the corpus, a comparison

	yiqṭol(u) in apodosis	*wa-qaṭal* as apodosis
Obligation	78%	67%
Future	16%	31%
Permission	4%	1%
Habitual present	1%	0%
Ability	1%	0.5%
Hypothetical	0%	0.5%
Total number	**121**	**226**

In a discussion of the development of the *wa-qaṭal* construction from its use in an apodosis, the relative frequencies of meanings in CBH should be recognised. As can be seen in Table 14, there is a correspondence between the frequencies of future and obligation. As is well known, future and obligation are related meanings (Bybee et al. 1994, 279), and if we compare their combined frequencies for *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal*, the correspondence is stunning: future-obligation is found in 94% of all *yiqṭol(u)* and in 98% of all *wa-qaṭal* in apodoses. The other meanings also correspond fairly well. My conclusion is that there is a semantic connection between *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* in the formation of apodoses in CBH. They are used with the same meaning in the coding of apodoses, and the question arises as to why there were two types at all.

As we have seen, *wa-qaṭal* was current, though not very frequent, as apodosis in early Northwest Semitic (§6.2.2). It was also used in modal series (§6.2.1). And *yaqtulu* was used in apodoses as well. When we compare *wa-qaṭal* in CBH with *wa-qaṭal* in Northwest Semitic, the difference is frequency, extension of domains, and extension of meaning. In early Northwest Semitic

texts, *wa-qaṭal* expressed a result in modal series and as apodosis. But the later pre-exilic Hebrew inscriptions indicate that there must have been a semantic shift, or rather widening, of *wa-qaṭal* to meanings closer to the functions of *yiqṭol(u)*: future, obligation, and habituality. This shift, the emergence of *wa-qaṭal* as a construction in Bybee's sense, must have taken place in a stage during or after Archaic Hebrew.[48]

The apodosis was one of the domains in which *wa-qaṭal* developed as a construction, but we need to investigate also the protasis domain.

6.7.2. Types of Protases in CBH

For an understanding of *wa-qaṭal* as apodosis, it is important to recognise also the protases in CBH. In a survey of the clause-types in protases, it is clear that *yiqṭol(u)* dominates; see Table 15.

Table 15: Protasis types in CBH[49]

	Protases	% of all protases
yiqṭol(u)	291	61%
wa-qaṭal[50]	11	2,3%
ellipsis[51]	3	0,6%
IMP	25	5,2%
XØ	56	11,7%
qoṭel	27	5,7%
qaṭal[52]	64	13,4%
Total in corpus[53]	**477**	**100%**

The dominant predicate in protases is *yiqṭol(u)*, about 60%.[54] This means that, when an apodosis is *wa-qaṭal*, the protasis is most often a *yiqṭol(u)* clause.[55] So the typical conditional sentence is one with a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate in the protasis and *wa-qaṭal* as

apodosis. And the typical apodosis expresses obligation, very fre-
quently so in legal discourse. An example is (47):

(47) *(wa-ʾim-O.noun-lō-yiqtol(u)!) + wa-qaṭal*

וְאִם־שְׁלָשׁ־אֵלֶּה לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה לָהּ) וְיָצְאָה חִנָּם אֵין כָּסֶף:

'(And if he does not do these three things for her,) she shall
go out for nothing, without payment of money.' (Exod.
21.11)

As we have already seen, *yiqtol(u)* is also very frequent in
apodoses. A comparison between *yiqtol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* in both
protases and apodoses is significant.

Table 16: Statistics of *yiqtol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* in protases and apodoses

	% of all protases	**% of all apodoses**
yiqtol(u)	61%	26%
wa-qaṭal	2.3%	48%
Total in corpus	**477**	**462**

As can be seen in Table 16, the dominant predicate in protases is
yiqtol(u). This means that, when an apodosis *wa-qaṭal* began to
develop as a construction, protases with a *yiqtol(u)* predicate had
high frequency. In apodoses, the dominating clause-type is *wa-
qaṭal*, with nearly 50% of all apodoses. The second most frequent
apodosis type has a *yiqtol(u)* predicate, a quarter of all instances
(26%). The apodoses in CBH are dominated by *yiqtol(u)* and *wa-
qaṭal* clauses.

If we consider Tables 12–16 from a diachronic perspec-
tive—more precisely, from the perspective of the relatively new
construction *wa-qaṭal*—we get the impression that the *wa-qaṭal*
clause-type was not needed in the protases (in CBH only about
2%),[56] but increasingly productive in the apodoses. The numbers

reveal an extension of the new *wa-qaṭal*, and this extension took place in the apodosis domain, not as first clause in protases.

6.8. Discussion about the Birthplace of the Construction *Wa-qaṭal*

In early Northwest Semitic, *wa-qatal* seems to have been a clause-type with result meaning. This result mostly had future time reference. The meaning was extended in CBH, and one of the new acquired meanings was a plain future, or obligation. These are meanings close to the meanings expressed by the imperfective gram *yaqtulu*. Since *yaqtulu* dominates in protases and is frequent also in apodoses, this means that, in early texts, *yaqtulu* is often followed by a *wa-qatal* clause with result meaning. When the result meaning was bleached and/or extended to future, *wa-qatal* became a clause that, in a few steps of extension, could express the same meanings as *yaqtulu*, only with the exception that *wa-qatal* always signalled continuity.

The quality of continuity and the result meaning are not typical for *yaqtulu* clauses. They are specific qualities of *wa-qatal*.

The 'consecutive' phenomenon, whereby *wa-qaṭal* came to continue specifically *yiqṭol(u)* clauses, belongs to a later stage, what we call CBH.

Something happened; *wa-qaṭal* was now no longer only used to signify result, but also future, and obligation—in the proper contexts.

With the future meaning, *wa-qaṭal* acquired semantics close to those of *yiqṭol(u)*. Khan (2021a) has not explained why *wa-*

qaṭal came to acquire semantics close to those of *yiqṭol(u)*. In the sections above, I have tried to attain an answer.

The old result meaning of *wa-qaṭal* can be demonstrated in certain domains: in protases, in apodoses, in modal sequences, and also in other types of sequences, such as instructions.

When the result meaning of *wa-qaṭal* was extended to future-obligation, it became a clause-type that had the same meaning as *yiqṭol(u)*, apart from a continuity signal.

6.9. Temporal or Causal Clause with *Wa-qaṭal*

Since one linguistic birthplace of the construction *wa-qaṭal* is a linking of the type *conditional clause + wa-qaṭal*, where the conditional clause is subordinate, a logical extension of the construction would be a linking with a similar type of subordinated clause: the temporal. This type of linking is amply attested in CBH. In the present section, the emphasis will be on temporal, but also causal, clauses that precede a *wa-qaṭal* clause.

In many languages, there is a close association between conditional and temporal linkings (Dixon 2009, 14). In CBH also, a semantic affinity can be perceived between conditional clauses and temporal clauses (both followed by main clauses). This can be illustrated by a number of borderline cases in which the classification is disputable. In a linking *temporal clause + main clause*, the event or state described in the temporal clause lies in the future or in the past; if in the future, the action in the temporal clause is expected to occur (Khan 2021a, 311). By contrast, the

conditional clause describes an eventuality that is not presupposed. A borderline case with the conjunction *ʾim* is illustrated in (48):

(48)   *wa-ʾim-PrP-yiqtol(u) + wa-qaṭal*

וְאִם־בְּאַחַת יִתְקָעוּ וְנוֹעֲדוּ אֵלֶ֫יךָ הַנְּשִׂיאִ֫ים רָאשֵׁי אַלְפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

'But if they blow only one, then the chiefs, the heads of the tribes of Israel, shall gather themselves to you.' (Num. 10.4)

In (48), the event in the temporal clause is expected to occur. On certain occasions, one silver trumpet is really blown.[57] But on other occasions, they will blow two trumpets. So in this respect the case is an eventuality. The syntax of the temporal clause is exactly the same as in the most frequent type of a protasis: the conjunction *ʾim* and the predicate *yiqtol(u)*.

Another borderline case of temporal linking is the following example with the conjunction *kī*:[58]

(49)   *Ø-kī-yiqtol(u) + wa-qaṭal*

כִּי תִבְנֶה֙ בַּ֫יִת חָדָשׁ וְעָשִׂ֫יתָ מַעֲקֶה לְגַגֶּ֫ךָ

'When you build a new house, you shall make a parapet for your roof.' (Deut. 22.8; Christensen 2002, 501)

In (49), the 'you' represents any Israelite, and for this collective entity, the action in the temporal clause is certainly expected to occur many times. On the other hand, not everyone will build a new house, and in this respect, from the point of view of the individual, the clause expresses an eventuality.[59]

A temporal clause may refer to the future. In the following example, the temporal conjunction is *ʾim* and nothing in the syntax indicates that a temporal and not a conditional clause is at hand:

(50) *wa-ʾim-yiqtol(u)! + wa-qatal*

וְאִם־יִהְיֶה הַיֹּבֵל֙ לִבְנֵ֣י יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל וְנֽוֹסְפָה֙ נַחֲלָתָ֔ן עַ֚ל נַחֲלַ֣ת הַמַּטֶּ֔ה אֲשֶׁ֥ר תִּהְיֶ֖ינָה לָהֶ֑ם

'And when the jubilee of the people of Israel comes, then their inheritance will be added to the inheritance of the tribe into which they marry.' (Num. 36.4a)

In (50), the temporal clause is expected to occur in the future: the jubilee. Since this is something to be repeated as a custom, the *wa-qatal* here has a sense of habituality.

When the temporal clause linking refers to events in the past, habituality is often implied:

(51) *wa-ʾim-ADV-yiqtol(u) + wa-qatal*

וְאִם־כֹּ֣ה יֹאמַ֗ר עֲקֻדִּים֙ יִהְיֶ֣ה שְׂכָרֶ֔ךָ וְיָלְד֥וּ כָל־הַצֹּ֖אן עֲקֻדִּֽים׃

'and if he said, The striped shall be your wages, then all the flock bore striped.' (Gen. 31.8b)

In the case of a temporal clause referring to the past, a conditional interpretation is not possible, since its truth value is settled. There is no eventuality. A *yiqtol(u)* predicate in the temporal clause usually indicates habituality in the past, and the same meaning must be given to the main clause (וְיָלְד֥וּ). The example illustrates how *wa-qatal* extends to past habitual semantics when the temporal clause has past time reference, and this is also the

case when the temporal clause is coded with a *qaṭal* morpheme with implied habitual meaning, as in (52):

(52)   *wa-haya: Ø-ʾim-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*

וְהָיָה אִם־זָרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעָלָה מִדְיָן וַעֲמָלֵק וּבְנֵי־קֶדֶם וְעָלוּ עָלָיו:

'For whenever the Israelites planted crops, the Midianites and the Amalekites and the people of the East would come up and attack them.' (Judg. 6.3)

The *wa-haya* in (52) is a macro-syntactic signal for background (Isaksson 1998). It does not belong to the temporal clause, which has a *qaṭal* predicate (זָרַע) with implied habituality. The *wa-qaṭal* main clauses (וְעָלָה and וְעָלוּ) in this example too express past habituality. This habitual meaning represents an extension of the construction *wa-qaṭal*, since a meaning of habituality is not attested for an apodosis *wa-qaṭal* in CBH.[60]

The most frequent temporal conjunction is *kī*. Many such examples exhibit a *wa-qaṭal* main clause with future or obligational meaning, meanings that are current also in apodoses of conditional sentences. In the present corpus, with its immense amount of legal material, obligation dominates, as in (53):

