

# The Verb in Classical Hebrew

## The Linguistic Reality behind the Consecutive Tenses

Bo ISAKSSON



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

Faculty of Asian and Middle  
Eastern Studies



<https://www.openbookpublishers.com>

©2024 Bo Isaksson



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

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

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

All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at  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

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

Semitic Languages and Cultures 27

ISSN (print): 2632-6906

ISSN (digital): 2632-6914

ISBN Paperback: 978-1-80511-350-8

ISBN Hardback: 978-1-80511-351-5

ISBN Digital (PDF): 978-1-80511-352-2

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0414

Cover image: Fragments of Hebrew Bible manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah. Left: Cambridge University Library, T-S A20.16 (Ruth 1.18–2.9). Right: Cambridge University Library, T-S A18.4 (Ezra 3.2–4.2). Courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library. Cover design: Jeevanjot Kaur Nagpal

The main fonts used in this volume are Charis SIL and SBL Hebrew.

## 7. THE LINGUISTIC REALITY BEHIND THE CONSECUTIVE TENSES

This chapter starts to make use of the main components of the verbal system established in the preceding chapters: the short *yiqṭol*, the long *yiqṭol*, *qaṭal*, and the relatively recently developed construction *wa-qaṭal*. It reinterprets the theory of consecutive tenses by performing a systematic investigation of clause linking in Classical Hebrew, with special emphasis on the discourse level. The chapter investigates the fundamental alternation between discourse continuity and discourse discontinuity and shows that this distinction has a signal: the switch from a *wa-Verb* clause-type, with the natural language connective *wa-*, to a discontinuity clause-type. The traditional hypothesis of a special ‘consecutive’ *wa-* is therefore unwarranted. This chapter is the centre of the book and represents a regeneration of Classical Hebrew text-linguistics. The emphasis lies on the continuity clause-types *wa(y)-yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal* (both *wa-Verb*), especially when they form chains of main-line clauses that are interrupted by discontinuity clauses.

### 7.1. A New Terminology

In §1.2.6, the essence of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics was summarised as an alternation between two clause-types (where ‘\*’ indicates a preliminary formulation):

Tenet 1\*. A series of ***wa-VX*** clauses is interrupted by a clause with (*wa*)-***XV*** pattern (Isaksson 2021a, 212).

The boldface **wa** in the formula indicates the common assumption that the *wa*- before a consecutive clause has a special nature: it is a ‘consecutive *waw*’. *V* in the formula is a finite verb and *X* is any non-verbal clausal constituent except negation. In the terminology of Buth (1995) and Hornkohl (2018, 48ff.), a discourse-continuity clause has a specific clause-type, **wa**-*VX*; a discontinuity clause is characterised by having a clausal constituent (*X*) before the verb. The parentheses enclosing the *wa* indicate that the *wa* is optional in the discontinuity clause.

Non-consecutive clauses more often than not start with a normal *wa*, but can also be asyndetic. Some oft-recognised alternatives in CBH text-linguistics are (Isaksson 2021, 212f.):

Tenet 1a\*. A series of **wa**-*VX* is interrupted by a clause with *wa*-*XV* pattern.<sup>1</sup>

Tenet 1b\*. A series of **wa**-*VX* is interrupted by a clause with  $\emptyset$ -*XV* pattern.<sup>2</sup>

Tenet 1c\*. A series of **wa**-*VX* is interrupted by a verbless clause.<sup>3</sup>

The term adopted by most scholars for the boldface **wa**- is ‘consecutive *waw*’. But some use ‘conversive’, ‘inversive’, ‘energetic’, or another distinguishing term.

As is argued in the present book, the main arguments in favour of a special ‘consecutive’ *wa* must be refuted:

1. The differences in vocalisation and gemination represent an innovative and orthoepic feature of the Tiberian reading tradition (see §1.2.5).
2. The impression of a ‘conversion’ is just an impression, caused by a diachronic retention (*wa(y)-yiqtol* with short indicative ‘preterite’ *yiqtol*; Hasselbach and Huehnergard

2008, 416) and an internal Hebrew semantic innovation (*wa-qatal* as construction; see §3 and §6 respectively).<sup>4</sup>

3. The range of meanings exhibited by ‘consecutive *waw*’ has the same semantic complexity as that of ‘copulative *waw*’ (see §2). Both can express temporal succession, logical result, elaboration, simultaneity, etc. (Garr 1998, lxxxvi).<sup>5</sup> The impression of a special ‘consecution’ is due to its use in the discourse-continuity clause-types *wa(y)-yiqtol* (often in narrative and report) and *wa-qatal* (often in instruction and legal discourse).<sup>6</sup> The Proto-Semitic conjunction \**wa* has only one reflex (*wa*) in CBH (Isaksen 2021a, 214; see §2). It is a natural language connective in the sense described by Van Dijk (1977, 58).

So it is necessary to update the terminology in the traditional system of consecutive tenses. It is not so much a question of ‘tenses’, but of ‘clauses’. And it is more apposite to regard the linkings with *wa(y)-yiqtol* and *wa-qatal* as expressions of *pragmatic discourse continuity* (see §1.2.6).<sup>7</sup> A *wa-V(X)* clause signals pragmatic continuity, and may, according to context, express thematic continuity, action continuity, and topics/participants continuity.<sup>8</sup> *Wa(y)-yiqtol* (see §3), with short *yiqtol* and normal *wa*, and the construction *wa-qatal* (see §6), are typical clause-types that signal discourse continuity in CBH.

A typical discontinuous type of clause, (*wa*)-XV, may signal the beginning of a literary unit, topicalisation of *X* or focus thereon, anteriority, simultaneity, background,<sup>9</sup> or elaboration. Discontinuity is a suitable term by which to unite these under a single heading (Hornkohl 2018, 49).<sup>10</sup>

Accordingly, Tenet 1 of Classical Hebrew text-linguistics should be reformulated in terms of continuity and discontinuity and without the assumption of a special ‘consecutive *waw*’ (Isaksson 2021a, 217); see Table 18.

Table 18: Tenet 1 (updated): The signalling of discourse continuity and discontinuity in CBH prose texts

**Tenet 1 (updated): Pragmatic discourse continuity // discontinuity in affirmative clauses (prose texts)<sup>11</sup>**

---

Tenet 1a. *wa*-VX // *wa*-XV, where X is not a simple negation<sup>12</sup>  
(see §7.2)

Tenet 1b. *wa*-VX //  $\emptyset$ -(X)V. This includes  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* (see §7.3)

Tenet 1c. *wa*-VX // (wa)-(X)-*qotel*<sup>13</sup> (see §7.4)

Tenet 1d. *wa*-VX // (wa)-X $\emptyset$ . Linking with a verbless clause<sup>14</sup>  
(see §7.5)

Tenet 1e. The imperfective interruption<sup>15</sup> (see §7.6)

---

In the updated Tenet 1 formula (a–e), there is no boldface *wa*. As is evident from Table 18, the traditional assumption of a special ‘consecutive’ *wa* would imply a *redundancy* in the signalling of pragmatic continuity (cf. Hornkohl 2018, 33). The fundamental alternation between discourse continuity and discourse discontinuity already *has* a signal, the switch from a *wa*-VX clause-type to a discontinuity clause-type. The hypothesis of a special ‘consecutive’ *wa* is unwarranted. A simple assumption of one natural language connective *wa* is enough to clarify the linguistic reality behind *wa* in the system of consecutive tenses (see §2.1; Isaksson 2021, 220f.).

Tenet 1 concerns various ways of coding interruptions (discontinuity) in a main line of continuity clauses, including interruption by way of aspectual contrast (1e). But a discontinuity

clause of the type 1a–1d can also be the first in a main line which is then followed by continuity clauses. A second tenet must describe the many cases when a discontinuity clause starts a new literary unit, in which case it also signals a break with the preceding discourse unit.<sup>16</sup> The semantic functions of this type of macro-syntactic marking, a new literary unit or paragraph (often with a focused element), are pragmatically determined.<sup>17</sup>

This kind of discontinuity may either signal a semantic connection with the preceding context (2a: *wa-XV*, 2c: *wa-(X)-qoṭel*, or 2d: *wa-XØ*) or the absence of such a signal (2b: *Ø-(X)V*, 2c: *Ø-(X)-qoṭel*, or 2d: *Ø-XØ*).<sup>18</sup> See Table 19.

Table 19: Tenets 2a–d

### Tenet 2

- 
- Tenet 2a. // *wa-XV* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *wa-VX*, where *X* is not a simple negation. Topic/focus and a new literary unit. With signal of backward connection (see §7.7)
- Tenet 2b. // *Ø-(X)V* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *wa-VX*. Topic/focus and a new literary unit. Without signal of backward connection (see §7.8)
- Tenet 2c. // *(wa)-(X)-qoṭel* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *wa-VX*. Topic/focus and a new literary unit with initial *qoṭel* clause. With or without signal of backward connection (see §7.9)
- Tenet 2d. // *(wa)-XØ* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *wa-VX*. New literary unit with initial verbless clause. With or without signal of backward connection (see §7.10)
- 

In Table 19, clause-types that may optionally be added as part of the discontinuous clause complex are put within parentheses. The initial // in 2a–d indicates that the discontinuity is signalled in relation to the clauses (if any) that precede the new literary unit. The clauses within parentheses (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) in 2a–d

indicate that some of the typical discontinuity clauses (1a, 1b, 1c, 1d) can be inserted at the beginning of a new paragraph before the main line is resumed by a continuity clause (type *wa-VX*).<sup>19</sup>

The backward connection signal in Tenet 2a, and sometimes in 2c and 2d, means that the first *wa* (in *wa-XV*, *wa-(X)-qoṭel*, or *wa-XØ*) is a discourse marker (not a clausal connective), signalling a certain semantic contextual connection to the preceding clauses (Miller 1999, 168).

In Tenets 2a–b, the initial *wa-XV* or *Ø-XV* can be a main-line clause in spite of its discontinuity signal (§§7.7.1, 7.8.1). In other pragmatic contexts, the initial (*wa*)-*XV* is a background clause (§§7.7.2, 7.8.2). In some shorter paragraphs, especially in direct speech, there is no continuity clause (of the type *wa-VX*), which means that at least one discontinuity clause forms a main-line by itself and is foregrounded in that quotation.<sup>20</sup> *Qoṭel* clauses (§7.9) and *XØ* clauses (§7.10) may also be foregrounded when initiating a new paragraph, especially when introduced by the deictic particle *hinnē*.<sup>21</sup>

As Tenet 1 indicates, the normal *wa* with immediately following finite verb is the decisive signal of discourse continuity in affirmative clauses. This observation enables us to formulate another tenet.

**Tenet 3 of CBH text-linguistics:** The clause-type *wa-V(X)* in CBH prose texts, where *V* is a finite verb, signals pragmatic discourse continuity in relation to corresponding clauses (see §7.11).<sup>22</sup>

In Tenet 3, *wa* is necessary<sup>23</sup> and *V* is necessary.<sup>24</sup> A *wa-V(X)* clause signals pragmatic continuity. No clausal element can be



inserted between *wa* and *V*, because this would make the clause signal discontinuity. In this text-linguistic sense, it is pertinent to speak of an inseparable union between *wa* and the verb in discourse-continuity clauses. The ‘inseparable union’ in the syntagms *wa(y)-yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal* results from their functions as markers of discourse continuity and was a reality on the textual level in CBH (but not on the morphological level). Specifically, *wa(y)-yiqṭol* and *wa-qaṭal* are not ‘tenses’, they are clause-types (Petersson 2019, 250).

In Tenet 1a, it is stipulated that the initial *X* element in the finite discontinuity clauses is not a simple negation (in my corpus, *lō* or *ʾal*).<sup>25</sup> A simple negation between *wa* and the verb creates no break in the continuity.<sup>26</sup> This enables us to formulate a tenet of continuity for negated clauses.

**Tenet 4 of CBH text-linguistics:** The negated clause-type *wa-NEG-V(X)* in CBH prose texts, where *V* is a finite verb, signals discourse continuity in relation to corresponding clauses. Here *NEG* may be *lō* or *ʾal* depending on the verbal morpheme that is negated (see §7.12).<sup>27</sup>

Tenets 1–3 are reformulations of observations that have been put forward now and then in the text-linguistic literature. Only the terminology is new, and with it the fundamental insight that there is only one *wa* in the verbal syntax, and no consecutive ‘tenses’, only clauses that are linked in continuity or discontinuity. This is the theme of this chapter. The remaining subsections will elaborate and exemplify and explain in detail the various cases of Tenets 1–4.

Since this book is mainly concerned with the linguistic reality behind the consecutive tenses, our emphasis lies on the continuity clause-types *wa(y)-yiqtol* and *wa-qaṭal*. However, jussive *wa-yiqtol(∅)* with *wa-ʾal-yiqtol(∅)* and imperative *wa-IMP* with *wa-ʾal-yiqtol(∅)* probably also signal continuity and function according to Tenet 3 and Tenet 4, and deserve a full description (cf. §§7.11–12).<sup>28</sup> For an overview with emphasis on *wa-qaṭal*, see §6.4.

## 7.2. Tenet 1a: *Wa-VX* // *Wa-XV*

Tenet 1a refers to the case when a long or short sequence of continuity clauses (type *wa-VX*) is interrupted by a discontinuity clause with initial conjunction *wa*, where *X* is not merely a negation (see Table 18). Tenet 1a also presupposes Tenet 3: a continuity affirmative clause starts with *wa*, directly followed by the finite verb form, *wa-V(X)*, where the *X*, a clausal constituent, is optional. Finally, we presuppose also Tenet 4, which means that the *X* in the discontinuity clause *wa-XV* is not a simple negation (in which case the clause would signal continuity).<sup>29</sup>

### 7.2.1. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqtol* // *Wa-X-qaṭal*

A linking of the type *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qaṭal* most often expresses contrast, complementary action(s), or background. It may describe a temporal succession only when *X* is an explicitly temporal adverb. The meanings of this linking that I have detected in the corpus are displayed in Table 20.

Table 20: The semantics of the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-X-qāṭal* linking

|                                       |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Contrast                              | 45         |
| Complementary action                  | 51         |
| Background                            | 48         |
| Elaboration                           | 11         |
| Content of perception                 | 12         |
| Temporal succession                   | 4          |
| Focal result <sup>30</sup>            | 1          |
| Temporal: relative time <sup>31</sup> | 1          |
| Enumeration of actions <sup>32</sup>  | 1          |
| Unclear <sup>33</sup>                 | 1          |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>175</b> |

Of the 175 registered cases in my database, about one quarter express a contrast, in which “the information conveyed by the Focal clause contrasts with that in the Supporting clause, and may be surprising in view of it” (Dixon 2009, 28). A simple example with *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses interrupted by focal *wa-X-qāṭal* expressing contrast is (1):

- (1) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + <sup>4</sup>*wa-X-qāṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*  
+ <sup>5</sup>*wa-X-qāṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ יָמִים וַיָּבֵא לָזֶן מִפְּרֵי הָאֲדָמָה מִנְחָה לַיהוָה: 4 וְהַבֵּל הֵבִיא גַם־הוּא  
מִבְּכֹרוֹת צֹאנוֹ וּמִחִלְבָּהֶן וַיִּשַׁע יְהוָה אֶל־הַבֵּל וְאֶל־מִנְחָתוֹ: 5 וְאֶל־קַיִן וְאֶל־  
מִנְחָתוֹ לֹא שָׂעָה וַיַּחַר לְקַיִן מְאֹד וַיִּפְּלוּ פָנָיו:

‘After some time Cain brought some of the fruit of the ground for an offering to the LORD. <sup>4</sup>**But Abel brought** some of the firstborn of his flock—even the fattest of them. And the LORD was pleased with Abel and his offering, <sup>5</sup>**but with Cain and his offering he was not pleased**. So Cain became very angry, and his expression was downcast.’ (Gen. 4.3–5)

In (1), the core of the narration is expressed by *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses (Tenet 3). The first interrupting *wa-X-qatal* clause describes a *contrasting* action: the *X* (הָבֵל) is in focal position and the information conveyed by this focal clause contrasts with that provided in the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses describing Cain's offering. As is often the case, the contrasting action (of Abel) is surprising in view of what Cain does. There is no signal of sequentiality between the actions of Cain and Abel. They are foregrounded and possibly performed at the same time (Cook 2012, 296f.). But the offering of Abel is different, which surprises the listener. The second *wa-X-qatal* in (1) is also a contrast: the Lord was not pleased with Cain's offering, though the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol* (וַיִּשַׁע) clause stated that he was pleased with Abel's—a new surprise. The last two *wa(y)-yiqtol* are temporally sequential.<sup>34</sup>

Very often, *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qatal* describe complementary actions. The events are expected rather than surprising. But there is a polarity in which the focused elements and/or their actions form a completed whole. An example is (2):

(2) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol!* + *wa-X-qatal*

וַיִּפֹּל עַל-צוֹאֲרֵי בְנֵימִן אֶחָיו וַיִּבֶךְ וּבְנֵימִן בָּכָה עַל-צוֹאֲרָיו:

‘Then he threw himself on the neck of his brother Benjamin and wept, and Benjamin wept on his neck.’ (Gen. 45.14)

In (2), two simultaneous foregrounded events are described (Cook 2012, 296). There is a polarity between Joseph and Benjamin, but no surprise. The two actions instead form a completed whole, and the linking expresses mutuality.<sup>35</sup>

Another important function of a *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qatal* linking is to code background. Background must be distinguished

from circumstantial clauses, which are semantically embedded in the main clause and usually refer directly to a constituent in the main clause. A background description is a more independent section in the text and often consists of historical or geographical information (see §2.3.3). Sometimes *qaṭal* in the background clause expresses a pluperfect meaning, as in (3):

(3) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + “...” + <sup>8</sup>*wa-X-qaṭal*

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֲמַחֶה אֶת־הָאָדָם «אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָאתִי» מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה מֵאָדָם עַד־  
בְּהֵמָה עַד־רֶמֶשׂ וְעַד־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּי נַחֲמָתִי בִּי עֲשִׂיתֶם: וְנָח מִצָּא חַן בְּעֵינַי  
יְהוָה: פ

‘So the LORD said, “I will wipe humankind, whom I have created, from the face of the earth—everything from humankind to animals, including creatures that move on the ground and birds of the air, for I regret that I have made them.” <sup>8</sup>But Noah had found favor in the sight of the LORD.’ (Gen. 6.7f., 6.8 translated after Westermann 1976, 522)

In (3), at the end of a narrative unit, the listener receives an anticipating piece of information about one man amongst humankind, who will become the principal character in the following story. An example of background as topographical information is (4):

(4) *wa(y)-yiqṭol!* + *wa-X-qaṭal* + *wa-X-qaṭal*

וַיִּשַׁג לָבָן אֶת־יַעֲקֹב וַיַּעֲקֹב תָּקַע אֶת־אֹהֶלֹו בְּהָר וּלְבָן תָּקַע אֶת־אֹהֶלֹו בְּהָר  
הַגִּלְעָד:

‘And Laban overtook Jacob. Now Jacob had pitched his tent in the hill country, and Laban with his kinsmen pitched tents in the hill country of Gilead.’ (Gen. 31.25)

In (4), with two *wa-X-qaṭal* clauses, the reader is informed of the geographical situation when Laban overtakes Jacob. The first *qaṭal* has a pluperfect meaning (Hornkohl 2018, 45). The second *qaṭal* concerns the pitching of the arriving Laban and should probably be interpreted as past perfective (*pace* Westermann 1981, 594).<sup>36</sup>

But a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-X-qaṭal* linking also often expresses an elaboration, where the second clause adds additional information about the event in the first clause (cf. Dixon 2009, 27). Elaborations can be coded by a discourse-continuity clause (see §2.3.1), but when *wa-X-qaṭal* is used, the constituent *X* is focal. An example is (5):

(5) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-X-qaṭal*

וַיִּסֹּב אֱלֹהִים | אֶת־הָעָם דֶּרֶךְ הַמִּדְבָּר יַם־סוּף וְחֲמִשִּׁים עָלוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם  
מִצְרַיִם:

‘God led the people by a roundabout route, through the desert by the Sea of Suf. The people of Israel went up from the land of Egypt fully armed.’ (Exod. 13.18)

The adverb ‘fully armed’ (חֲמִשִּׁים) is placed first in the second clause and is focal. This clause adds further information about the event in the first clause, Israel’s going out from Egypt.<sup>37</sup>

The clause-type *wa-hinnē-qaṭal* is a special case. It expresses the content or result of a perception verb in the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause. It functions semantically as a complement clause, as in (6):

(6) *wa(y)-yiqṭol!* + *wa-hinnē-qaṭal*

וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְהִנֵּה נִשְׁחָתָהּ

‘God saw how corrupt the earth had become’ (Gen. 6.12)

In (6), the *wa-hinnē-qatal* clause functions as the complement of a verb of seeing and observation. But sometimes the perception verb in the first clause is understood, as in (7):

(7) *wa(y)-yiqtol! + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-hinnē-qatal*

וַיִּשֶׁב יָדוֹ אֶל־חִיקוֹ וַיּוֹצֵאֶהָ מִחִיקוֹ וְהָנָה שְׁבָה כְּבָשָׂרוֹ:

‘So he put his hand back inside his cloak, and he took it out again, and it was restored like the rest of his flesh.’ (Exod. 4.7)

In (7), the perception verb is only understood, so that the *wa-hinnē-qatal* clause alone describes the content of the impression.<sup>38</sup>

If a *wa-X-qatal* is to express temporal succession, an explicit temporal adverb is used, as in (8):

(8) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol*  
+ <sup>22</sup>*wa-ADV-qatal*

וַיִּתְחַטְּטֻּם הַלְוִיִּם וַיִּכְבְּסוּ בְּגָדֵיהֶם וַיָּנֻף אֹהֶרֶן אֹתָם תְּנוּפָה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיִּכַּף־  
עֲלֵיהֶם אֹהֶרֶן לְטַהֲרָם: וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן בָּאוּ הַלְוִיִּם לַעֲבֹד אֶת־עֲבֹדָתָם בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד  
לִפְנֵי אֹהֶרֶן וּלְפָנָי בְּנִי

‘The Levites purified themselves and washed their clothing; then Aaron presented them like a wave offering before the LORD, and Aaron made atonement for them to purify them.

<sup>22</sup>**Only after this** the Levites **went in** to do their work in the tent of meeting before Aaron and before his sons.’ (Num. 8.21f.)

The temporal succession expressed by the *wa-ADV-qatal* (וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן) in (8) has special emphasis. It is not just the default temporal succession of a continuity clause (like *wa(y)-yiqtol*); rather, the preceding actions described by *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses are a necessary

condition for the next action described by the *wa-ADV-qaṭal* clause.<sup>39</sup>

### 7.2.2. Interruption Type *Wa-qaṭal* // *Wa-X-yiqṭol(u)*

See §6.12.

## 7.3. Tenet 1b: *Wa-VX* // *Ø-(X)V*

In a main line of continuity clauses, an asyndetic clause with a finite verbal predicate that is not a participle may signal a rich variety of discontinuities (see Tables 21–23). This is demonstrated in the present section.<sup>40</sup>

### 7.3.1. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqṭol* // *Ø-X-qaṭal*

In this type of interruption, the discontinuity clause is asyndetic with a finite verbal predicate, *qaṭal*. *X* may be a simple negation (*lō*) or it may contain a focused clausal constituent *X* positioned before the verb. The meanings of the linking that are detected in my database are displayed in Table 21.

Table 21: The semantics of the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *Ø-X-qaṭal* linking

|                                    |           |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Elaboration                        | 44        |
| Summary                            | 11        |
| Same-event addition                | 6         |
| Background                         | 11        |
| Editorial comment                  | 14        |
| Contrast                           | 5         |
| Peak                               | 1         |
| Complementary action <sup>41</sup> | 1         |
| Unclear <sup>42</sup>              | 2         |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>95</b> |



Out of the 95 registered examples in the corpus<sup>43</sup> of the linking *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qatal*, about half are cases of elaboration. An elaboration supplies more details with fuller information and has focus (a ‘focal clause’; Dixon 2009, 6). Thus if *wa(y)-yiqtol* is foregrounded as part of the main line, an elaboration must be analysed as foregrounded as well. One of the examples exhibits two elaborative  $\emptyset$ -*X-qatal* clauses:

- (9) *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*PrP-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-qatal*

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים | אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא  
אֲתָם:

‘God created humankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them, male and female he created them.’  
(Gen. 1.27)

In (9), the two *qatal* clauses repeat with different word order the same action as in the initial *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause and supply further details about this event: God created them male and female.<sup>44</sup>

There are also examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qatal* expressing a summary. In this case, the *qatal* clause contains less detail than the main-line *wa(y)-yiqtol*, which has focus. I consider a summary to be foregrounded also, as in (10):<sup>45</sup>

- (10) *wa(y)-yiqtol-kə-REL-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*ADV-qatal*

וַיַּעַשׂ נֹחַ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֱלֹהִים בְּן עֵשָׂה:

‘And Noah did all that God commanded him. Thus he did.’  
(Gen. 6.22)

The case of same-event addition is more interesting than just a repetition with other or similar words (see §2.3.4). As an

elaboration, it involves two clauses that “describe different aspects of a single event” (Dixon 2009, 27). A canonical English instance is *You are together with me; (and) as for me, I am together with you* (Dixon 2009, 27). I have identified six cases of same-event addition coded by the *wa(y)-yiqtol + Ø-X-qatal* linking in my corpus, one of which is (11):

(11) *wa(y)-yiqtol + Ø-S.noun-qatal*

וַיָּגָעוּ כָּל-בְּשָׂרָה | הָרֹמֵשׁ עַל-הָאָרֶץ בְּעוֹף וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבַחַיָּה וּבְכָל-הַשָּׂרֵץ הַשָּׂרֵץ  
עַל-הָאָרֶץ וְכָל הָאָדָם: כֹּל אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁמַת-רוּחַ חַיִּים בְּאַפָּיו מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְבָּהָ  
מָתוּ:

‘And all living things that moved on the earth died, including the birds, domestic animals, wild animals, all the creatures that swarm over the earth, and all humankind. <sup>22</sup>Everything on dry land that had the breath of life in its nostrils died.’ (Gen. 7.21f.)

In (11), the two clauses describe different aspects of the extinction of all living creatures on the earth. In English, the focal clause of a same-event addition is sometimes introduced by *more-over* (Dixon 2009, 43). This type of semantics is also found in CBH, as is exemplified in (12):

(12) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + Ø-lō-qatal*

וַיִּשָּׂא אֶת-הָאֲרָבָה וַיִּתְקַעְהוּ יָמָה סוּף לֹא נִשְׁאַר אֲרָבָה אֶחָד בְּכָל גְּבוּל  
מִצְרַיִם:

‘and it (the wind) picked up the locusts and blew them into the Red Sea. Not even one locust remained in all the territory of Egypt.’ (Exod. 10.19)

In (12), the *qatal* clause is focal with an implicit *moreover*. It describes another aspect of the same event, blowing the locusts into the Red Sea.<sup>46</sup>

When *qatal* clauses are negated, the perfective aspect is neutralised, and they can be used to express circumstantial meanings, as in (13):

- (13) *PREP-VN + wa(y)-yiqtol + Ø-O.noun-lō-qatal + wa-O.noun-lō-qatal*

בַּעֲלֹתִי הָהָרָה לְקַחַת לִוְחֹת הָאֲבָנִים לִוְחֹת הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר־כָּרַת יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם  
וְאֲשֶׁב בָּהֶר אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעַיִם לַיְלָה לֹחֶם לֹא אָכַלְתִּי וַיָּמִים לֹא שָׁתִיתִי:

‘When I went up the mountain to receive the stone tablets, the tablets of the covenant that the LORD made with you, I remained there forty days and nights, **eating and drinking nothing**.’ (Deut. 9.9, NET, my emphasis)

The asyndetic *qatal* clauses are certainly simultaneous with the action in the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause, and their relational meaning (the semantics of the linking) comes close to that of circumstantial clauses, as can be seen in the New English Translation.<sup>47</sup>

A *wa(y)-yiqtol + Ø-X-qatal* linking can also be used to express background, a comment by the narrator, or even a more specific comment by the editor. The distinction between these is not always possible to uphold and the borderline is diffuse. A piece of information supplied by the narrator is found in (14):

- (14) *wa(y)-yiqtol + <sup>10</sup>Ø-NP-REL-qatal + Ø-ADV-qatal*<sup>48</sup>

וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אוֹתוֹ יִצְחָק וַיִּשְׁמַעֲאֵל בְּנָיו אֶל־מַעֲרַת הַמְּכַפְּלָה אֶל־שֵׁדָה עַפְרָן בֶּן־  
צֹחַר הַחֹתִי אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי מִמְרָא: הַשֵּׁדָה אֲשֶׁר־קָנָה אַבְרָהָם מֵאֵת בְּנֵי־חָתָן  
שָׁמָּה קָבַר אַבְרָהָם וְשָׂרָה אִשְׁתּוֹ:

‘His sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah near Mamre, in the field of Ephron the son of Zohar, the Hittite. <sup>10</sup>The field that Abraham had purchased from the sons of Heth, there Abraham was buried with his wife Sarah.’ (Gen. 25.9f.)

In (14), the  $\emptyset$ -ADV-*qatal* clause is the narrator’s reminder that this was the field that Abraham had already purchased (Westermann 1981, 486).<sup>49</sup>

An example of a comment by the editor(s) is (15):

(15) *wa(y)-yiqtol +  $\emptyset$ -ADV-*qatal**

וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיַּחֲנּוּ בְקִרְיַת יְעָרִים בְּיְהוּדָה עַל־כֵּן קָרְאוּ לְמָקוֹם הַהוּא מַחֲנֵה־דָן עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה הִנֵּה אַחֲרֵי קִרְיַת יְעָרִים:

‘They went up and camped in Kiriath Jearim in Judah. (That is why that place is called Camp of Dan to this very day. It is west of Kiriath Jearim.)’ (Judg. 18.12)

(15) supplies an example of a “late etiological and extranarrative note” (Boling 1975, 264).<sup>50</sup>

In a few examples, *wa(y)-yiqtol +  $\emptyset$ -X-*qatal** shows a contrastive addition, in which case the information conveyed by the second clause contrasts with that provided in the first clause (Dixon 2009, 28), as in (16):

(16) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-O.noun-*qatal* + wa-O.noun-*qatal* + <sup>26</sup> $\emptyset$ -*raq-PrP-lō-qatal**

וַיֵּד הַבָּרִד בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֶת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה מֵאֲדָם וְעַד־בְּהֵמָה וְאֶת כָּל־עֹשֵׁב הַשָּׂדֶה הִכָּה הַבָּרִד וְאֶת־כָּל־עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה שִׁבְרָ: רַק בְּאֶרֶץ גִּזְשֵׁן אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא הָיָה בָרִד:

‘The hail struck everything in the open fields, both people and animals, throughout all the land of Egypt. The hail struck everything that grows in the field, and it broke all the trees of the field to pieces. <sup>26</sup>**Only in the land of Goshen**, where the Israelites lived, **was there no hail**. (Exod. 9.25f.)