(53)   *IMP + wa-qaṭal: kī-yiqṭol(u) +* **wa-qaṭal**

דַּבֵּר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם כִּי תָבֹאוּ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי נֹתֵן לָכֶם **וְשָׁבְתָה** הָאָרֶץ שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה:

'Speak to the people of Israel and say to them: When you come into the land that I give you, **the land shall keep** a Sabbath to the LORD.' (Lev. 25.2)

In (53), the temporal clause refers to a point in the future and describes an event that is presupposed to take place. The following *wa-qaṭal* (וְשָׁבְתָה) has a meaning of obligation. No habituality is expressed by this *wa-qaṭal*. The example illustrates that a temporal clause with future time reference is often followed by a non-habitual *wa-qaṭal* clause.[61]

A comparison with a temporal *kī*-clause and a following main *yiqṭol(u)* clause is illuminating:

(54) *(kī-yiqṭol(u)) + wa-qaṭal + wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)-N +* [13]*wa-kī-yiqṭol(u)-N + Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)-N*

> כִּי־יִמָּכֵר לְךָ אָחִיךָ הָעִבְרִי אוֹ הָעִבְרִיָּה) וַעֲבָדְךָ שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים וּבַשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁבִיעִת תְּשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ חָפְשִׁי מֵעִמָּךְ: וְכִי־תְשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ חָפְשִׁי מֵעִמָּךְ **לֹא תְשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ** רֵיקָם:

'If your brother, a Hebrew man or a Hebrew woman, is sold to you, he shall serve you six years, and in the seventh year you shall let him go free from you. [13]And when you let him go free from you, **you shall not let him go** empty-handed.' (Deut. 15.12f.)

The first *kī-yiqṭol(u)* clause in (54) is a protasis, but the second (וְכִי־תְשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ) is clearly a temporal clause, since the context takes for granted that the release will take place. Example (54) also illustrates that, when the main line that follows is a *yiqṭol(u)* clause (לֹא תְשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ), it follows the word order rule with non-initial position of the verb, and is nearly always asyndetic, as is the case also with apodoses (see §6.7.1).[62]

A futural temporal *kī*-clause with following main *wa-qaṭal* can be habitual if this is implied by the context, an example of which is found in (55).

(55) *kī-S.noun-qaṭal* + **wa-qaṭal** + *wa-S.pron-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + **wa-qaṭal** + *wa-PrP-lō-yiqṭol(u)*

כִּי־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶ֫יךָ בֵּרַכְךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר־לָ֑ךְ **וְהַעֲבַטְתָּ֙** גּוֹיִ֣ם רַבִּ֔ים וְאַתָּ֖ה לֹ֣א תַעֲבֹ֑ט **וּמָשַׁלְתָּ֙** בְּגוֹיִ֣ם רַבִּ֔ים וּבְךָ֖ לֹ֥א יִמְשֹֽׁלוּ׃

'When the LORD your God has blessed you as he promised you, **then you shall lend** to many nations, but you shall not borrow, **you shall rule** over many nations, but they shall not rule over you.' (Deut. 15.6)

The blessing in the temporal clause describes an anterior action projected into the future.[63] The main clauses refer to habitual actions in the future.[64]

But a temporal clause with *qaṭal* predicate can of course have past time reference. Such instances usually describe habitual actions, as in (56):

(56) *wa-kī-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*

וְכִי־הֵקִ֣ים יְהוָה֮ לָהֶם֮ שֹֽׁפְטִים֒ וְהָיָ֤ה יְהוָה֙ עִם־הַשֹּׁפֵ֔ט וְהוֹשִׁיעָם֙ מִיַּ֣ד אֹֽיְבֵיהֶ֔ם כֹּ֖ל יְמֵ֥י הַשּׁוֹפֵ֑ט

'Whenever the LORD raised up judges for them, the LORD was with the judge, and he saved them from the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge.' (Judg. 2.18a)

In (56), the perfective aspect of the *qaṭal* morpheme means that the actions of the Lord are viewed as a single whole, but a habitual interpretation is necessitated by the plural form 'judges' (שֹֽׁפְטִים֒). The main line of *wa-qaṭal* clauses expresses repeated actions in the past.

A *wa-qaṭal* clause following a temporal clause can also express habituality in speech time, as in (57):

(57) *kī-lō-XØ* + *bəṭɛrɛm-yiqṭol(u)* + **wa-qaṭal**

כִּי לֹא כַנָּשִׁים הַמִּצְרִיֹּת הָעִבְרִיֹּת כִּי־חָיוֹת הֵנָּה בְּטֶרֶם תָּבוֹא אֲלֵהֶן הַמְיַלֶּדֶת **וְיָלָדוּ**׃

'Because the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women, for they are vigorous: before the midwife comes to them **they give birth**.' (Exod. 1.19)

In (57), reference time is the same as speech time, and *wa-qaṭal* has a present habitual meaning.

As *wa-qaṭal* can function as a conditional clause in relatively rare cases (about 2% of all protases), so it can also function as a temporal clause in special instances. In all such instances, the *wa-qaṭal* temporal clause has a close semantic connection with the preceding clause(s), as in (58):[65]

(58) *IMP* + *wa-IMP* + [13]*[wa-qaṭal]* + *wa-qaṭal*

עֲלֵה אֶל־הַר הָעֲבָרִים הַזֶּה וּרְאֵה אֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל׃ [**וְרָאִיתָ אֹתָהּ**] וְנֶאֱסַפְתָּ אֶל־עַמֶּיךָ גַּם־אָתָּה

'Go up into this mountain of Abarim and see the land that I have given to the people of Israel. [13][**When you see it**,] you also shall be gathered to your people' (Num. 27.13)

There are also examples of temporal clauses with verbal noun predicates (infinitive construct). Since the infinitive is not attested as predicate in a protasis in my corpus, I conclude that this is an extension of the construction *wa-qaṭal*. What was not tolerable as protasis before an apodosis with *wa-qaṭal* became acceptable as temporal clause. An example is (59):

(59) *wa-bə-yōm-VN* + *wa-qaṭal*

וּבְיוֹם פָּקְדִי וּפָקַדְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם חַטָּאתָם׃

'But in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them.' (Exod. 32.34)

In *protases*, verbless clauses and active participles are tolerable, but not verbal nouns. Verbal nouns are usually perceived as adverbial expressions embedded in a clause, not as clauses involved in a temporal linking. Example (59) illustrates how a prepositional phrase in a construct relation (בְּיוֹם) with a verbal noun (פָּקְדִי) fills the slot of a temporal clause with a following *wa-qaṭal* as main clause. This is an extension of what is tolerable as a preceding subordinated clause before the *wa-qaṭal* construction.[66]

An example of a *yiqṭol(u)* morpheme with a preceding temporal VN clause illustrates well how a long *yiqṭol* is used in this case (60):

(60) *wa-bə-VN-yiqṭol(u)! (not wa-bə-VN + Ø-yiqṭol(u)!)*

וּבְבֹא מֹשֶׁה לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ יָסִיר אֶת־הַמַּסְוֶה עַד־צֵאתוֹ

'Whenever Moses went in before the LORD to speak with him, he would remove the veil, until he came out.' (Exod. 34.34a)

In (60), the VN-clause is perceived by linguistic competence to be embedded in the *yiqṭol(u)* clause. There is no linking between two clauses, as would have been the case with a *wa-qaṭal* clause. And a constituent (the *VN* phrase) precedes the *yiqṭol(u)* morpheme, so the word order rule is fulfilled.[67]

When a verbal noun clause is accepted as temporal clause before *wa-qaṭal*, even a prepositional phrase can serve the same purpose (being a temporal clause) before *wa-qaṭal*, as in (61).

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

וּבְי֨וֹם שִׂמְחַתְכֶ֜ם וּֽבְמוֹעֲדֵיכֶם֮ וּבְרָאשֵׁ֣י חָדְשֵׁיכֶם֒ **וּתְקַעְתֶּ֣ם** בַּחֲצֹֽצְרֹת֮ עַ֣ל
עֹלֹֽתֵיכֶ֔ם וְעַ֖ל זִבְחֵ֣י שַׁלְמֵיכֶ֑ם

'On the day of your gladness also, and at your appointed
feasts and at the beginnings of your months, **you shall
blow** the trumpets over your burnt offerings and over the
sacrifices of your peace offerings.' (Num. 10.10a)

From a prepositional phrase, the step is not long to using
an adverbialised noun as temporal clause before *wa-qaṭal*, as in
(62), which is a rare case:[68]

(62) *Ø-noun* + **wa-qaṭal** + *⁷wa-noun* + **wa-qaṭal**

עֶ֕רֶב **וִֽידַעְתֶּ֕ם** כִּ֧י יְהוָ֛ה הוֹצִ֥יא אֶתְכֶ֖ם מֵאֶ֣רֶץ מִצְרָ֑יִם׃ וּבֹ֗קֶר **וּרְאִיתֶם֙** אֶת־כְּב֣וֹד
יְהוָ֔ה

'At evening **you shall know** that it was the LORD who
brought you out of the land of Egypt, ⁷and in the morning
you shall see the glory of the LORD.' (Exod. 16.6f.)

As in the case of conditional and temporal clauses, a subor-
dinated cause/reason clause is usually also marked with an initial
specific conjunction in CBH. An example with following *wa-qaṭal*
is (63):

(63) *wa-(S.noun)-CONJ-qaṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-
      S.noun-yiqṭol(u)-N*

וְעַבְדִּ֣י כָלֵ֗ב עֵ֣קֶב הָֽיְתָ֞ה ר֤וּחַ אַחֶ֙רֶת֙ עִמּ֔וֹ וַיְמַלֵּ֖א אַחֲרָ֑י וַהֲבִֽיאֹתִ֗יו אֶל־הָאָ֙רֶץ֙
אֲשֶׁר־בָּ֣א שָׁ֔מָּה וְזַרְע֖וֹ יוֹרִשֶֽׁנָּה׃

'But my servant Caleb, because he has a different spirit and
has followed me fully, I will bring him into the land into

which he went, and his descendants shall possess it.' (Num. 14.24)

The cause/reason clause is marked by an initial conjunction (עֵקֶב) after a left dislocation (עַבְדִּי כָלֵב). The subordination also involves the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause (וַיְמַלֵּא) with anterior meaning. This is the reason (or cause), and there then follows the main clause *wa-qaṭal* (וַהֲבִיאֹתִיו), which expresses what will happen because of the stated reason. This is a promise, and the last *yiqṭol(u)* clause elaborates that promise with a focused element (זַרְעוֹ).[69]

6.10. Topics and their *Wa-qaṭal* Comments

Haiman (1978, 585) writes:

> The topic represents an entity whose existence is agreed upon by the speaker and his audience. As such, it constitutes the framework which has been selected for the following discourse.

A topic is something agreed upon by speaker and listener, while a conditional clause describes a hypothetical case, an eventuality. Topics are givens, conditionals are not (Haiman 1978, 571, 583). This difference is reflected in the syntactic marking of clauses in CBH. Conditional clauses are overwhelmingly coded by an initial subordinating conjunction, most often *ʾim* but frequently also *kī*. Verbless conditional clauses also nearly always contain a marker.[70] Topics, on the other hand, are often coded as main verbless clauses, without initial conjunction. Since topics are coded by main clauses, it is pertinent to define the distinction between topic and comment by using a semantic terminology: the topic clause is a supporting clause and comment clauses are

focal. A consequence of this terminology is that chained clauses linked in a relation of temporal succession cannot describe a topic–comment relation, since clauses involved in temporal succession linking are focal (Dixon 2009, 2f.).