In (16), the *qatāl* clause describes the surprising contrast that there was no hail in the land of Goshen, where the Israelites lived.<sup>51</sup>

An instance of a peak expressed by the linking *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qatāl* is (17):

(17) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-S.noun-qatāl* +  $\emptyset$ -*S.noun-qatāl* + *wa-S.noun-qatāl*

וַיִּט מֹשֶׁה אֶת־מִטְהוֹ עַל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיְהִי נֶהָג רִיחַ קָדִים בְּאֶרֶץ כְּלִימָיוֹם  
הַהוּא וְכָל־הַלֵּילָה הַבֹּקֶר הָיָה וְרוּחַ הַקָּדִים נֹשָׂא אֶת־הָאַרְבֶּה:

‘So Moses extended his staff over the land of Egypt, and the LORD brought an east wind on the land all that day and all night. **Morning was, and the east wind had already carried the locusts.**’ (Exod. 10.13)

The  $\emptyset$ -*X-qatāl* with copula verb is not an ordinary temporal expression. It cannot be translated by ‘When there was morning’, or ‘In the morning’. As it stands, it has a dramatic effect on the reader, as if being there in the morning and seeing the locusts carried away (NET note).

### 7.3.2. Interruption Type *Wa-qatāl* // $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqṭol(u)*

In this type of linking, the dominant meanings are various types of elaborations. It seems that asyndesis is especially fitting for the expression of elaboration. See Table 22.

Table 22: The semantics of the *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol* linking

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Elaboration (no ‘echo’)                 | 39        |
| Elaboration (‘echoing’)                 | 34        |
| Same-event addition                     | 3         |
| Contrast                                | 2         |
| Explanation (comment)                   | 1         |
| Complement <sup>52</sup>                | 1         |
| Apodosis <sup>53</sup>                  | 2         |
| Asyndetic relative clause <sup>54</sup> | 2         |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>84</b> |

While one type of elaboration means that the second clause “echoes the first” with more details, another just describes more details about the action or state in the first clause (Dixon 2009). In practically all instances of *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol*(*u*) linking, the second clause describes the same event (or state) as the first clause.

Since instructions and legal matter are prominent text-types in the corpus, the individual clauses in this type of linking express mainly various shades of obligation (70 out of 84 cases).<sup>55</sup>

An example of an elaboration where the second clause does not ‘echo’ the first, but just gives more details about the same event, is (18):

(18) *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*lō-yiqtol*(*u*)!

וְקָצַתָּהּ אֶת־כַּפָּהּ לֹא תִחֹס עֵינֶךָ:

‘then you must cut off her hand; your eye shall have no pity.’ (Deut. 25.12)

In (18), the second clause describes in more detail how the action put forward as an obligation in the first clause is to be performed:

having no pity while cutting off her hand. The meaning of both clauses is obligation.<sup>56</sup>

Sometimes  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* clauses exhibit different semantics in relation to a preceding *wa-qatal*, as in (19):

(19) *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-yiqtol(u)* +  $\emptyset$ -*S.noun-yiqtol(u)*

וַעֲשִׂיתָ מִנֶּרֶת זָהָב טָהוֹר מִקִּשָּׁה תַעֲשֶׂהָ הַמְנוֹרָה יִרְכָּה וְקִנָּה גְבִיעֶיהָ כַּפֹּתֶיהָ  
וּפְרָחֶיהָ מִמֶּנֶּה יִהְיוּ:

‘You are to make a lampstand of pure gold. The lampstand is to be made of hammered metal; its base and its shaft, its cups, its buds, and its blossoms are to be from the same piece.’ (Exod. 25.31)

In (19), the first  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* clause echoes the *wa-qatal*, adding a detail: hammered metal. The second  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* clause does not echo the *wa-qatal*, but describes a different aspect of the same action: when making the lampstand, its blossoms are to be from the same piece.

Another example of *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* expressing elaboration with ‘echoing’ is (20):

(20) *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-yiqtol(u)*

וְאָכְלוּ אֶת־הַבָּשָׂר בַּלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה צֶלִי־אֵשׁ וּמִצּוֹת עַל־מִרְיָם יֹאכְלֶהּ:

‘They will eat the meat the same night; they will eat it roasted over the fire with bread made without yeast and with bitter herbs.’ (Exod. 12.8)

In (20), the *yiqtol(u)* clause echoes the first, and supplies more details about the event.<sup>57</sup>

A same-event addition with future meaning is exemplified in (21):

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

וְקִדְשְׁתָּ אֹתָם וְהָיוּ קֹדֶשׁ קְדָשִׁים כָּל־הַנִּגַּע בָּהֶם יִקְדָּשׁ:

‘You are to sanctify them, and they will be most holy; **anything that touches them will be holy.**’ (Exod. 30.29)

In (21), the meaning is future in the second and third clauses. The semantics of the linking *wa-qatal + Ø-S.noun-yiqtol(u)* are same-event addition: the *yiqtol(u)* clause describes another aspect of the same state (being most holy): anything that touches them will be holy.<sup>58</sup>

In a few instances, *wa-qatal + Ø-X-yiqtol(u)* describes a contrast addition (Dixon 2009, 28). The registered instances are both signalled by an initial *raq* ‘only, but’. This is illustrated in (22):

(22) *wa-qatal + Ø-raq-PrP-yiqtol(u)*

וְסָרוּ הַצִּפְרָדָּעִים מִמָּךְ וּמִבֵּיתְךָ וּמִעַבְדֶּיךָ וּמִמַּעְמָדְךָ כִּי בִיָּאֵר תִּשְׁאַרְנָה:

‘The frogs will depart from you, your houses, your servants, and your people; they will be left only in the Nile.’ (Exod. 8.7)

In (22), the *Ø-X-yiqtol(u)* describes an exceptional and possibly surprising contrast with the event in the *wa-qatal* clause: the frogs will not depart from the Nile. In both clauses, the temporal reference is future.<sup>59</sup>

A *wa-qatal + Ø-X-yiqtol(u)* may also, but rarely, express an explanation of or comment on previous commands, as in (23):

(23) *wa-qatal + Ø-O.noun-yiqtol(u)!*

וַעֲשִׂיתָ אֹתוֹ שָׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ רֶקֶחַ מִרְקָחַת מַעֲשֶׂה רֶקֶחַ שָׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ  
יִהְיֶה:



‘You are to make this into a sacred anointing oil, a scented blend, the work of a perfumer. **It will be sacred anointing oil.**’ (Exod. 30.25)

The  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqṭol(u)* in (23) is probably not a command but an explanation of the purpose and intended use of the scented blend.

### 7.3.3. $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* as Discontinuity Clause

A  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* clause is a relatively infrequent phenomenon in CBH, represented by 62 instances (records) in my database; see Table 23. This clause-type will be examined in this section.

Table 23: The semantics of the  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal*

|                           |           |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Paragraph beginning       | 27        |
| Elaboration (‘echoing’)   | 8         |
| Elaboration (no echo)     | 4         |
| Same-event addition       | 2         |
| Complement                | 4         |
| Parenthesis               | 1         |
| Peak                      | 2         |
| Protasis                  | 1         |
| Apodosis                  | 6         |
| Topic–comment             | 4         |
| Asyndetic relative clause | 3         |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>62</b> |

$\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* may be used as a main-line (foreground) clause; it can begin a new paragraph (§7.3.3.1), or it can be linked to a preceding main clause (§7.3.3.2). In addition, it may constitute an asyndetic relative clause (§7.3.3.4), express a peak in narration, code a parenthesis in speech, function as apodosis (§7.3.3.3) or

(once) as protasis. What unites all these uses is that it is a discontinuity clause (Tenet 3) with the expected meanings of a *qatal* verbal morpheme (see §5).

I do not include in this section the five cases of virtual  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* inthetic cleft sentences (Khan 2019, 15–18), of which I quote only one example here:<sup>60</sup>

(24) *wayhī-PrP-PrP* + \* $\emptyset$ -*qatal* (better: *FOCUS-PrP-PrP-qatal*)

וַיְהִי בַּחֹמֶת וַיִּשְׁ-מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה בְּרֵאשׁוֹן בְּאַחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ חָרְבוּ הַמַּיִם מֵעַל הָאָרֶץ

‘In the six hundred and first year, in the first day of the first month, the waters had dried up from the earth.’ (Gen. 8.13)

In (24), *wayhī* is a focus marker, which has developed from the matrix verbal copula clause in CBH. The main informative element in the construction is the *qatal* morpheme (חָרְבוּ). As it is used in CBH, the construction exhibits a monoclausal syntax, which has developed from a biclausal cleft construction. Such constructions are excluded in this section because the *qatal* clause is only virtually of the  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* type.<sup>61</sup>

### 7.3.3.1. $\emptyset$ -*qatal* as Paragraph Beginning (// $\emptyset$ -*qatal*)

$\emptyset$ -*qatal* is used relatively frequently at the beginning of direct speech (27 × in my database), either in report or other uses (for example, performative). The simplest type of report is the single informative utterance, as in (25):

(25) *wa-X-qatal*: “ $\emptyset$ -*qatal*”

וַהֲקֵל נִשְׁמָע בֵּית פַּרְעֹה לֵאמֹר בָּאוּ אֶתִּי יוֹסֵף

‘Now the report was heard in the household of Pharaoh, “**Joseph’s brothers have arrived.**”’ (Gen. 45.16)

Example (25) is a proof that a main line (foreground) may consist of only one non-continuity clause.

But a report in direct speech starting with *Ø-qatal* can of course be continued by *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause(s), as in (26):<sup>62</sup>

(26) *Ø-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

דָּבַר הָאִישׁ אֲדֹנֵי הָאָרֶץ אֲתָנּוּ קָשׁוֹת וַיִּתֵּן אֲתָנּוּ בְּמַרְגָּלִים אֶת־הָאָרֶץ:

‘The man, the lord of the land, spoke harshly to us, and took us to be spies of the land.’ (Gen. 42.30)

Another frequent meaning of *Ø-qatal* at the beginning of an utterance is the performative, as in (27):

(27) *Ø-qatal*

הִרִמֹּתִי יָדִי אֶל־יְהוָה אֵל עֲלִיּוֹן קֹנֵה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ:

‘I raise my hand to the LORD, the Most High God, Creator of heaven and earth, (and vow):’ (Gen. 14.22)

In (27), a performative *qatal* expresses Abraham’s oath to the king of Sodom (Cook 2012, 207 n. 46). The oath clearly has present time reference (Brockelmann 1908–13, II, §76b).

But present time reference is not confined to performative utterances; it is found also with stative *Ø-qatal* starting a new paragraph, as in (28):

(28) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “*Ø-qatal* + *CONJ-lō-qatal*”

וַיִּכְרַ יְהוּדָה וַיֹּאמֶר צִדְקָה מִמֶּנִּי כִּי־עָלֶכֶן לֹא־נִתְּתִיהָ לְשֵׁלָה בְנִי

‘Judah recognised them and said, “She is more upright than I, because I did not give her to Shelah my son.”’ Gen. 38.26)

I conclude that *Ø-qatal* clauses in direct speech are a normal way of initiating paragraphs in CBH.<sup>63</sup>

7.3.3.2. Main Clause //  $\emptyset$ -*qatal*

This section treats the cases ( $21 \times$ ) when  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* as a discontinuity clause is linked to a preceding main-line clause. The range of meanings expressed by this discontinuity is considerable: elaboration, same-event addition, complement, parenthesis, and even peak; see Table 23. A relatively frequent relational meaning is elaboration, as in (29):

(29)  $\emptyset$ -*X-qatal* + <sup>19</sup> $\emptyset$ -*qatal*

בַּיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי הִקְרִיב נֶתְנָאֵל בֶּן־צוּאֵר נָשִׂיא יִשָּׁשְׁכָר: הִקְרִב אֶת־קַרְבָּנוֹ קֶעֱרַת־  
בָּסָף אֶחָת שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָה מִשְׁקָלָהּ מִזֶּרֶק אֶחָד כֶּסֶף שִׁבְעִים שֶׁקֶל בְּשֶׁקֶל  
הַקֹּדֶשׁ שְׁנֵיהֶם | מִלֵּאִים סֵלֶת בִּלְוִלָה בְּשֶׁמֶן לְמִנְחָה:

‘On the second day Nethanel son of Zuar, leader of Issachar, presented an offering. <sup>19</sup>He offered for his offering one silver platter weighing 130 shekels and one silver sprinkling bowl weighing 70 shekels, both according to the sanctuary shekel, each of them full of fine flour mixed with olive oil as a grain offering.’ (Num. 7.18f.)

In (29), the first clause is clearly foregrounded and main-line. In the elaboration, the second clause echoes the first, adding additional information about the event (Dixon 2009, 27). This is what is exemplified in (29). The second *qatal* clause concerns the same offering as described already by the first *qatal* clause, but it adds further details about it: the silver platter, the bowls, the flour, the olive oil. The passage is a piece of narration, and both *qatal* morphemes express a past perfective meaning.<sup>64</sup>

An elaboration can also describe the same event or state without echoing the first clause. The clause supplies some more

details about the event or state (cf. Dixon 2009, 27, 50). In some cases, this is expressed by a  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause, as in (30):

(30) *wa-X $\emptyset$  +  $\emptyset$ -qatal*

וְאַבְרָהָם וְשָׂרָה זָקְנִים בָּאִים בִּימֵים חָדָל לְהֵיוֹת לְשָׂרָה אַרְחַ כְּנָשִׁים:

‘Abraham and Sarah were old and advancing in years; the way of women had ceased to be with Sarah.’ (Gen. 18.11)

(30) is part of a background complex. Abraham and Sarah were old. Another detail in this situation was that Sarah had long since passed menopause. This is expressed by the  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause, which is semantically related to the preceding verbless clause. The  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* does not echo the fact expressed by *X $\emptyset$* , but it supplies more detail about this state.

An example of same-event addition is (31):

(31)  $\emptyset$ -*ēn-X $\emptyset$  +  $\emptyset$ -qatal*

אֵין זֹאת בְּלִתִּי אִם-חֶרֶב גִּדְעוֹן בֶּן-יוֹאָשׁ אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל נָתַן הָאֱלֹהִים בְּיָדוֹ אֶת-  
מִדְיָן וְאֶת-כָּל-הַמַּחֲנֶה:

‘Without a doubt this symbolises the sword of Gideon son of Joash, the Israelite. God has handed Midian and all the army over to him.’ (Judg. 7.14)

In his dream, a man identified the sword of Gideon, which is another aspect of saying that God had handed over Midian to Gideon. The second clause cannot be said to describe additional details of the state in the first clause, so the  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* is not an elaboration.<sup>65</sup>

In rare instances,  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* can express a complement in relation to the preceding clause. My examples have an anterior or counterfactual meaning, as in (32):

(32)  $\emptyset$ -REL-*qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -IMP +  $\emptyset$ -IMP;

מה ראיתם עשיתי מהרו עשו כמזג:

‘What you have seen me **do**, quickly copy me.’ (Judg. 9.48, Sasson 2014, 389)

Within a relative construction that constitutes the direct object of the following imperatives, the  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause forms a complement to the preceding perception verb (ראיתם).<sup>66</sup>

It is also possible to form a parenthesis with  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* in fluent direct speech, as is shown in (33):

(33)  $\emptyset$ -X-( $\emptyset$ -*qatal*)-*yiqtol(u)*

רק נשיכם וטפכם ומקונכם (ידעתי כי־מקנה רב לכם) ישובו בעריכם אשר נתתי לכם:

‘But your wives, children, and livestock (—I **know you have much livestock**—) may remain in the cities I have given you.’ (Deut. 3.19)

In (33), within the main *yiqtol(u)* clause, a  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause is inserted as a parenthesis, after the subject noun phrase but before the main verb.

The discontinuity signalling of a  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause may also, in specific but rare cases, be used to express a peak, an intensification of the events in a narration. This is attested in poetry (Gen. 49.9; Judg. 5.26f.) but sometimes also in prose, and especially with verbs of motion (Brockelmann 1956, §133a). By coding temporally successive events with discontinuity clauses, a ‘staccato’ motion is achieved with highly focused actions (J-M §177a; Isaksen 2017, 248). An example is (34):

(34) *wa(y)-yiqtol + Ø-qatal + Ø-qatal + wa-X-qotel + wa-XØ*

וַיַּעֲלוּ חֲמִשָּׁתָה הָאֲנָשִׁים הַהֵלֶכִים לְרַגֵּל אֶת־הָאָרֶץ בָּאוּ שָׁמָּה לִקְחוּ אֶת־הַפֶּסֶל  
וְאֶת־הָאֱפֹד וְאֶת־הַתִּרְפָּים וְאֶת־הַמַּסֶּכֶה וַהֲכִיזוּ נֹצֵב פֶּתַח הַשַּׁעַר וְשֵׁשׁ־  
מֵאוֹת הָאִישׁ הַחֲגֹר כָּלִי הַמִּלְחָמָה:

‘The five men who had gone spying out the land approached, **went in** there, **stole** the carved image, the ephod, the personal idols, and the metal image, while the priest was standing at the entrance to the gate with the 600 fully armed men.’ (Judg. 18.17)

In (34), the two ‘staccato’ *Ø-qatal* clauses code temporally successive actions in the past. It is narration, the aspect is perfective, and the discontinuity *qatal* clauses produce a dramatic turning point in the narrative, in a fatal moment of the account that would not have been there with only *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses.<sup>67</sup>

### 7.3.3.3. *Ø-qatal* in Conditional and Topic–comment

#### Linkings

There are definite similarities between topics and conditions. Both can be said to formulate the framework for the following discourse. This is the reason why conditions and topics are treated in the same section here. But while a conditional clause describes a hypothetical case, an eventuality, a topic is something agreed upon by the speaker and his audience (see §6.10).

A condition is usually explicitly marked by a conjunction, usually *ʾim* or *kī*. But there are instances when this is not the case, and in one instance in my database, a *Ø-qatal* clause even introduces a protasis (35):

(35) ( $\emptyset$ -*qatal*<sup>68</sup> +  $\text{'}\bar{o}$ -*qatal*) +  $\emptyset$ -X $\emptyset$ 

הָיָה בְּשֵׁרוֹ אֶת־זִוְבוֹ אוֹ־הִחֲתִים בְּשֵׁרוֹ מִזִּזְבוֹ (טְמֵאָתוֹ הוּא)

‘(whether his body has secreted his discharge or has blocked his discharge,) he is unclean.’ (Lev. 15.3)

Usually, however, when a  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause is involved in a conditional linking, it is as apodosis, an example of which is displayed in (36):

(36) (*wa-im-yiqtol(u)*! + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal*) + <sup>18</sup> $\emptyset$ -*qatal* + *kī-VNabs-yiqtol(u)*

וְאִם־יִפְנֶה לְבַבְךָ וְלֹא תִשְׁמַע וְנִדְחָתָ וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לְאֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וְעַבַּדְתָּם:  
הַגִּדַּתִּי לְכֶם הַיּוֹם כִּי אֶבְדָּ תֵאבְדוּן

‘(But if you turn aside and do not obey, but are lured away and worship other gods and serve them,) <sup>18</sup>I declare to you this very day that you will certainly perish!’ (Deut. 30.17f.)

In the  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* apodosis in (36), the *qatal* morpheme has one of its expected meanings as a perfective gram: the performative. It illustrates that *qatal* retains its normal semantic characteristics in conditional linkings, in protases, and in apodoses (see §5).<sup>69</sup>

But a  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause can also express a comment on a preceding topic clause. As is the case also with apodoses, a comment is focal, while the topic is not. The topic just expresses an expected fact, a comment something that is not known or expected. An example of  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* as comment is (37):

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

זֶה־לִּי עֲשָׂרִים שָׁנָה בְּבֵיתְךָ עַבְדְּתִיד אַרְבַּע־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה בְּשֵׁתִי בְּנִתִיד וְשֵׁשׁ  
שָׁנִים בְּצִאֲנִיד וְתַחֲלִף אֶת־מִשְׁכַּרְתִּי עֲשֶׂרֶת מָנִים:



‘These twenty years I’ve been in your house—I worked like a slave for you—fourteen years for your two daughters and six years for your flocks—but you changed my wages ten times!’ (Gen. 31.41)

The topic in (37) is the verbless clause, here with past time reference. This is the given, what is agreed upon by both Jacob and Laban. Then follows the comment coded by a  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* (עֲבַדְתִּיךָ) followed by a *wa(y)*-*yiqtol* clause (וַתַּחֲלֶף). Both clauses in the comment express a perfective aspect with past time reference, but because of the adverbial expressions, they by implication involve habitual or repeated actions during the twenty years. We can expect that Jacob and Laban did not agree upon that.

Another example of a topic–comment construction with  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* is much disputed, which is the reason I quote it here (38):

(38) *wa-X* $\emptyset$  + *wa-X* $\emptyset$  + <sup>8</sup> $\emptyset$ -*qatal* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* + <sup>9</sup>*wa-X-yiqtol(u)*  
*qatal* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* + <sup>9</sup>*wa-X-yiqtol(u)*

וְהָמָן כְּזֶרַע-גֵּד הוּא וְעֵינָיו כְּעֵין הַבְּדִלָּח: 8 שָׁטוּ הָעָם וּלְקָטוּ וְטָחְנוּ בִּרְחִים אוֹ  
 דָּכוּ בַמִּדְכָּה וּבִשְׁלוּ בַפָּרוֹר וַעֲשׂוּ אֹתוֹ עֲגֹת וְהָיָה טַעְמוֹ כְּטַעַם לֶשֶׁד הַשָּׁמֶן:  
 9 וּבִרְדַּת הַטֵּל עַל-הַמַּחֲנֶה לַיְלָה יָרַד הָמָן עָלָיו:

‘(Now the manna was like coriander seed, and its appearance was like that of bdellium. <sup>8</sup>The people went about and gathered it, and ground it with mills or pounded it in mortars; they baked it in pans and made cakes of it. Its taste was like the taste of fresh olive oil. <sup>9</sup>And when the dew came down on the camp in the night, the manna fell with it.)’ (Num. 11.7–9)

The whole passage in (38) is a “parenthetical description of the manna that interrupts the continuing narrative” (Levine 1993,

322). It starts with two verbless clauses functioning as the topic. The comment is then introduced by a  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause, as we have seen already in the previous example (37). In this case also, the  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* has an implied past habitual meaning. It has been argued that the syntax is irregular (Joosten 2012, 218; but cf. Driver 1892, §114, who considers it regular).<sup>70</sup> The alternative syntax that is often argued for, with a *wa-qatal* introducing the comment with past (habitual) time reference, is found nowhere in my database. A *wa-qatal* as comment after a verbless clause topic always has future time reference or a meaning of obligation (see §6.10).

So the  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* in (38) introduces the comment and signals past time reference. The aspect is perfective, but the implied meaning is habitual. This habitual description proceeds with aspectually explicit *wa-qatal* clauses and a final *yiqtol(u)*. The disjunctive  $\text{'}o$  *qatal* clauses alternating with *wa-qatal* and having the same past habitual meaning is a peculiarity of the development of the *wa-qatal* construction. A *wa-qatal* has no corresponding disjunctive clause. When *wa-qatal* developed in CBH, the  $\text{'}o$  *qatal* clause-type had to do double duty: serving as disjunctive clause for both *qatal* and *wa-qatal*. So a  $\text{'}o$  *qatal* clause may have the meaning of either *qatal* or the new *wa-qatal* (see §5.4.8).<sup>71</sup>

#### 7.3.3.4. $\emptyset$ -*qatal* as Relative Clause

In relatively few cases in prose,  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* constitutes an asyndetic relative clause. The  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* clause is then embedded in the main clause. This is a phenomenon more frequent in poetry.<sup>72</sup> An example in prose is (39):

- (39) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-hinnē-XØ + Ø-qəṭal + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol*

וַיֵּשָׂא אַבְרָהָם אֶת־עֵינָיו וַיֵּרָא וְהִנֵּה־אֵיל אַחֵר נֹאֲחֻז בְּסֻבָּךְ בְּקִרְנָיו וַיֵּלֶךְ  
אַבְרָהָם וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הָאֵיל וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ לְעֹלָה תַּחַת בְּנוֹ:

‘Abraham looked up and saw behind him<sup>73</sup> a ram **caught in the bushes by its horns**. So Abraham went over and got the ram and offered it up as a burnt offering instead of his son.’ (Gen. 22.13)

In (39), the asyndetic relative clause belongs to the verbless clause that constitutes the complement of the preceding perception verb (וַיֵּרָא). The relative clause has the function of an enlarged attribute. It is detached somewhat from its head noun by an inserted adverbial *ʾaḥar*.<sup>74</sup>

#### 7.4. Tenet 1c: *Wa-VX // (Wa)-(X)-qəṭel*

In a main line of continuity clauses, a *qəṭel* clause signals a specific range of discontinuities. This is what the present section demonstrates.

##### 7.4.1. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqṭol + Ø-(X)-qəṭel*

When a *qəṭel* clause interrupts a main line of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses, it is usually circumstantial and directly related to the main clause. In such a case, the *qəṭel* morpheme qualifies a constituent in the main clause. The examples exhibit various degrees of dependence in relation to the constituent to be qualified in the main clause (Isaksson 2009, 57–59); see Table 24.

Table 24: The semantics of the *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *(wa)-(X)-qotel* linking

|                     | <i>wa-(X)-qotel</i> | <i>Ø-(X)-qotel</i> |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Circumstantial      | 27                  | 23                 |
| Focused progressive | 8                   | 0                  |
| Focused complement  | 13                  | 0                  |
| Background          | 18                  | 1                  |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>66</b>           | <b>24</b>          |

The theme of the present section is *qotel* clauses qualifying a main line in asyndesis (see Table 24, right column). In such cases, the asyndetic *qotel* clauses generally lack a constituent *X* before the participle (thus *Ø-qotel*), and are closest to the status of an (adverbial) attribute, a qualifier, as in (40):

(40) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *Ø-qotel* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶת-קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מְתַהַלֵּךְ בְּגֶן לְרוּחַ הַיּוֹם וַיִּתְחַבֵּא הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ  
מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים בְּתוֹךְ עֵץ הַגָּן:

‘They heard the sound of the LORD God **moving about in the garden at the breezy time of the day**, and they hid from the LORD God among the trees of the orchard.’ (Gen. 3.8)

In (40), the *qotel* is positioned directly after the constituent (in the main clause) which it qualifies, in the same position as an attribute. But it is not determined, as an attribute would have been. Though its head noun (יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים) is a proper name, the participle has no definite article, a fact that reveals its adverbial nature. The *qotel* clause is dependent to a certain degree, which its position reveals, and it has no subject of its own, but it is a full clause (there is a predication, and the *qotel* has a verbal ‘force’).

A  $\emptyset$ -*qotəl* clause can also refer back to a pronominal suffix, as in (41):

(41) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol +  $\emptyset$ -qotəl*

וַיִּרְדְּפוּ מִצְרַיִם אַחֲרֵיהֶם וַיִּשְׁיֹגוּ אוֹתָם חֲנִים עַל-הַיָּם

‘The Egyptians chased after them and overtook them **camping by the sea.**’ (Exod. 14.9)

The *qotəl* clause in (41) represents an extension of the use of the participle in the position of an attribute, since it now qualifies a pronominal suffix, but it is still positioned directly after the head (the suffix).

In several instances, the  $\emptyset$ -*qotəl* clause is positioned with linguistic distance from its head noun in the main clause, as in (42):

(42) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol +  $\emptyset$ -qotəl +  $\emptyset$ -qotəl + wa-qotəl*

וַיֵּלְכוּ חֲמִשָּׁת הָאֲנָשִׁים וַיָּבֹאוּ לַיִּשָּׁה וַיֵּרְאוּ אֶת-הָעָם אֲשֶׁר-בְּקִרְבָּהּ יוֹשֵׁבֶת-  
לְבַטָּח בְּמִשְׁפַּט צִדְנִים [שָׁקֵט וּבִטָּח]

‘So the five men journeyed on and arrived in Laish. They saw the people in the middle of the town **living securely** according to Sidonian custom, **undisturbed and unsuspecting.**’ (Judg. 18.7)

The participles in (42) have different referents in the main line, and they are positioned with a distance from their respective heads in the main line. The first *qotəl* (יוֹשֵׁבֶת) is feminine and refers back to the preceding feminine pronominal suffix, referring to the city of Laish. In the translation, this is rendered ‘the town **living securely**’ (thus Butler 2009, 365). This *qotəl* is positioned

directly after its head (the feminine suffix in בְּקִרְבָּהּ), but the two last participles are masculine and refer back to, and qualify, the people (הָעָם). In the example, the verbal usage of the participle has developed far beyond the non-predicative attributive use of *qoṭel*, and it is remarkable that the two masculine participles (שֶׁקֶט | וּבְטָח) are positioned so remotely from their head noun. It is also noticeable that they can be coordinated with *wa*, so that a sequence of subordinated verbal *qoṭel* is formed ( $\emptyset$ -*qoṭel* + *wa*-*qoṭel*).

A preposed *X* constituent when *qoṭel* is asyndetically attached (thus  $\emptyset$ -*X*-*qoṭel*) is a rare phenomenon. I have found only one instance of *wa(y)*-*yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X*-*qoṭel*:

(43) *wa(y)*-*yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X*-*qoṭel* + *wa*-*X*-*qoṭel*

וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֲלֵיכֶם מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ קוֹל דְּבָרִים אַתֶּם שֹׁמְעִים וְתִמוּנָה אֵינְכֶם  
רֹאִים וּזְלָתִי קוֹל:

‘Then the LORD spoke to you from the middle of the fire;  
you kept hearing the sound of the words, but didn’t see  
a form—only a voice.’ (Deut. 4.12)

The *qoṭel* clauses in (43) describe events that are concomitant with that of the main clause. The participles also describe actions that are progressive with past time reference, a typical imperfective property of a verbal morpheme. And it is possible for the *X* be a complex of constituents, *O.noun-S.pron* and *O.noun-’ēn-S.pron* respectively.

In one instance, an asyndetic *qoṭel* clause is not circumstantial, but is given a more independent relation to the main clause, in the function of background (44):

(44) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-X-qatal + <sup>23</sup>Ø-ēn-X-qotel + CONJ-XØ + wa-X-qotel*

וַיִּתֵּן שָׂר בֵּית־הַסֵּהר בְּיַד־יוֹסֵף אֶת כָּל־הָאֲסִירִים אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית הַסֵּהר וְאֶת כָּל־  
אֲשֶׁר עֹשִׂים שָׁם הוּא הָיָה עֹשֶׂה: אֵין | שָׂר בֵּית־הַסֵּהר רָאָה אֶת־כָּל־מַאֲוָמָהּ  
בְּיָדוֹ בְּאֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אָתּוֹ וְאֲשֶׁר־הוּא עֹשֶׂה יְהוָה מַצְלִיחַ: ס

‘The warden put all the prisoners under Joseph’s care. He was in charge of whatever they were doing. <sup>23</sup>The warden did not concern himself with anything that was in Joseph’s care because the LORD was with him and whatever he was doing the LORD was making successful.’ (Gen. 39.22f.)

In (44), *wa(y)-yiqtol* is the continuity clause, while the *qatal* describes a same-event addition to this clause (Dixon 2009, 27). The two *qotel* clauses have the character of a background description; they are not adverbial as circumstantial *qotel* clauses usually are.<sup>75</sup>

#### 7.4.2. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqtol // Wa-(X)-qotel*

Since the verbal *qotel* stems from a semiverbal formation used as an adverbial clause in the position of an (adverbial) attribute, syndetic *qotel* clauses are generally more independent and have more diverse functions. They are also far more frequent than the asyndetic ones, by a ratio of 3:1; see Table 24, middle column. *Wa-(X)-qotel* is frequently used as background and, even when circumstantial, does not adapt to the syntax of an attribute, but begins with a subject noun or pronoun that refers back to an actant in the pragmatic world of the main clause, as in (45):

(45) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-X-qotel*

וַיִּקְמוּ מִשָּׁם הָאֲנָשִׁים וַיִּשְׁקְפוּ עַל-פְּנֵי סֹדֶם וְאַבְרָהָם הָלַךְ עִמָּם לִשְׁלֹחָם:

‘The men got up to leave and looked down toward Sodom, **Abraham walking with them to see them off.**’ (Gen. 18.16)

While an asyndetic circumstantial *qotel* clause is tightly connected to one preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol*, the syndetic circumstantial *qotel* clause describes a more independent action. In (45), the subject noun (אַבְרָהָם) is not an actant in the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol*, but belongs to its pragmatic world.

If a constituent in the main clause is to be qualified by the *wa-X-qotel*, it can be repeated (in X), but is often referred to by an anaphoric personal pronoun instead, as in (46):

(46) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-S.pron-qotel + wa-XØ*

וַיִּשְׁמַע הָאֱלֹהִים בְּקוֹל מְנוּחַ וַיָּבֹא מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים עוֹד אֶל-הָאִשָּׁה וְהִיא יוֹשֶׁבֶת בַּשָּׂדֶה וּמְנוּחַ אִישָׁהּ אֵין עִמָּה:

‘God answered Manoah’s prayer. God’s angel came to the woman again **while she was sitting in the field.** But her husband Manoah was not with her.’ (Judg. 13.9)

In (46), the personal pronoun (הִיא) in the *qotel* clause refers back to the prepositional phrase (אֶל-הָאִשָּׁה) in the immediately preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause. It is reasonable to analyse *qotel* in this function as a finite imperfective formation.<sup>76</sup>

When *qotel* is introduced by the focus marker *hinnē* (thus *wa-hinnē-X-qotel*), the clause may function as a focused main-line clause. The meaning is progressive or stative depending on the verb. An example is (47):



(47) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-hinnē-S.noun-qotel*

וַיָּבֹא יִפְתָּח הַמִּצְפָּה אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ וְהִנֵּה בָתּוֹ יֹצֵאת לִקְרֹאתוֹ בְּתַפִּים וּבְמַחְלוֹת

‘Jephthah came home to Mizpah, and there was his daughter hurrying out to meet him, with tambourines and dancing.’ (Judg. 11.34)

The *wa-hinnē-X-qotel* clause in (47) is a focused and foregrounded clause, in which the new and important information is described. It expresses a past progressive action.<sup>77</sup>

Very often, the focused *wa-hinnē-X-qotel* codes the content of a perception, in which case it functions as a complement clause with focus. The perception verb in itself is unimportant; the new and important information is what is perceived, as in (48):<sup>78</sup>

(48) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-hinnē-S.noun-qotel*

וַיֵּרָא וְהִנֵּה יֹצֵחַל מִצְחֶק אֶת רֵבֶקָה אִשְׁתּוֹ:

‘And he observed Isaac caressing his wife Rebekah.’ (Gen. 26.8)

But *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-(X)-qotel* may also signal background descriptions, in which the *qotel* clause has an informative character, valuable to the receiver of the text, as in (49):

(49) *wa(y)-yiqtol + <sup>12</sup>wa-S.noun-qotel + wa-XØ*

וַיֵּרֶד הוּא וּפְרָה נַעֲרָו אֶל־קֶצֶה הַחֲמִשִּׁים אֲשֶׁר בְּמַחֲנֶה: וּמִדָּלוּ וַעֲמָלָק וְכָל־  
בְּנֵי־קֶדֶם נִפְלִים בְּעֵמֶק כְּאֶרְבֶּה לָרֶב וְלִגְמִלְיָהֶם אִין מִסְפָּר כְּחֹל שְׁעַל־שְׂפַת  
הַיָּם לָרֶב:

‘So he went down with Purah his servant to where the sentries were guarding the camp. <sup>12</sup>**Now the Midianites, Amalekites, and the people from the east covered the valley** as numerous as locusts. Their camels were too many to count; as innumerable as the sand on the seashore.’ (Judg. 7.11f.)

The *qoṭel* clause in (49) supplies a valuable description of the situation before the battle. It does not directly qualify anything in the main clause. This is typical of a background clause: it is a relatively independent description ‘behind the scene’ of the pragmatic world of the main clause(s). It is also typical that the background description is a complex of clauses: in this case, a verbless clause supplies additional facts.

This ‘behind the scene’ description can of course also be expressed by a *wa-S.pron-qoṭel* clause, as in (50):

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

וַיָּקָם אַחֲרֵי אֲבִימֶלֶךְ לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל תּוֹלָע בֶּן־פּוּאָה בֶּן־דּוֹדוֹ אִישׁ  
יִשָּׁשְׁכָר וְהוּא־יָשָׁב בְּשָׁמִיר בְּהָר אֶפְרָיִם:

‘After Abimelech, in order to save Israel, arose Tola, “son” of Puah, “son” of Dodo, a man of Issachar. **He lived at Shamir in the Ephraimite hill country.**’ (Judg. 10.1, Boling 1975, 186, my emphasis)

In (50), the syntax of the *qoṭel* clause is exactly the same as many of the circumstantial clauses presented above, but it is obvious that is not a circumstantial qualifier in this sense. It is simply descriptive of a general fact: the place where Tola lived. This means that the syntax alone cannot always decide between a circumstantial clause and a more independent background description.

A canonical and instructive instance of a *wa-X-qoṭel* background description is (51):

- (51) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + <sup>10</sup>wa-X-qoṭel + wa-X-yiqṭol(u) + wa-qataḏ*  
 וַיִּצְמַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן־הָאֲדָמָה כָּל־עֵץ נֹחַמֵּד לְמַרְאֶה וְטוֹב לְמַאֲכָל וְעֵץ  
 הַחַיִּים בְּתוֹךְ הָעֵץ וְעֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וְרָע: וְנָהָל יֵצֵא מֵעֵדֶן לְהַשְׁקוֹת אֶת־הַגֶּן  
 וּמִשָּׁם יִפְרֹד וְהָיָה לְאַרְבַּעָה רָאשִׁים:

‘The LORD God made all kinds of trees grow from the soil, every tree that was pleasing to look at and good for food, and the tree of life in the middle of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. <sup>10</sup>**Now a river flows from Eden to water the garden**, and from there it divides and becomes four headstreams.’ (Gen. 2.9f.)

The *qoṭel* clause in (51) constitutes a more independent description of the garden, the creation of which has been presented in the preceding clauses. The purpose of this background is to present geographical information still valid for the receivers of the text, and it is therefore to be translated by a general present: “es ist Wissenstradition in ursprünglich mündlicher Form” (Westermann 1976, 293). The background is a complex of clauses. It is introduced by a *qoṭel* clause, but ‘continued’ by *wa-X-yiqṭol(u)*, where X is a focused prepositional phrase (מִשָּׁם), followed by a continuity clause *wa-qataḏ*. The participle is here fully verbal, and relatively young as an imperfective in the verbal system. Here it has the meaning of a general present. It has taken over the function of initiating clause-type in the background complex, but it was not natural to continue the description of the flowing river with coordinated *qoṭel* clauses. Instead, the old imperfective *yiqṭol(u)* was used, together with its continuity counterpart *wa-qataḏ*.<sup>79</sup>

An exceptional case of background with prospective meaning expressed by a *wa-qoṭel* clause is found in (52):

(52) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-qoṭel + wa-X-qoṭel*

וַיִּקַּח מָנוּחַ אֶת־גְּדִי הָעִזִּים וְאֶת־הַמִּנְחָה וַיַּעַל עַל־הָעֹזַר לַיהוָה וּמִפְּלֹא לַעֲשׂוֹת  
וּמִנּוּחַ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ רְאִים:

‘Manoah took a young goat and a grain offering and offered them on a rock to the LORD, **and he was about to do an amazing thing** while Manoah and his wife was watching.’  
(Judg. 13.19)

The *wa-qoṭel* in (52) is used immediately after the proper name of God, and it is reasonable to suppose that YHWH is the understood subject of the participle. The position of the clause after a pausal accent indicates that it has a certain independence. Normally, *qoṭel* clauses without explicit subject are asyndetic and circumstantial, as we have seen, so the syndesis indicates that the clause is not circumstantial. The *wa-qoṭel* (וּמִפְּלֹא לַעֲשׂוֹת) is probably not a concomitant action, but expresses what the Lord is going to do in the immediate future, a relatively frequent meaning of a verbal participle. The next *qoṭel* clause has an explicit subject (מָנוּחַ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ) and is concomitant with what the Lord is going to do in the future: Manoah and his wife will be watching when YHWH does an amazing thing. It is a future action projected back to the past reference time of the narrative main line.

#### 7.4.3. Interruption Type *Wa-qatāl* // *(Wa)-(X)-qoṭel*

A *qoṭel* clause after a main line of *wa-qatāl* is relatively infrequent. The reason is probably that a *qoṭel* clause does not easily express

obligation. A second reason is that *wa-X-yiqtol(u)* is still fully productive as discontinuity clause expressing obligation or future, the most frequent meanings of *wa-qatal*.

In the cases I have detected, the *qotel* clause is mostly circumstantial in relation to *wa-qatal*. See Table 25.<sup>80</sup>

Table 25: The semantics of the *wa-qatal* + (*wa*)-(X)-*qotel* linking

|                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Temporal succession | 1        |
| Circumstantial      | 6        |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>7</b> |

In one example, a *qotel* clause is foregrounded with future time reference:

- (53) *VNabs-yiqtol(u)* + *kī-yiqtol(u)!* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* +  
<sup>14</sup>*wa-gam-O.noun-qotel* + *wa-X-yiqtol(u)*

יָדַעַתְּ כִּי־גֵר | יִהְיֶה זֶרַעְךָ בְּאֶרֶץ לֹא לָהֶם וְעֲבָדוּם וְעָנּוּ אֹתָם אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת  
שָׁנָה: וְגַם אֶת־הַגּוֹי אֲשֶׁר יַעֲבֹדוּ בָּן אֲנֹכִי וְאַחֲרָיו יֵצְאוּ בִּרְכָשׁ גָּדוֹל:

‘Know for certain that your descendants will be strangers in a foreign country. And they will be slaves there, and they will be oppressed for 400 years. <sup>14</sup>**But I will execute judgment on the nation** that they will serve. Afterward they will come out with many possessions.’ (Gen. 15.13f.)

In (53), the *qotel* clause is foregrounded in a series of prospective clauses which starts with *kī-yiqtol(u)* and continues with *wa-qatal*. It is possible that the futural *qotel* has a special nuance: that YHWH is already resolved to execute this judgement 400 years ahead in the future.<sup>81</sup>

In most cases, *wa-qatal* with a following *qotel* clause is a circumstantial linking, even with *qotel* in its prototypical attributive position, as in (54):

(54) *kī-qoṭel + kī-PrP-VN + wa-qāṭal + wa-qāṭal + Ø-qoṭel*

כִּי יֵדַע אֱלֹהִים כִּי בַיּוֹם אֲכַלְכֶּם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקַחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם וְהִייתֶם כְּאֱלֹהִים יֹדְעֵי  
טוֹב וָרָע:

‘for God knows that when you eat from it your eyes will open, and you will be like God, **knowing good and evil.**’  
(Gen. 3.5)

The *qoṭel* clause in (54) follows directly after its head noun (אֱלֹהִים), which is indefinite, and the *qoṭel* itself is a construct noun before its objects (טוֹב וָרָע). In such instances, it can be argued that the *qoṭel* is non-verbal. I have brought forward this example because of its prototypical nature. From this position, there developed the verbal *qoṭel* (see §4.1.1.1), and the borderline between verbal and non-verbal, finite and non-finite, in the case of *qoṭel*, is sometimes difficult to draw. An example of a verbal but infinite circumstantial use of *qoṭel* after *wa-qāṭal* is (55):

(55) *wa-qāṭal + Ø-qoṭel + wa-qoṭel*

וְהִפְקִדְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם בְּהִלָּה אֶת־הַשְׁחָפֶת וְאֶת־הַקְדָּחַת מְבִלּוֹת עֵינַיִם וּמְדִיבַת  
נֶפֶשׁ

‘I will inflict horror on you, consumption and fever, **diminishing eyesight and draining away the vitality of life.**’  
(Lev. 26.16)

In (55), the last two direct objects in the main clause (אֶת־הַשְׁחָפֶת וְאֶת־הַקְדָּחַת) are determined by definite articles, but the following active participles are indefinite, and clearly adverbial. They form two circumstantial clauses qualifying the preceding objects (all are feminine plural). The *qoṭel* clauses are verbal (but infinite), each having one direct object.<sup>82</sup>

## 7.5. Tenet 1d: *Wa-VX* // (*Wa*)-*XØ*

In a main line of continuity clauses, a verbless clause signals a specific kind of discontinuity, since it always describes a state (see Tables 26–27). This is what the present section demonstrates.

### 7.5.1. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqtol* // (*Wa*)-*XØ*

In a verbless clause, there is no verb, and this determines the uses of *XØ* as an interruption in a narrative main line; see Table 26.

Table 26: The semantics of the *wa(y)-yiqtol* + (*wa*)-*XØ* linking

|                       |            |
|-----------------------|------------|
| Background            | 64         |
| Editorial comment     | 24         |
| Circumstantial        | 43         |
| Complement            | 15         |
| Contrast              | 1          |
| Same-event addition   | 1          |
| Temporal succession   | 2          |
| Unclear <sup>83</sup> | 2          |
| Focus, no linking     | (4)        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>156</b> |

The semantics of the linking displayed in Table 26 are dominated by backgrounding and editorial information as well as circumstantial uses. In addition, some are (focal) complement clauses in the form of *wa-hinnē-XØ* constructions. The rest—contrast, same-event addition, temporal relative time, and temporal succession—are exceptional (for the terms, see Dixon 2009). I have found no semantic distinction between *wa-XØ* and *Ø-XØ* as interruptive clause after *wa(y)-yiqtol*. In the following, syndetic and asyndetic verbless clauses are treated together.

In my classification in the database, background is defined as information beside the main line that was relevant or important to the contemporary receivers of the text. A large proportion of all *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *(wa)-XØ* are background. A typical example of background is:

- (56) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *Ø-XØ* + *wa-XØ* + *wa-XØ*

וַיָּקָם וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיָּבֹא עַד־נֶכַח יְבוּס הִיא יְרוּשָׁלַם וַעֲמֹז צֶמֶד חֲמֹרִים חֲבוּשִׁים  
וּפִילֹגֶשׁוֹ עִמּוֹ:

‘He got up, went away and traveled as far as Jebus (that is, Jerusalem). **He had with him a pair of saddled donkeys and his concubine.**’ (Judg. 19.10)

In (56), the first verbless clause is an editorial parenthesis, but the other *XØ* clauses belong to the narrative and constitute background information necessary for the receivers to understand the narration.

Information about the age of the protagonist probably also belongs to the world of the narrative and is background, as in (57):<sup>84</sup>

- (57) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-XØ*

וַיֵּלֶךְ אַבְרָם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֵלָיו יְהוָה וַיֵּלֶךְ אִתּוֹ לוֹט וְאַבְרָם בֶּן־חֲמֵשׁ שָׁנִים  
וְשִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה בְּצֵאתוֹ מִחָרָן:

‘So Abram left, just as the LORD had told him to do, and Lot went with him. **Now Abram was 75 years old when he departed from Haran.**’ (Gen. 12.4)



Editorial parentheses or comments are insertions meant to clarify the text for later readers, as in (58):<sup>85</sup>

(58) *wa(y)-yiqtol + (wa-XØ) + wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַיֵּלֶךְ יְהוּדָה אֶל-הַכְּנַעֲנִי הַיּוֹשֵׁב בְּחֶבְרוֹן (וְשֵׁם-חֶבְרוֹן לְפָנִים קָרִית אַרְבַּע)  
וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶת-שֵׁשַׁי וְאֶת-אֲחִימָן וְאֶת-תַּלְמַי:

‘Judah moved against the Canaanites who lived in Hebron (earlier, Hebron was called Qiryat-arba) and they defeated Sheshay, Ahiman, and Talmay.’ (Judg. 1.10, Sasson 2014, 136)

There is also a relatively frequent use of *wa(y)-yiqtol + (wa)-XØ* to code a circumstantial state in relation to the main-line clause(s). In such cases, the verbless clause is *semantically* embedded in the main clause and corresponds to an attribute or prepositional phrase, a construction frequent also in Arabic (Isaksson 2009, 62f.). This is illustrated in (59):

(59) *wa(y)-yiqtol-O.noun + Ø-XØ + O.noun + Ø-XØ*

וַיִּקַּח הָאִישׁ גָּזָם זָהָב בֶּקַע מִשְׁקָלָו וּשְׁנֵי צְמִידִים עַל-יָדָיָהּ עָשָׂהָ זָהָב  
מִשְׁקָלָם:

‘The man took out a gold nose ring **weighing a beka** and two gold wrist bracelets **weighing ten shekels**, and gave them to her.’ (Gen. 24.22)

Such circumstantial verbless clauses as in (59) are not syntactically embedded, and cannot be analysed, for example, as relative clauses, since the same semantic relation is achieved by syndetic verbless clauses, as is shown in (60):<sup>86</sup>

(60) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-XØ + wa-XØ*

וַיִּצֶק לוֹ אַרְבַּע טְבַעֲתֵי זָהָב עַל אַרְבַּע פַּעֲמֹתָיו וּשְׁתֵּי טְבַעֲתֵי עַל-צִלְעוֹ הָאַחַת  
וּשְׁתֵּי טְבַעֲתֵי עַל-צִלְעוֹ הַשְּׁנִית:

‘He cast four gold rings for it at its four feet, **with two rings on one side and two rings on the other side.**’ (Exod. 37.3)

Clauses of the type *wa-hinnē-XØ* after perception verbs constitute a special case. They have focus, and very often express a complement to a (sometimes implicit) sensory receptor verb in the main clause (Zewi 2011), as in (61):

(61) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-hinnē-XØ*

וַתָּבֹא אֵלָיו הַיּוֹנָה לָעֵת עֶרֶב וְהָיָה עָלֶיהָ זֵית טָרֵף בִּפִּיהָ

‘And the dove came back to him in the evening, and behold, in her mouth was a freshly plucked olive leaf.’ (Gen. 8.11)

In instances such as (61), the perception verb is implicitly understood, which is indicated by the translation ‘and behold’. When the perception verb is explicit in the main clause, the function of the *wa-hinnē-XØ* as (focused) complement is evident (62):

(62) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-hinnē-XØ + wa-hinnē-XØ + Ø-qotel<sup>87</sup>*

וַיֵּרָא וְהָיָה בְּאֵר בְּשָׂדֶה וְהָיָה שָׁם שְׁלֹשָׁה עֲדָרֵי צֹאן רֹבְצִים עָלֶיהָ

‘He saw **a well in the field and three flocks of sheep** lying beside it.’ (Gen. 29.2)

In (62), *wa(y)-yiqtol* of a typical perception verb (וַיֵּרָא) is directly followed by two *wa-hinnē-XØ* clauses expressing the two complements of the perception. It is the detailed account of the perceived objects that is focal.<sup>88</sup>

In one instance, *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *(wa)-XØ* expresses a contrast relation (63):

(63) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + ***wa-XØ*** + *()-O.noun* + *Ø-qatal* + *kī-XØ*

וַיִּשְׁלַח יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־יָמִינוֹ וַיָּשֶׁת עַל־רֹאשׁ אֶפְרַיִם וְהוּא הַצָּעִיר וְאֶת־שְׂמָאלוֹ  
עַל־רֹאשׁ מְנַשֶּׁה שְׂכָל אֶת־יָדָיו כִּי מְנַשֶּׁה הַבְּכוֹר:

‘Israel stretched out his right hand and placed it on Ephraim’s head, **although he was the younger**. (He put) his left hand on Manasseh’s head, crossed his hands, even though Manasseh was the firstborn.’ (Gen. 48.14)

In (63), the syndetic verbless clause has a contrast meaning, since the expected procedure would have been to place the right hand on the firstborn. Before the second direct object (אֶת־שְׂמָאלוֹ), there is an ellipsis: a verb is understood (‘placed’). The example also contains an unusual *Ø-qatal* expressing elaboration (see §7.3.3), and a concessive nuance of *kī* (HALOT meaning 12).

One instance of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *(wa)-XØ* expresses a same-event addition, describing a different aspect of the same event as in the main clause. A verbless clause in this type of clausal relation is not circumstantial. It is, however, semantically a supporting clause in Dixon’s (2009, 6) sense, while the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause is focal.

(64) *wa(y)-yiqtol!* + ***Ø-’ēn-XØ***

וַתְּהִי שָׂרַי עֲקָרָה אֵין לָהּ וָלֵד:

‘But Sarai was barren; **she had no child**.’ (Gen. 11.30)

In (64), the verbless clause describes another aspect of the state described by the *wa(y)-yiqtol* with stative (copula) verb. The

verbless clause is not circumstantial and absolutely not background. The two clauses express the same situation in different words.

Cases where *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *(wa)-XØ* express temporal succession are extremely rare. In only two instances does *(wa)-XØ* describe such a sequentiality. The first is (65):

(65) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + “*wa-hinnē-S.noun-qoṭel*” + <sup>4</sup>*wa-hinnē-XØ*

וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם הֲנִי לֹא נָתַתָּה זָרַע וְהִנֵּה בְּנֵי בֵיתִי יוֹרְשֵׁי אֹתִי: וְהִנֵּה דְבַר־יְהוָה  
אֵלָיו

‘Abram said, “After all, you have not given me an offspring, *so now*, a son > one born in my house will be my heir.”

‘But *just then* the word of the Lord came to him.’ (Gen. 15.3f., Van der Merwe 2007, 132)

In (65), the *wa-hinnē-XØ*, directly after *wa(y)-yiqṭol* with ensuing quotation, serves to express that the answer will contradict Abram’s preceding expectation (Van der Merwe 2007, 132).

The second instance is the chronicle-type text where Enoch finishes his days on the earth:

(66) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + ***wa-XØ*** + *kī-qāṭal*

וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנוּךְ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים וַאֲיָנָנוּ כִּי־לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים:

‘Enoch walked with God, **and then he was no more**, because God had taken him.’ (Gen. 5.24)

(66) is an anomaly in the genealogy of Genesis 5 (Westermann 1976, 484). Instead of this verse, we expected a simple וַיָּמָת (in pause). A dynamic state persists (Enoch walked with God), and then suddenly Enoch is no more on the earth. A pluperfect is a reasonable translation of *kī-qāṭal* (thus Westermann 1976, 469).

In a few instances, *wa-hinnē-XØ* is a focused clause without describing the content of a perception, and with only a vague semantic relation to the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol*, as in (67):

(67) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + ***wa-hinnē-XØ***

וַיִּשְׁמַע קוֹלֵנוּ וַיִּשְׁלַח מַלְאָךְ וַיֹּצֵאֵנוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם וְהִנֵּה אֲנִיכֶם בְּקֶדֶשׁ עִיר קֶצֶה  
גְּבוּלָדָּ:

‘He heard our voice and sent a messenger, and has brought us up out of Egypt. **Now we are here in Kadesh**, a town on the edge of your border.’ (Num. 20.16)

The verbless clause in (67) is focused and describes the present state of the speaker. Its semantic relation to preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses is vague. The *wa-hinnē-XØ* must be analysed as a main clause in direct speech, and forms the starting point of Moses’ appeal to the king of Edom in the following verses. From this perspective, the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol* just describe a historical background for the appeal, which now starts.<sup>89</sup>

### 7.5.2. Interruption Type *Wa-qatal* // *(Wa)-XØ*

Table 27: The semantics of the *wa-qatal* + *(wa)-XØ* linking

|                               |           |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Explanatory note              | 29        |
| Circumstantial                | 18        |
| Addition: contrast            | 4         |
| Reason                        | 11        |
| Complement                    | 2         |
| Unclear meaning <sup>90</sup> | 1         |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>65</b> |

In the text-types where *wa-qatal* can be regarded as a main line in the corpus, interruption with a *(wa)-XØ* clause frequently expresses an explanatory note, to use a term taken from Milgrom (1991, 305); see Table 27. An example is (68):

(68) *wa-qatal + Ø-XØ + Ø-XØ*

וְהִקְטִיר אֹתוֹ הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל־הַעֲצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאֵשׁ עֵלָה הוּא אִשָּׁה רִיחַ  
נִיחַח לַיהוָה:

‘Then the priest must offer it up in smoke on the altar on the wood which is in the fire—it is a burnt offering, a gift of a soothing aroma to the Lord.’ (Lev. 1.17)

Such an explanatory note is not circumstantial, but is to be regarded as a comment to the reader on the significance of the preceding instruction or procedure. It belongs to the text and corresponds to background information in narration.<sup>91</sup>

The second most frequent function of *wa-qatal + (wa)-XØ* is to code a circumstantial relation. Such clauses in some way refer back to the *wa-qatal* clause and are semantically part of it. An example is (69):

(69) *wa-qatal + Ø-XØ + wa-XØ + wa-XØ*

וַעֲשׂוּ אֲרֹז עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אֲמָתִים וְחָצִי אַרְבֹּו וְאֲמָה וְחָצִי רִחְבּוֹ וְאֲמָה וְחָצִי  
קִמְתּוֹ:

‘They are to make an ark of acacia wood—its length being two cubits and a half, its width a cubit and a half, and its height a cubit and a half.’ (Exod. 25.10)

In (69), anaphoric pronouns refer back to the direct object in the main clause. But anaphoric pronouns are not necessary in a cir-

cumstantial clause, which may refer back to a phenomenon mentioned or not mentioned in the pragmatic world of the main clause, as in (70):

(70) *wa-qatal* + *wa-ʿēn-XØ*

וְנָתַתִּי שָׁלוֹם בָּאָרֶץ וְשָׁכַבְתֶּם וְאַיִן מִמְּחִיד

‘I will grant peace in the land, and you will lie down to sleep **without anyone terrifying you.**’ (Lev. 26.6)

The verbless clause in (70) mentions a phenomenon that belongs to the possible world of the *wa-qatal* clause. It does not refer to a constituent in the main clause, but nevertheless has circumstantial function.<sup>92</sup>

Some circumstantial verbless clauses take on a nuance of contrast, as in (71):

(71) *wa-qatal* + *wa-XØ*

וְכָשְׁלוּ אִישׁ-בְּאַחֵיוּ כַּמִּפְּנֵי-חֶרֶב וְרִדְּף אֵין

‘They will stumble over each other as those who flee before a sword, **though there is no pursuer**’ (Lev. 26.37)

In (71), the verbless clause has a nuance of contrast, and can be translated with an initial ‘though’ (thus Milgrom 2001, 2273). The verbless clause has an active participle which should be analysed as a noun.<sup>93</sup>

Some cases of *wa-qatal* + (*wa*)-*XØ* express a reason (Hartley 1992, 363). It is significant that many reason clauses are introduced by the particle *kī*, which is also used to express a temporal ‘when’, a cross-linguistic phenomenon (Dixon 2009, 20). An example is (72):

(72) *wa-qatal + wa-qatal + ki-XØ*

וְהִתְקַדְּשֶׁתֶם וְהִיִּיתֶם קְדוֹשִׁים כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם:

‘You must sanctify yourselves and be holy, for I am YHWH your God.’ (Lev. 20.7)

In (72), it is unclear whether *ki* is a conjunction or an emphatic adverb. But the function of the verbless clause is to remind the people that “[b]ecause of what Yahweh has done for them, they have every reason to keep his commandments” (Hartley 1992, 363). This seems to be the function of similar verbless clauses without *ki*, expressing that YHWH himself is the reason for obeying his commands, as in (73):<sup>94</sup>

(73) *wa-qatal + wa-qatal + Ø-XØ*

וְשִׁמְרֶתֶם אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשְׁכֶם:

‘You must be sure to obey my statutes. I am YHWH who sanctifies you.’ (Lev. 20.8)

Finally, in special cases, the interruption *wa-qatal + (wa)-XØ* may express a complement, as in (74):<sup>95</sup>

(74) *wa-qatal + Ø-XØ + Ø-INT-XØ + Ø-INT-XØ*

וּרְאִיתֶם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ מִהֲיָוָא וְאֶת־הָעָם הַיֹּשֵׁב עָלֶיהָ הֲחֹזֶק הוּא הֲרַפָּה הַמְעַט  
הוּא אֲסִירָב:

‘and you shall see the land, **what it is like**, and the people who lives in it, **whether it is strong or weak, few or many**’ (Num. 13.18)



## 7.6. Tenet 1e: The Aspectual Interruption

Tenet 1e accounts for a different type of discourse interruption, what Fleischman (1985, 854) calls “narrative subordination,” current in Classical Arabic and discussed in Isaksson (2009, 84–87). In this type of interruption, backgrounding and circumstantial clauses are not primarily coded by word order, but by a switch of tense–aspect. The signal is the shift from a narrative past perfective clause to a verbal morpheme expressing imperfective aspect. This type of interruption does not depend on the presence of an element *X* before the verb, but has a powerful tense–aspect switching effect, effective also in oral performance (Fleischman 1985, 865f.). The same phenomenon in Old French has puzzled investigators, because the temporal connections “often seem confused and the choice of tenses illogical,” and the “consensus has been to view TS [tense switching] in older Romance as a stylistic LITERARY device” (Fleischman 1985, 866). Tense–aspect contrasts do “the discourse work of ‘narrative subordination’” (Fleischman 1985, 868). This is a phenomenon predominantly found in narratives: “events in the foreground are expressed typically by perfective forms, while background information is expressed by imperfective forms” (Fleischman 1985, 869). This type of narrative subordination is typical of oral textuality in Old Romance, creating “an interruption in the temporal line for insertion of background material” (Fleischman 1985, 871).