The primary interest in the present section will be the use of *wa-qaṭal* clauses as focal clauses after a topic clause. I will not treat linkings of the type *XØ + wa(y)-yiqṭol*.[71]

For the development of the construction *wa-qaṭal*, the *topic + wa-qaṭal* linking is of great interest, because it represents an expansion of the clauses that are tolerable before *wa-qaṭal*. When we have analysed extensions of the *conditional clause + wa-qaṭal* linking, we have until now treated only subordinate clauses before *wa-qaṭal*: conditional, temporal, and causal clauses. In the present type of linking, the clause that precedes *wa-qaṭal* is allowed to be a main clause, though with a supportive meaning (the topic) in relation to the following focal *wa-qaṭal* (the comment).

Before we turn to the *wa-qaṭal* clause as comment, it is practical to consider the corresponding use of *yiqṭol(u)*. The comparison is instructive, because it reveals a complementary distribution:

(64)   *Ø-XØ + Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u) + kī-PrP-qaṭal*

זֹאת הַפַּעַם עֶצֶם מֵעֲצָמַי וּבָשָׂר מִבְּשָׂרִי לְזֹאת יִקָּרֵא אִשָּׁה כִּי מֵאִישׁ לֻקֳחָה־זֹאת:

'This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.' (Gen. 2.23)

It is not reasonable to regard the verbless clause in (64) as sub-
ordinate. It is a plain statement of what is agreed upon. The
yiqṭol(u) clause supplies the new information, with a notion of
obligation.[72] The *yiqṭol(u)* clause lacks a connective *wa*, which is
the more frequent option when a *yiqṭol(u)* clause functions as
comment after a verbless clause. The example illustrates that
when a focal clausal constituent (in this case לְזֹאת) is to be placed
before the verb in the comment, a *yiqṭol(u)* clause is used. It also
illustrates that, in topic–comment linking, the comment can often
be accurately translated with an initial *therefore*: 'therefore she
shall be called Woman'. The topic is the starting point, the moti-
vation for the comment.[73]

When no initial constituent is needed before the verb in the
comment, a *wa-qaṭal* clause can be used. With a *wa-qaṭal* com-
ment also, the nuance is often an understood 'therefore', as in
(65):

(65) *Ø-XØ + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*

בִּגְדֵי־קֹדֶשׁ הֵם וְרָחַץ בַּמַּיִם אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ וּלְבֵשֵׁם:

'They are holy garments, so he must bathe his body in wa-
ter and put them on.' (Lev. 16.4)

The topic expressed by the verbless clause (בִּגְדֵי־קֹדֶשׁ הֵם) consti-
tutes the motivation for the obligations in the *wa-qaṭal* clauses.
In this case, there was no need of a clausal constituent in focal
position in the comment clauses, or of a negated comment. Both
an initial constituent and a negation would have required com-
ment clauses with a *yiqṭol(u)* predicate. In my database, *wa-qaṭal*
comment clauses seem to be as frequent as *yiqṭol(u)* comments.[74]

At the end of this section, it is necessary to discuss also the role of left dislocations, since they are coded as topics, sentence-initially, with the only difference being that the starting phrase is not a clause but a certain non-verbal constituent. A left dislocation also expresses old information, something agreed upon (Haiman 1978, 572).[75] Left dislocations occur in seemingly all types of clauses, but for our purposes, *yiqtol(u)* clauses with left dislocation supply the most pertinent comparison for *wa-qaṭal*. All *yiqtol(u)* clauses after a left dislocation are asyndetic, an example of which is found in (66):

(66) **wa-PrP** + *Ø-lō-yiqtol(u)*

    וּמֵעֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ

    '**but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil** you shall not eat (of it)' (Gen. 2.17)

The *yiqtol(u)* clause has no connective, but the status of the preceding constituent (*PrP*) as left dislocation is revealed by the presence of an anaphoric pronoun in the last phrase (מִמֶּנּוּ). The left dislocation in this case is a prepositional phrase with some complication, involving a verbal noun (הַדַּעַת) and its following direct objects (טוֹב וָרָע).[76]

The left dislocations with *wa-qaṭal* are apparently often semantically similar to protases with quantifier, which implicitly code an eventuality:

(67) *(kōl-NP-REL-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u))* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*

    (כָּל־הָאָדָם וְהַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר־יִמָּצֵא בַשָּׂדֶה וְלֹא יֵאָסֵף הַבַּיְתָה) וְיָרַד עֲלֵהֶם הַבָּרָד וָמֵתוּ:

'(Every man or animal that will be found in the field and will not have been gathered into the house)—then the hail will descend upon them and they will die.' (Exod. 9.19, Propp 1999, 289)

The segment before the *wa-qaṭal* clauses is basically a quantifier (כָּל-) and a noun phrase with a relative clause attribute (*REL-yiqṭol(u) + wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*). That this noun phrase is perceived as a left dislocation is corroborated by the anaphoric pronoun (עֲלֵהֶם) in the first *wa-qaṭal* clause. At the same time, the quantifier and the pragmatics of the situation signal an eventuality: some have been gathered into the house, and some have not. In this sense, the linking is close to a conditional sentence, and the extension of the construction *wa-qaṭal* to be used after a left-dislocated noun phrase is easy to imagine.[77] A conditional meaning may also be achieved with a simple relative clause construction, as in (68):

(68) *(Ø-REL-yiqṭol(u)! + wa-qaṭal) + wa-qaṭal*

אֲשֶׁר־יַכֶּה אֶת־קִרְיַת־סֵפֶר וּלְכָדָהּ) וְנָתַתִּי לוֹ אֶת־עַכְסָה בִתִּי לְאִשָּׁה:

'(Whoever devastates Qiriath-sepher and captures it,) to him I'll give my daughter Achsah as wife.' (Judg. 1.12, Boling 1975, 50f.)

The relative clause complex is syntactically a noun phrase, but semantically, it involves the rare eventuality that someone would dare to attack, and manage to capture, Qiriath-sepher.[78]

There are also less frequent instances when *wa-qaṭal* has a preceding left dislocation without a sense of conditionality:

(69) *(wa-O.noun-REL-qaṭal)* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*

וְטַפְּכֶ֗ם אֲשֶׁ֤ר אֲמַרְתֶּם֙ לָבַ֣ז יִהְיֶ֔ה וְהֵבֵיאתִ֣י אֹתָ֔ם וְיָ֣דְעוּ֙ אֶת־הָאָ֔רֶץ אֲשֶׁ֥ר
מְאַסְתֶּ֖ם בָּֽהּ׃

'But your little ones, who you said would become a prey, I
will bring them in, and they shall know the land that you
have rejected.' (Num. 14.31)

The left dislocation in (69) is a noun phrase (with relative clause)
which is resumed as object pronoun (אֹתָ֔ם) in the first *wa-qaṭal*
clause.[79]

The use of *wa-qaṭal* clauses after non-conditional left dislo-
cations represents an extension of the *wa-qaṭal* construction, from
its corresponding use as apodosis.

6.11. First Clause and *Wa-qaṭal* Being of Equal Status[80]

We have already seen that *wa-qaṭal*, apart from its function as
apodosis, can be used as a main clause after a temporal clause,
as comment in a topic–comment linking, and with result meaning
in modal series and instructional text-types.

Khan (2021a, 309, examples 9 and 12) refers also to an-
other extensional step of the construction *wa-qaṭal*. In this exten-
sion, all clauses are of equal status and semantically focal. This
extension is systematically treated in the present section (see
§§6.11.1–4). We will discuss the use of *wa-qaṭal* after the follow-
ing clause-types: *(wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)*, *wa-qaṭal*, *qoṭel*, and *qaṭal*. The
reversed clausal order (with *wa-qaṭal* first) is treated in §§6.12–
13.

As we have seen already, *wa-qaṭal* is by its nature a clause that follows what is usually another clause, and the extension of its meaning discussed in the present section concerns the preceding clause. It is time to consider *wa-qaṭal* in some basic types of main-line discourse—that is, its linking with clauses of equal status.

6.11.1. *Yiqṭol(u) + Wa-qaṭal*

There is already a close connection between *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* in conditional sentences, and it is not surprising that, in an overwhelming number of cases, *wa-qaṭal* as continuity clause-type continues a main-line *yiqṭol(u)* clause, whatever the meaning of this *yiqṭol(u)* may be.[81]

The meanings of the linking *yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal* attested in my database are displayed in Table 17.

Table 17: *Yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal* in main structures

Obligation	119
Future	88
Ability	8
Habitual past	5
Modal volitive[82]	3
Modal permissive[83]	3
General present	1
Habitual present	1
Past progressive	1
Total	**229**

As can be seen in Table 17, the related meanings of future and obligation dominate when the linking is used in main structures. An example of a future meaning is (70).

(70) *wa-O.noun-yiqtol(u)! + **wa-qaṭal***

וְק֤וֹץ וְדַרְדַּר֙ תַּצְמִ֣יחַֽ לָ֔ךְ **וְאָכַלְתָּ֖** אֶת־עֵ֥שֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶֽה׃

'thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you; **and you shall eat** the plants of the field.' (Gen. 3.18)

Apart from the future meaning of the two clauses, the semantics of the linking are interesting. As it is usually translated, as above, the sense of the linking is remarkably pointless. But the discourse-continuity clause *wa-qaṭal* (וְאָכַלְתָּ֖) presupposes the world of the thorns and thistles—the pain of labour described in the preceding clauses—'and (under such circumstances) you shall eat the plants of the field'.[84]

But of course, in the text-types we encounter in the Pentateuch, a meaning of obligation dominates in the corpus.

(71) *Ø-VNabs-yiqtol(u) + wa-qaṭal*

הִמּ֧וֹל ׀ יִמּ֛וֹל יְלִ֥יד בֵּֽיתְךָ֖ וּמִקְנַ֣ת כַּסְפֶּ֑ךָ וְהָיְתָ֧ה בְרִיתִ֛י בִּבְשַׂרְכֶ֖ם לִבְרִ֥ית עוֹלָֽם׃

'They must indeed be circumcised, whether born in your house or bought with money. Thus shall My covenant be marked in your flesh as an everlasting pact.' (Gen. 17.13)

As is often the case, the discourse-continuity *wa-qaṭal* presupposes the procedure in the preceding clause, and implies a specific semantic connection: 'in this way My covenant shall be marked in your flesh'.[85]

It is very common that both clauses in *yiqtol(u) + wa-qaṭal* have the same meaning, for example, either obligation or future, but this is not necessary. An example with different meanings is (72):

(72) *Ø-VNabs-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*

פָּקֹד יִפְקֹד אֱלֹהִים֙ אֶתְכֶ֔ם וְהַעֲלִתֶ֥ם אֶת־עַצְמֹתַ֖י מִזֶּֽה׃

'God will surely take care of you, and then you must carry my bones up from here.' (Gen. 50.25)

In (72), the first clause expresses a conviction about a future act of God, while the second clause is an obligation upon the sons of Joseph. The discourse-continuity *wa-qaṭal* implicitly carries over the point of time expressed by the *yiqṭol(u)* clause, which motivates a translation 'and then', 'and at that time'.[86]

The meaning of ability is usually found in only one of the clauses in the linking *yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*, but there are exceptions, as in (73):[87]

(73) *wa-ADV-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*

וְאֵ֤יךְ אֶֽעֱשֶׂה֙ הָרָעָ֤ה הַגְּדֹלָה֙ הַזֹּ֔את וְחָטָ֖אתִי לֵֽאלֹהִֽים׃

'How then can I do this great wickedness and (in this way) sin against God?' (Gen. 39.9)

Though the meanings of future and obligation dominate when *yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qaṭal* are linked, various shades of habituality and progressivity are also possible, as in example (74):

(74) *wa-S.noun-qoṭel + wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*

וְנָהָר֙ יֹצֵ֣א מֵעֵ֔דֶן לְהַשְׁק֖וֹת אֶת־הַגָּ֑ן וּמִשָּׁם֙ יִפָּרֵ֔ד וְהָיָ֖ה לְאַרְבָּעָ֥ה רָאשִֽׁים׃

'A river flowed out of Eden to water the garden, and there it divided and became four rivers.' (Gen. 2.10)

In (74), a *yiqṭol(u)* clause is followed by *wa-qaṭal*, both with past progressive meaning. The example also illustrates the diachronic intrusion of the relatively new predicative active participle with

past progressive meaning as first clause (but not as second clause).

As Table 17 shows, a sense of habituality seems to be slightly more frequent than pure progressivity. An example is (75):

(75) *wa-S.noun-yiqtol(u) + wa-qatal + wa-qatal*

וּמֹשֶׁה֩ יִקַּ֨ח אֶת־הָאֹ֜הֶל וְנָֽטָה־ל֣וֹ ׀ מִח֣וּץ לַֽמַּחֲנֶ֗ה הַרְחֵק֙ מִן־הַֽמַּחֲנֶ֔ה וְקָ֥רָא ל֖וֹ אֹ֥הֶל מוֹעֵ֑ד

'Now Moses used to take the tent and pitch it outside the camp, far off from the camp, and he called it the tent of meeting.' (Exod. 33.7)

In (75), *yiqtol(u)* and *wa-qatal* have a meaning of past habituality; in other instances, the temporal reference is present or has a more general habituality.[88]

6.11.2. The Linking Type *Wa-qatal + Wa-qatal*

In this type of linking, two or more discourse-continuity clauses are linked in such a way that there is a connection with the preceding clauses. The linking often describes temporally successive events, as in (76):

(76) *wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal*

וְנֶאֶסְפוּ־שָׁ֣מָּה כָל־הָעֲדָרִ֗ים וְגָלֲל֤וּ אֶת־הָאֶ֙בֶן֙ מֵעַל֙ פִּ֣י הַבְּאֵ֔ר וְהִשְׁק֖וּ אֶת־הַצֹּ֑אן וְהֵשִׁ֧יבוּ אֶת־הָאֶ֛בֶן עַל־פִּ֥י הַבְּאֵ֖ר לִמְקֹמָֽהּ׃

'and all the flocks were gathered there, and the shepherds would roll the stone from the mouth of the well and water the sheep, and put the stone back in its place over the mouth of the well.' (Gen. 29.3)

This type of chaining of only discourse-continuity clauses of course receives its past habituality from the preceding clauses, where the background description starts with a construction *kī-PrP-yiqṭol(u)* (כִּי מִן־הַבְּאֵר הַהִוא יַשְׁקוּ) in the preceding verse. In (76), only the verbal actions are focal, not other constituents.[89]

A more frequent type of *wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal* linking has future time reference or, in instruction, expresses obligation. An example is (77):

(77) *wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*

וְהִקְרִיב אַהֲרֹן אֶת־פַּר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ וְכִפֶּר בַּעֲדוֹ וּבְעַד בֵּיתוֹ וְשָׁחַט אֶת־פַּר הַחַטָּאת אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ:

'Aaron shall present the bull as a sin offering for himself, and shall make atonement for himself and for his house. He shall kill the bull as a sin offering for himself.' (Lev. 16.11)

In (77), the semantics of the *wa-qaṭal* clauses are of obligation, and the first two exhibit a sequential linking. The third, however, is a summary. This illustrates the variation of the discourse-continuity linkings. A discourse-continuity clause may express, among other things, also elaboration and summary. The latter is the case with the third *wa-qaṭal* in (77).[90]

6.11.3. The Linking Type *Qoṭel + Wa-qaṭal*

Since we can observe a renewal of the coding of (immediate) future meanings within CBH, with an intrusion of active participles in predicative position (Joosten 1989, 144–46; Notarius 2010a, 251, 254, 259),[91] it is not surprising that we encounter *qoṭel + wa-qaṭal* linkings with future meaning. An example is:

(78) *kī-PrP-ADV-S.pron-qoṭel + wa-qaṭal*

כִּי֩ לְיָמִ֨ים ע֜וֹד שִׁבְעָ֗ה אָֽנֹכִי֙ מַמְטִ֣יר עַל־הָאָ֔רֶץ אַרְבָּעִ֣ים י֔וֹם וְאַרְבָּעִ֖ים לָ֑יְלָה וּמָחִ֗יתִי אֶֽת־כָּל־הַיְקוּם֙ «אֲשֶׁ֣ר עָשִׂ֔יתִי» מֵעַ֖ל פְּנֵ֥י הָֽאֲדָמָֽה:

'For in seven days I will send rain on the earth forty days and forty nights, and every living thing that I have made I will blot out from the face of the ground.' (Gen. 7.4)

In (78), a *wa-qaṭal* clause is linked to a predicative active participle clause. Both have the same future meaning ('in seven days').[92]

There are, however, examples that indicate that *wa-qaṭal* in CBH may, as an extension, have a more independent function, as discourse-continuity counterpart to *yiqṭol(u)*. In a linking with *qoṭel*, it may express meanings that deviate from that of the preceding participle:

(79) *wa-hinnē-S.noun-qoṭel +* [13]*wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*

וְהִנֵּ֤ה עֵֽינֵיכֶם֙ רֹא֔וֹת וְעֵינֵ֖י אָחִ֣י בִנְיָמִ֑ין כִּי־פִ֖י הַֽמְדַבֵּ֥ר אֲלֵיכֶֽם: וְהִגַּדְתֶּ֣ם לְאָבִ֗י אֶת־כָּל־כְּבוֹדִי֙ בְּמִצְרַ֔יִם וְאֵ֖ת כָּל־אֲשֶׁ֣ר רְאִיתֶ֑ם וּמִֽהַרְתֶּ֛ם וְהֽוֹרַדְתֶּ֥ם אֶת־אָבִ֖י הֵֽנָּה:

'And now your eyes see, and the eyes of my brother Benjamin see, that it is my mouth that speaks to you. [13]You must tell my father of all my honor in Egypt, and of all that you have seen. Hurry and bring my father down here.' (Gen. 45.12f.)

The active participles (רֹאֹות and הַֽמְדַבֵּר) in (79) express a progressive present, while the *wa-qaṭal* clauses have obligational meaning ('You must tell').[93]

6.11.4. The Linking Type *Qaṭal* + *Wa-qaṭal*

The linking *qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* indicates that the *wa-qaṭal* construction has attained a level of syntactic and semantic independence as an expression of imperfective meanings, such as future, obligation, and habituality. The most frequent case of *qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* having deviating meaning is the anterior/future combination, as in (80):

(80) *kī-ʿattā-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*

כִּי־עַתָּ֞ה הִרְחִ֧יב יְהֹוֶ֛ה לָ֖נוּ וּפָרִ֥ינוּ בָאָֽרֶץ׃

'For now the LORD has made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land.' (Gen. 26.22)

In (80), the initial *kī* starts a direct speech and is an emphatic adverb. The meaning of the *qaṭal* clause is clearly anterior, and the *wa-qaṭal* has an independent meaning (future finality).[94]

    With a performative meaning of *qaṭal*, we often find that a following *wa-qaṭal* has future meaning, as in (81):

(81) *Ø-O.noun-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*

אֶת־קַשְׁתִּ֕י נָתַ֖תִּי בֶּעָנָ֑ן וְהָֽיְתָה֙ לְא֣וֹת בְּרִ֔ית בֵּינִ֖י וּבֵ֥ין הָאָֽרֶץ׃

'I now set my bow in the clouds, and it will be the sign of the covenant between me and the earth.' (Gen. 9.13)

In (81), the performative meaning of the first-person *qaṭal* is followed by a promise expressed by *wa-qaṭal* (וְהָיְתָה֙).[95]

6.12. The Linking *Wa-qaṭal + (Wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)*

After having treated the linking *yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*, it is logical to consider also the reversed linking *wa-qaṭal + X-yiqṭol(u)*, where *X* is not merely the negation *lō*. *Wa-qaṭal + yiqṭol(u)* is not just a reversed clausal order; it is a different type of linking. While *yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal* is a discourse-continuity linking, *wa-qaṭal + X-yiqṭol(u)* signals discontinuity. It cannot express temporal succession, if not equipped with specific temporal adverbs.[96] The discontinuity may signal a focal constituent, a contrast, a complementary action, elaboration with focal element, and sometimes also a comment (explanation). An example of the preverbal element *X* describing a contrasting element is (82):

(82) *kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-**O.pron**-yiqṭol(u)*

וְהָיָ֗ה כִּֽי־יִרְא֤וּ אֹתָךְ֙ הַמִּצְרִ֔ים וְאָמְר֖וּ אִשְׁתּ֣וֹ זֹ֑את וְהָרְג֥וּ אֹתִ֖י וְאֹתָ֥ךְ יְחַיֽוּ׃

'and when the Egyptians see you, they will say, "This is his wife." Then they will kill me, but they will let **you** live.' (Gen. 12.12)

In (82), the last two clauses form a contrast linking: "the information conveyed by the Focal clause contrasts with that provided in the Supporting clause, and may be surprising in view of it" (Dixon 2009, 28). The *wa-qaṭal* clause (וְהָרְג֥וּ אֹתִ֖י) is the supporting clause, and *X-yiqṭol(u)* (וְאֹתָ֥ךְ יְחַיֽוּ׃) is focal. The preverbal element puts the object pronoun in focal position, and sets it in contrast with the final object pronoun (אֹתִ֖י) in the preceding clause.[97]

Frequently, a *wa-qaṭal + X-yiqṭol(u)* linking describes two complementary actions which are performed on the same occasion, as in (83):

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

וְנָתַנּוּ אֶת־בְּנֹתֵ֫ינוּ֙ לָכֶ֔ם **וְאֶת־בְּנֹתֵיכֶ֖ם** נִֽקַּֽח־לָ֑נוּ וְיָשַׁ֣בְנוּ אִתְּכֶ֔ם וְהָיִ֖ינוּ לְעַ֥ם
אֶחָֽד:

'Then we will give our daughters to you, and we will take
your daughters to ourselves, and we will dwell with you
and become one people.' (Gen. 34.16)

The chiasm in the first two clauses in (83) creates a complemen-
tarity between the two groups of daughters. The actions de-
scribed are not sequential, but supposed to be concurrent during
a certain period of time.[98]

Frequently, a *wa-qaṭal + X-yiqṭol(u)* linking codes an elab-
oration with a preverbal focal element (*X*), as in (84):

(84) *wa-qaṭal + Ø-PrP-PrP-bə-VN-yiqṭol(u)-N*

וְהִקְטִ֥יר עָלָ֛יו אַהֲרֹ֖ן קְטֹ֣רֶת סַמִּ֑ים בַּבֹּ֣קֶר בַּבֹּ֗קֶר בְּהֵיטִיב֛וֹ אֶת־הַנֵּרֹ֖ת יַקְטִירֶֽנָּה:

'And Aaron shall burn fragrant incense on it. Every morn-
ing when he dresses the lamps he shall burn it.' (Exod.
30.7)

In (84), "the second clause echoes the first, adding additional in-
formation about the event" (Dixon 2009, 27). In the *yiqṭol(u)*
clause, more detailed instruction is given as to how Aaron must
burn the incense, and the two preverbal prepositional phrases
(בַּבֹּ֣קֶר בַּבֹּ֗קֶר) are in focal position for emphasis.[99] Clauses express-
ing elaboration are sometimes discourse-discontinuous, some-
times continuous (but in the latter case, there is no preverbal fo-
cal element; see §2.3.1).