This interruption is found also in Central Semitic languages, like Classical Arabic (Isaksson 2009, 84f.):

(75) *fa-qatala* + ***wa-yaqtulu***

*fa-kāna rasūl-u llāh-i ṢL'M ma'a 'umm-i-hi 'Āminat-a bint-i Wahb-in wa-ḡadd-i-hi 'Abd-i l-Muṭṭalib-i bn-i Hāšim-in fī kilā'at-i llāh-i wa-hifẓ-i-hi wa-yunbit-u-hu llāh-u nabāt-an ḥasan-an*

‘The apostle of God lived with his mother Āmina d. Wahb and his grandfather ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Hāšim in God’s care and keeping, **and God let him grow up like a fine plant.**’ (Ish. 107:10-11)

In (75), the foregrounding *fa-qatala* clause is interrupted by a *wa-yaqtulu* clause expressing a background comment with past time reference. The background signal is exclusively coded by the tense–aspect switch from the perfective *qatala* to the imperfective *yaqtulu*. Word order is not crucial, only the aspectual contrast.

A similar background construction can be found in the Deir ‘Allā inscription, Combination I:

(76) *wa-yaqtul* + *wa-lā-qat[al* + *wa-yaq]tul* + ***wa-VN-yaqtulu***<sup>96</sup>

(3) ויקם . בלעם . מן . מחר [ .. ] ... ול יכ[ל . אכל . ויצ]ם [ . ] ויב[כ(4)ה  
 . יבכה .

‘And Balaam arose the next day [ ... ] and he was not able [to eat, and he fast]ed, **and thereby he wept grievously.**’ (KAI<sup>5</sup> 312:3–4)

In (76), a series of discourse-continuity clauses in narrative (including the *wa-lā-qatal* clause; cf. Tenet 4 below), is interrupted by a *yaqtulu* clause, expressing background with information about Balaam’s simultaneous weeping.

In addition to the imperfective interruption of a narrative main line, it is important to recognise the slightly different semantics produced by the continuity clauses *wa-qatāl* (Tenet 3, see §7.11) and *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* (Tenet 4, see §7.12). Such clauses have no focused constituent before the verb and display a closer semantic connection with the preceding main clause. There is an aspectual interruption, but the semantic relation is more intimate. In this type of clause combining, a main-line past perfective *wa(y)-yiqṭol* is linked with a following imperfective *wa-qatāl* (see §7.6.3), or with the corresponding negated imperfective continuity *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* (see §7.6.2). Two continuity clauses are combined, but with an aspectual shift. In this way, a backgrounded event or state is coded with a special immediacy in relation to the preceding *wa(y)-yiqṭol*.

Aspectual interruption with continuity clause:

*wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-qatāl*

*wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*

In spite of the aspectual difference, the imperfective continuity clauses usually share the actants and the pragmatics of the preceding main clause. The interrupting *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* and *wa-qatāl* are therefore treated separately in this section (in §7.6.2 and §7.6.3). The discontinuity clauses *(wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)*, where X is not a simple negation, are discussed first (§7.6.1).

To this must be added some imperfective uses of *qoṭel* (see §7.6.4).

### 7.6.1. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqtol //* (*Wa*)-*X-yiqtol(u)*

It is conspicuous that this type of linking is so relatively infrequent. The imperfective use of the long *yiqtol* in a switch from narrative main line is on the decrease in CBH and in the process of being replaced by the diachronically later *qotel* morpheme (see §7.4). Purely circumstantial uses of *yiqtol(u)*—so frequently found in Arabic—are rare. See Table 28.<sup>97</sup>

Table 28: The semantics of the *wa(y)-yiqtol* + (*wa*)-*X-yiqtol(u)* linking

|                      |           |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Circumstantial       | 1         |
| Comment of redactor  | 6         |
| Background           | 6         |
| Reason <sup>98</sup> | 2         |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>15</b> |

I have only one example of the circumstantial use of *X-yiqtol(u)* (77):

(77) *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-X-yiqtol(u)-N*

וַיְהִי קוֹל הַשּׁוֹפָר הוֹלֵךְ וְחִזַּק מְאֹד מִשָּׁה יְדַבֵּר וְהָאֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֶנּוּ בְקוֹל:

‘The sound of the horn grew louder and louder, while Moses was speaking and God was answering him with a voice.’  
(Exod. 19.19)

The two *yiqtol(u)* clauses in (77) express continuous action with past time reference (Zewi 1999, 108).

A slightly more frequent use of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + (*wa*)-*X-yiqtol(u)* is as (editorial) comment with information that does not pertain to the actual pragmatic situation of the text, but to the time of the redactor. Indications of such a comment are phrases

like *עַל־כֵּן* ‘therefore’ or *עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה* ‘to this very day’ (Childs 1963, 281, 283, 288). An example is (78):

(78) *wa(y)-yiqtol + CONJ-qatal + wa-X-qotel + <sup>33</sup>Ø-‘al-kēn-lō-yiqtol(u) + REL-XØ + kī-qatal*

וַיִּזְרַח־לּוֹ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כַּאֲשֶׁר עָבַר אֶת־פְּנוּאֵל וְהוּא צָלַע עַל־יָרְכוֹ: עַל־כֵּן לֹא־  
יֹאכְלוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־גֵּיד הַנֶּשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר עַל־כִּף הַיָּד עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי נָגַע  
בְּכַף־יָרְדָּה יַעֲקֹב בְּגִיד הַנֶּשֶׂה:

‘The sun rose over him as he crossed over Penuel, but he was limping because of his hip. <sup>33</sup>Therefore the Israelites do not eat the sinew which is attached to the socket of the hip to this very day, because he struck the socket of Jacob’s hip near the attached sinew.’ (Gen. 32.32f.)

The *Ø-‘al-kēn-lō-yiqtol(u)* clause in (78) explains a custom, a frequent feature in comments. The custom, not otherwise mentioned in the Old Testament (Westermann 1981, 634), is not known to the supposed readers and the *yiqtol(u)* must be interpreted as present habitual.<sup>99</sup>

The linking *wa(y)-yiqtol + (wa)-X-yiqtol(u)* is sometimes also used for background with information that is concomitant with or relevant to the event described by the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause. A *(wa)-X-yiqtol(u)* clause describes background information in (79):

(79) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-X-yiqtol(u)*

וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה כֵּן וַיָּבֹא עָרֹב כָּבֵד בֵּיתָה פֶּרֶעָה וּבֵית עֲבָדָיו וּבְכָל־אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם  
תִּשְׁחַת הָאֶרֶץ מִפְּנֵי הָעָרֹב:

‘And Yahweh did so, and heavy ‘*ārōb* came to Pharaoh’s house and his slaves’ house. And in all the land of Egypt the land was being devastated from before the ‘*ārōb*.’ (Exod. 8.20, Propp 1999, 288)

In (79), the imperfective *yiqtol(u)* clause provides background information about similar concomitant events in the whole of Egypt. Temporal succession is not expressed here. The *wa-X-yiqtol(u)* cannot be interpreted as one more *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause, as is done in many translations (e.g., ESV; NIV). A contrast is expressed between the past perfectivity in the main line and the imperfectivity in the *yiqtol(u)* clause. At the same time, *wa-X-yiqtol(u)* is not a continuity clause in this linking, and should not be expected to express result.<sup>100</sup>

The same type of linking may be achieved from a main-line *qatal* clause to an imperfective *X-yiqtol(u)*.<sup>101</sup>

### 7.6.2. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqtol //*

#### *Wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*

When the *yiqtol(u)* clause is of the continuity type, there is still an aspectual contrast in the linking, but the semantic connection with the preceding main line is closer and can often, but not always, be translated with a focal result clause (§2.3.6), or as a clause carrying over the preceding manner (§2.3.8). I have registered five examples of this type of linking; one is (80):

(80) *wa(y)-yiqtol-A + wa-lō-yiqtol(u)!*

וְאֶתְנָה אֶת־הַלְוִיִּם נְתַנִּים | לְאַהֲרֹן וּלְבָנָיו מִתּוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעֹבֵד אֶת־עֲבֹדַת  
בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאֶהֱל מוֹעֵד וּלְכַפֵּר עַל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא יִהְיֶה בְּבִנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶגֶף  
בְּגֶשֶׁת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ:

‘I have delegated the Levites to be assigned to Aaron and to his sons from among the Israelite people, to perform the tasks of the Tent of Meeting and to serve as redemption for

the Israelite people, **so that no plague may afflict** the Israelite people as a result of Israelites' approaching the Sanctuary.' (Num. 8.19, Levine 1993, 270, my emphasis)

The continuity clause in (80) presupposes the pragmatic world of the events in the main clauses and the *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* easily takes a notion of 'in this way', referring to the previous actions or procedures. An alternative translation of the continuity clause in (80) is, 'in this way no plague may afflict the Israelite people'. If it is a result clause, it is a focal result clause.

A *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* in relation to a main-line *wa(y)-yiqtol* is a continuity clause that depends semantically on the preceding main clause. Another example is (81):

(81) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + ***wa-lō-yiqtol(u)***

וַיִּרְכְּסוּ אֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן מִטְּבַעְתָּיו אֶל־טְבַעֶת הָאֶפֶד בַּפֶּתִיל תְּכֵלֶת לְהִיט עַל־חֻשְׁב  
הָאֶפֶד וְלֹא־יִנָּח הַחֹשֶׁן מֵעַל הָאֶפֶד כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה:

'They tied the breastpiece by its rings to the ephod's rings with blue cord, so that it was above the waistband of the ephod; **in this way the breastpiece did not come loose** from the ephod, just as the LORD had commanded Moses.' (Exod. 39.21)

In (81), the imperfective *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* clause expresses what is achieved by the precautions described in the main line: tying the breastpiece by its rings, placing it above the waistband. As a result of following these instructions, the breastpiece does not come loose. The breastpiece was expected to be used for a long time. The *yiqtol(u)* has a nuance of habitual enduring, and, because of the main-line *wa(y)-yiqtol*, past time reference.

The linking from a narrative main line to *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* should probably be classified as a special case of background.

But a *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* may also express a circumstantial action, as in (82):

(82) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*

וַיְהִי שְׁנֵיהֶם עֲרוּמִים הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ וְלֹא יָתִבּוּ שָׁשׁוּ:

‘The man and his woman were both naked, **and they felt no shame.**’ (Gen. 2.25)

In the *yiqtol(u)* clause, no new constituent is introduced; the actants are carried over from the main clause. The temporal reference is also carried over: it is past time, and the action or process is concomitant with the state described by the copula verb in the main clause. But the aspect is imperfectivity, describing an ongoing process. So the clause is circumstantial (thus Brockelmann 1908–13, II, §321b).<sup>102</sup>

A *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* clause may also, after a main-line *qatal* clause, express a nuance of ‘in this way’, referring to the precautions carried out in the main clause, as in (83):

(83) *wa-X-qatal + <sup>22</sup>wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*

וּלְבִנֵי לֵוִי הֵנָּה נָתַתִּי כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל לְנַחֲלָה חֶלֶף עֲבֹדָתָם אֲשֶׁר־הֵם עֹבְדִים אֶת־עֲבֹדַת אֱהֵל מוֹעֵד: וְלֹא־יִקְרְבוּ עוֹד בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־אֱהֵל מוֹעֵד לְשָׂאת חֲטָא לְמוֹת:

‘To the Levites I have given every tithe in Israel, in lieu of a land grant, as exchange for the tasks they will be performing by attending to the Tent of Meeting. <sup>22</sup>In this way Israelites will no longer encroach upon the Tent of Meeting, thereby incurring the penalty of death.’ (Num. 18.21f.)



In (83), the *qaṭal* describes the precautions taken, to assign to the Levites the task of attending to the Tent of Meeting. In this way, the Israelites will be protected. “The careful attention of the Levites to their assigned tasks will prevent ordinary Israelites from encroaching on the area of the Sanctuary” (Levine 1993, 451). The meaning of the *yiqṭol(u)* morpheme is not obligation, but pure prospective future.

### 7.6.3. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqṭol* // *Wa-qaṭal*

A *wa-qaṭal* clause signals imperfective aspect and continuity. Both these properties are important when *wa-qaṭal* is used in a narrative context. The imperfectivity of *wa-qaṭal* causes an interruption from the narrative main line, but the continuity signals a close semantic relation with the preceding main clause(s). “Its lack of temporal boundaries is exploited to disrupt the chain of perfective temporally bounded events” (Khan 2021a, 318). This is a controversial and relatively infrequent type of linking, which will be discussed in some detail below. See Table 29.

Table 29: The semantics of the *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-qaṭal* linking

|                            |           |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Background                 | 11        |
| Subevent                   | 5         |
| Editorial comment          | 2         |
| (Topic–comment obligation) | (1)       |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>19</b> |

The continuity of the *wa-qaṭal* clause-type gives the clause a nuance of immediacy in relation to the narrative main line, which can be used to express a direct response to a quoted speech—a response that is not expressed as a quoted rejoinder, but related in the background, as in (84):

- (84) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + “...” + wa-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַתֵּרָא דְלִילָה כִּי־הִגִּיד לָהּ אֶת־כָּל־לְבוֹ וַתִּשְׁלַח וַתִּקְרָא לְסֶרְנֵי פְלִשְׁתִּים לֵאמֹר  
עָלוּ הַפֶּעַם כִּי־הִגִּיד לָהּ [לִי] אֶת־כָּל־לְבוֹ וְעָלוּ אֵלֶיהָ סֶרְנֵי פְלִשְׁתִּים וַיַּעֲלוּ  
הַכֶּסֶף בְּיָדָם:

‘Delilah saw that he had told her his secret, and she sent and called the rulers of the Philistines, saying, “Come up here again, for he has told me his secret.” **On which the rulers of the Philistines went up to her, and brought the silver in their hands.**’ (Judg. 16.18)

The *wa-qatal* clause in (84) disrupts the chain of perfective, temporally-bounded events, with the effect that the event it describes is placed in the background. At the same time, the continuity signal of *wa-qatal* expresses an immediacy in the response of the Philistine rulers, possibly with a humorous nuance. The *wa-qatal* clause follows directly after the quoted message of Delilah, and its action is temporally sequential in relation to the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol*. In this context, it is not appropriate to regard *wa-qatal* as habitual, nor as frequentative (as Rubinstein 1963, 64). This *wa-qatal* is sequential and describes a single past event, but in the background.<sup>103</sup> The next action in the background is coded by a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause (cf. §2.3.3).

Another example of backgrounded *wa-qatal* after quotation is (85):

- (85) *wa(y)-yiqtol + “Ø-X-yiqtol(u)” + wa-qatal*

וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם אֲנֹכִי אֲשַׁבֵּעַ: וְהִזְכָּח אַבְרָהָם אֶת־אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ עַל־אֲדֹתָ בָּאָר  
הַמֵּים אֲשֶׁר גָּזְלוּ עִבְדֵי אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ:

‘And Abraham said, “I will swear,” **on which Abraham lodged a complaint** against Abimelech concerning a well that Abimelech’s servants had seized.’ (Gen. 21.24f.)

The direct speech rejoinder in (85) is coded by a *yiqtol(u)* clause (אֲנֹכִי אֶשָׁבֵעַ), which is often translated as a performative, as if Abraham were swearing an oath. But the *yiqtol(u)* morpheme is not regularly used as performative. The normal syntax of performative utterances uses *qatal*. It fits the pragmatics of the situation better to interpret the *yiqtol(u)* as expressing a promise to swear, if only some conditions are fulfilled. These conditions are not expressed in a full quotation, but reviewed or summarised in a background clause introduced by *wa-qatal*. This *wa-qatal* follows directly after the quotation and is intended to substitute a longer continued quotation with a shorter summary. The *wa-qatal* is temporally sequential, but not part of the main-line narration. It is not frequentative. It continues the quoted direct speech with a review in the background of the rest of the speech.<sup>104</sup>

A similar background example of *wa-qatal* directly after a quotation is (86):

(86) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “...” + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “...”  
+ <sup>6</sup>*wa-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַיּוֹצֵא אֹתוֹ הַחוּצָה וַיֹּאמֶר הַבִּטָּא הַשָּׁמַיְמָה וּסְפֹר הַכּוֹכָבִים אִם-תּוּכֵל לִסְפֹּר  
אֹתָם וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ כֹּה יִהְיֶה זֶרְעֶךָ: וְהָאֱמֵן בֵּיתָהּ וַיַּחֲשֹׁבָהּ לוֹ צִדְקָה:

‘The LORD took him outside and said, “Gaze into the sky and count the stars—if you are able to count them!” Then he said to him, “So will your descendants be.” <sup>6</sup> **On which Abram trusted the LORD**, and the LORD credited it to him as righteousness.’ (Gen. 15.5f.)

Abram's response comes directly after the quoted utterance of God. What the LORD said inspired Abram's confidence (Rainey 2003b, 16), and his response is related as a single mental event in the background. The background also contains a discourse-continuity past perfective *wa(y)-yiqtol* relating God's evaluation of Abram's trust, which seems to be a natural continuation if *wa-qatal* is past narrative, but not if it is habitual. Two mental responses, from Abram and from God, are described behind the scene. The imperfective *wa-qatal* clause disrupts "the flow of narrative by removing temporal boundaries in order to signal closure and climax" (Khan 2021a, 317f.). This simple background clause about Abram's response to God is a single event that, together with the ensuing *wa(y)-yiqtol*, codes both closure and climax.<sup>105</sup>

In many cases, the background character of a *wa-qatal* clause after *wa(y)-yiqtol* is obvious, for example, in the case of the copula verb in (87):

(87) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-haya*

וַתִּסֶּף עוֹד וַתֵּלֶד בֶּן וַתִּקְרָא אֶת-שְׁמוֹ שֶׁלָּה וְהָיָה בְּכֶזֶיב בְּלִדְתָּהּ אֹתוֹ:

'Then she had yet another son, and she named him Shelah.

It was at Kezib that she gave birth to him.' (Gen. 38.5)

The *wa-haya* in (87) has a neutral subject.<sup>106</sup> It is a continuity clause and expresses "the immediate background of another action" (Hornkohl 2014, 288).<sup>107</sup>

As example (86) shows, a *wa-qatal* clause inserted into the backbone of the narrative does not necessarily play an unimportant role. It just plays a different role with its continuity signalling and imperfectivity. A *wa-qatal* in narration "can have the

effect of marking an event as a subevent cohering with what precedes, embedded in the higher-level narrative chain” (Khan 2021a, 318). Such a subevent often also signals closure, as in (88):

- (88) *wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-qəṭal*

וְהָיָה צֶלֶל [צֶלֶל] לֶחֶם שְׁעָרִים מִתְהַפֵּךְ בְּמַחֲנֵה מִדְיָן וַיָּבֹא עַד-הָאֹהֶל וַיִּפֹּהוּ  
וַיִּפֹּל וַיִּהְיֶה כְּהוֹלְמָה לְמַעַלָּה וַיִּפֹּל הָאֹהֶל:

‘There was a round loaf of barley tumbling into the Midianite camp. It reached the tent and struck it, so that it fell; it turned it upside down, **on which the tent collapsed.**’  
(Judg. 7.13)<sup>108</sup>

The syntax of this dream report is the typical one. The scene starts with a *qoṭel* clause (with initial *hinnē*), and within the same scene the event line goes on with *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses. The closure of the report is coded by a *wa-qəṭal* clause that expresses the immediate final event, the collapse of the tent.<sup>109</sup>

Example (86) has a *wa-qəṭal* clause with an intransitive verb, which could give the impression that the duration of the action is important. But duration or repetition is not necessary for the *wa-qəṭal* clause to code a subevent after *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, as is shown in (89):

- (89) *wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa-qəṭal*

וַיֵּצֵא אֶהוּד הַמַּסְדֵּרוֹנָה וַיִּסְגֹּר דִּלְתוֹת הָעֲלִיָּה בְּעֵדוֹ וַיִּנְעַל:

‘Ehud slipped out toward the colonnade, and shut the doors of the upper chamber behind him, **on which he bolted them.**’ (Judg. 3.23)<sup>110</sup>

The *wa-qatal* in (89) codes a subevent in the main chain of actions, a detail that is worth mentioning, a closure of a series of events that belong together:<sup>111</sup> the getting out, shutting the doors and, as a closure, the bolting.<sup>112</sup>

A special case is (90), where the subevent takes the form of a temporal clause with following *wa-qatal*:

(90) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-qatal + wa-qatal*

וַיִּלְקְטוּ אֹתוֹ בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר אִישׁ כְּפִי אֲכָלוֹ וְחֶם הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וַיִּמָּס׃

‘They picked it up morning after morning, each man according to what he needed to eat, and when the sun grew hot, it melted away.’ (Exod. 16.21)

In the main-line *wa(y)-yiqtol*, the aspect is bounded but has an inferred habitual meaning because of the adverbial expressions. This is the main event. The subevent is coded by two *wa-qatal* clauses, of which the first functions as a temporal clause, the second as the main clause in the temporal linking. The two *wa-qatal* clauses display a mutual linking that is sometimes encountered also in conditional sentences (see §2.3.10). Instead of a protasis marked with a conjunction, the conditional clause may take the form of a *wa-qatal* clause (see §6.7.2; Ges-K §159g). This syntax is used when there is a special semantic connection with the preceding clause, in this case the *wa(y)-yiqtol*. So the two *wa-qatal* clauses should be analysed as one *wa-qatal* (׃וַיִּמָּס׃), with a preceding temporal clause coded by *wa-qatal* (וְחֶם). By implication, the last *wa-qatal* clause is habitual. We know this from the context, but as the examples discussed above show, a *wa-qatal* clause may express a single subevent without habituality or repetition.<sup>113</sup>

There are also cases when one or more *wa-qatal* clauses code an independent background complex after a *wa(y)-yiqtol* main line. In such instances, the *wa-qatal* can be an editorial comment, rather than a background that belongs to the pragmatic world of the main line. An example is (91):

- (91) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + <sup>26</sup>*wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)*  
+  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)*

וַיִּבְחַר מֹשֶׁה אֲנָשִׁי־חַיִּל מִכָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּתֵן אֹתָם רָאשִׁים עַל־הָעָם שָׂרֵי אֲלָפִים  
שָׂרֵי מֵאוֹת שָׂרֵי חֲמִשִּׁים וְשָׂרֵי עֶשְׂרֵת: וַשִּׁפְטוּ אֶת־הָעָם בְּכָל־עֵת אֶת־הַדָּבָר  
הַקָּשֶׁה יִבְיֹאוּן אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וְכָל־הַדָּבָר הַקָּטָן יִשְׁפּוּטוּ הֵם:

‘Moses selected men of ability from the whole of Israel, then set them in charge over the people, leaders over thousands, leaders over hundreds, leaders over fifties, and leaders over tens. <sup>26</sup>They decided cases for the people on a continuing basis: the difficult problem, they brought straight to Moses; every routine problem, they dealt with.’ (Exod. 18.25f., Durham 1987, 247)

The *wa-qatal* clause in (91) belongs to a situation that is clearly subsequent to the one when Moses did the actual selection of the men of competence. The meaning is past habitual, and the following asyndetic *yiqtol(u)* clauses, also habitual, express elaborations in relation to the *wa-qatal* clause (cf. §7.3.2).<sup>114</sup>

An editorial comment with *wa-qatal* after *wa(y)-yiqtol* is also exemplified in (92):

(92) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + <sup>31</sup>wa-qatal*

וַיִּשֶׂם אֶת־הַכִּיֹּר בֵּין־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וּבֵין הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וַיִּתֵּן שָׁמָּה מַיִם לְרַחֲצָה: וְרַחֲצוּ  
מִמֶּנּוּ מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן וּבְנֵי אֶת־יְדֵיהֶם וְאֶת־רַגְלֵיהֶם:

‘And he put the large basin between the tent of meeting and the altar, and set there water for washing. <sup>31</sup>Moses and Aaron and his sons would wash their hands and their feet from it.’ (Exod. 40.30f.)

The *wa-qatal* clause in (92) describes a later phase, when Moses and Aaron and his sons habitually washed their hands and feet in the large basin. In relation to the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses, *wa-qatal* expresses future and iterated action (Propp 2006, 658).

Finally, a *wa-qatal* after a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause may also express an independent future/obligation meaning, as in (93):

(93) *Ø-X-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol + <sup>16</sup>wa-qatal + wa-X-yiqtol(u)*

רַק בְּאַבְתָּיִךְ חֲשַׁק יְהוָה לְאַהֲבָה אוֹתָם וַיִּבְחָר בְּזַרְעָם אַחֲרֵיהֶם בְּכֶם מִכָּל־  
הָעַמִּים כִּיּוֹם הַזֶּה: וּמִלְתֶּם אֶת עַרְלֹת לִבְבְּכֶם וְעִרְפְּכֶם לֹא תִקְשׂוּ עוֹד:

‘Only to your ancestors did he show his loving favour, and he chose you, their descendants, from all peoples—as is apparent today, <sup>16</sup>so you should circumcise the foreskin of your heart, and stiffen your necks no more!’ (Deut. 10.15f.)

In (93), a report *qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol* summarises the deeds of God in relation to Israel. It is not strictly narration, but the aspect is perfective (past) anyway. The first two clauses state something that is agreed upon by the receivers of the text and have the function of a topic. This topic constitutes the reason for the comment, coded by a *wa-qatal* clause with obligational meaning. This meaning is independent of the meaning of the *qatal* and *wa(y)-yiqtol*



clauses. The *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-qatal* is a topic–comment linking (see §6.10), and the aspectual contrast discussed in the present section is irrelevant here, which is the reason for the parentheses in Table 29.

#### 7.6.4. Interruption Type *Wa(y)-yiqtol* // *(Wa)-(X)-qoṭel*

The interruption type *wa(y)-yiqtol* // *(wa)-(X)-qoṭel* is aspectual when *qoṭel* functions as a finite imperfective morpheme. The opposition is not so much a matter of word order, but of tense–aspect opposition (cf. Fleischman 1985). I have decided to treat all uses of *qoṭel* in relation to a *wa(y)-yiqtol* clause in the same place, for which I refer to Tenet 1c (see §§7.4.1–2).

#### 7.7. Tenet 2a: // *Wa-XV* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *Wa-VX*

This section concerns the instances when there is a break with the preceding main line and this break starts a new paragraph and a new continuity main line (*wa-VX*).<sup>115</sup> The new beginning may consist of clause(s) in the background (§7.7.2), or in the foreground (§7.7.1). It is often very simple (only *wa-XV*), but can be complicated by several types of discontinuity clauses (such as those within parentheses). I have found no *wa-X-yiqtol(u)* beginning a new paragraph,<sup>116</sup> so in this section only *wa-X-qatal* clauses are discussed, foregrounded or backgrounded. The foregrounded *wa-X-qatal* are nearly always past perfective, while the backgrounded *wa-X-qatal* express a stative or pluperfect meaning; see Table 30.

Table 30: The *wa-X-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* beginning a new paragraph

|                         |           |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Foregrounded (59)       |           |
| Perfective past         | 57        |
| Anterior <sup>117</sup> | 1         |
| Stative <sup>118</sup>  | 1         |
| Backgrounded (14)       |           |
| Pluperfect              | 8         |
| Stative                 | 6         |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>73</b> |

### 7.7.1. *Wa-X-qatal* (foreground) + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *Wa(y)-yiqtol*

When  $V = qatal$  in the initial discontinuity clause, the most frequent case is that the *(wa)-X-qatal* is itself a main-line clause and also syndetic (with initial *wa*, thus foreground *wa-X-qatal*). The syndesis in such a case signals a semantic connection with the preceding context (Isaksson 2021, 219, 226). A canonical instance of Tenet 2a, without further complicating discontinuity clauses (Tenet 1a–d) before the continuity clause (*wa-VX*), is (94):

(94) *wa-VX* + *wa-VX* + *wa-VX* + *wa-V* + *wa-VX* + <sup>2</sup>*wa-XV* + *wa-VX* + <sup>3</sup>*wa-VX* + *wa-VX* (= Tenet 2a)

*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*  
*wa(y)-yiqtol* + <sup>2</sup>*wa-S.noun-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + <sup>3</sup>*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*<sup>119</sup>

וַיִּשָּׂם לָבֹן בְּבֹקֶר וַיִּנָּשֶׂק לְבָנָיו וּלְבָנוֹתָיו וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָהֶם וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיֵּשֶׁב לָבֹן  
 לְמָקוֹמוֹ: 2 וַיַּעֲקֹב הָלַךְ לְדֹרְכּוֹ וַיִּפְגְּעוּ-בּוֹ מְלֹאכֵי אֱלֹהִים: 3 וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב  
 בְּאֵשֶׁר רָאִים מַחֲנֶה אֱלֹהִים זֶה וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמֵהֶם הַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא מַחֲנֵי: פ

‘Laban got up early in the morning and kissed his grandchildren and his daughters goodbye and blessed them.