Even when not elaborative, a frequent function of a *wa-qaṭal + X-yiqṭol(u)* linking is to mark an element (*X*) as focal, as in (85):

(85) *wa-qaṭal +* [19]*wa-**PrP-PrP-O.noun**-yiqṭol(u))!*

וּבָאתָ אֶל־הַתֵּבָה אַתָּה וּבָנֶיךָ וְאִשְׁתְּךָ וּנְשֵׁי־בָנֶיךָ אִתָּךְ׃ וּמִכָּל־הָחַי מִכָּל־בָּשָׂר שְׁנַיִם מִכֹּל תָּבִיא אֶל־הַתֵּבָה לְהַחֲיֹת אִתָּךְ

> 'And you shall come into the ark, you, your sons, your wife, and your sons' wives with you. [19]And **of every living thing of all flesh**, you shall bring **two of every sort** into the ark to keep them alive with you.' (Gen. 6.18b–19a)

The linking in (85) does not describe an elaboration, because the two clauses represent two different actions. There is a special emphasis on the prepositional phrases (מִכָּל־הָחַי מִכָּל־בָּשָׂר) and on the direct object (שְׁנַיִם מִכֹּל), positioned before the verb. The two actions in the instruction are not marked for sequentiality.[100]

A further frequent function of the *wa-qaṭal + X-yiqṭol(u)* linking is to add a comment or explanation. An example is:

(86) *wa-qaṭal + Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)!*

וְעָשִׂיתָ אֹתוֹ שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ רֹקַח מִרְקַחַת מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵחַ שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה׃

> 'And you shall make of these a sacred anointing oil blended as by the perfumer; it shall be a holy anointing oil.' (Exod. 30.25)

The *yiqṭol(u)* clause supplies an explanation of the purpose of the preceding action and the status of the special holy oil.[101]

6.13. The Linking *Wa-qaṭal* + *(Wa)-lō-yiqṭol(u)*

While the linking *wa-qaṭal* + *(wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)* signals discontinuity, *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* does not. Tenet 1 (cf. §§7.2–6) holds for affirmative clauses, but when clauses are negated, a clause-type *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*, without further preverbal elements, signals discourse continuity. From a diachronic perspective, *wa-qaṭal* has taken over from *yiqṭol(u)* the function of discourse continuity in affirmative clauses, but in negative clauses, no takeover has taken place; *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* is retained (cf. §7.12). An example that shows this is (87):

(87) *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)!*

וַהֲקִמֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי֙ אִתְּכֶ֔ם וְלֹא־יִכָּרֵ֧ת כָּל־בָּשָׂ֛ר ע֖וֹד מִמֵּ֣י הַמַּבּ֑וּל וְלֹא־יִהְיֶ֥ה ע֛וֹד מַבּ֖וּל לְשַׁחֵ֥ת הָאָֽרֶץ׃

> 'I will maintain my covenant with you, and never again will all living things be wiped out by the waters of a flood; and never again will a flood destroy the earth.' (Gen. 9.11)

The promise to Noah in (87) starts with a discourse-continuity *wa-qaṭal* clause (וַהֲקִמֹתִי) which connects to the declaration of the covenant with Noah and his sons in Genesis 9.9f. The two negated *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* clauses have no focal elements and describe in two steps the promises that God will maintain in the covenant that is referred to in the initial *wa-qaṭal* clause.[102]

6.14. Summary: The Identity of *Wa-qaṭal* as Imperfective Construction in CBH

This chapter has given a plausible explanation of *wa-qaṭal* as a construction in the sense formulated in the theory of Joan Bybee

(2010; 2015). *Wa-qaṭal* is not a tense, but it is a construction for the expression of typical imperfective meanings in CBH. The application of Bybee's theory to the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type was first proposed by Geoffrey Khan (2021a). In his view, *wa-qaṭal* is a construction in the same sense as the English future construction *be going to*: the constituent parts are analysable, but the meanings of the construction cannot be deduced from its constituents. This explains why the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type has seemed inexplicable to Hebrew scholarship. Many of its meanings are imperfective, while *qaṭal* is an anterior and perfective verbal gram in CBH, with its origin in a resultative formation (see §5.1).

If *qatal* was originally a resultative formation, then we must assume the resultative meaning to be prototypical also for *wa-qaṭal*. The precursors of the *wa-qaṭal* construction with result meaning are attested in early Northwest Semitic. It is used as result clause in modal sequences (§6.2.1), as well as in the function of apodosis (§6.2.2). Such functions and meanings remained in use even when the *qatal* morpheme developed into a verbal morpheme with mainly anterior and past perfective meanings. And in Iron Age Northwest Semitic, the *wa-qatal* clause-type continued to be used as a result clause in modal sequences and as apodosis.

In CBH, the inherited use of *wa-qaṭal* in modal sequences and as apodosis was gradually *extended* to other types of environments, (1) with extended type of the preceding clause: subordinate clauses (temporal and causal), and gradually main clauses before *wa-qaṭal*, but also (2) with extended meanings of *wa-qaṭal* itself, from result to plain future and obligation. This is confirmed

by a corresponding development in the pre-exilic inscriptions (Renz 2016).

The interaction of *wa-qaṭal* as result clause with the long *yiqṭol* in many domain types developed into an alternation between a discontinuous *X-yiqṭol(u)* and a continuous *wa-qaṭal*, both expressing future or obligation. This alternation was reinforced by the necessity to replace the continuity clause-type **wa-yiqṭol(u)*, which was increasingly intolerable in CBH (see §3.4.3). A *wa-qaṭal* alternating with the imperfective *yiqṭol(u)* is not attested in the Archaic Hebrew poetry, but in CBH, it prevails as the continuity counterpart of *(wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)*. In this sense, the construction *wa-qaṭal* also, among all other uses, represents a replacement.

---

[1] For corresponding innovative uses of *wa-qaṭal* in pre-exilic Hebrew inscriptions, see Gogel (1998, 77f.); Schüle (2000, 137–39); Renz (2016, §4.2.1). See also §§6.2–3.

[2] For *wa-qaṭal* as apodosis in the Northwest Semitic languages of the Iron Age, contemporary with CBH, see Renz (2016, §2.2).

[3] Tropper (2012, 717) suggests that *qaṭal* is used in the first apodosis (but not in the second) because it directly succeeds the *w* that introduces the apodosis (this is not so in the second apodosis).

[4] Another example of an apodosis with a constituent before a prefix verb is pointed out by Smith (1991, 9) from KTU[3] 2.41:16–18: *mnm . irštk / d* [.] *ḫsrt . **w** . ank / aštn . {.} l . iḫy* 'Whatever you desire that you lack, **I will send** it for my brother' (linking pattern: *O.pron*-prefix verb + *wa-S.pron*-prefix verb).

[5] *ydy* is probably also a futural *qaṭal* (Tropper 2012, 716).

[6] *prˤ* can alternatively be interpreted as an infinitive (Tropper 2012, 716).

[7] For the terms result clause and focal clause, see Dixon (2009, 6, 22).

[8] The full linking pattern for the conditional sentence is: *(šumma-la-yaqtulu) + wa-la-VNabs-yaqtulu + wa-X-yaqtulu + wa-qatal* (Rainey 2015, 1485).

[9] I am not convinced that the first-person *yaqtul* in this case must be called "abgeschwächt" (thus Renz 2016, 454).

[10] Such meanings of *wa-qatal* "beschränkt sich auf feste Konstruktionen" (Renz 2016, 458).

[11] According to Renz (2016), the meaning of additional command (or obligation) is a relatively late function of *wa-qaṭal* in the Hebrew inscriptional material. As for the first *wa-qaṭal* (וצוך) in (17), I dare not decide whether the meaning is past tense, performative (letter convention, 'declarativum'), or future. The authorities differ on this point; see Renz (2016, §4.1.2.1) for a discussion. Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* in modal sequences in epigraphic Hebrew: Arad 2:4–6 (*wa-IMP + wa-qaṭal*); Arad 17:1–4 (*IMP + wa-qaṭal*; HI 35; Gogel 1998, 265); Arad 24:13–15 (… *wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*), as instruction, probably with an initial erased imperative (HI 51; Renz 2016, §4.2.1.2).

[12] Donner and Röllig (1971–76, II:223) interpret the *qatal* (הוית) as an anterior: 'so habe auch ich das Schwert im Lande Ja'udi sein lassen'. But cf. a parallel of a future *wa-gam-qatal* in CBH: Gen. 17.16 (*wa-qaṭal + wa-gam-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*, all with future interpretation; Westermann 1981, 304; see also Schulz 1900, 32).

[13] Exod. 31.15; Lev. 7.25, 27; 17.15; 18.29; 23.29, 30; Num. 19.13.

[14] Another similar use of *wa-qaṭal* in Phoenician is quoted by Renz (2016, 460 n. 153): KAI³ 79:6–11, with a relative clause having the same function as a protasis: אש יסר… ושפט פן בעל 'jeder, der entfernen will… (Ipf.), Tinnit, Angesicht des Ba'al wird/soll richten…' (but KAI⁵ 79:7 reads אש לסר…).

[15] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* expressing finality in modal sequences: Exod. 8.12 (*Ø-IMP + wa-IMP + wa-qaṭal*) 'so that it may become gnats'; 18.19 (*Ø-IMP + wa-qaṭal*) 'to lay their cases before God'; 19.23 (*Ø-IMP + wa-qaṭal*) 'Set limits around the mountain to make it sacred'; Num. 4.19 (*wa-O.pron-IMP + wa-qaṭal + wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*)—according to Garr

(1998, lxxxiii), a result from a preceding situation, 'and [as a result] they will live'; 7.5 (*Ø-IMP* + **wa-qaṭal** + *wa-qaṭal*) 'that they may be used'; 8.7 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + **wa-qaṭal**) וְהִטֶּהֲרוּ׃, a frequent phrase, 'so that they become pure'; Judg. 16.5 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal*) 'that we may bind him'.

[16] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* as complement in modal series: Num. 15.38 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + **wa-qaṭal** + **wa-qaṭal**); 35.2 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal*); Deut. 12.28 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal*).