Then Laban left and returned home. <sup>2</sup>**So Jacob went on his way** and the angels of God met him. <sup>3</sup>Jacob exclaimed when he saw them, “This is the camp of God!” So he named that place Mahanaim.’ (Gen. 32.1–3)

The events described in (94) follow after Laban’s pursuit of Jacob, and their peace agreement. Laban leaves (= five *wa(y)-yiqtol*), and then a new paragraph starts with Jacob alone as actant. This new paragraph is marked by a *wa-X-qatal* clause and ensuing continuity clauses (three *wa(y)-yiqtol*). The initial *wa* in *wa-X-qatal* signals a semantic connection with the preceding context (Laban and Jacob).

Slightly more complicated is the example from Genesis 14 (95):

- (95) *wa-X-qatal* + *wa-XØ* + <sup>19</sup>*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “...” + <sup>20</sup>*wa(y)-yiqtol* (= Tenet 2a + 1d)

וּמֶלְכִּי-צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם הוֹצִיא לָחֶם וַיֵּין וְהוּא כֹהֵן לֵאלֹהִים עֲלִיֹן: וַיִּבְרַכְהוּ וַיֹּאמְרוּ  
בְּרוּךְ אֲבָרָם לֵאלֹהִים עֲלִיֹן כִּנְהָ שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ: וּבְרוּךְ אֵל עֲלִיֹן אֲשֶׁר-מִגְן צָרָתָךְ  
בְּיָדְךָ וַיִּתֵּן-לּוֹ מֵעֶשֶׂר מִכָּל:

‘Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine. (Now he was the priest of the Most High God.) <sup>19</sup>He blessed Abram, saying,

“Blessed be Abram by the Most High God,  
Creator of heaven and earth.

<sup>20</sup>Worthy of praise is the Most High God,  
who delivered your enemies into your hand.”

Abram gave Melchizedek a tenth of everything.’ (Gen. 14.18–20, NET)

In (95), the new paragraph is signalled by a foregrounded *wa-X-qatal* clause marking discontinuity and, at the same time, a semantic connection with the preceding context (Abram's return after defeating Kedorlaomer). A new actant (Melchizedek) enters with a separate, and unexpected, series of events. After the *wa-XV* clause (*wa-S.noun-qatal*) comes another parenthetical discontinuity clause (*wa-XØ*), before the main line is resumed by *wa-VX* clauses (*wa(y)-yiqtol*).

An example of an added participle clause after the initial discontinuity *wa-X-qatal* is the following:

- (96) ***wa-X-qatal*** + ***wa-X-qotel*** + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-XØ* (= Tenet 2a + 1c)

וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן יָצָא אָחִיו וַיְדֹ אֶחָזֶה בְּעֶקֶב עֵשָׂו וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ יַעֲקֹב וַיִּצְחָק בֶּן־  
שְׁשִׁים שָׁנָה בְּלִדְתָּם אֹתָם:

‘After this, his brother came out, with his hand grasping Esau’s heel; so he was named Jacob. Isaac was sixty years old when Rebekah gave birth to them.’ (Gen. 25.26)

In (96), the discontinuous *wa-X-qatal* clause is foregrounded and starts a new paragraph. It is followed by a circumstantial participle clause before the main line is resumed by a continuous *wa-VX* clause (וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ יַעֲקֹב). The added verbless clause is backgrounded (see §7.5.1).<sup>120</sup>

### 7.7.2. ***Wa-X-qatal* (background) + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d)** + ***Wa(y)-yiqtol***

The typical backgrounded *wa-X-qatal* that begins a new paragraph is stative (including copula verbs) or, alternatively, has pluperfect meaning. The initial *wa* signals a semantic connection

with the preceding context. An example with pluperfect meaning is (97):

- (97) *wa-X-qatal + wa-XØ + wa-XØ + <sup>2</sup>wa(y)-yiqtol + “...” + wa(y)-yiqtol* (= Tenet 2a with Tenet 1d)

וְשָׂרַי אִשְׁתְּ אַבְרָם לֹא יָלְדָה לוֹ וְלֹא שִׁפְחָה מִצְרִית וְשָׂמָּה הָגָר: וְתֹאמַר שָׂרַי  
אֶל-אַבְרָם הִנֵּה-נָא עֲצָרְנִי יְהוָה מִלֵּדֶת בֶּן-נָא אֶל-שִׁפְחָתִי אוּלַי אֲבִנָּה מִמֶּנָּה  
וַיִּשְׁמַע אַבְרָם לְקוֹל שָׂרַי:

‘Now Sarai, Abram’s wife, had not given birth to any children, but she had an Egyptian servant named Hagar. <sup>2</sup>So Sarai said to Abram, “The LORD has prevented me from having children. Please sleep with my maidservant. Perhaps I can build a family through her.” And Abram listened to Sarai.’ (Gen. 16.1f.)

In (97), the *qatal* clause is clearly pluperfect (Westermann 1981, 277). The background also includes the verbless clauses, and begins a new paragraph (Moshavi 2013), within which the continuity clauses (*wa-VX*) follow in the next verse.

An example with copula verb is (98):

- (98) *wa-X-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol + “...”* (= Tenet 2a)

וַהֲנַחֵשׁ הָיָה עָרוֹם מִכָּל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-  
הָאִשָּׁה אַף כִּי-אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכָּל עֵץ הַגָּן:

‘Now the serpent was shrewder than any of the wild animals that the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, “Has God really said, You must not eat from any tree of the garden?”’ (Gen. 3.1)

In (98), *qatal* of the copula verb establishes the discontinuity clause as background, and “the fronting serves to mark both the

serpent as a topic of the ensuring [sic] discourse and the start of an episode” (Hornkohl 2018, 52). Though the serpent is a new topic, there is a clear semantic connection with the preceding context.<sup>121</sup>

## 7.8. Tenet 2b: // Ø-(X)V + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + Wa-VX

Asyndetic finite discontinuity clauses that begin a new paragraph lack a signal of backward connection (to a previous context). When a Ø-X-*qatal* clause begins a new paragraph, it is usually foregrounded with past perfective meaning (§§7.8.1–2). In the rare case of Ø-X-*yiqtol(u)* starting a literary unit in narration, it forms a temporal clause (§7.8.3), or, with a following main line of *wa-qatal* clauses, is prospective with future time reference (§7.8.4); see Table 31.

Table 31: The Ø-XV + *wa*-VX beginning a new paragraph

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Ø-X- <i>qatal</i> + <i>wa(y)-yiqtol</i>     |           |
| Foregrounded                                | 19        |
| Backgrounded                                | 3         |
| Ø-X- <i>yiqtol(u)</i> + <i>wa(y)-yiqtol</i> |           |
| Past temporal clause                        | 1         |
| Ø-X- <i>yiqtol(u)</i> + <i>wa-qatal</i>     |           |
| Prospective (future)                        | 3         |
| <b>Total</b>                                | <b>26</b> |

### 7.8.1. Ø-X-*qatal* (foreground) + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + Wa(y)-*yiqtol*

So far, we have treated syndetic *qatal* clauses (*wa*-X-*qatal*) beginning a new paragraph. But asyndetic *qatal* clauses (Ø-X-*qatal*) are

also fairly frequent in this function.<sup>122</sup> The difference is the lack of backward signalling. In some cases, it is possible to detect a semantic connection with the preceding context, but this is not signalled in the linguistic code (Isaksson 2021, 226). A case without backward semantic connection is the start of a report in direct speech in (99):

(99)  $\emptyset$ -XV + <sup>5</sup>wa-VX + wa-VX (= Tenet 2b)

הַגִּבְעָתָה אֲשֶׁר לְבִנְיָמִן בָּאתִי אֲנִי וּפְלִגְשִׁי לָלוֹן: וַיִּקְמוּ עָלַי בְּעֵלֵי הַגִּבְעָה  
וַיִּסְבּוּ עָלַי אֶת-הַבַּיִת לֵילָה

“I and my concubine came to Gibeah in the territory of Benjamin to spend the night. <sup>5</sup>The leaders of Gibeah attacked me, and surrounded the house where I was staying at night...” (Judg. 20.4f.)

Since this is the start of a narration (report) in direct speech, there is nothing before this clause to connect to, and the quotation does not start with a *wa*. The Levite begins his report with an asyndetic *qaṭal* clause, with past perfective meaning ( $\emptyset$ -ADV-*qaṭal*). The report then continues with discourse-continuity clauses (*wa(y)-yiqtol*), also with past perfective meaning. Since this is a quotation, it starts a new paragraph. And it is foreground.

A more complicated paragraph beginning, with both foreground and background before the main line, is (100):

(100)  $\emptyset$ -XV + <sup>2</sup>wa-XV + wa-X $\emptyset$  + wa-X-*qoṭel* + <sup>3</sup>wa-VX + “...”  
+ wa-VX (= Tenet 2b with Tenet 1a + 1d + 1c)

בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ: 2 וְהָאָרֶץ הִיְתָה תֵהוֹ וְנָהוּ  
וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל-פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם: 3 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים  
יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי-אוֹר:

‘In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.  
<sup>2</sup>Now the earth was formless and empty, and darkness was  
 over the surface and the deep, and the Spirit of God was  
 hovering over the waters. <sup>3</sup>Then God said, “Let there be  
 light.” And there was light.’ (Gen. 1.1–3)

The passage starts with asyndesis, and there is nothing before this asyndetic clause to connect to (Isaksson 2021, 226f.). This first asyndetic *qaṭal* clause has a dynamic past perfective meaning and belongs to the foreground. Focus is on the first constituent, ‘In the beginning’ (בְּרֵאשִׁית). This first clause signals discourse discontinuity and marks a new literary unit (Tenet 2b). The next three clauses, in Genesis 1.2, are backgrounded. The *wa-XV* clause (וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוֹ וָבֹהוּ) has a stative (copula) predicate and describes the state of the earth (Tenet 1a); the *wa-XØ* clause (וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם) is descriptive of the darkness (Tenet 1d); and the *wa-X-qoṭel* clause concerns the ongoing activity of the Spirit of God (Tenet 1c). The foreground is resumed with continuity clauses in Genesis 1.3 (*wa-VX*). Example (100) illustrates Tenet 2b well, with an initial discontinuity  $\emptyset$ -XV, in this case foregrounded, and nearly all possible added discontinuity clauses expressing background, corresponding to Tenet 1a, d, c: a *wa-XV* clause (with *V* = *qaṭal*), a *wa-XØ* clause, and a *wa-X-qoṭel* clause.

Another example with several discontinuous *qaṭal* clauses with past perfective meaning is (101):

(101)  $\emptyset$ -XV + *wa-XV* + <sup>24</sup>*wa-XV* + <sup>25</sup>*wa-VX* (= Tenet 2b with Tenet 1a)



הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ יָצָא עַל־הָאָרֶץ וְלוֹט בָּא צָעָה: 24 וַיְהִי הַמָּטָר עַל־סֹדֶם וְעַל־  
 עֲמֹרָה גִפְרִית וְאֵשׁ מֵאֵת יְהוָה מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם: 25 וַיַּהֲבֹךְ אֶת־הָעָרִים הָאֵל וְאֶת־  
 כָּל־הַכְּנָר וְאֶת כָּל־יֹשְׁבֵי הָעָרִים וְצִמְח הָאֲדָמָה:

‘As the sun rose over the land, Lot entered Zoar, <sup>24</sup>and the LORD rained brimstone and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah, from the LORD, from the sky, <sup>25</sup>so he overthrew these cities, the whole valley and their inhabitants and the vegetation of the soil.’ (Gen. 19.23–25, after Wenham 1994, 34)

The three *X-qatal* clauses in (101) all signal discontinuity. The first is asyndetic, which marks a weak semantic connection with the preceding context. An interpretation where one of them expresses temporal succession would contradict the linguistic code. What they signal is simultaneity, and this is what a translation has to cope with.<sup>123</sup> At the same time, they express a dramatic highlighting (Hornkohl 2018, 48, 49 n. 64). Three past perfective *qatal* clauses begin a new paragraph (Brockelmann 1956, §122n; Blau 1959, 134 n. 2). Like many interpreters, I take the three *qatal* clauses as foreground, with past perfective meaning.<sup>124</sup> The continuity clauses start in Genesis 19.25 with *wa-VX* (וַיַּהֲבֹךְ).<sup>125</sup>

### 7.8.2. $\emptyset$ -*X-qatal* (background) + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *Wa(y)-yiqtol*

The backgrounding asyndetic *qatal* clauses that introduce a new paragraph are few (in my database, only 3 ×). Here also we encounter *qatal* as a stative verb, or with pluperfect meaning, or as the beginning of a report in speech. A beginning of a report is (102):

(102)  $\emptyset$ -X-*qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-lō-qatal* (= Tenet 2b, Tenet 4)

אִישׁ רִיב הָיִיתִי אֲנִי וְעַמִּי וּבְנֵי־עַמּוֹן מְאֹד וְאַתֶּנָּק אֶתְכֶם וְלֹא־הוֹשַׁעְתֶּם אוֹתִי  
מִיָּדָם:

‘My people and I were in a struggle and the Ammonites were oppressing me greatly. I asked for your help, but you did not deliver me from their power.’ (Judg. 12.2)

The copula verb in the first clause is stative and the clause describes a situation in the past. This is the background for the following continuity clauses in the foreground.<sup>126</sup>

### 7.8.3. $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol(u)* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *Wa(y)-yiqtol*

The originally imperfective *yiqtol(u)* is rare in background, and even more so as the beginning of a narrative. I have found one example, in the report uttered by Abraham’s servant. It clearly starts a new paragraph; see (103):

(103)  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol(u)*! + *wa-hinnē-qotel* + *wa-X∅* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  
*wa(y)-yiqtol* (= Tenet 2b with Tenet 1d)

אֲנִי טָרַם אֲכַלָּה לְדַבֵּר אֶל־לְבִי וְהִנֵּה רַבֶּקָּה יָצְאָה וְכַדָּה עַל־שִׁכְמָהּ וְתִרְדּ  
הָעֵינָה וְתִשָּׂאב וְאָמַר אֵלֶיהָ הִשְׁקִינִי נָא:

‘Before I finished praying in my heart, along came Rebekah with her water jug on her shoulder! She went down to the spring and drew water. So I said to her, “Please give me a drink.”’ (Gen. 24.45)

In the initial subordinate (temporal) clause, after the adverb *terem*, *yiqtol(u)* has retained its imperfectivity (with past time reference). The *wa-hinnē-qotel* clause is focal (foregrounded, see §7.4.2) and the verbless clause is circumstantial. After the three subordinate clauses, the main line begins with continuity clauses (*wa(y)-yiqtol*).

#### 7.8.4. Ø-*X-yiqtol(u)* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *Wa-qatal*

Since *wa-qatal* as continuity clause is most frequent in instruction with initial (*wa*)-*X-yiqtol(u)* in a modality of obligation, and is also very frequent in modal series with an initial volitive, the cases of *yiqtol(u)* clauses starting a new paragraph with following continuous *wa-qatal* are relatively rare. This happens in prospective sentences with future time reference, and there is usually a sense of narration, though the series of events is transposed to the future. An example is (104):

(104) Ø-*X-yiqtol(u)* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* (= Tenet 2b)

יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־הֵתֵּלַכְתִּי לִפְנֵי יְשׁוּעָה מִלְאָכּוֹ אֶתְּךָ וְהַצֵּלִיחַ דְּרָכְךָ וְלִקְחָתָּ אִשָּׁה  
לְבָנִי מִמִּשְׁפַּחְתִּי וּמִבֵּית אָבִי:

‘The LORD, before whom I have walked, will send his angel with you. He will make your journey a success and you will find a wife for my son from among my relatives, from my father’s family.’ (Gen. 24.40)

In (104), Abraham’s servant quotes his master and relates Abraham’s conviction about the future success of the journey. It is clearly a new unit in the speech (Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64). The *X* before *yiqtol(u)* in this case also includes a relative clause, which functions as an attribute to the subject YHWH.<sup>127</sup>

## 7.9. Tenet 2c: // (Wa)-(X)-*qoṭel* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *Wa-VX*

This section treats the cases when a *qoṭel* clause introduces a new paragraph in narration before continuous *wa(y)-yiqtol* (§7.9.1), or, in direct speech and future time reference, before continuous *wa-qatal* (§7.9.2).

### 7.9.1. // (Wa)-X-*qoṭel* + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + *Wa(y)-yiqtol*

A *qoṭel* clause beginning a new paragraph in narration may form a subordinated (temporal) clause, be backgrounded, or, with an initial *wa-hinnē*, be foregrounded, often in dream reports; see Table 32.

Table 32: The functions of *qoṭel* beginning a new paragraph in narration

|                                   |           |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>Qoṭel</i> is a temporal clause | 3         |
| <i>Qoṭel</i> is backgrounded      | 6         |
| <i>Qoṭel</i> is foregrounded      | 4         |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>13</b> |

An example of an initial *qoṭel* clause with temporal meaning at the start of a new paragraph is (105):

(105)  $\emptyset$ -X-*qoṭel* + *wa-hinnē-X-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “...” (= Tenet 2c + 1a)

הָמָּה מִיִּסְיָבִים אֶת־לִבָּם וְהֵנָּה אֲנָשִׁי הָעִיר אֲנָשִׁי בְּגִיב־בְּלִיעַל נִסְבּוּ אֶת־הַבַּיִת  
מִתְדַּפְּקִים עַל־הַדָּלֶת וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־הָאִישׁ בְּעַל הַבַּיִת הַזֶּקֶן לֵאמֹר הוֹצֵא אֶת־  
הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־בָּא אֶל־בֵּיתְךָ וְנִדְעֶנּוּ:

‘While they were having a good time, then suddenly some men of the city, some good-for-nothings, surrounded

the house and kept beating on the door. They said to the old man who owned the house, “Send out the man who came to your house, so we can take carnal knowledge of him.” (Judg. 19.22)

The *qoṭel* clause is circumstantial in relation to the following foregrounded *qaṭal* clause. These two clauses form a break with the preceding narration and constitute, with the past perfectivity of *qaṭal*, the beginning of a new paragraph. The continuity clauses, in the form of *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, follow directly after the *qaṭal* clause. The directive particle *wa-hinnē* puts the action of the *qaṭal* clause in the foreground of the narration.<sup>128</sup>

Often, the initial *qoṭel* morpheme forms a background clause. A straightforward example, without further discontinuity clauses before *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, is (106):

(106) *wa-X-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (= Tenet 2c)

וַעֲפְרוֹן יָשֵׁב בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי־חֶת וַיַּעַן עֲפְרוֹן הַחִתִּי אֶת־אַבְרָהָם בְּאֶזְנֵי בְנֵי־חֶת לְכָל  
בְּאֵי שְׁעֵר־עִירוֹ לֵאמֹר:

‘(Now Ephron was sitting among the sons of Heth.) And Ephron the Hittite replied to Abraham in the presence of the sons of Heth—before all who entered the gate of his city—’ (Gen. 23.10)

In (106), the *qoṭel* clause gives background information about Ephron being present in the city gate. This introduces a new paragraph. There then directly follows the foregrounded and discourse-continuity *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (וַיַּעַן).<sup>129</sup>

A more complex background construction with initial *qoṭel* clauses is found in (107):

(107) *wa-(S.noun)-S.pron-qotēl + <sup>5</sup>wa-X-qotēl + wa(y)-yiqtol + <sup>6</sup>wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol (= Tenet 2c + 1c)*

וּדְבוֹרָה אִשָּׁה נְבִיאָה אָשֶׁת לַפִּיזוֹת הָיָא שְׁפָטָה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵת הַהִיא: 5  
וְהָיָא יוֹשֶׁבֶת תַּחַת־תְּאֵמֶר דְּבוֹרָה בֵּין הָרָמָה וּבֵין בֵּית־אֵל בְּהָר אֶפְרָיִם וַיַּעֲלוּ  
אֵלֶיהָ בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְמִשְׁפָּט: 6 וַתִּשְׁלַח וַתִּקְרָא לְבָרָק בֶּן־אֲבִינֵעַם מִקְדֵּשׁ  
נַפְתָּלִי

‘Now Deborah, a prophetess, wife of Lappidoth, was leading Israel at that time. <sup>5</sup>She would sit under the Date Palm Tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the Ephraimite hill country. The Israelites came up to her to have their disputes settled. <sup>6</sup>She sent and summoned Baraq son of Abinoam from Kedesh in Naphtali.’ (Judg. 4.4–6)

The first hemistich of Judges 4.4 is a left dislocation (וּדְבוֹרָה אִשָּׁה (נְבִיאָה אָשֶׁת לַפִּיזוֹת), and the *qotēl* clause is resumed with a corresponding subject pronoun (הָיָא).<sup>130</sup> The background consists of two *qotēl* clauses, of which the second is followed by a *wa(y)-yiqtol* belonging to the background description (וַיַּעֲלוּ; see §2.3.3.3). The perfective aspect does not in itself signal habituality, but allows for the action to be repeated or customary. The background construction with *wa(y)-yiqtol* (וַיַּעֲלוּ אֵלֶיהָ בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (לְמִשְׁפָּט: after the habitual *qotēl* clause has an implied habitual meaning, ‘and the people of Israel would come up to her for judgment’ (Sasson 2014, 250). The foreground and main line is resumed with the *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses in Genesis 4.6 (וַתִּשְׁלַח וַתִּקְרָא). The example illustrates that a discourse-continuity clause may be used in a background complex and thus be backgrounded, but in such cases, the background is introduced by at least one discontinuous clause.<sup>131</sup>

*Wa-hinnē* is a focus particle that puts *qoṭel* in the foreground at the beginning of a new paragraph. An example is (108):

(108) *wa-hinnē-S.noun-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  
“...” (= Tenet 2c)

וְהָיָה בָּרָק רֹדֵף אֶת־סִיסְרָא וַתֵּצֵא יָעֵל לִקְרֹאתוֹ וַתֹּאמֶר לוֹ לָךְ וְאִרְאֶךָ אֶת־  
הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־אַתָּה מְבַקֵּשׁ

‘Baraq just then was tracking Sisera. Jael went out to meet him, saying, “Come, I will show you the man you are seeking.”’ (Judg. 4.22, Sasson 2014, 103)

With Baraq entering the scene, a new paragraph begins, with the aftermath of the narrative. And this is done by means of a foregrounded *qoṭel* with progressive action visible to Jael (Sasson 2014, 270). The main line is continued by *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses.<sup>132</sup>

Dream reports display a special syntax when using the active participle. In the following example, the first *qoṭel* clause is backgrounded (109):

(109)  $\emptyset$ -*X-hinnē-X-qoṭel* + <sup>18</sup>*wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* (= Tenet 2c)

בְּחֶלְמִי הִנְנִי עֹמֵד עַל־שֹׁפֶת הַיָּאֵר: וְהָיָה מִן־הַיָּאֵר עֹלֹת שִׁבְעַת פָּרוֹת בְּרִיאֹת  
בָּשָׂר וְיִפֹּת תֹּאֵר וַתֵּרְעִינָה בָּאָחוּ:

‘In my dream I was standing by the edge of the Nile,<sup>18</sup> and there came up out of the Nile seven cows, fat and sleek, and they grazed in the reeds.’ (Gen. 41.17f.)

It is typical of the syntax of dream reports that scene reports are introduced by the deictic particle *wa-hinnē* before *qoṭel*. In (109), the first *hinnē-qoṭel* clause (asyndetic) is a background description of the initial situation in the dream. I interpret the following *wa-*

*hinnē-X-qoṭel* (וְהָיָה מִן־הַיּוֹרְעַר עֲלֶיךָ) as a main line in this dream report syntax. It is notable that a *wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* clause within the same scene can be continued by a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* that describes another successive event in the dream, both foregrounded.<sup>133</sup>

### 7.9.2. // Ø-X-qoṭel + Wa-qāṭal

The active participle may also introduce a new paragraph with following discourse-continuity *wa-qāṭal* clauses. The six instances in my database all start a quotation and are focused. Since there is nothing to connect to in preceding clauses, no conjunction *wa* introduces the speech. The temporal reference of the clauses is future or near future. Often, *qoṭel* is preceded by the deictic particle *hinnē*, as in (110):

(110) *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + “Ø-*hinnē-X-qoṭel* + *wa-qāṭal* + *wa-qāṭal* + *wa-qāṭal*” (= Tenet 2c)

וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי הִנְנִי מְפַרֵד וְהִרְבִּיתִּיךָ וְנָתַתִּיךָ לְקָהָל עַמִּים וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־הָאָרֶץ  
הַזֹּאת לְיֶרֶעְךָ אַחֲרַיִךְ אֲחֵזָת עוֹלָם:

‘He said to me, “I am going to make you fruitful and will multiply you. I will make you into a community of peoples, and I will give this land to your descendants as an everlasting possession.”’ (Gen. 48.4)

The example shows that discourse-continuity clauses are not always temporally successive, even when they describe a series of promised events that will take place in the future. The *qoṭel* and the first *wa-qāṭal* are related as same-event additions, while the second *wa-qāṭal* is an elaboration (Dixon 2009, 27). And the promise given to Abraham and Isaac is repeated in the third *wa-qāṭal*. Joseph is reminded of the blessing and promise given to



Jacob in Lus: the multiplicity of descendants and the possession of the land (Westermann 1982, 207).<sup>134</sup>

## 7.10. Tenet 2d: // (Wa)-XØ + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + Wa-VX

### 7.10.1. // (Wa)-XØ + (1a, 1b, 1c, or 1d) + Wa(y)-yiqtol

The thirteen instances of a verbless clause followed by *wa(y)-yiqtol* introducing a new paragraph are found in narrative texts and, not surprisingly, in most of them the *XØ* is backgrounded. See Table 33.

Table 33: The linking *(wa)-XØ* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* beginning a new paragraph

|              |           |
|--------------|-----------|
| Backgrounded |           |
| <i>wa-XØ</i> | 6         |
| <i>Ø-XØ</i>  | 5         |
| Foregrounded |           |
| <i>wa-XØ</i> | 2         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>13</b> |

In some cases, a new paragraph or literary unit is introduced by just a verbless clause followed by main-line *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses. This verbless clause may be either syndetic or asyndetic. If it is syndetic, a semantic connection with the previous context is indicated. A backgrounded syndetic example is (111):

(111) *wa-XØ* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* (= Tenet 2d)

וּלְכֶן מְדִין שְׁבַע בָּנוֹת וּתְבִאָנָה וּתְדִלָּה וּתְמַלְאָנָה אֶת־הָרֶהָטִים לְהַשְׁקוֹת  
צֶאֱן אֲבִיהֶן:

‘Now, Midian’s priest had seven daughters; they came and drew and filled the troughs in order to water their father’s flock.’ (Exod. 2.16)

In the preceding clauses, Moses had fled from Pharaoh and settled by a certain well. The new paragraph in (111) signals a connection to these events with its initial conjunction *wa* (in וּלְכֶהֱן). The verbless clause expresses a background to the following main-line events coded by three discourse-continuity *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses.<sup>135</sup>

A more complex beginning of a new paragraph with asyndetic initial verbless clause is found in (112):

(112)  $\emptyset$ -X $\emptyset$  + *wa*-X-*qatāl* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + “...” (= Tenet 2d with 1a)

הֵם עִם־יְבוּס וְהַיּוֹם יָד מְאֹד וַיֹּאמֶר הַנָּעַר אֶל־אֲדֹנָיו לְכֶ־נָּא וְנִסְוָהָ אֵל־  
עִיר־הַיְבוּסִי הַזֹּאת וְנָלִין בָּהּ:

‘When they were near Jebus, the day was almost gone. Therefore the servant said to his master, “Come on, let’s stop at this Jebusite city and spend the night in it.”’ (Judg. 19.11)

In (112), a background complex consists of a verbless clause and a *qatāl* clause. It is reasonable to interpret the verbless clause as temporal in relation to the following *qatāl* clause.<sup>136</sup> Both clauses are backgrounded (*qatāl* has pluperfect meaning). The background complex expresses the reason for the following discourse-continuity *wa(y)-yiqṭol* (וַיֹּאמֶר), and constitutes the start of a new scene in which the small group approaches a Jebusite city.<sup>137</sup>

But a verbless clause initiating a new paragraph can also be foregrounded. Both of my examples are from genealogies (Westermann 1981, 482). One is (113):

(113) *wa-S.pron-XØ-«REL-qaṭal» + <sup>8</sup>wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol + wa(y)-yiqṭol (= Tenet 2d)*

וְאַלֶּה יְמֵי שְׁנֵי־חַיֵּי אַבְרָהָם אֲשֶׁר־חַי מֵאֶת שָׁנָה וְשִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה וְחֲמִשׁ שָׁנִים:  
וַיָּגֹעַ וַיָּמָת אַבְרָהָם בְּשִׁיבָה טוֹבָה זָקֵן וְשֹׁבֵעַ וַיֵּאֲסֹף אֶל־עַמּוּ:

‘These were the days of the years of Abraham’s life, 175 years. <sup>8</sup>And Abraham breathed his last and died in a good old age, an old man and full of years; and he was gathered to his ancestors.’ (Gen. 25.7f.)

The natural interpretation of the verbless clause is as a foregrounded clause, with focused information about the exact age of Abraham at the beginning of a short genealogical narrative (Westermann 1981, 481f.).<sup>138</sup>

### 7.10.2. // (*Wa*)-*XØ* + *Wa-qaṭal*

The instances of a verbless clause starting a new paragraph with following main-line *wa-qaṭal* are mainly found at the beginning of utterances. For this reason, the examples I have found are asyndetic (*Ø-XØ*); there is nothing to connect to backwards. An obvious use of this type of linking seems to be as topic, with the comments coded by the following *wa-qaṭal* clauses (see §6.10). Of the five examples in my database, four are topic–comment linkings. The fifth, in (114), exhibits an even closer semantic relation:

- (114)  $\emptyset$ -*hinnē*- $X\emptyset$  + *wa-qatal* + *REL-qatal* + *kī-qatal* (= Tenet 2d)

הֵנּוּ וְעַלֵּינוּ אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם «אֲשֶׁר־אָמַר יְהוָה» כִּי חָטֵאנוּ:

‘We are ready to invade the place designated by YHWH.  
We have been remiss!’ (Num. 14.40, Levine 1993, 361)

As Levine (1993, 371) points out, the idiom *hinnennū wə-‘ālinū* is unique. The deictic particle *hinnē* forms, with its pronominal suffix, a separate verbless clause, ‘We are ready’, which is followed by a *wa-qatal* clause that specifies what they are ready for. Semantically, this usage of *wa-qatal* comes close to a complement clause.

But many examples are topics with following comments.

- (115)  $\emptyset$ -*S.pron-hinnē*- $X\emptyset$  + *wa-qatal* (= Tenet 2d)

אֲנִי הִנֵּה בְרִיתִי אֶתְּךָ וְהָיִיתָ לְאֵב הַמּוֹן גּוֹיִם:

‘Siehe, das ist mein Bund mit dir: Du sollst zum Vater vieler Völker werden.’ (Gen. 17.4, Westermann 1981, 303)

After a first-person personal pronoun in extraposition (Khan 1988, 67), the verbless clause is given additional emphasis by the particle *hinnē*. This clause announces God’s part in the covenant. Abraham’s part is formulated later (Gen. 17.9). So the verbless clause describes the topic. The comment, the covenant promise, is specified in the *wa-qatal* clause with future time reference.

Another example of a topic–comment linking, but without the particle *hinnē* introducing the verbless clause, is (116):

(116)  $\emptyset$ -X $\emptyset$  + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* (= Tenet 2d)

אֲנִי יְהוָה וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם מִתַּחַת סִבְלַת מִצְרַיִם וְהִצַּלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מֵעַבְדֹתָם  
וְגָאֵלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם בְּזֵרְעַ נְטוּיָה וּבְשִׁפְטִים גְּדֹלִים:

‘I am YHWH. I will bring you out from your enslavement to the Egyptians, and I will rescue you from the hard labour they impose, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great judgments.’ (Exod. 6.6)

The one who speaks is YHWH. This is what is agreed upon. And because he is YHWH, he will bring the Israelites out from their slavery. The translation of the *wa-qatal* clauses could have started with ‘And therefore I will bring you out...’. The temporal reference is future. The series of main-line *wa-qatal* clauses continues with five more (the whole prospective utterance is found in Exodus 6.6–8).

It is not necessary that the *wa-qatal* clauses express a plain prediction or promise. Obligation is also possible, as in (117):

(117) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + “ $\emptyset$ -*hinnē*-X $\emptyset$  + *wa-qatal* + <sup>22</sup>*wa-haya-bə*-VN + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal*” (= Tenet 2d)

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה הִנֵּה מָקוֹם אֲתִי וְנִצַּבְתָּ עַל-הָצֹר: וְהָיָה בְּעֵבֶר כַּבְּדִי וְשִׁמְתִּיךָ  
בְּנִקְרַת הָצֹר וְשִׁכַּתִּי כַּפִּי עָלֶיךָ עַד-עֲבָרִי:

‘YHWH said, “Here is a place near me. You are to stand on the rock, <sup>22</sup>and when my glory passes by, I will put you in the crevice of the rock and cover you with my hand during my passing.”’ (Exod. 33.21f.)

In (117), the verbless clause describes what is agreed upon, the place near YHWH. The next *wa-qaṭal* is an instruction in the second person ('you are to stand'), and the first-person *wa-qaṭal* clauses provide information about the future actions of YHWH.<sup>139</sup>

### 7.11. Tenet 3: The Prototypical Discourse-continuity Clause-type *Wa-V(X)*

Tenet 3 is a statement about the pattern of discourse-continuity clauses in CBH. This book has shown in detail that it holds for the clause-types *wa(y)-yiqtol* and *wa-qaṭal*. It probably holds also for volitives and modal sequences, but to show this is not part of our aim (see §1.1).

**Tenet 3 of CBH text-linguistics:** The clause-type *wa-V(X)* in CBH prose texts, where *V* is a finite verb, signals discourse continuity in relation to corresponding clauses.

The characteristic feature of discourse-continuity clauses is that they can form an unbroken main-line sequence with corresponding clauses (see Table 34). This book is full of examples of Tenet 3, but it is of course falsifiable. One or two counterexamples are enough to disprove the assertion.

Tenet 3 states that a normal conjunction *wa*, with immediately following finite verbal morpheme, forms a main line of continuity clauses. As finite verbs (*V*), I have identified the following verbal morphemes: the short *yiqtol* (indicative and jussive), the *qaṭal*, and the imperative. The long *yiqtol* does not form affirmative continuity clauses in CBH (type *wa-yiqtol(u)*), due to word order restrictions (see §3.4.3).

The continuity clause-type has special properties that concern its relation to preceding clause(s). There is an immediacy and a closeness in the semantic connection. A continuity clause easily carries over (understands) the previous pragmatic world, its actants and temporal reference.

*Remark 1.* The *wa-qatal* clause-type has developed into a construction with imperfective meanings similar to those of the long *yiqtol* (see §6). Its meaning cannot be deduced from its components *wa* + *qatal*, but it still conforms to Tenet 3 and has a normal conjunction *wa*.

*Remark 2.* In modal series, *wa-qatal* after volitives (*IMP*; *yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ )) has certain continuity properties, but does not correspond to *wa-IMP* or *wa-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ). After a volitive, *wa-qatal* can express finality or instructional details that are semantically related to the initial volitive (see §6.4).

*Remark 3.* In narration, *wa-qatal* has certain continuity properties, but with aspectual interruption (see §7.6.3).

*Remark 4.* The *qotel* morpheme does not form a main line of continuity clauses (*wa-qotel* is attested in a few cases, but not as main line); see §4.1.1.1.

In the following, I will restrict myself to a few typical examples of *wa-V(X)* as continuity clause.

The prime example of a continuity clause in narration is *wa(y)-yiqtol*, as in (118):

(118) *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + <sup>17</sup>*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*  
+ *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*

וַיֵּצֵא קִיז מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּאַרְצ־נֹד קִדְמַת־עֵדֶן: וַיֵּדַע לִין אֶת־אֲשֶׁתּוֹ וַתְּהַר  
וַתֵּלֶד אֶת־חֲנֹךְ וַיְהִי בָנָה לְעִיר וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם הָעִיר כָּשֶׁם בְּנוֹ חֲנֹךְ:

‘So Cain went out from the presence of the LORD and settled in the land of Nod, east of Eden. <sup>17</sup>And Cain was intimate with his wife, and she became pregnant and gave birth to Enoch. And he became the founder of a city, <sup>140</sup> and he named the city after his son Enoch.’ (Gen. 4.16f.)

The *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses in (118) have past perfective meaning and, in this example, each expresses temporal succession in relation to the preceding clause.

A good example of a series of continuous *wa-qatal* clauses is (119):

(119) *wa-qatal + wa-qatal + <sup>10</sup>wa-qatal + <sup>11</sup>wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal*

וְחִבַּרְתָּ אֶת־חֲמֵשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת לְבָד וְאֶת־שֵׁשׁ הַיְרִיעֹת לְבָד וְכַפַּלְתָּ אֶת־הַיְרִיעָה  
הַשְּׁשִׁית אֶל־מֹול פְּנֵי הָאֹהֶל: 10 וְעָשִׂיתָ חֲמִשִּׁים לְלֹאֹת עַל שַׁפַּת הַיְרִיעָה  
הָאַחַת הַקִּיצָנָה בַּחֲבֵרַת וְחֲמִשִּׁים לְלֹאֹת עַל שַׁפַּת הַיְרִיעָה הַחֲבֵרַת הַשְּׁנִיָּת:  
11 וְעָשִׂיתָ קְרָסִי נְחֹשֶׁת חֲמִשִּׁים וְהִבַּאתָ אֶת־הַקְּרָסִים בַּלְלֹאֹת וְחִבַּרְתָּ אֶת־  
הָאֹהֶל וְהָיָה אֶחָד:

‘And you shall fasten the five curtains separate and the six curtains separate. And you shall double the sixth curtain against the Tent’s front. <sup>10</sup>And you shall make fifty loops on the one curtain’s *lip*, the outermost on the *fastening*, and fifty loops on the *lip* of the curtain, the second *fastening*. <sup>11</sup>And you shall make bronze clasps, fifty, and bring the clasps into the loops and fasten the Tent, so that it shall be one.’ (Exod. 26.9–11, Propp 2006, 312)

In (119), a series of instructions is formulated by seven *wa-qatal* clauses, of which the last (וְהָיָה) has the old result meaning (see §6.5). All *wa-qatal* have the same subject ‘you’ and the meaning



is obligation. If not otherwise stated, we can presume that the instructions are to be performed in the textual order.

Imperatives may also take part in (shorter) series of continuity clauses, as in (120):

(120)  $\emptyset$ -IMP + wa-IMP + wa-IMP + wa-IMP + wa-IMP

פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֹאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְכִבְשׁוּהָ וּרְדּוּ בַדָּגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל־  
חַיַּה הָרֶמֶשׂת עַל־הָאָרֶץ:

‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.’ (Gen. 1.28)

In (120), the first imperative starts without a conjunction. This is the beginning of the paragraph (start of utterance). So this first clause signals discontinuity ( $\emptyset$ -IMP), and is a corresponding initial clause (see Table 34). The rest of the imperatives signal continuity, adding one command to the other, directed to the created humankind.

The jussive *yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ) does not usually form long series of continuity clauses. It is normally combined with imperatives and sometimes also *wa-qatal* clauses in modal sequences. A short example is (121):

(121)  $\emptyset$ -*yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ )! + wa-*yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ) + wa-*yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ )!

יִפֹּת אֱלֹהִים לְיִפֹּת וַיֵּשְׁבֶן בְּאַהֲלֵי־שֵׁם וַיְהִי כְנָעַן עֶבֶד לָמוֹ:

‘May God enlarge Japheth, and let him dwell in the tents of Shem, and let Canaan be his servant!’ (Gen. 9.27)

As the beginning of a (poetic) utterance, the sequence starts with an initial discontinuity clause signalling the beginning of the

unit. There then follow two jussive *wa-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ) which add further volitive blessings to Japheth.

## 7.12. Tenet 4: The Prototypical Negated

### Discourse-continuity Clause-type

#### *Wa-NEG-V(X)*

Tenet 4 is a statement about the pattern of negated discourse-continuity clauses in CBH. This book has shown that it holds for the clause-types *wa-lō-qatal* and *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*. It probably holds also for *wa-ʾal-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ) in modal sequences, but it is not part of our aim to show this.

**Tenet 4 of CBH text-linguistics:** The clause-type *wa-NEG-V(X)* in CBH prose texts, where *V* is a finite verb, signals discourse continuity in relation to corresponding clauses.

The characteristic feature of negated continuity clauses is that they may alternate seamlessly with corresponding affirmative continuity clauses (see Table 34), forming an unbroken main-line sequence. *NEG* may be *lō* or *ʾal* depending on the verbal morpheme that is negated. This book has many examples of Tenet 4, but it is of course falsifiable. One or two counterexamples are enough to disprove the assertion.

*Remark.* In narration, *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* has certain continuity properties, but with aspectual interruption (see §7.6.2).

For each affirmative continuity clause, there is a corresponding negated continuity clause. For historical reasons, CBH does not usually form negated continuity clauses from the same verbal morpheme (*V*) as in the corresponding affirmative clause.

If the affirmative continuity clause is *wa-V<sub>1</sub>*, the negated continuity clause is in several cases *wa-NEG-V<sub>2</sub>*, where  $V_2 \neq V_1$ , and not the expected *wa-NEG-V<sub>1</sub>*. The jussive *wa-ʾal-yiqṭol(∅)* is exceptional; it is the negative counterpart of both *wa-yiqṭol(∅)* and *wa-IMP*.<sup>141</sup>

Of course, a corresponding initial clause is usually discontinuous, but can be part of the main line (see §§7.7–8). A set of corresponding affirmative and negated continuity clauses is displayed in Table 34.

Table 34: Initial discontinuous clauses and corresponding affirmative and negated continuity clauses

| Initial discount.                  | Affirmative cont.   | Negated cont.           |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>(wa)-X-qāṭal</i> <sup>142</sup> | <i>wa(y)-yiqṭol</i> | <i>wa-lō-qāṭal</i>      |
| <i>(wa)-X-yiqṭol(u)</i>            | <i>wa-qāṭal</i>     | <i>wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)</i>  |
| <i>∅-yiqṭol(∅)</i>                 | <i>wa-yiqṭol(∅)</i> | <i>wa-ʾal-yiqṭol(∅)</i> |
| <i>∅-(X)-IMP</i>                   | <i>wa-IMP</i>       | <i>wa-ʾal-yiqṭol(∅)</i> |

The corresponding affirmative and negated continuity clauses are treated below.

### 7.12.1. *Wa(y)-yiqṭol* and Non-interruptive *Wa-lō-qāṭal*

This type of alternating with a negative clause without interruption of the main line has already been mentioned (see §5.5, and Isaksson 2015a, 256; cf. example in §7.8.2). The non-interruption of the main line is easiest to detect when the verbal semanteme is dynamic. An example is (122):

(122) *wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa-lō-qatal + wa(y)-yiqtol + wa(y)-yiqtol + “...”*

וַיֵּעֲתֶק מִשָּׁם וַיַּחְפֹּר בְּאֵר אֲחֵרֶת וְלֹא רָבוּ עָלֶיהָ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמָהּ רֶחֱבֹת וַיֹּאמֶר  
כִּי־עָתָה הִרְחִיב יְהוָה לָנוּ וּפָרִינוּ בָאָרֶץ:

‘He went away from there and dug another well, and over that one they didn’t quarrel. So he called it Rechovot, and he said: “Now at last the LORD has granted us ample space to increase in the land.”’ (Gen. 26.22)

The *wa-lō-qatal* clause expresses a temporal succession in relation to the preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses, and the succeeding *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses are also temporally sequential relative to the negated clause.<sup>143</sup>

It must be stated that discourse continuity may signal a great variety of clausal relations; temporal succession is only one of them. For a survey of the semantics of *wa*-linking in CBH, including discourse-continuity linking, see §2.3.

### 7.12.2. *Wa-qatal* and *Wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*

While *wa-qatal* has nearly completely replaced the clause-type *\*wa-yiqtol(u)*, the negated counterpart *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* is retained from Central Semitic. It functions as the negated continuity counterpart of *wa-qatal*. An example is (123):

(123) *wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-X-lō-yiqtol(u) +*  
<sup>23</sup>*wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-qatal + wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*

וַלְקַחֲתָם אֶגְדָּת אַזּוֹב וַיְבַלְתָּם בְּדָם אֲשֶׁר־בְּסֶף וַהֲגַעְתָּם אֶל־הַמִּשְׁקוּף וְאֶל־  
שְׁתֵּי הַמְּזוּזֹת מִן־הַדָּם אֲשֶׁר בְּסֶף וְאֹתָם לֹא תַצְאוּ אִישׁ מִפֶּתַח־בֵּיתוֹ עַד־בֹּקֶר:  
23 וַעֲבֹר יְהוָה לְנֶגֶף אֶת־מִצְרַיִם וְרָאָה אֶת־הַדָּם עַל־הַמִּשְׁקוּף וְעַל שְׁתֵּי  
הַמְּזוּזֹת וּפָסַח יְהוָה עַל־הַפֶּתַח וְלֹא יָתַן הַמִּשְׁחָת לָבֹא אֶל־בְּתִיכֶם לְנֶגֶף:

‘You shall take a branch of hyssop, and dip in the blood that is in the basin, and apply to the lintel and to the two doorposts some of the blood that is in the basin. And not one of you is to go out the door of his house until morning.’<sup>23</sup> The LORD will pass through to strike the Egyptians, and then he will see the blood on the lintel and the two doorposts, therefore the LORD will pass over the door, **and will not permit** the destroyer to enter your houses to strike you.’ (Exod. 12.22f.)

(123) contains an instruction section, and a section that describes what will happen in the near future (in the night) when the instruction is obeyed. The instruction (obligation) starts with three *wa-qaṭal* clauses. They describe actions that are clearly temporally sequential. There then follows as the last clause in verse 22 a discontinuity clause with a focused subject pronoun (וְאַתָּה). It is a general instruction that no one is to go out of the door until morning. The next verse is a description of what will happen during the night. The actions are temporally sequential and the meaning is future, not obligation. The last two clauses, *wa-qaṭal* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*, express what is achieved when the instruction is obeyed: the Lord will pass over and will not permit the destroyer. This is a relatively frequent meaning of continuity clauses: the focal result (see §2.3.6), which can often be translated with an initial ‘therefore’. It is important to note that the two clauses together, as a clausal complex, express the focal result: it begins with *wa-qaṭal* (וַיַּקְטֹל) and ends with *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* (וְלֹא יִקְטֹל), and both have the same meaning, except that the second is negated. In (114), the *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* is not a result clause in

relation to the immediately preceding *wa-qatal*; it is just the negated counterpart of *wa-qatal*.<sup>144</sup>

In the semantic linking of focal result illustrated above, the result is based on facts and circumstances that are presented in the preceding clause(s). The known facts motivate what is expressed by the continuity clauses (*wa-qatal* or *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*). But there is another type of result in CBH, also expressed by continuity clauses, which is based on obligational instructions. In this type of result, the linking with a continuity clause (*wa-qatal* or *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*) expresses what is achieved by following the instruction (see §2.3.8). This type of result cannot be translated with an initial ‘therefore’. A better option in many cases is an initial ‘in this way’. Such a result clause is not syntactically subordinate. We have already shown that *wa-qatal* may begin this type of supporting result clause (see §2.3.8), so it is reasonable to expect that its negated counterpart can too. An example of this is (124):

(124) *wa-qatal* + ***wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*** + *wa-qatal*

וְהָיָה עַל־אַהֲרֹן וְעַל־בָּנָיו בְּבָאֵם | אֶל־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד אִם בְּגִשְׁתֶּם אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ  
לְשֵׁרֶת בְּקֹדֶשׁ וְלֹא־יָשְׂאוּ עֹן וּמָתוּ

‘These must be on Aaron and his sons when they enter the tent of meeting, or when they approach the altar to minister in the Holy Place; **in this way they will not incur guilt** and die.’ (Exod. 28.43)

A continuity clause carries over the pragmatic ‘world’ of the preceding clause(s). In this case, it carries over and presupposes the cultic instructions and procedures described in the previous clauses. This is what the negated *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* expresses. In the

CBH syntax, an explicit phrase ‘in this way’ would be redundant. In (124), it is followed by its affirmative continuity counterpart (וַמֵּתוֹ) taking part in the same result complex. The clauses that describe the cultic regulations are focal, and the result, coded by *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-qāṭal*, is supporting.<sup>145</sup>

But carrying over the preceding pragmatic ‘world’ may also imply carrying over the preceding temporal reference. This is a relatively frequent function of *wa-qāṭal* clauses.<sup>146</sup> An example with both *wa-qāṭal* and *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* is (125):

(125) Ø-hinnē-X-qoṭel + <sup>4</sup>*wa-qāṭal* + *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)*!

הֲנֵה יְדִי־הוֹה הוֹיָה בְּמִקְנֶךָ אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה בַּסּוֹסִים בַּחֲמֹרִים בַּגְּמֻלִים בַּבָּקָר  
וּבַצֹּאן דָּבָר כָּבֵד מְאֹד: וְהִפְלִיָּה יְהוָה בֵּין מִקְנֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵין מִקְנֶה מִצְרַיִם וְלֹא  
יָמוּת מִכָּל־לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל דָּבָר:

‘The hand of the LORD is about to be on your livestock in the field, on the horses, the donkeys, the camels, and the sheep and goats— a very heavy plague. <sup>4</sup>At that time the LORD will distinguish between the livestock of Israel and the livestock of Egypt, and nothing will die of all that the Israelites have.’ (Exod. 9.3f.)

In (125), the *wa-qāṭal* clause presupposes the temporal reference of the *qoṭel* clause, and its negated counterpart follows with the same temporal reference. It is of course not necessary to translate with an explicit phrase ‘at that time’, which can be left understood also in a translation.<sup>147</sup>

An example with *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* alone carrying over the preceding temporal reference is (126):

- (126) “*wa-X-hinnē-qoṭel* + <sup>11</sup>*wa-qāṭal* + ***wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*** + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)!*” + <sup>12</sup>*wa(y)-yiqtol* + “*Ø-XØ-REL-X-qoṭel* + <sup>13</sup>*Ø-X-qāṭal* + *wa-qāṭal*”

וְאֲנִי הִנְנִי מְקִים אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם וְאֶת־זֶרְעְכֶם אֲחִירִיכֶם: 10 וְאֵת כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה אֲשֶׁר אִתְּכֶם בְּעוֹף בְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל־חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ אִתְּכֶם מִכָּל יֹצֵאֵי הַתֵּבָה לְכָל חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ: 11 וְהִקְמַתִּי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם וְלֹא־יִכָּרֵת כָּל־בָּשָׂר עוֹד מִמֶּי הַמַּבּוּל וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה עוֹד מַבּוּל לְשַׁחַת הָאָרֶץ: 12 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים זֹאת אִוֶּת־הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי נֹתֵן בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם וּבֵין כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה אֲשֶׁר אִתְּכֶם לְדֹרֹת עוֹלָם: 13 אֶת־קִשְׁטִי נֹתַתִּי בַעֲנַן וְהָיְתָה לְאוֹת בְּרִית בֵּינִי וּבֵין הָאָרֶץ:

“I am about to establish my covenant with you, with your descendants after you, <sup>10</sup>and with every living creature that is with you: the birds, the livestock and every wild animal with you, all going out of the ark, every animal on earth.

<sup>11</sup>I will establish my covenant with you, **and then never again will all living beings be destroyed** by the waters of a flood, and there will never again be a flood to destroy the earth.” <sup>12</sup>God added, “Here is the sign of the covenant that I am about to make between myself and you and every living creature with you, for all generations to come: <sup>13</sup>I herewith put my rainbow in the cloud—it will be a sign of the covenant between myself and the earth.” (Gen. 9.9–13)

(126) is an aetiological narrative about the origin of the rainbow (Westermann 1976, 634). It tells of God establishing a covenant between himself and the descendants of Noah and the rest of all living creatures. The clause-types used for making this covenant are *X-qoṭel*, *wa-qāṭal*, *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*, and *Ø-X-qāṭal*. All of them are sometimes translated with English present tense, as if all could express a performative meaning. But the regular means of expressing a performative in CBH is by using the *qāṭal* morpheme



(see §5.4.5). The active participle in main clauses in such formulations describes an intention for the immediate future. And *wa-qatal* and *X-yiqtol(u)* are regular expressions for future actions (see §§4.4, 6.11.1). It is therefore reasonable to interpret the *qatal* clause as the one with a performative meaning which establishes the covenant: “Meinen Bogen setze ich in die Wolken” (Westermann 1976, 616). The *wa-qatal* (וְהִקְמַתִּי) in verse eleven ‘I will establish my covenant’ is still describing an intention about a future action, and the following *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* (וְלֹא-יִכָּרֵת כָּל-בָּשָׂר עוֹד) takes over this futural temporal reference point: at that time, when this is done, ‘never again will all living beings be destroyed’.<sup>148</sup>

The function of *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* as the negative counterpart of *wa-qatal* is illustrated also in some complex protases in legal language, as in (127):

(127) *wa-kī-yiqtol(u) + wa-qatal + wa-lō-yiqtol(u)! + wa-qatal*

וְכִי-יִרְיֵב אָנָשִׁים וְהִכָּה-אִישׁ אֶת-רֵעֵהוּ בְּאֶבֶן אוֹ בְּאֶגְרֹף וְלֹא יָמוּת וְנָפַל  
לְמִשְׁכָּב:

‘If men fight, and one strikes his neighbor with a stone or with his fist and he does not die, but must remain in bed...’  
(Exod. 21.18)

(127) shows one complete protasis with a legal case that is formulated as a story about a man who strikes his neighbor. The events described in the story are temporally sequential and coded by *wa-qatal* and *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* clauses with the same meaning.<sup>149</sup>

The function of *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* as the negative counterpart of *wa-qatal* is also displayed in descriptions of future series of events, as in (128):

(128)  $\emptyset$ -bə-VN + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-qatal* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*

בְּשִׁבְרִי לָכֶם מִטֶּהֱלַחַם וְאָפוּ עֶשְׂרֵי נָשִׁים לַחֲמֶכֶם בְּתֵנּוֹר אֶחָד וְהָשִׁיבוּ  
לַחֲמֶכֶם בַּמֶּשְׁקָל וְאָכְלִיתֶם וְלֹא תִשְׂבְּעוּ: ס

‘When I cut off your supply of bread, ten women will bake your bread in one oven; and they will ration your bread by weight, and you will eat and not be satisfied.’ (Lev. 26.26)

As continuity clauses, both *wa-qatal* and *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* may in specific text-types express temporally successive actions, and this is the case in (128). In the example, *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* does not express a result. It is just the negated counterpart of affirmative *wa-qatal*.<sup>150</sup>

### 7.12.3. *Wa-yiqtol(∅)* and *Wa-’al-yiqtol(∅)*

Jussive *wa-yiqtol(∅)* and *wa-’al-yiqtol(∅)* do not form long sequences of continuity clauses. Modal sequences usually combine imperatives, jussives (including cohortatives), and additional instructions in the form of *wa-qatal* clauses (see §6.4). An example of a modal sequence with only jussives is (129):

(129)  $\emptyset$ -*yiqtol(∅)* + *wa-yiqtol(∅)* + *wa-’al-yiqtol(∅)*

תִּכְבֶּד הָעֵבֶדָה עַל־הָאֲנָשִׁים וַיַּעֲשׂוּ־בָהּ וְאִל־יִשְׁעוּ בְּדִבְרֵי־שָׁקֶר:

‘Let the work be hard upon the men; so let them do it, and not look to words of deceit.’ (Exod. 5.9, Propp 1999, 244)

In (129), the initial main-line jussive is asyndetic and discontinuous. It is followed by two continuity jussives with initial *wa*, of which the last is negated with *’al*. As is often, but not always, the case, the continuity jussives receive a nuance of purpose (see

§2.3.9). (129) illustrates that *wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)* may function as the negative continuity counterpart of *wa-yiqtol(∅)*.<sup>151</sup> Most other cases of *wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)* are to be analysed as negated imperative clauses (see §7.12.4).

#### 7.12.4. *Wa-IMP* and *Wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)*

The main focus in this section is on the negated continuity volitive clause-type *wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)*. The exact sequence *wa-IMP* + *wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)*, with a discourse-continuity *wa-IMP* clause directly followed by a negated continuity clause *wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)*, is not attested in my database. An example of *wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)* functioning as a discourse-continuity negated imperative clause is (130):

(130) *∅-IMP* + *∅-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)*<sup>152</sup> + *wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)* + *∅-IMP* + *pen-yiqtol(u)*!

הַמֶּלֶט עַל-נַפְשְׁךָ אֶל-תִּבְיֹט אַחֲרָיִךְ וְאֶל-תַּעֲמֹד בְּכָל-הַכְּבֹד הַהָרָה הַמֶּלֶט פֶּן-  
תִּסָּפֶה:

‘Flee for your lives! Don’t look back, and don’t stop anywhere in the plain! Flee to the mountains or you will be swept away!’ (Gen. 19.17)

The modal sequence in (130) consists of three syntactically independent imperative clauses, of which one is negated (*∅-IMP*; *∅-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)*; *∅-IMP*). A discourse-continuity negated imperative (*wa-ʿal-yiqtol(∅)*) follows the asyndetic negated clause (*אֶל-תַּעֲמֹד*). The negated jussives are combined as if they form a semantic unit.

Continuity clauses after an initial imperative may create a semantically unified sequence of events, as in (131):

(131) *wa-‘attā-IMP + wa-ʾal-yiqṭol(Ø) + wa-ʾal-yiqṭol(Ø)*

וְעַתָּה הִשָּׁמְרִי נָא וְאַל-תִּשְׁתֵּי יַיִן וְשִׁכָּר וְאַל-תֹּאכַל כָּל-טָמֵא

‘Now be careful! Do not drink wine or beer, and do not eat anything unclean.’ (Judg. 13.4)

The modal sequence in (131) concerns what Manoah’s wife should take care to do. Because of the semantics of the first verb (הִשָּׁמְרִי), the following negated continuity clauses with jussive morphemes are interpreted as complements, ‘Now see to it that you do not drink wine and beer...’ (see §2.3.9).<sup>153</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For *wayyiqṭol* and *wa-X-qatal*, this is formulated by Niccacci (1990, §§39, 40). Also, but more generally, Longacre and Hwang (1994, 345): “Discontinuities marked by departure from *wayyiqṭol* clauses, introduce further information into the narrative.”

<sup>2</sup> Niccacci (1990, 64, 71): “WAYYIQTOL → (WAW-)X-QATAL (note that the WAW can be omitted).”

<sup>3</sup> As Niccacci (1990, 65, 71, 112), for example, puts it: “simple nominal clause, usually preceded by WAW.”

<sup>4</sup> Pardee (2012, 290) proposes the term “*w*-retentive forms” for both *wa(y)-yiqṭol* and *wa-qatal*. But *wa-qatal* has developed imperfective meanings which cannot be called retention of the original West Semitic perfective *qatal*. ‘Symmetry’ has also been adduced as a driving force behind the development of ‘consecutive’ *wa-qatal*, but symmetry is not a feature that must be expected in a living language (Cook 2012, 104).

<sup>5</sup> In a similar way, Müller (1991, 156) compares *wa* with the German *und*. Tropper (1996, 635) defines its meaning in Biblical Hebrew and Old Aramaic as “und (dann).”

<sup>6</sup> For a critical discussion of discourse types, see Notarius (2008, 57–59; 2013, 10f., 51–53).

<sup>7</sup> Givón (1983, 7): “The thematic paragraph is the most immediately relevant level of discourse within which one can begin to discuss the

complex process of *continuity in discourse*.” See further Bailey and Levinsohn (1992, 193–205); Buth (1995); Hornkohl (2018, 48f.).

<sup>8</sup> The most concrete of these is the last one, ‘topics/participants continuity’; cf. Givón (1977, 203; 1983, 7); Buth (1995, 97–99); Hornkohl (2018, 48). “Action continuity pertains primarily to *temporal sequentiality* within thematic paragraph, but also to temporal *adjacency* therein... In the grammar/syntax, which is primarily (though not exclusively) a clause-level coding instrument, action continuity receives its expression strongly and universally via the tense–aspect–modality sub-system most commonly attached to the verbal word” (Givón 1983, 8). According to the traditional terminology, it is “the converted forms” that express continued topicality and, in the case of *wa(y)-yiqtol*, “controls the *flow* of the story” (Smith 1991, 14, quoting Givón 1977, 198). From a cross-linguistic perspective, common signals of continuity are “zero anaphora” and “unstressed/bound pronouns or grammatical agreement” (Givón 1983, 17). Among the grammatical signals of discontinuity, Givón (2001, II:225) enumerates “*Y-movement* or *contrastive topicalization*,” which “often involves fronting of the contrasted topic—if it is normally in a non-initial position in the clause” (see also Fox 1983, 219).