[17] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* clauses that add expression of intention in modal series: Gen. 1.14 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)!* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*)—according to Dallaire (2014, 147), purpose; 6.21 (*wa-S.pron-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*, pause before *wa-qaṭal*); 19.2 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *wa-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*); 30.32 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-qaṭal*); 31.44 (*Ø-IMP* + *Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)-A* + *wa-qaṭal*)—but according to Dallaire (2014, 147), purpose; 37.20 (*wa-ʿattā-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*); 43.14 (*wa-S.noun, yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-qaṭal*); 45.9b–10 (*Ø-IMP* + *Ø-ʾal-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-qaṭal* +[10] *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*); 45.19 (*Ø-O.pron-IMP* + *Ø-IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*); 47.29 (*IMP* + *wa-qaṭal* + *Ø-ʾal-nā-yiqṭol(Ø)*); 47.30 (*IMP* + … + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*); Exod. 3.16; 4.21; 8.12; 18.19, 22; 19.23 (intended result); 19.24; 30.34–35; Num. 3.6 (first *wa-qaṭal*), 41; Deut. 28.8 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)!* + *wa-qaṭal*, jussive; Joosten 2012, 271 n. 33, 339)—*pace* Tropper (1998, 175), who calls it future; 28.22 (jussive in a curse; Joosten 2012, 271 n. 33); Judg. 11.37 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*); 16.5; 19.13—according to Blau (2010, 192), optional use of *wa-qaṭal* as modal form, but according to Dallaire (2014, 147), purpose; 20.32 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)-A* + *wa-qaṭal*).

[18] I do not claim that I have registered all occurrences of *wa-qaṭal* in modal series in the corpus, but of those registered, nine express finality–result, 23 intention, six additional information, and as many as 74 code additional instructions.

[19] Motion purpose (Dixon 2009, 45) is often expressed by simple coordination in CBH, as in the case of the last *wa-qaṭal* (וְאָכָל), '(in order for him) to eat'.

[20] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* describing additional instruction in modal series: Gen. 6.14 (*Ø-IMP + Ø-ADV-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*); 6.21 (*wa-S.pron-IMP + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); 27.44 (*wa-ʿattā-VOC-IMP + wa-IMP + Ø-IMP + wa-qaṭal*); 41.33f. (*wa-ʿattā, yiqṭol(Ø)! + wa-yiqṭol(Ø) + ³⁴ Ø-yiqṭol(Ø)-V + wa-yiqṭol(Ø)! + wa-qaṭal*)—the 'long' יַעֲשֶׂה is volitive (Westermann 1982, 95; J-M §79m; Joosten 2011b, 214; 2012, 434), and probably jussive with ventive clitic, 'Let Pharaoh on his own behalf proceed to appoint' (see §1.2.2 and §3.4.1.3); 44.4 (*Ø-IMP + Ø-IMP + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); 45.9 (*Ø-IMP + wa-IMP + wa-qaṭal*); 47.25 (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø) + wa-qaṭal*); Exod. 7.26; 8.16; 9.1, 8, 13; 12.21b–22, 32; 17.5; 19.10; 24.1–2; 28.42–43; 34.1–2; Lev. 1.2; 2.6 (*Vnabs + wa-qaṭal*; Dallaire 2014, 146); 10.12f.; 15.2; 17.2; 18.2; 19.2; 21.1; 23.2, 10; 24.14; 25.2; 27.2; Num. 3.45; 5.12, 21f. (*Ø-yiqṭol(Ø) + wa-qaṭal*); 6.2; 8.2, 6, 7; 11.16; 13.17–20; 15.18, 38; 16.5 (*wa-yiqṭol(Ø)! + wa-qaṭal + wa-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)!*); 19.2–3 (*Ø-IMP + wa-yiqṭol(Ø) + ³wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); 20.8, 26; 25.17 (*VNabs + wa-qaṭal*; Dallaire 2014, 146); 27.18–19; 28.2; 33.51; 34.2; 35.10; Deut. 1.16 (Dallaire 2014, 152f.); 10.1f.; 16.1 (Dallaire 2014, 153); 31.26 (Dallaire 2014, 153); Judg. 4.6, 20; 6.25f. (Dallaire 2014, 146); 9.2; 11.6 (*Ø-IMP + wa-qaṭal + wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*); 21.10, 20.

[21] As in Exod. 13.3; 24.1–2; Judg. 6.25.

[22] Other instances where I have perceived that *wa-qaṭal* clauses in modal series express information rather than added instruction: Exod. 14.2–4 (*IMP + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); 33.1–2 (*Ø-IMP + Ø-IMP + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); Num. 10.2 (*Ø-IMP + Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*, an explanation, not a command).

[23] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* with result meaning in a sequence expressing obligation: Gen. 24.4; Exod. 26.6, 11; 28.7; 40.9; Lev. 22.9 וּמֵתוּ; Num. 4.15 'so that they won't die'; 4.20 'so that they die'; Deut. 5.27; 13.11; 17.5; 21.21 'to death'; 22.21, 24; 24.13.

²⁴ In a few cases, an initial adverb like *raq* or *ʿattā* with distinctive accent can precede a jussive in direct speech, as in Gen. 50.5; Exod. 3.18; Deut. 2.28; see further §3.4.4.2.

²⁵ Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* with result meaning after a futural *yiqṭol(u)* clause: Gen. 24.40 (last *wa-qaṭal*); 27.12 (both *wa-qaṭal*); Exod. 22.23 (last *wa-qaṭal*); 23.27 (both *wa-qaṭal*); 23.31; Num. 4.15; 11.21; 17.20; Deut. 2.25 (both *wa-qaṭal*); Judg. 15.18. For result *wa-qaṭal* in *pɛn* complexes, see §6.5.5.

²⁶ Another example of an ability *yiqṭol(u)* clause followed by result *wa-qaṭal* is Exod. 10.25.

²⁷ Other instances of result *wa-qaṭal* clauses within a protasis: Exod. 21.12 (Garr 1998: lxxxiii); 21.20, 26 'so that he destroys it'; 21.28 (with a very frequent result clause וָמֵת 'to death'); 21.33 'so that either dies'; 21.35 'to death' or 'so that it dies'; 22.1, 5; Lev. 4.13 'so they become guilty'; 13.12 'so that the disease covers'; 20.17 'so that he sees'; Deut. 19.11.

²⁸ Other instances of result *wa-qaṭal* clauses within an apodosis: Gen. 34.16 'and we will stay with you to make one nation'; Lev. 12.7–8 'so that she will be clean'; Lev. 25.28 (last *wa-qaṭal*) 'that he may return to his property'; 25.35 'so that he can continue living with you'; Num. 27.11 'that he may possess it'; Deut. 22.24 'to death'.

²⁹ Other examples of *pɛn* complexes with result *wa-qaṭal* clauses: Gen. 3.22; 19.19—Westermann (1981, 360) translates, 'daß ich sterben müßte'; Exod. 13.17; 19.21; 23.29; Deut. 11.16 'to serve and worship other gods!' (see also Dallaire 2014, 148); 25.3; Judg. 18.25.

³⁰ EA 104:43–52: *XØ* + *qatal* + *wa-lā-yaqtulu* + *wa-qatal* (Baranowski 2016a, 175).

³¹ Counterfactual *wa-qaṭal* with result meaning is also found in Gen. 26.10 (Schüle 2000, 126); 40.14 (*kī-ʾim-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal-nāʾ* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*, the first and third *wa-qaṭal* with result meaning, as in 'so that he will release me from this prison'); 43.9 (within a protasis, counterfactual; Nyberg 1972, §86gg:2)—Garr (1998, lxxxiii) and Rainey

(2003b, 27) interpret *wa-qaṭal* as a result clause; Judg. 9.11, 13 (both *INT-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*; Boling 1975, 173).

[32] See §3.4.1. The most precarious homonymy was of course with the jussive *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*.

[33] Temporal clause linkings are not included. The numbers refer to the conditional sentences registered in my database, excerpted as records from the corpus. I do not pretend that they represent exactly all conditional sentences in the corpus, only that the numbers are fairly complete. This is the reason I supply percentages in conditional linking statistics. They are significant. The '*X*' in the table is allowed to be a simple negation.

[34] The three exceptional instances of clause-initial *yiqṭol(u)* are probably cases of an understood VNabs before the *yiqṭol(u)* (ellipsis); all examples are found in the same chapter: Exod. 22.6, 11, 12. The morphology is not distinctive, but compare the *VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* construction of apodoses in Exod. 21.12, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 28, 36 שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם ;22.5 שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם; 22.13: שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם ;22.15; 23.4; 31.15; Lev. 20.2, 9; 12, 15, 27; 24.17; Num. 35.21. In two of the clause-initial cases, the protasis has a *Vnabs + yiqṭol(u)* construction: Exod. 22.11, 12.

[35] All asyndetic short *yiqṭol* apodoses are volitive, some negated (with *ʾal*; Ges-K §159n): Gen. 18.3; Exod. 33.15; 34.9; Lev. 25.14; Num. 23.27; 32.5; Deut. 20.5, 6, 7; Judg. 6.31; 7.3; 9.15, 20.

[36] Gen. 4.7; 24.43; 30.1; 42.16; Exod. 7.27; 8.17; 9.3; 10.4; Lev. 21.9.

[37] The few syndetic *yiqṭol(u)* apodoses are questions that implicitly cast doubt about something: Exod. 8.22; Num. 16.22.

[38] All four syndetic jussive apodoses come after a protasis with imperative predicate, with the meaning 'if you fulfil the command, then this will happen'. There is a condition and there is a result. Such jussive apodoses seemingly tend to be coded in the same way as jussive purpose clauses (*wa-yiqṭol(Ø)*): Gen. 12.1–2 (¹*(Ø-IMP)* + ²*wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A* + *wa-IMP*)—here the two first jussives have pronominal suffixes, which means they cannot take a ventive/cohortative clitic: the third jussive has a such a clitic, so this is probably the

intended meaning for all jussives in the example; Exod. 3.10; Judg. 9.7, 19.

[39] The sixteen (4 + 12) jussive apodoses with ventive/cohortative clitic seem to have a certain preference for syndesis, as in: Gen. 13.9 (2×); 17.2; 26.3; 29.27; 30.28; 31.3; 32.10; 34.12; 47.16 (*Ø-IMP* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)-A*); 47.19; Exod. 9.28; 24.12. But four are asyndetic: Gen. 18.21; 30.31; 43.4; Num. 22.34.

[40] The *kī-ʿattā-qaṭal* apodoses are counterfactual: Gen. 31.42; 43.10; Num. 22.29, 33.

[41] Macro-syntactic *wa-haya* (Isaksson 1998) sometimes introduce an apodosis: Lev. 5.5; 27.10, 33; Num. 15.24. They are not classified as *wa-qaṭal* apodoses in this study.

[42] Other examples of *qaṭal* predicates with anterior meaning in apodoses: Exod. 22.14 (*Ø-qaṭal*)—but the interpretation is disputed (see Propp 2006, 105, 252); Lev. 20.13, 18, 20; Num. 16.29; 19.13; 32.23 (*Ø-hinnē-qaṭal*); Deut. 19.18. Anterior-future apodoses with *qaṭal* predicate are asyndetic in the corpus.

[43] Anterior-present means that *qaṭal* has anterior aspect when reference time is speech time, as in Judg. 6.13, (וְיֵשׁ יְהוָה עִמָּנוּ) וְלָמָּה מְצָאַתְנוּ כָּל־זֹאת 'If the LORD is with us, why then has all this happened to us?'. See Müller (1994, 164), who calls this "Weiterführung eines Gesprächsgangs."

[44] Other examples of counterfactual *qaṭal* in apodoses: Gen. 43.10 (*kī-ʿattā-qaṭal*); Num. 22.29, 33 (both *kī-ʿattā-qaṭal*); Judg. 8.19 (*Ø-lō-qaṭal*; see Li 2017, 7); 13.23 (*Ø-lō-qaṭal*; Cook 2012, 250); 14.18 (*Ø-lō-qaṭal*; Cook 2012, 250).