<sup>9</sup> In the Ugaritic poetry, there are examples of discontinuity marked by *\*qatala* introducing background information, for example, KTU<sup>3</sup> 1.16:III: 13–15, where *kly* expresses that the food, wine and oil ‘had been consumed’ or ‘used up’ (Smith 1991, 69).

<sup>10</sup> Biblical Hebrew has, according to Givón (1983, 33), a “pragmatically-controlled word-order flexibility,” and thus “the preverbal position of NP’s covers a wide range of *discontinuity*,” the post-verbal position, on the other hand, includes both the neutral word order and right dislocation. Smith (1991, 14) also refers to Givón (1983). Cook (2012a, 297f.) argues that “deviations from *wayyiqtol*” may indicate e.g. “focus fronting,” avoidance of temporally successive interpretation, “marking of a new discourse section,” and “signaling of background information,” but he disregards the role of *wa* in the signalling of continuity. According to Fox (1983, 226), who works with the text of Genesis, “the OV word-

order for objects in EBH is always a contrastive, localized referential device,” while the SV word order is often “used to re-introduce a topic back into the register over a much larger gap of absence.” SV-ordered subjects are much more discontinuous than VS-ordered, and an OV word order has a definite discontinuous nature (Fox 1983, 236, 226, 247).

<sup>11</sup> Here ‘//’ means ‘is interrupted by’. Parentheses mark a variant: ‘(wa)’ means that *wa* is an option, and the alternative is zero marking (asyndesis). Tenet 1 is revised compared to Isaksson (2021, 217–20), in order to account for the various discontinuity functions of *qoṭel* clauses (1c) and the aspectual contrast of *wa-qatal* in narrative discourse (1e).

<sup>12</sup> The X in a *wa-XV* discontinuous clause cannot be a simple negation such as *lō* (cf. Tenet 4). Tenet 1a should be read: a series of clauses of the type *wa-VX* is interrupted by a clause of the *wa-XV* type. The *wa*-introduced discontinuity is the most frequent type of discontinuous linking in my corpus, but asyndesis is also used (Tenet 1b). For example, after a *wa(y)-yiqtol* main line, I have registered 101 discontinuity clauses of the  $\emptyset$ -*X-qatal* type and 267 of the *wa-X-qatal* type. Similarly, after a *wa-qatal* main line, I have 86 clauses of the type  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)*, but 138 of the type *wa-X-yiqtol(u)*.

<sup>13</sup> This includes all linkings with *qoṭel* clauses, finite and infinite. Some of them could have been discussed under Tenet 1e, because of some obvious imperfective meanings of *qoṭel* such as habitual action, but I have decided to treat all linkings with *qoṭel* clauses under 1c in order to achieve a unified description of the variety of *qoṭel* linkings.

<sup>14</sup> To achieve a consistent and intuitive notation, I designate verbless clauses as *X $\emptyset$* , where X stands for any first constituent in the clause and  $\emptyset$  the absence of a verb. Tenets 1c and 1d indicate that participle clauses and verbless clauses, with or without initial *wa*, may also signal discourse discontinuity.

<sup>15</sup> This concerns the aspectual contrast perfective // imperfective, which from a comparative perspective is not dependent on word order, but is coded by a gram-switch from a perfective to an imperfective morpheme

(Isaksson 2009, 91f.). The originally imperfective *yiqtol(u)* in CBH is sometimes used in imperfective contrast linking; see §7.6.1. *Wa-qatal* (§7.6.3) and *qoṭel* (§7.6.4) also express imperfective contrast in relation to a main-line *wa(y)-yiqtol*.

<sup>16</sup> The case of *wa-X-qatal* + *wayyiqtol* starting a “short independent narrative” is pointed out by Niccacci (1990, §89). He also mentions *wa-X-yiqtol* + *wayyiqtol* and *(wa)-XØ* + *wayyiqtol* as comprising “the beginning of the narrative” (Niccacci 1990, §91).

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of the concept of paragraph, see Longacre (1979, 115–17).

<sup>18</sup> This is what Givón (1983, 9) calls a chain initial topic: “(i) Characteristically a newly-introduced, newly-changed or newly-returned topic; thus (ii) Characteristically a *discontinuous* topic in terms of the preceding discourse context; but (iii) Potentially—if an important topic—a rather *persistent* topic in terms of the *succeeding* discourse context.” There is a parallel in the chaining syntax of Ugaritic poetry: “While the Ugaritic prefix forms are used to present sequence of action in the main narrative poems, the Baal Cycle, Keret and Aqhat (so Fenton 1973, 32), Ugaritic \**qatala* signals a disjunction in the narrative. Furthermore, those instances of Ugaritic \**qatala* beginning a new narrative section which reverts to prefix verbal forms... correspond to the BH prose construction of initial \**qatal* followed by converted imperfects” (Smith 1991, 67f. n. 3). By ‘converted imperfects’ Smith refers to *wa(y)-yiqtol* clauses.

<sup>19</sup> I define ‘main-line clause’ as a foregrounded clause (see §1.2.8, and Hopper and Thompson 1980, 280, 283, 294; Cook 2012, 283–88). Such a clause often, but not always, signals discourse continuity.

<sup>20</sup> As in Sarah’s reply to the Lord in a one-clause rejoinder: לֹא צִחֲקָתִי ‘I did not laugh!’ (Gen. 18.15).

<sup>21</sup> Examples of foregrounded *(wa)-hinnē-(X)-qoṭel* beginning a new paragraph: Gen. 38.13; 48.4, 21; Exod. 8.25; 16.4; Num. 25.6; 25.12; Judg. 4.22 (new scene with a new actant); 7.13 (dream report); 19.16. Foregrounded *(wa)-hinnē-XØ* is not found in the corpus, but cf. 1 Kgs 19.13.

<sup>22</sup> For the term ‘corresponding’, see §7.12 and Table 34. I exclude *V = qoṭel*, because *wa-qoṭel* as finite verb clause is an extremely rare phenomenon. Possible but doubtful examples with *V = qoṭel* are: Gen. 16.11 (but could be *wa-qatal*; according to HALOT, it is a mixed formation); 20.16; 28.12 (functions as an added attribute after another *qoṭel*, in dream report); 41.32 (future); Judg. 8.4 (but in attributive circumstantial position; see further §4.1.1.1 and §7.4); 13.19 (*wa-qoṭel* after pause expresses background: immediate future action in the past by an actant in the foregoing clause); 18.7 (but attributive). The *wa-hinnē-qoṭel* clause-type is not used as a discourse-continuity clause in dream reports. Every *wa-hinnē-qoṭel* introduces a new scene in the dream, and the discourse-continuity clause-type to be used within the scene is often *wa(y)-yiqtol*, as many *wa-hinnē-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* linkings show, for example Gen. 28.13; 41.2–4 (past time reference; Joosten 2012, 187); 41.6f., 18–20, 23f.; Judg. 7.13.

<sup>23</sup> Schüle (2000, 105): “Damit liegt nahe, daß sich in der festen Verbindung von *wa-* und *yáqtul* Progreß nicht auf die Verbalform, sondern auf das *wa* = bezieht.” It must be added that *wa(y)-yiqtol* is often used as continuity clause in background complexes, as in Judg. 4.4f.

<sup>24</sup> Joosten (2012, 38) maintains that “[i]n Hebrew texts, verb-initial clauses imply discursive continuity, while non-verb-initial clauses normally imply some type of discontinuity.” This is necessary, but it is not sufficient. A discourse-continuity clause must also be preceded by the conjunction *wa*. It seems that Joosten recognises only two types of continuity clauses, *wa(y)-yiqtol* and *wa-qatal*, leaving out the possibility that jussive *wa-yiqtol* (short) can express discourse continuity in a modal domain (cf. Joosten 2012, 18 n. 26).

<sup>25</sup> For negation in CBH, see Sjörs (2018, ch. 5).

<sup>26</sup> For historical reasons, the *qatal* gram has replaced indicative *yiqtol(Ø)* (< *\*yaqtul*) in negated narrative main-line clauses, so that the negative continuity counterpart of *wa(y)-yiqtol* is not *\*wa-lō-yiqtol(Ø)* but *wa-lō-qatal* (an innovation). Simple negated clauses of the types *wa-lō-qatal*



and *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* signal discourse continuity in spite of the clausal element (only the negation) between the conjunction and the verb. In Biblical Hebrew, the *qatal* morpheme has taken over the application field of negated realis short *yiqtol*, whereas in Amarna Canaanite, *wa-lā-yaqtul* and *wa-lā-qatal* are used interchangeably (Baranowski 2016a, 188). So the negative clause-type *wa-lā-yaqtul* is attested in Amarna, but not in Biblical Hebrew. We do not find an indicative *\*wa-lō-yiqtol(Ø)* anywhere in CBH. As for imperfective clauses, the negative counterpart of *wa-qatal* in CBH is *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* (the latter being a retention). The innovative imperfective clause-type *wa-qatal* never developed a corresponding negative clause, since *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* existed and was fully functional in all phases of CBH (it could not be confused with *\*wa-lō-yiqtol(Ø)* since the latter had been discarded already in Proto-Hebrew).

<sup>27</sup> Pace Gentry (1998, 14), who assigns the “negated forms” to the non-sequential category.

<sup>28</sup> For an attempt, see Dallaire (2014).

<sup>29</sup> For *wa(y)-yiqtol* // *(wa)-X-yiqtol(u)*, the imperfective interruption, see §7.6.1.

<sup>30</sup> See §2.3.6. My example is Gen. 44.20 with a stative *qatal*: וְאֶבְיוֹ אֶהְיֶה: ‘and (therefore) his father loves him’, because he is the only one of his mother’s sons left.

<sup>31</sup> I have one example of a stative *wa-X-qatal* functioning as a temporal clause after *wa(y)-yiqtol*: Judg. 4.1, ‘The Israelites again did evil in the LORD’s sight **after Ehud’s death** (וְאַחֲרֵי מוֹת עֲהוּד:)’.

<sup>32</sup> This is Exod. 6.3–5, where 6.4 *wa-gam-qatal* and 6.5 *wa-gam-S.pron-qatal* in a personal report and summary enumerate the actions of YHWH.

<sup>33</sup> “Some of the details of Jacob’s methods are obscure” (Wenham 1994, 256), and so is the function of the discontinuity *wa-X-qatal* clause in Gen. 30.40 (וְהַכְשִׁיבִים הַפְרִיד יַעֲקֹב), preceded by *wa(y)-yiqtol* in 30.39. It may perhaps signal a new paragraph.

<sup>34</sup> Examples of contrasting *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qatal*: Gen. 1.5 (day/night; Rainey 2003, 13; Hornkohl 2018, 37); 1.10; 2.20; 4.2; 11.3;

12.15f.; 14.10, 16; 15.10; 18.33; 20.15f.; 25.6—Cook (2012, 297) calls this “focus fronting;” 31.47; 32.22 (but it could be a *wa-S.pron-qotel* and circumstantial clause); 35.18 (cf. Cook 2012, 298); 37.11; 40.21f.; 41.54; 42.3f., 8 (Hornkohl 2018, 37); Exod. 6.3; 9.6; 12.38; 14.28f.; 15.19; 16.13 (also temporal succession because of בְּכֶכֶךְ); 20.21; Num. 11.10 (I interpret עָרָא as *qatal*, in accordance with HALOT); 12.15; 14.38; 16.27, 34—but according to Buth (1995, 96), this is background; Judg. 1.25 (simultaneous foregrounded event; Cook 2012, 296); 1.28 (*wa-VNabs-lō-qatal*, contrasting actions); 4.16; 6.40; 7.3, 6, 8 (2 ×), 25; 9.18; 20.32.

<sup>35</sup> Examples of complementary *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qatal*: Gen. 18.6f.—Cook (2012, 297) calls this “focus fronting;” 19.6 (went out and shut the door); 19.9–11 (this is a case of polarity of actions, where four sequential *wa(y)-yiqtol* and then two simultaneous *wa-X-qatal* make up a whole sequence of actions, and the last *wa(y)-yiqtol*, וַיֵּלֶךְ, is sequential to the preceding *qatal* clause, ‘therefore’); 24.46, 53; 27.15f.; 32.2; 33.16f. (Esau and Jacob), 17 (he built a house and shelters, expected complementary actions); 41.51f. (Manasseh and Ephraim); 43.15, 21f.; 45.14; 47.20f.; Exod. 9.23 (Moses and the Lord, a mutuality); 9.25, 33; 14.6 (his chariots and his army); 17.10; 24.6 (“reciprocity,” according to Propp 2006, 295); 36.10 (five curtains and five other curtains); 36.17, 23f., 24f.; 37.26f.; 39.17f.; 40.34 (the cloud and the glory of the Lord, a mutual action); Lev. 8.15 (the blood and the rest of the blood); 8.16f. (the bull and the rest of the bull); 8.19f. (the ram and the rest of the ram); 8.20f., 25f.; 9.9–11 (the blood, the rest of the blood, and the fat and the kidneys); Num. 13.30f. (Caleb and the men); 13.33 (mutuality); 24.25; 31.9; 32.34–37 (the Gadites and the Reubenites); 32.40f.; Judg. 1.8 (put the city to the sword and set it on fire); 3.6 (their daughters and their own daughters); 7.25; 8.12, 16f.; 9.45, 56f.; 11.17, 29; 18.27.

<sup>36</sup> Examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qatal* expressing background: Gen. 6.8; 8.5 (Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 8.13f.; 22.20–23 (anticipating information about who was the father of Isaac’s wife Rebekah); 31.25, 33f. (Moshavi 2013; Hornkohl 2018, 45, 49 n. 64); 34.4f. (inserted

background complex; *pace* Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64, 52); 34.7 (Joosten 2012, 169 n. 24; Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 37.35f.; 41.56f. (Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 42.22f.; 48.9f. (Cook 2012, 212); Exod. 9.30–32; 10.13; 11.9f.; 12.34–36; 16.34f. (narrator's comment); 17.12; 24.10f., 13f. (pluperfect; Propp 2006, 107); 36.3, 6f.; Lev. 24.23; Num. 13.22; 14.10, 44; 17.12, 15 (Buth 1995, 95); 26.9–11 (within a relative clause complex); Judg. 1.20f., 33; 2.16f.; 3.19; 4.3 (pluperfect); 6.21 (pluperfect); 7.1 (geographical information); 7.8; 8.11, 29f.; 9.51f.; 11.39; 14.3f.; 16.20, 31; 18.30; 20.34, 42; 21.8.

<sup>37</sup> Examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qaṭal* expressing elaboration, where I include also cases where there is no 'echoing' but only more details of the event (cf. Dixon 2009, 27): Gen. 7.15f. (with left dislocation and then focused elements); 19.3 (a detail is focused, *niṣṣṣ*); 39.4, 22; Exod. 12.29 (or the *wayhī* clause starts athetic cleft; Khan 2019); 13.18; 35.21; 36.33f. (details in the production of the bars in the tabernacle); 38.27f.; Num. 31.7b–8; Judg. 12.9 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qaṭal* + *wa-X-qaṭal*).

<sup>38</sup> Examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-hinnē-qaṭal* expressing the content of a (sometimes understood) perception: Gen. 6.12; 8.13 'and he saw that the surface of the ground was dry'; 19.28; Exod. 4.7; 9.7; 16.10 (understood perception verb); 34.30; 39.43; Num. 17.7, 23; Judg. 6.28; 20.40. I count Num. 17.12 and Judg. 21.8 as background.

<sup>39</sup> JPS TANAKH 1985: 'Thereafter the Levites were qualified to perform their service in the Tent of Meeting'. Other examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-ADV-qaṭal* describing an emphatic temporal succession: Gen. 23.17–19; 45.15 (see also §2.3.5); Exod. 34.32.

<sup>40</sup> For *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *Ø-X-yiqtol(u)*, see §7.6.1.

<sup>41</sup> Complementary actions are usually syndetic (*wa-X-qaṭal*), but Exod. 36.11 is an exception, describing the production of the first and second (complementary) sets of the end curtain.

<sup>42</sup> The semantics of the *Ø-X-qaṭal* linking in Gen. 7.8 are unclear. The asyndesis and the discontinuity are probably a case of literary style (Westermann 1976). Gen. 7.7f. constitutes the fulfilment of the God's

command in Gen. 7.1 and 7.2–3, where we also encounter asyndesis in 7.2 (see Wenham 1987, 179). The linking is also unclear in Gen. 8.18f., and for the same reason (fulfilment of command in Gen. 8.16f. with asyndetic syntax).

<sup>43</sup> Since  $\emptyset$ -*lō-qāṭal* also signals discontinuity, such examples are included here (it does not fulfil Tenet 3).

<sup>44</sup> Other examples of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qāṭal* expressing elaboration: Gen. 7.19f.; 13.11f.; 27.36 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-qāṭal* + *wa-hinnē-‘attā-qāṭal*); 34.27f.; 41.11, 12, 13 (the first *qāṭal* clause is elaborative in relation to the initial *wayhī*, and the two following *qāṭal* clauses with initial object pronouns form contrastive topics; Hornkohl 2018, 37); 41.48; 44.12; 45.21f. (a fulfilment of Pharaoh's instructions in vv. 16–20); 46.6f.; 49.28; 50.23; Exod. 8.13; 10.23 ( $\emptyset$ -*lō-qāṭal*); 34.28; 35.22; 36.8—Propp (2006, 625) translates, ‘Griffins, webster’s work he made them’; 36.11f., 14, 35; 37.7f. (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-qāṭal* +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-qāṭal*); 37.9, 17, 25; 38.3, 7; 39.8f.; Num. 2.34; 3.49f.; 7.6–9; 8.3; 11.32; 33.3; Deut. 9.9, 18; 29.4; Judg. 6.2; 20.48.

<sup>45</sup> Nearly all my summary examples have an initial *kēn*: Gen. 6.22; Exod. 7.6; 12.28; 37.23f. (but <sup>23</sup>*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + <sup>24</sup> $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-qāṭal*); 39.32; 40.16; Num. 1.54; 5.4; 8.20; 9.5; 17.26.

<sup>46</sup> Examples of same-event addition coded by the linking *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qāṭal* in CBH: Gen. 7.21f.; Exod. 8.27 ‘not even one was left’; 10.19; 14.28; Deut. 2.34; Judg. 4.16.

<sup>47</sup> Similar negated clauses with circumstantial semantics in a *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qāṭal* linking: Exod. 10.22f.; 34.28; Deut. 9.18; 29.4.

<sup>48</sup> The  $\emptyset$ -*NP-REL-qāṭal* is a left dislocation.

<sup>49</sup> Possible examples of background information coded by *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qāṭal*: Gen. 25.9f., 18; 29.34 (with initial adverbial ‘*al-kēn*’); 29.35 (‘*al-kēn*’); 30.6 (‘*al-kēn*’); Exod. 37.14 (with copula verb); Lev. 8.29; Num. 4.48f.; Judg. 6.19 (the clauses  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-qāṭal* + *wa-O.noun-qāṭal* are both background); 7.19 ‘just after they had changed the guards’; 20.15.

<sup>50</sup> Examples of comments by the editor(s) coded by the linking *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qaṭal*: Gen. 6.4 (for a discussion, see Westermann 1976, 509f.); 11.8f. (*al-kēn*); 16.13f. (*al-kēn*); 19.22 (*al-kēn*); 21.30f. (*al-kēn*); 25.30 (*al-kēn*); 31.48 (*al-kēn*); 33.17 (*al-kēn*); Exod. 4.25f. ( $\emptyset$ -*āz-qaṭal*); Exod. 15.23 (*al-kēn*); Num. 13.23f.; 31.52f. ‘Each soldier had taken plunder for himself’; Judg. 15.19 (*al-kēn*); 18.12. I have generally not taken examples from genealogies, but there is one in Gen. 4.20.

<sup>51</sup> Examples of contrast coded by the linking *wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*X-qaṭal*: Gen. 3.14–17 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*PrP-qaṭal* + *wa-PrP-qaṭal*)—according to Hornkohl (2018, 36, 52), the non-subjectival frontings here serve as genuine topics highlighting the addressee of each curse; 47.20–22 (*raq*); 47.26 (*raq*); 50.8 (*raq*); Exod. 9.26.

<sup>52</sup> In one instance, Lev. 23.21 (וְקִרְאתֶם בְּעֶצְמָם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה מִקְרָא לְדָשׁ יְהִיֶּה לָכֶם) with linking pattern *wa-qaṭal* +  $\emptyset$ -*S.noun-yiqtol(u)*! +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-lō-yiqtol(u)*, the asyndetic *yiqtol(u)* clauses describe the content of the proclamation in the *wa-qaṭal* clause. It is an account, a summary, not a quotation of the proclamation. On this point, I follow Milgrom (2001, 1933, 2009), who finds the syntax awkward; he translates ‘On that very day, you shall proclaim: It shall be for you a sacred occasion, you must do no laborious work’. The linking can, however, be interpreted simply as an elaboration with more details.

<sup>53</sup> Two rare cases when *wa-qaṭal* forms a protasis and  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* is the apodosis: Exod. 12.44; Lev. 10.19. It is a linking, but the *wa-qaṭal* cannot be said to form a main line which is interrupted.

<sup>54</sup> In two instances, the  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* constitutes an asyndetic relative clause: Deut. 13.17 (וְהָיְתָה תֵּל עוֹלָם לֹא תִבְנֶה עוֹד: וּבְנֵיתָ שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה 27.5 אֶלֶּהִיד מִזְבֵּחַ אֲבָנִים לֹא-תִגְנִיף עֲלֵיהֶם בְּרוּל: In my estimation, the  $\emptyset$ -*X-yiqtol(u)* are relative clauses, each closely related to a preceding constituent in the *wa-qaṭal*, but many translators take them as elaborations; thus NET Deut. 13.17 ‘It will be an abandoned ruin forever—it must never be rebuilt again’.

<sup>55</sup> There is future meaning in ten cases: Gen. 17.16, 20; Exod. 8.7, 19; 29.37; 30.25, 29; Lev. 10.19; Num. 11.18f.; Deut. 13.17. Habitual past

meaning: Exod. 18.26; 40.31f. Permissive meaning: Lev. 6.6; 25.46; Num. 6.20 (the *yiqtol(u)* clause).

<sup>56</sup> Other examples of *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol(u)* expressing elaboration without echoing the first clause: Gen. 17.16, 20; Exod. 8.19; 21.8 (the apodosis); 23.5 (*wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -VNabs-*yiqtol(u)*, in apodosis); 25.14f., 26f., 31; 27.2, 3; 28.6f., 20; 29.34; 30.36; Lev. 1.17; 3.9 (difficult; see Milgrom 1991, 203); 5.11; 13.11 (*wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -lō-*yiqtol(u)*); 23.15 (thus Milgrom 2001, 1933); 23.20, 32; 24.5; 25.29 (the apodosis); 25.30, 46, 52; 27.12, 33; Num. 5.15; 10.6; 11.19; 19.11f.; 28.19; 29.7; 35.5; Deut. 7.2 (two asyndetic *yiqtol(u)* clauses); 12.7f.; 25.12.

<sup>57</sup> Other examples of *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol(u)* expressing elaboration with 'echoing': Exod. 12.4, 8, 14; 18.26 (both  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol(u)* have past habitual meaning; Zewi 1999, 119, 139); 25.11, 18, 29, 31 (the first  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol(u)*); 26.7, 17, 31; 28.9–11, 13f., 15, 32, 37; 30.1, 7, 10; 40.31f.; Lev. 4.12; 7.12f.; 12.2; 14.5f.; 23.11, 15f., 41; 25.9; 27.8; Num. 3.47; 6.9; 19.5; 33.54.

<sup>58</sup> Examples of *wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol(u)* expressing same-event addition: Exod. 29.37; 30.29; Deut. 5.32 (not turning right or left is another aspect of doing what the LORD has commanded).

<sup>59</sup> The other contrast example in my corpus is Exod. 21.19 (*wa-qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -raq-O.noun-*yiqtol(u)* + *wa*-VNabs-*yiqtol(u)*), with obligatory meaning in both clauses.

<sup>60</sup> I also exclude from the discussion the cases of  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* after a left dislocation, as in Gen. 34.8; 47.21; Exod. 9.30.

<sup>61</sup> Other examples of virtual \* $\emptyset$ -*qatal* in monoclausal constructions with initial focus marker *wayhî*: Exod. 12.51; 16.27; 40.17; Deut. 1.3.

<sup>62</sup> Other examples of reports beginning with  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* (performatives not included): Gen. 27.35; 30.6 (anterior, with 'energetic' suffix on *qatal*; Zewi 1999, 150); 30.18 (anterior); 37.17 (anterior, clause-initial *qatal*; Korchin 2008, 332); 38.24 (anterior); 39.14 (*rəʾû* with anterior  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatal*; Korchin 2008, 331 n. 15); 42.28 (anterior); 47.25 (anterior); Exod. 32.9 (anterior); 35.30 (anterior after *rəʾû*); Deut. 1.20, 41 (both anterior); Judg. 16.2, 23 (both anterior and single clause utterances).

<sup>63</sup> Non-reportive examples in my corpus: Gen. 14.22 (performative); 23.13 (performative, not beginning of speech, but new paragraph); 32.11 (stative verb, preceded in 32.10 only by a vocative with quotation); 38.26 (stative); Exod. 21.5 (stative); 32.9 (anterior); Num. 11.5 (stative; Brockelmann 1908–13, II, §76b—it is an independent clause in direct speech); 14.20 (performative or anterior); Deut. 1.20, 41 (both anterior); 26.3 (performative; Rainey 2003b, 11); 30.19 (performative); Judg. 15.3 (stative).

<sup>64</sup> According to Joosten (2012, 218),  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* here is “text-critically or otherwise doubtful.” Instances of  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* expressing elaboration (with echoing): Gen. 21.14—the  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* clause elaborates upon וַיִּתֵּן אֶל-הָהָגֶר, but Joosten (2012, 218), regards it as completely irregular, while Driver (1892, §163), interprets it as circumstantial, ‘having placed it and the boy on her shoulder’: some scholars analyses *šām* as *qoṭel*, which is possible; 48.14—‘he crossed his hands’ is past perfective and elaborates upon the preceding *wa(y)-yiqṭol*: it is not circumstantial, as argued by Driver (1892, §163); Exod. 35.31–35; 32.7f.; Num. 7.18f.; 30.15 (*wa-qatāl* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl*, anterior); Deut. 9.16 (*wa-hinnē-qatāl* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl*); Judg. 20.42f. (*qoṭel* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl*)—according to Boling (1975, 283), within background complex, and according to Joosten (2012, 218), text-critically doubtful.

<sup>65</sup> Examples of  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* expressing elaboration without echo or same-event addition (another aspect of the same event) in relation to the preceding clause: Exod. 14.3 ( $\emptyset$ -*X* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl*, elaboration); Num. 17.11 (*kī-qatāl* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* ‘for wrath has gone out from the LORD—the plague has begun!’, elaboration); Judg. 2.17 (elaboration); 7.14 ( $\emptyset$ -‘*ēn*-*X* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl*, same-event); 20.31 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl*) ‘The Benjaminites went out to attack the army, they left the city unguarded’—this is another aspect of the same event, but Driver (1892, §163) takes it as circumstantial.

<sup>66</sup> Other examples of  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl* as complement: Gen. 21.7 (after utterance verb); Deut. 13.15 (*wa-hinnē-X* +  $\emptyset$ -*qatāl*); 17.4 (same as 13.15).

<sup>67</sup> According to Joosten (2012, 218), the use of  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* here is completely irregular. Another possible example is Gen. 40.10, in a dream report (*wa-X* $\emptyset$  +  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* +  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal*, where the second  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* is temporally sequential).

<sup>68</sup> The *rār* is admittedly a hapax, but it is *qaṭal* (Milgrom 1991, 908).

<sup>69</sup> Other examples of  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* as apodosis: Gen. 43.14 (stative verb with implied future time reference; Gropp 1991, 47; Cook 2012, 207 n. 46)—J-M (§1760, p. 610 n. 1) argues that the asyndesis is caused by assonance and should be analysed as *wa-qaṭal*; Exod. 22.14 (( $\emptyset$ -*im-X* $\emptyset$ ) +  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal*, ‘then he has already paid for it’, but the interpretation of apodosis is disputed; see Propp 2006: 105, 252); Lev. 13.37 (anterior projected into a future case); Deut. 4.25f. (performative in an oath formula); 8.19 (performative; Rainey 2003b, 11f.; Cook 2012, 207 n. 46).

<sup>70</sup> Schulz (1900, 41) and Li (2017, 6) consider the *wa-qaṭal* to be simple past (same as *qaṭal*).

<sup>71</sup> Topic–comment examples with  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* as comment: Gen. 31.41; Num. 11.8; 14.4; Deut. 34.4 (present anterior: ‘This is the land... I have let you see it’).

<sup>72</sup> Some examples from archaic poetry: Deut. 32.6, 15, 18, 37 (Isaksson 2017, 242f., 248, 249f., 258f.).

<sup>73</sup> The אחר is often emendated to אחר (Westermann 1981, 432), but this is not necessary. *’aḥar* can be an adverb ‘behind’ (HALOT). Wenham (1994, 98) retains the text.

<sup>74</sup> Other instances of  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* functioning as relative clause in my prose corpus: Lev. 13.39 (in an apodosis,  $\emptyset$ -*X* $\emptyset$  +  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal* +  $\emptyset$ -*X* $\emptyset$ ); 14.46 (after a construct head noun; Zewi 2020, 94).

<sup>75</sup> Instances of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -(*X*)-*qoṭel*: Gen. 3.8; 21.9 (Brockelmann 1956, §103a; Westermann 1981, 412); 21.14—pace Driver (1892, §163), who takes it as  $\emptyset$ -*qaṭal*, while Joosten (2012, 218 n. 40) calls it an anomalous *qaṭal*; 25.27 (close to nominal יָשַׁב); 39.23 (background, see above); Exod. 2.11; 5.20; 14.9, 30; 36.20; 37.9 (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* +  $\emptyset$ -*qoṭel* +  $\emptyset$ -*qoṭel* + *wa-X* $\emptyset$ ); Num. 7.89; 11.10; 15.33; 22.23, 31; 24.2; Deut. 4.12 ( $\emptyset$ -*X*-*qoṭel*); 28.7; Judg. 1.24; 12.14; 18.7. I am unable to



explain Judg. 8.4 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* +  $\emptyset$ -*qoṭel*); see Sasson (2014, 360) for a discussion.