[45] Other examples of performative *qaṭal* in apodoses: Deut. 4.26 (*Ø-qaṭal*); 8.19 (*Ø-qaṭal*).

[46] Cf. the solemn apodosis introduced by *kī ʾim* in Exod. 22.22 (with *yiqṭol(u)* predicate).

[47] Gropp (1991, 47) and Cook (2012, 207 n. 46) also regard the passage as a possible example of *qaṭal* with future reference. But J-M (§176o, p.

610 n. 1) suggests the *Ø-qaṭal* to be a *wa-qaṭal* clause in nature: "the same form was preferred for the sake of assonance."

[48] For the assumption that the corpus of Archaic Biblical Hebrew is earlier than CBH, see Pat-El and Wilson-Wright (2013, 400).

[49] I do not count embedded non-finite temporal expressions like verbal noun phrases as protases. Some such temporal phrases do express eventualities, as in Gen. 2.17: כִּי בְּיֹום אֲכָלְךָ מִמֶּנּוּ מֹות תָּמוּת (*kī-PrP-VN-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)!*), a case of man's free choice. Other examples: Lev. 24.16; Num. 35.19.

[50] The *wa-qaṭal* clause-type is rare (as is the case also in Amarna; Renz 2016, 451). It marks discourse continuity and is used when there is a close connection with a preceding clause or context: Gen. 33.13 (related to the preceding *qoṭel*-clause); 34.30 (an eventuality; Westermann 1981, 650); 42.38; 44.22 (Ferguson 1882, 79; Ges-K §159d); 44.29 (connection to preceding discussion; Ferguson 1882, 46; Ges-K §159g); Exod. 12.44 (connection to a legal case); Lev. 10.19 (connection to preceding *wa(y)-yiqṭol*; Ferguson 1882, 80; Ges-K §159g); Num. 14.13 (connection to previous context, 'And if…'; same in 14.14–15); 14.14, 15; 36.3 (connects to a preceding *qaṭal* clause). A similar conclusion was reached by Dallaire (2014, 152) concerning the choice of *wa-qaṭal* (and not *yiqṭol(u)*) after a deontic VNabs: "The *weqatal* appears in clauses expressing sequentiality while, in disjunctive clauses, the *yiqtol* is preceded by a *waw* + a nonverbal element."

[51] Elliptic protases may have only a noun phrase or an adverb; the verb form is understood, e.g., Gen. 13.9; 18.21; 42.16.

[52] Most *qaṭal* protases have anterior meaning projected into a future eventuality (45×). None expresses a pure futurity. The rest express pluperfect (1×, Num. 12.14, though possibly counterfactual), or are counterfactual (6×), past perfective (1×, Judg. 9.19), or stativic (7×).

[53] The number of registered protases is somewhat higher than that of apodoses, because of the sometimes complicated structure of conditional sentences in legal discourse. Examples of more than one protasis

in a conditional sentence: Exod. 22.6; Lev. 3.1; 4.3; 5.1, 2, 4; 27.20; Num. 14.13f.; 35.20f.

[54] This is the case also in Phoenician, in which a reflex of Central Semitic **yaqtulu* dominates as predicate (Renz 2016, 460).

[55] This often the case also in Amarna Canaanite (Renz 2016, 449).

[56] I refer to the first introductory clause in a protasis. In complex protases, *wa-qaṭal* is often used as a second, third, or fourth clause.

[57] Levine (1993, 303) translates, 'When only one is sounded, the chieftains, heads of the Israelite militias, shall assemble before you'.

[58] The conjunction *kī* is frequent also as conditional particle. In my database of 477 protases, about 18%, or 88 protases, are introduced by *kī*. The most frequent conditional particle, *ʾim*, is found in 50% of all conditional clauses.

[59] Some other borderline cases of temporal/conditional linkings: Num. 10.9 (*wa-kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*); 21.9 (*wa-haya + ʾim-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*)—according to Ges-K (§159o), conditional; Deut. 4.30 (*Ø-XØ + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); 23.25 (*Ø-kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*).

[60] Other examples of temporal clauses with conjunction *ʾim* (*wa-qaṭal* has habitual meaning in all): Gen. 31.8a (*Ø-ʾim-ADV-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*; Ferguson 1882, 81)—according to Ges-K (§159r, s), conditional; 38.9 (*wa-haya: Ø-ʾim-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*)—according to Ges-K (§159o), conditional; Num. 36.4 (*wa-ʾim-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*).

[61] Other cases of futural temporal *kī*-clause with following non-habitual *wa-qaṭal*: Gen. 12.12 (*wa-haya: kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal + wa-O.pron-yiqṭol(u)*); 32.18f. ([18]*[kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal]* + [19]*wa-qaṭal*)—according to Ges-K (§159bb), conditional; 46.33f.; Exod. 7.9 (*kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal*); 30.12 (*kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); Lev. 5.23 (*wa-haya + [kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal] + wa-qaṭal*); 14.34f. (*[kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal]* + [35]*wa-qaṭal+wa-qaṭal*); 19.23 (*[wa-kī-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal] + wa-qaṭal*); 23.10; Num. 33.51f. (*kī-S.pron-qoṭel + wa-qaṭal*); 35.10f. (*kī-S.pron-qoṭel* + [11]*wa-qaṭal*); Deut. 7.1; 11.29; 30.1–3.

[62] Some other examples of main-line *yiqtol(u)* clauses after a temporal clause of the type *kī-yiqtol(u)* or *ʾim-yiqtol(u)* (all except one of which are asyndetic): Gen. 4.12 (*Ø-kī-yiqtol(u) + Ø-lō-yiqtol(u)*); Exod. 3.21 (*wa-haya + kī-yiqtol(u)-Npar + Ø-lō-yiqtol(u)*); 22.22 (*kī-ʾim-VNabs-yiqtol(u) + Ø-VNabs-yiqtol(u)*); 23.23f.; 40.37 (*wa-ʾim-lō-yiqtol(u) + wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*, exception, habitual past); Lev. 19.5 (*kī-yiqtol(u) + Ø-PrP-yiqtol(u)*); Deut. 19.1f.; 20.1.

[63] It does not correspond to CBH usage to translate *qatal* as a plain future.

[64] Other temporal *kī*-clauses with following main line coded by future habitual *wa-qatal* clauses: Exod. 1.10 (*wa-haya: kī-yiqtol(u) + wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal*); 13.4f. (obligation concerning a custom); Lev. 15.13 (this statute concerning a man with a discharge can be expected to have validity many times in a man's life, which means that habituality is implied; the *kī*-clause is expected to occur, so it is not conditional); Num. 18.26 (*kī-yiqtol(u) + wa-qatal*, habitual obligation).

[65] The temporal clause is enclosed within brackets. Other instances of *[wa-qatal] + wa-qatal* in a temporal clause linking: Exod. 4.14 (Ges-K §159g); 12.13 'when I see the blood, I will pass over you' (Fergusson 1882, 71; Ges-K §159g); 16.21 'but when the sun grew hot, it melted' (Fergusson 1882, 72, 80, Ges-K §159g); Lev. 22.7; Num. 10.3, 5, 6; 15.39.

[66] Other examples of verbal noun clauses (PREP-VN) functioning as temporal clauses before main-line *wa-qatal*: Gen 27.45 (future); 44.30f. (future); Lev. 26.26 (habitual future); Num. 9.19 (habitual past); Deut. 29.18 (future); Judg. 8.7 (future intention).

[67] Other examples of temporal *VN* before *yiqtol(u)*: Exod. 3.12 (*bə-VN-yiqtol(u)-Npar*); 9.29; 30.20; 33.8; Lev. 13.14; 23.22; 24.16; Num. 8.2; 10.7, 36; 15.19; Deut. 23.12; 25.19; Judg. 2.19; 8.9; 18.10.

[68] Brockelmann (1956, §13a) argues that the adverbial nouns are "Eingliedrige Nominalsätze." Joosten (2012, 292) analyses the *noun + wa-qatal* construction as a case of extraposition (left dislocation).

[69] Other cause/reason clauses with following main clause *wa-qaṭal*: Gen. 29.15 (*INT-kī-XØ + wa-qaṭal*, rhetorical question, 'because you are my kinsman, should you serve me for nothing?'); Num. 10.31 (*CONJ-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*, obligation).

[70] In my database, of a total of 57 *XØ* protases, prepositions occur with the following frequencies: *ʾim* 75%, *hinnē* 14%, *lū* 2%, *yēš* 2%, *biltī* 2% (reversed clausal order with main clause before *XØ*).

[71] Such linkings show that a *XØ* topic clause can both be topic *and* describe an initial background in narration, a double duty. Some examples: Gen. 41.12 (*wa-XØ + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol*); 42.6 (*wa-XØ + Ø-XØ + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol*); 47.13 (*wa-XØ + kī-XØ + wa(y)-yiqṭol*). See further §7.10.

[72] Adam was given authority to give names to all livestock, and this is his namegiving of woman.

[73] Other examples of *yiqṭol(u)* clauses as comments after a verbless topic: Gen. 3.14 (*Ø-PP + Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)*); 3.17 (*Ø-PP + Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)-N*); 3.19 (*kī-XØ + wa-PrP-yiqṭol(u)!*, the *kī* is emphatic adverbial); 25.23 (*Ø-XØ + wa-S.noun-PrP-yiqṭol(u)*); 35.10 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)*)—according to Khan (2019, 50), *XØ* with no copula; 40.13 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); 40.18f. ([18]*Ø-XØ +* [19]*Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal*); 41.44 (*Ø-XØ + wa-PrP-lō-yiqṭol(u)!*, the given is 'I am Pharaoh'); 48.5 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)*); Exod. 20.10 (*wa-XØ + Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 30.8f. (*Ø-XØ +* [9]*Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); Lev. 6.14 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-PrP-yiqṭol(u)*); 18.7, 15 (both *Ø-XØ + Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 21.21 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-O.noun-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 23.8 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-O.noun-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 23.27 (*Ø-ʾak̠-XØ + Ø-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)!*); 23.35, 36 (both *Ø-XØ + Ø-O.noun-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); 25.11 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)*); Num. 28.17 (*wa-XØ + Ø-ADV-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)*, the comment is 'at that time'); 28.18 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-O.noun-lō-yiqṭol(u)*) 'at that time'; Deut. 12.23 (*kī-S.noun-S.pron-XØ + wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*)—*kī* is adverbial, the *XØ* has a copula before the definite predicate (Khan 2019, 49); 16.9 (*wa-XØ + Ø-lō-yiqṭol(u)*) 'at that time' or 'therefore'; Judg. 17.6 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-S.noun-O.noun-PrP-yiqṭol(u)!*, habitual past); 21.25 (*Ø-XØ + Ø-S.noun-O.noun-yiqṭol(u)*).

[74] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* comment clauses after an *XØ* topic: Gen. 17.4; 20.11 (Khan 2021a, 309); 26.24 (*kī-XØ* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*, adverbial *kī*); 28.15; 34.30 (*wa-XØ* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal*, where the first *wa-qaṭal*, וְנֶאְסְפוּ עָלַי, expresses an eventuality and thus something conditional, but at the same time it is the first clause in a comment after the *XØ*); Exod. 5.5 (irony and contrast); 6.6 'I am YHWH, and therefore…'; 33.21; Lev. 11.44 'For I am the LORD your God. Consecrate yourselves therefore, and be holy' (ESV); 13.3, 11, 25, 42f. (all in apodoses); 16.31; 18.5; 19.37; 20.17, 25; 21.7f.; 23.32; 25.10; Num. 4.24f.; 14.40 (but this is a unique idiom; see Levine 1993, 361); 14.43.

[75] For left dislocations with following *wa-qatal* in Phoenician, see Krahmalkov (1986).

[76] From the statistics in my database, it seems that *yiqṭol(u)* clauses are constructed with left dislocation more frequently than are *wa-qaṭal* clauses: 52 *yiqṭol(u)* as against 25 *wa-qaṭal*. Some of the *yiqṭol(u)* examples with left dislocation: Gen. 6.20; 9.6; 17.12f., 15; 21.13; 28.13, 22; 31.43; 50.5; Exod. 1.22; 12.16; 30.37; Lev. 2.11; 7.7, 14, 19, 32f.; 11.3, 9; 13.45; 18.9, 10, 11; 21.14; 22.23, 28; 27.26; Num. 6.7; 9.17; 17.20; 22.20, 38; 23.26; 30.14; Deut. 14.27; Judg. 7.4; 11.24 (2×). A special case is the many instances of a left dislocation before a conditional *kī-yiqṭol(u)* in protases describing legal cases, as in Lev. 1.2; 2.1; 15.19; 19.20; Num. 5.6.

[77] Some more examples of *wa-qaṭal* clauses after a left dislocation which is semantically close to a protasis with quantifier: Exod. 12.15 (*kī-kōl-qoṭel* + *wa-qaṭal*); 12.19 (Propp 1999, 356); 12.44 (Propp 1999, 357); 31.14 (Propp 2006, 319); Lev. 15.11, 17; Num. 21.8. Examples without quantifier: Gen. 17.14; Lev. 26.36 (a *nifʿal* participle left dislocation)—according to Khan (2021a, 309, 312), "the *weqaṭal* clause is a comment on a preceding topical entity;" Num. 23.3 (Ferguson 1882, 78).

[78] Another relative clause example is Deut. 17.12.

[79] Other non-conditional left dislocations with *wa-qaṭal* are found in: Lev. 4.11 (a rather complicated object noun construction); 13.58; Num.

3.46f. (complicated object noun phrase); 17.3 (object noun phrase resumed in *wa-qaṭal*); 34.6 (geographical description); Deut. 21.3.

[80] For the terminology 'be of equal status', see Halliday (2004, 374, 489).

[81] For the pre-exilic Hebrew Inscriptions, see §6.3 and Renz (2016, §4.2.2). The linking *yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* with future meaning (cf. Table 17) is a late step in the development of *wa-qaṭal* (as a construction), attested in the inscriptions at the end of the pre-exilic period (Renz 2016, 661). In this connection, focusing on main-line clauses, we shall discard cases of *yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* in substructures such as complex relative sentences, complex protases, complex temporal sentences, etc. Even if the linking in substructures behaves as expected, and within the same semantic range as in main-line linking, for the sake of clarity, they are not considered here. We will discuss *yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* in main structures, which will include background but not subordinate clause complexes.

[82] *yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* has in rare cases a volitive nuance: Exod. 8.23 (both volitive); Exod. 12.48 (*wa-qaṭal* within a temporal clause complex, thus a substructure); Deut. 1.41 (both volitive).

[83] Lev. 25.40f. (*wa-qaṭal* permissive); Deut. 19.4 (*wa-qaṭal* within relative sentence); 24.13 (*wa-qaṭal* permissive).

[84] Walsh (1977, 168) concludes in his analysis that "The pain of insufficiency and labour will burden man's eating." Since the number of futural instances of *yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* is so large, I supply only those registered from Genesis and Exodus here: Gen. 13.15f.; 15.13; 18.18; 22.17f. (*wa-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-yiqṭol(Ø)* + [18]*wa-qaṭal*); 24.40; 26.4; 27.12; 28.14; 32.13 (*Ø-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal*); 40.13, 19; 50.24; Exod. 3.20f.; 4.12 (promise after imperative); 4.15f.; 7.2 (first clause obligation, then *yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qaṭal* future); 7.3f.; 8.24; 11.7f.; 12.48 (permissive + future); 16.12; 20.24; 22.22f. (adverbial *kī*); 23.27, 30f., 31 (adverbial *kī*); 28.43; 32.13; 33.14, 19; 34.10.

[85] Westermann (1981, 304) translates, 'Das soll mein Bund an eurem Fleisch sein, ein ewiger Bund'. I supply here examples of *yiqṭol(u)* +

wa-qaṭal with obligational meaning in Genesis and Exodus: Gen. 4.14; 6.3 (ability + obligation); 17.5; 24.4 (adverbial *kī*); 24.38; 32.20f.; 50.25 (future + obligation); Exod. 2.7; 5.7; 10.25 (obligation + ability); 12.11, 17; 13.19 (future + obligation); 18.21f.; 20.9, 24; 23.10, 11; 25.36f.; 26.3f., 24f.; 28.3, 25; 29.4, 8, 15, 17, 31; 30.30; 31.13f.; 40.2f., 14.

[86] Westermann (1982, 234) translates, 'Wenn sich Gott euer annimmt, dann bringt meine Gebeine von hier "mit euch" hinauf!'.

[87] Other examples with the meaning of ability in *yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal* linkings: Gen. 6.3 (ability + obligation); 24.7 (future + ability); Exod. 10.25 (both, depending on interpretation; Propp 1999, 341); 28.7 (obligation + ability); Num. 11.22 (both); 22.11 (both).

[88] Examples of habitual or progressive *yiqṭol(u) + wa-qaṭal* in main structures: Gen. 2.6 (progressive past?; Gzella 2021, 76f.); 2.10 (progressive past; Hornkohl 2014, 288); 2.24 (present or general habituality); 29.3 (habitual past; Khan 2021a, 309, 312); 33.7 (above); Lev. 26.41 'had to continue in opposition(?)' (Milgrom 2001, 2274, 2332).

[89] Other habitual past *wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal* linkings: Exod. 34.34f.; Num. 10.21.

[90] Other examples of future, obligational, etc., *wa-qaṭal + wa-qaṭal* linkings: Gen. 9.16 (future, but by inference a temporal linking; Ferguson 1882, 79); 17.16 (future); Exod. 28.29f. (obligation); Lev. 5.13 (future); 16.13, 18–20 (both obligation); 20.22 (obligation); 22.31 (obligation); 26.16, 20 (both future); Num. 8.10f. (obligation); 10.3 (obligation); 11.17 (future, ability); 13.20 (obligation); 20.8 (ability); Deut. 4.39 (obligation); 24.13 (obligation and future); Judg. 7.18 (future and obligation); 21.21 (obligation).

[91] For the typological connection between present progressive and immediate future, see Bybee et al. (1994, 275–78).

[92] Other examples of *qoṭel + wa-qaṭal* linking with future meaning: Gen. 6.17f.; 9.9f.; 41.29f.; Exod. 3.13; 7.17f., 27f.; 8.25; 9.3f.; 10.4f.; 11.4f.; 16.4; 17.6; Deut. 4.22; 11.31.

[93] Other examples of *qoṭel* + *wa-qaṭal* with deviating meanings: Exod. 4.14 (progressive present, future); 13.15f. (progressive present, obligation); 16.5 (future, obligation); Num. 15.30 (apodosis: general present, obligation); Deut. 30.16 (progressive present, future).

[94] Other anterior-future combinations of *qaṭal* + *wa-qaṭal* linking: Gen. 33.10; Num. 19.13 (anterior-obligation); Judg. 13.3 (contrastive *wa-qaṭal*; Schüle 2000, 125).

[95] On this interpretation of *qaṭal* in Gen. 9.13, I follow Westermann (1976, 616, 634). Another example is Gen. 17.20; thus Brockelmann (1956, §135b), *pace* Westermann (1981, 304), who translates 'Siehe, ich will ihn segnen'.

[96] Cf. the common linking *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-ʾaḥar-yiqṭol(u)* 'only after that…' in Lev. 14.19, 'The priest shall offer the sin offering and make atonement for the one to be cleansed from his uncleanness. **Then afterward**, he shall slaughter the burnt offering'. Other examples: Lev. 15.29b; 22.7; Num. 5.26; 6.20; 19.7; Judg. 7.11.

[97] Other examples of focal contrasting *X-yiqṭol(u)* after *wa-qaṭal*: Gen. 17.20b–21a 'but *my covenant* I will establish with Isaac'; Exod. 4.21 (*you* contrasting *I*); 18.26; 24.2 (Hornkohl 2018, 37); 25.21; 33.11, 23; 34.3; 36.29; Lev. 2.12; 7.32; 16.25; 25.46; 26.12; Num. 5.31; 33.54; Deut. 15.12 (in apodosis); 28.12.

[98] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* + *X-yiqṭol(u)* expressing complementarity: Gen. 44.9 (in apodosis); 47.24; Exod. 29.12, 13f.; Lev. 4.7, 17f., 25, 30, 34; 5.9; 14.5f.; 26.5, 29 (flesh of yours sons, flesh of your daughters); 26.33; Num. 6.16f.; 35.2, 3; Deut. 10.16; 12.3; Judg. 6.25; 7.7.

[99] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* + *(wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)* expressing elaboration: Exod. 23.5; 26.31, 35; 27.2, 3; 28.6f., 9–11, 15f., 20f., 37; 30.1, 10; 40.31f. (habitual past); Lev. 3.9 (Milgrom 1991, 203); 4.12; 10.13f.; 12.2; 18.26; 23.11, 15f., 32; 24.5; 25.9, 10, 52; 27.8, 12; Num. 3.47; 6.9; 19.5, 11f. ([11]*wa-qaṭal* + [12]*Ø-S.pron-yiqṭol(u)* + *Ø-yiqṭol*, the latter verb is a textual error); 29.7.

[100] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal* + *(wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)* with preverbal focal element: Gen. 17.6, 16, 20 (all future, increase); 28.21f.; Exod. 7.15,

17f., 28f.; 8.7, 19; 12.8 (or elaboration); 12.12, 14; 19.5f. (or contrast); 21.19, 35; 25.11 (or elaboration); 25.14f., 18 (or elaboration); 25.27, 29, 31 (or elaboration); 26.7; 28.13f., 32, 39; Lev. 6.4f.; 16.14; Judg. 13.5 (but *wa-qaṭal* is a mixed formation: וְיָלַדְתְּ could be *wa-qoṭel*).

[101] Other examples of *wa-qaṭal + (wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)* expressing a comment with further information: Exod. 28.4f.; 29.28, 37; 30.29, 36; Lev. 15.24; 23.20; 25.29; Num. 10.6; 35.5 (or summary).

[102] Similarly in Gen. 9.15, 'I will remember my covenant that is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh. And the waters shall never again become a flood to destroy all flesh'. Other examples: Gen. 17.4b–5; 41.30f., 36; Exod. 9.4; 10.5; 12.13, 23 'the LORD will pass over the door and will not allow the destroyer to enter your houses to strike you'; 22.10b; 30.12; Lev. 5.8; 11.44; 15.31; 17.6f.; 18.26 'But you shall keep my statutes and my rules and do none of these abominations'; 18.30; 20.22, 25; 22.9; 26.11 'I will make my dwelling among you, and my soul shall not abhor you'; 26.26b 'you shall eat and not be satisfied'; 26.31; Num. 9.19 (habitual past); 11.17; 18.5; 35.12.