<sup>76</sup> Examples of circumstantial *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(X)-qoṭel*: Gen. 14.13 (X = *S.pron*); 18.1, 8 (both *S.pron*); 18.10 (*S.noun*, but possibly background); 18.16, 22 (both *S.noun*); 19.1 (*S.noun*); 24.30 (with focus marker *hinnē*); 37.15 (with *hinnē*); Exod. 2.5 (*S.noun*); 9.24; 14.8, 27 (both *S.noun*); Num. 22.22 (*S.pron*); 23.6, 17 (both with *hinnē*); 25.6 (*S.pron*); Deut. 4.11 (*S.noun*); 9.15 (*S.noun*); Judg. 3.25 (*hinnē*); 6.11; 8.4 (*wa-qoṭel*); 13.9 (*S.pron*); 13.20 (*S.noun*); 16.12 (*S.noun*); 19.28 (nominal, probably to be analysed as *X* $\emptyset$ ); 20.33 (*S.noun*).

<sup>77</sup> ‘Focused’ means: “One clause refers to the central activity or state of the biclausal linking” (Dixon 2009, 3). Instances of focused *wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* after *wa(y)-yiqtol*: Exod. 2.13; Judg. 3.25 (stative); 4.22 (stative); 7.13; 11.34; 14.5; 19.18, 27.

<sup>78</sup> Examples of focused complement *wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* after perception verb (*wa(y)-yiqtol*): Gen. 18.2; 24.63; 26.8; 28.12; 33.1; 37.25 (three *qoṭel* clauses of which only the first is introduced by *wa-hinnē*; the second continues the perception content with *wa-S.noun-qoṭel* and the third with  $\emptyset$ -*qoṭel*); 39.3 (special case: perception introduced by *kī-X* $\emptyset$  and continued by *wa-X-qoṭel*); 40.6; 41.22 (dream); Exod. 3.2; 14.10; Judg. 9.43.

<sup>79</sup> Examples of backgrounding *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-X-qoṭel*: Gen. 2.9f.; 13.7; 14.12; 24.20f.; 25.28; 27.4f.; 30.36; Exod. 5.12f.; 13.20f.; Num. 10.33; 33.40; Judg. 7.11f.; 10.1; 13.19 (*wa-qoṭel*, see below); 14.3f.; 17.7; 18.15f.

<sup>80</sup> I have excluded Exod. 25.31f. (<sup>31</sup>*wa-qataḏ* +  $\emptyset$ -*O.noun-yiqtol(u)* +  $\emptyset$ -*S.noun-yiqtol(u)* + <sup>32</sup>*wa-S.noun-qoṭel* +  $\emptyset$ -*X* $\emptyset$  + *wa-X* $\emptyset$ ), although the *wa-S.noun-qoṭel* (וַיִּשְׁעוּהָ קַיִּים יְצִאִים מִצְדֵּיהָ) is often translated as a main clause in the instruction text with obligational meaning, e.g., ‘Six branches are to extend from the sides of the lampstand’ (NET). In view of the extreme rarity of *qoṭel* clauses with a meaning of obligation (I have no evident examples), it is more plausible that the verbal force of the preceding *wa-qataḏ* (וַעֲשֶׂהָ) is understood also here (i.e., ellipsis), as in Propp (2006, 311), who translates, ‘And six reeds going out from its

sides—', where 'six reeds' is the direct object of *wa-qaṭal* in verse 31 ('And (you shall make) six reeds going out from its sides'). In such a case, the *qoṭel* clause is circumstantial, an expected relational meaning. But the passage is disputed, and not included in the table.

<sup>81</sup> Wenham (1987, 324): 'But I am to judge the nation which they serve'.

<sup>82</sup> Examples of a linking *wa-qaṭal* + (*wa*)-(X)-*qoṭel*, where *qoṭel* is circumstantial: Gen. 3.5; 15.13f. (<sup>14</sup>*wa-gam-O.noun-qoṭel-S.pron*, where *O.noun* is a complex with a relative clause); Exod. 25.20; 26.15 (*wa-qaṭal* +  $\emptyset$ -*qoṭel*); 33.10; Lev. 26.16; Num. 10.25.

<sup>83</sup> Two cases of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + (*wa*)-X $\emptyset$  with unclear semantic relations, both in genealogies: Gen. 4.19; 36.22.

<sup>84</sup> Gen. 12.4b belongs to *P* (Westermann 1981, 176f.). Further examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + (*wa*)-X $\emptyset$  expressing background: Gen. 2.19 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa*-( $\emptyset$ )-X $\emptyset$ , with left dislocation coded by quantifier and relative clause); 9.18; 11.29; 12.4; 13.1f.; 16.15f.; 17.23–25; 25.26 (age of Isaac); 28.19; 29.31; 36.8, 32, 35, 39 (the first X $\emptyset$  is circumstantial, but the second is background); 37.24; 38.6; 39.11; Exod. 7.6f.; 12.39–42; 16.31; 17.1; 24.16f.; 32.15f.; 36.8f.; Lev. 8.21, 28; 24.11; Num. 10.33f.; 11.26; 12.2.f.; 13.3, 17–20, 22; 20.12f.; 22.4; 33.9, 38f.; Deut. 2.17–21 (<sup>21</sup> $\emptyset$ -X $\emptyset$  + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa(y)-yiqtol*, where the three *wa(y)-yiqtol* also belong to the background); 34.6f.; Judg. 1.22 'and the LORD was with them'; 1.35f.; 3.17; 4.2; 8.9f.; 11.34; 13.2, 9; 16.26f.; 17.5f., 7; 18.7, 28, 29; 19.3; 20.27; 21.24f.

<sup>85</sup> Further examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + (*wa*)-X $\emptyset$  expressing editorial insertion: Gen. 10.12; 12.6; 14.7, 8, 17; 19.37, 38; 23.2; 26.33; 35.6, 19, 20, 27; 48.7; Num. 33.36; Judg. 1.11, 23, 26; 6.24; 7.1; 18.12 ( $\emptyset$ -*hinnē*-X $\emptyset$ ); 19.10.

<sup>86</sup> Examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + (*wa*)-X $\emptyset$  describing a circumstantial state relation: Gen. 9.23 (but possibly background); 12.8 (Brockelmann 1908–13, II §321a); 13.1; 24.10, 22; 25.1, 6, 25 (first an adverbial adjective and then  $\emptyset$ -X $\emptyset$ ); 25.29; 36.39 (only the first X $\emptyset$  is circumstantial, the second is background); 38.1, 2; 41.8, 24; 44.14; Exod. 14.7, 22; 24.10; 32.15; 36.36; 37.1, 3, 6, 10, 25; 38.1; Lev. 24.10; Num. 10.14–

28; 22.7; 31.6; Deut. 9.15; 25.18 (but I take the last clause as *wa-lō-qatāl* with stative verb); Judg. 3.16 ‘Ehud made himself a sword with two edges and a length of 18 inches’; 3.27; 10.4; 13.2; 14.6; 16.4; 17.1; 18.7; 19.15 (the circumstantial *wa-XØ* implicitly expresses a reason; Boling 1975, 272); 20.35.

<sup>87</sup> For the adverbial *qoṭel* clause, see Isaksson (2009, 57–59).

<sup>88</sup> Other examples of *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-hinnē-XØ* expressing complementation, sometimes with only implicit perception verb: Gen. 1.31; 22.13; 31.2, 10; 37.29 (implicit); 41.7 (implicit); 42.27; 43.21 (implicit); Num. 12.10; 32.1; Judg. 3.24; 14.8; 21.9.

<sup>89</sup> Since the semantic relation with the preceding *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clause(s) is vague and the verbless clause is a main clause, we should not use the term linking here. The *wa(y)-yiqṭol* clauses just precede the verbless clause in the same verse. Other examples of focused verbless clauses functioning as main clauses (and with preceding *wa(y)-yiqṭol*): Gen. 25.24; Exod. 11.3 (not *wa-hinnē*, but *Ø-gam-XØ* ‘moreover’); 16.14.

<sup>90</sup> The unclear case is Exod. 13.12; according to Propp (1999, 371), MT is suspiciously redundant.

<sup>91</sup> Other examples of *wa-qatāl* + *(wa)-XØ* expressing an explanatory note: Exod. 12.11; 29.18 (*wa-qatāl* + *Ø-XØ* + *Ø-XØ* + *Ø-XØ*); 29.25; 30.10; Lev. 1.13; 2.3, 9f., 15; 3.16 ‘all the fat belongs to the Lord’; 4.21, 24; 5.9 (*wa-qatāl* + *wa-S.noun-yiqṭol(u)* + *Ø-XØ*; Milgrom 1991, 305); 5.12, 18f.; 6.8–10; 7.5; 12.7 (“subscript,” according to Milgrom 1991, 761); 13.8 (in apodosis), 13, 15, 17 (in apodosis); 13.20 (with asyndetic relative clause; Milgrom 1991, 769); 13.22, 25, 27, 30; 27.16 (an algorithm for a homer of barley being priced in silver; Milgrom 2001, 2366).

<sup>92</sup> I regard the participle (מַחֲרִיךְ) as being used as a noun here. Other instances of *wa-qatāl* + *(wa)-XØ* coding a circumstantial relation are: Exod. 22.9 (in protasis); 22.13 (in protasis); 25.12, 17, 20, 23; 26.15–17, 37; 27.1; 36.30, 38; Num. 3.9; 10.18 (*wa-qatāl* is habitual past; *pace* Pat-El 2021, 105 n. 47); 35.5, 27 (in apodosis); Deut. 28.26.

<sup>93</sup> Other instances of *wa-qatāl* + *(wa)-XØ* expressing contrast (Dixon 2009, 28): Lev. 5.1 (within a protasis, *wa-qatāl* + *wa-XØ* וְ *qatāl* וְ

*qaṭal*)—Milgrom (1991, 292) translates, ‘and although he was a witness’; 26.17, 36.

<sup>94</sup> Other reason clauses in linkings of the type *wa-qaṭal* + (*wa*)-*X*Ø: Lev. 22.31, 32; Num. 5.13 (not about YHWH, but within a protasis, and can be taken as a circumstantial with nuance of reason). Reason linkings of the type *wa-qaṭal* + *kī*-*X*Ø, where *kī* may be emphatic-adverbial: Exod. 22.26; 29.33; 31.14; Lev. 5.11; 20.7; 24.9; Deut. 14.29.

<sup>95</sup> In Deut. 13.15 (*wa-qaṭal* + *wa-hinnē*-*X*Ø + Ø-*qaṭal*), both *X*Ø and Ø-*qaṭal* function as complements.

<sup>96</sup> For the analysis, see Hackett (1984, 36f.). VN is an infinitive absolute. A parallel construction is found outside my corpus in 1 Sam. 1.10: *וַתִּתְפַּלֵּל עַל־יְהוָה וּבְכָה חֲבִבָּהּ* ‘She prayed to the LORD and was weeping greatly’ (*wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-VNabs-yiqṭol(u)*). But Joosten (1999, 24) argues that the *yiqṭol(u)* here is “prospective.”

<sup>97</sup> The clause-type *wa-lō-yiqṭol(u)* is treated separately and not included here; see §7.6.2.

<sup>98</sup> Two instances of reason clauses introduced by an adverbial (emphatic) *kī*: Gen. 50.3; Judg. 14.10 (both with the pattern *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *kī-kēn-yiqṭol(u)*, and both habitual).

<sup>99</sup> Other examples of comments coded by *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + Ø-*X-yiqṭol(u)* (all are asyndetic): Num. 21.13f. (a historical written source); Deut. 2.17–20 (Ø-*X-yiqṭol(u)* + Ø-*X-qaṭal* + *wa-X-yiqṭol(u)*, historical information); 3.8f.; Judg. 10.4 *הָיָה הַיּוֹם* (present habitual); 11.39f. ‘year after year’ (present habitual).

<sup>100</sup> There is no causal relationship between the ruin of the houses of Pharaoh and his officials and the ruin of the whole of Egypt; *pace* Gzella (2021, 83) ‘so that it was corrupted’. Examples of backgrounding *wa-X-yiqṭol(u)* after main-line *wa(y)-yiqṭol*: Gen. 2.24; 29.2 (adverbial *kī*); 43.32 (adverbial *kī*); Exod. 8.20; 34.33f.; 40.34–36 (habitual past).

<sup>101</sup> Some main-line *qaṭal* clauses with imperfective *X-yiqṭol(u)*: Gen. 31.39 (Ø-*X-qaṭal* + Ø-*X-yiqṭol(u)*-N + Ø-*X-yiqṭol(u)*-N, habitual past); Num. 9.15 (*wa-X-qaṭal* + *wa-X-yiqṭol(u)!*, past progressive). In none of the examples is *X* merely a negation (*lō*).

<sup>102</sup> My only five examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* linking are: Gen. 2.25 (circumstantial); Exod. 39.21 ‘thus’, ‘in this way’; Num. 8.19 ‘in this way’; Judg. 6.4 ‘in this way’ (habitual past; Isaksson 2009, 86); 12.6 ‘thus he could not pronounce the word correctly’ (repeated action; Isaksson 2009, 86).

<sup>103</sup> Practically all authorities argue that this *wa-qatal* is anomalous. Despite *lectio difficilior*, BHS emends to *wa(y)-yiqtol*, and thus also Ges-K (§112tt). Schulz (1900, 38) and Joosten (2012, 227), among many, regard it as ‘*wa* + *qatal*’.

<sup>104</sup> BHS emendates to *wa(y)-yiqtol*. Ges-K (§112rr) considers the *wa-qatal* frequentative. J-M (§119z) says there is omission of “energetic Waw” in the *wa-qatal*. Joosten (2012, 227) identifies the form as “w” + QATAL.”

<sup>105</sup> Hornkohl (2014, 261, 288) describes this *wa-qatal* as continual, imperfective, past, durative. Schulz (1900, 37), Gropp (1991, 48), and Joosten (2012, 226) identify it as *wa* + *qatal*. Gropp (1991, 48) prefers to read *wa(y)-yiqtol*. J-M (§119z) calls it an anomalous occurrence of *w-qatalti*. Nyberg (1972, §86kk) states that *wa-qatal* here has the same function as *yiqtol(u)* and codes a verbal circumstantial clause describing a subevent (“biomständighet”) beside the main event. Ges-K (§112ss) says: “A longer or constant continuance in a past state is perhaps represented by the perfect with י (as a variety of the frequentative perfect with י).” Westermann (1981, 252) concludes that the *wa-qatal* clause “die Erzählung nicht weiterführt,” that is, it does not belong to the narrative main line but to the background.

<sup>106</sup> It is possible to interpret *wa-haya* as having a personal subject: Judah, as Wenham (1994, 361) translates: ‘He was in Chezib when she bore him’. It makes sense, but the problem is that Judah is not mentioned in the clause, nor in the immediately preceding clauses (he is explicitly mentioned in Gen. 38.2).

<sup>107</sup> Schulz (1900, 37), Ges-K (§112uu), and Westermann (1982, 42) emendate to a *XØ* clause. Joosten (2012, 227 n. 70) identifies this instance as “w” + QATAL.” I have registered the following eleven instances of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-qatal* coding background: Gen. 15.5f.; 21.24f.;

38.5 (Wenham 1994, 361)—Hornkohl (2014, 288) regards *wa-qatal* here as the immediate background of another action; 38.9 (*wa-haya* with temporal clause and habitual past); Num. 10.14–17; 21.9 (*wa-haya* with temporal clause); Judg. 6.3 (*wa-haya* with temporal clause and habituality); 12.5 (*wa-haya* with temporal clause and habitual past); 16.18; 19.8 (Isaksson 2009, 77; after quotation); 19.30 (*wa-haya* with temporal clause and habitual past).

<sup>108</sup> For the hapax *ṣəlīl* (Kativ) or *ṣəlīl* (Qere), see Sasson (2014, 109, 353). According to Sasson, ‘the tent’ is “presumably the one central to the military operation.”

<sup>109</sup> Schulz (1900, 38) identifies this form as *wa + qatal*. König (1881–97, II 2 §367i) attributes it to the “beharrenden Charakter des Vorgangs,” but cf. the next example (Judg. 3.23). Lambert (1893, 56) prefers to emendate to VNabs.

<sup>110</sup> Several words translated according to Sasson (2014, 101).

<sup>111</sup> Renz (2016, 644–47) adduces one example from the pre-exilic inscriptions of *wa-qatal* “am Abschluss einer Erzählkette.” HI MHsh 1.4–5 **ואסם** **כימם** **ויכל** **ויקצר** **עבדך** **ויכל** **ואסם** **כימם** ‘And your servant harvested and measured **and stored**, according to the schedule’; Renz translates the *wa-qatal* ‘und häufte (währenddessen/Schließlich) in den Speicher’.

<sup>112</sup> Hornkohl (2014, 290) suggests the translation “‘and he was locking’ for the closing of a scene; cf. 2 Sam 13.18.” Nyberg (1972, §86kk) calls this a single past event described in a verbal circumstantial clause as a subevent (“biomständighet vid sidan av huvudhandlingen”). Gentry (1998, 17f.) also argues that *wa-qatal* is circumstantial: ‘was locking up’. But Ges-K (§112tt) suggests an error in the text, “[o]r does **וַיַּעַל**, as a frequentative, imply fastening with several bolts?” (n. 1). The *wa-qatal* (**וַיַּעַל**) has been questioned widely by Biblical Hebrew scholarship. BHS suggests emendation to *wayyin‘ol*. Boling (1975, 87) prefers to “read as infinitive absolute, rather than the anomalous perfect of MT.” J-M (§119z) calls this omission of energetic Waw in *wa-qatal*. Schulz (1900, 38) and Joosten (2012, 227) identify it as *wa + qatal*.

<sup>113</sup> According to Joosten (2012, 174), *wa-qatal* is iterative. Examples of *wa-qatal* describing subevents after *wa(y)-yiqtol* in the corpus: Exod. 36.37f.—Propp (2006, 649) expected *wa(y)-yiqtol*, and his translation ‘and he will plate’ is problematic, while Joosten (2012, 228 n. 73) calls this a problematic use of *wa-qatal*; 39.3—according to Schulz (1900, 38), this is *wa + qatal*, but according to Propp (2006, 653), VNabs, while Joosten (2012, 228 n. 73) says it “may be regarded as iterative,” and Hornkohl (2014, 288) calls it a multi-step process; Judg. 3.23; 7.13. Outside the corpus: 2 Sam. 12.31; 13.18; 1 Kgs 18.4—Joosten (2012, 227, 307) calls this “Single WEQATAL,” but translates (p. 370) ‘and provided them [continually] with bread and water’; 2 Kgs 23.4—according to Khan (2021a, 316f.), a subevent of the same overall event.

<sup>114</sup> Instead of *wa-qatal*, Propp (1999, 627) reads *wayišpātū*, which in CBH must be analysed as *wa + jussive*.

<sup>115</sup> When estimating new paragraphs, one must bear in mind that paragraph units in CBH are shorter than what is acceptable in English printed texts.

<sup>116</sup> For *Ø-X-yiqtol(u)*, see §§7.8.3–4.

<sup>117</sup> Gen. 24.35 ‘The LORD has richly blessed my master’ (NET).

<sup>118</sup> Exod. 1.7 ‘The Israelites, however, were fruitful’ (NET).

<sup>119</sup> Two subordinated clauses are disregarded in the pattern: the temporal clause (בְּאַשֶׁר רָאִים) and the quotation (מִחֲנֶה אֱלֹהִים זֶה).

<sup>120</sup> Other examples of foregrounded *wa-X-qatal* clauses introducing a new paragraph: Gen. 4.1 (Cook 2012, 298; Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64; Isaksson 2021, 223f.); 13.14–18 (Westermann 1981, 209; Hornkohl 2018, 49); 19.4f., 38; 21.1 (Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 24.35 (anterior in report); 24.62f.; 25.26, 34 (new paragraph and foreground; *pace* Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 26.15, 26f. (Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 27.6–11 (Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 27.30f.; 33.3, 7, 17; 34.26; 38.30; 41.50; 45.16; Exod. 1.7; 7.21; 14.10; 19.3—Givón (2001, I:349) calls this “use of the perfect in topic switching;” 19.18; Lev. 10.16; Num. 1.18 (Levine 1993, 127); 11.4; 12.16; 16.35 (foreground; *pace* Buth 1995, 96); Deut. 4.21 (report); 9.20; 10.6; Judg. 1.9, 27 (*wa-lō-qatal*, וְלֹא הָוִישׁ מִנְשֵׁה: an

unusual beginning of a paragraph, but there is a connection with the previous actant, Joseph); 1.29; 3.5f., 31; 4.17; 6.19, 33—but Joosten (2012, 177) calls this background; 6.34, 35; 7.24; 9.44 (two paragraphs with parallel series of events); 16.23; 18.18, 27; 20.17, 33, 37, 40, 41, 48; 21.1f., 15 (*qatal*, not *qotel*). For Gen. 29.9 (with initial temporal *qotel* clause,  $\emptyset$ -X-*qotel* + *wa*-X-*qatal*, where *qatal* is foregrounded), and Gen. 38.25 (with initial subordinate  $\emptyset$ -X-*qotel*), see Tenet 2c (§7.9).

<sup>121</sup> Other examples of *wa*-X-*qatal* (background) + (*Tenet 1a–d*) + *wa*(y)-*yiqtol*: Gen. 13.5–7 (copula verb); 19.15 (pluperfect; Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 31.19–21 (pluperfect; Hornkohl 2018, 45, 49 n. 64); 39.1 (pluperfect, new discourse section; Cook 2012, 298; Hornkohl 2018, 45, 52); 46.28 (pluperfect, resumes the narrative from 46.7); Exod. 3.1 (copula verb, not to be classified as *qotel*); Num. 1.47f. (pluperfect; Levine 1993, 3); 20.2f. (copula verb); 32.1 (copula verb); Deut. 34.9 (stative verb); Judg. 1.16 (pluperfect; Boling 1975, 51); 3.26f. (pluperfect; Boling 1975, 85).

<sup>122</sup> For  $\emptyset$ -*qatal* beginning a new paragraph in direct speech, see §7.3.3.1.

<sup>123</sup> Wenham (1994, 58): “The syntax suggests that sunrise, Lot’s arrival in Zoar, and the fire from heaven coincide.”

<sup>124</sup> For an interpretation of the first two *qatal* clauses with pluperfect meaning, and thus as backgrounded, see Westermann (1981, 360, 373). The problem with this interpretation is that the third *qatal* (וַיְהִי הַמָּטִיר) must be taken as equivalent to a *wa*(y)-*yiqtol*, expressing temporal succession.

<sup>125</sup> Other asyndetic foregrounded *qatal* clauses (thus  $\emptyset$ -X-*qatal*) introducing a new paragraph: Gen. 7.13 (beginning of the flood story of P; Westermann 1976, 586); 15.1—the formula אֶתְּרָה הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה “markiert nie die einfache Fortsetzung, sondern überbrückt immer einen Abstand zum Vorhergehenden” (Westermann 1981, 257); 25.19f. (start of genealogy); 41.10 (beginning of report in direct speech; אָנֹכִי מִצְרַיִם is just an introduction and not an event to connect to; see also Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); 43.20 (beginning of report in direct speech); 44.19 (beginning of report in direct speech; Hornkohl 2018, 49 n. 64); Exod.



19.1f.—“it is an independent event, not logically consequent to what precedes” (Propp 2006, 154); Num. 11.35; 21.12f. (in a formulaic chronicle); Deut. 10.1–3 (new paragraph in report); 22.16 (start of a fictive direct speech in a legal case); Judg. 1.30, 31, 33 (I cannot explain why Manasseh 1.27, and Ephraim 1.29, the sons of Joseph, are syndetic, whereas Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali, are asyndetic; it is a sort of list from Zebulon 1.30); 6.8 (beginning of report in speech); 20.4f. (beginning of report).

<sup>126</sup> Other asyndetic backgrounded *qatal* clauses introducing a new paragraph (thus  $\emptyset$ -X-*qatal*): Gen. 6.9f. (copula verb, the X $\emptyset$  is a headline); Judg. 18.22f. (two *qatal* with pluperfect meaning,  $\emptyset$ -X-*qatal* + *wa*-X-*qatal*, but the clauses could be just background, not starting a new paragraph).

<sup>127</sup> Other examples of  $\emptyset$ -X-*yiqtol*(*u*) + (Tenet 1a–d) + *wa*-*qatal* beginning a new paragraph: Lev. 26.34 (future,  $\emptyset$ -*āz*-*yiqtol*(*u*) + *wa*-*qatal*); Judg. 7.7 ( $\emptyset$ -PrP-*yiqtol*(*u*)! + *wa*-*qatal*, future, beginning of speech).

<sup>128</sup> Other examples of a circumstantial *qotel* clause starting a new paragraph: Gen. 29.9f. ( $\emptyset$ -ADV-S.pron-*qotel* + *wa*-X-*qatal* + *ki*-*qotel* + <sup>10</sup>*wayhi*-(CONJ-*qatal*) + *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol*)—here *wa*-X-*qatal* is foregrounded, *pace* Lunn (2006, 46), who argues that Rachel “fades into the background;” 38.25 ( $\emptyset$ -X-*qotel* + *wa*-X-*qatal* + *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol*)—the participle is circumstantial with temporal meaning (Westermann 1982, 42), ‘when she was about to be brought out’, and as such, related to *qatal*, which is foregrounded, a dramatic turning point and a new scene.

<sup>129</sup> Other relatively uncomplicated instances of backgrounding *qotel* before a *wa*(*y*)-*yiqtol* main line are: Exod. 20.18; Judg. 9.45—Butler (2009, 248) regards the paragraph as a summary.

<sup>130</sup> *Pace* Sasson (2014, 250), who takes the initial expression as a verbless clause, ‘Deborah was a woman prophet’ (see also Boling 1975, 92).

<sup>131</sup> All my registered backgrounded *qotel* clauses beginning a new paragraph in narration: Gen. 23.10; 41.17; Exod. 20.18; Judg. 4.4; 9.45; 15.14.

<sup>132</sup> Examples of foregrounded *qoṭel* beginning a new paragraph in narration: Num. 25.6; Judg. 4.22; 7.13; 19.16f. Some cases of *qoṭel* introducing a new paragraph are not morphologically distinctive (all concern the form  $\text{קָטַל}$ ); those with initial focus particle *wa-hinnē* are foregrounded, the others backgrounded: Num. 25.6 (*wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*); Judg. 15.14 ( $\emptyset$ -*X-qoṭel* + *wa-X-qāṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*)—although according to Driver (1892, 211), it is *qāṭal*; 19.16f. (*wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*).

<sup>133</sup> Another start of a dream report is found in Judg. 7.13 ( $\emptyset$ -*hinnē-O.noun-qāṭal* + *wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa-qāṭal*), where the initial *qāṭal* does not belong to the dream but functions as background outside the dream discourse ('I had a dream'). There then follows the start of the dream report, with *wa-hinnē-X-qoṭel* and then two *wa(y)-yiqṭol*. For the last *wa-qāṭal*, see §7.6.3.

<sup>134</sup> Other examples of //  $\emptyset$ -*X-qoṭel* + *wa-qāṭal* as a paragraph beginning: Gen. 17.19; 48.21 ( $\emptyset$ -*hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel*); Exod. 8.25 ( $\emptyset$ -*hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel*); 11.4f.; 16.4f. ( $\emptyset$ -*hinnē-S.pron-qoṭel*).

<sup>135</sup> Other examples of backgrounded *wa-X $\emptyset$*  + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* beginning a new paragraph: Gen. 7.6f. (<sup>6</sup>*wa-X $\emptyset$*  + *wa-S.noun-qāṭal* + <sup>7</sup>*wa(y)-yiqṭol*, where *X $\emptyset$*  is a temporal clause); 24.1f. (*wa-S.noun-X $\emptyset$*  +  $\emptyset$ -*qāṭal* + *wa-S.noun-qāṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*)—Hornkohl (2018, 49 n. 64) calls this a new unit; 41.46f.; 43.1f.; 47.13.

<sup>136</sup> Boling (1975, 275) takes *rad* as a biform of *yrd* (*qāṭal*); HALOT instead emends the text to *yāraḏ*.

<sup>137</sup> Other examples of backgrounded  $\emptyset$ -*X $\emptyset$*  + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* beginning a new paragraph: Num. 11.33 ( $\emptyset$ -*X $\emptyset$*  +  $\emptyset$ -*terem-yiqṭol(u)* + *wa-S.noun-qāṭal* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*); 33.1f.; Deut. 26.5 ( $\emptyset$ -*X $\emptyset$*  + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*, report); Judg. 18.1f.

<sup>138</sup> The next example, the beginning of Ishmael's genealogy, is similar: Gen. 25.17f. (*wa-X $\emptyset$*  + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol* + *wa(y)-yiqṭol*; Westermann 1981, 482).

<sup>139</sup> Another instance of  $\emptyset$ -*X $\emptyset$*  + *wa-qāṭal* beginning a paragraph: Gen. 20.11 (cf. Khan 2021a, 309, 312).

<sup>140</sup> The clause is translated according to Westermann (1976, 437): ‘und gebar den Henoch, der wurde Erbauer einer Stadt’.

<sup>141</sup> For the so-called cohortative, see §§1.2.2, 3.4.2.3.

<sup>142</sup> For Ø-*qatal*, see §7.3.3.

<sup>143</sup> Further examples of *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-lō-qatal*, with temporal succession if not otherwise stated: Gen. 8.8f. (<sup>8</sup>*wa(y)-yiqtol* + <sup>9</sup>*wa-lō-qatal* + *wa(y)-yiqtol* + *kī-XØ*); 8.12; 30.40 (same-event addition; see §2.3.4); 31.33–35 (3 ×); 34.18f.; 35.5 (implicit result meaning); 38.20, 26; 40.21–23; Exod. 1.17; 6.9; 7.13, 22, 23 (summary; see §2.3.1); 8.11, 15, 28; 9.7, 10f., 12; 10.15, 20, 27; 11.10; 14.20 (implicit result); 15.22, 23 (stative verb, can be interpreted as temporal succession); 16.18, 19f., 24; 33.3 (possibly simultaneous with the immediately preceding *wa(y)-yiqtol*, but not background; cf. the discussion in §2.3.3); 40.34f. (stative verb and focal result; see §2.3.6); Num. 11.25 (*wa-lō-qatal* is temporally sequential in relation to *wa(y)-yiqtol*, and both express repeated actions after *qotel*; Joosten 2012, 185); 21.21–23; 24.1 (focal result); 33.14; Deut. 1.45; 9.23 (*wa(y)-yiqtol* + *wa-lō-qatal* + *wa-lō-qatal*, elaboration; see §2.3.1, §2.3.4); Judg. 2.2, 14 (stative verb, focal result clause); 2.23 (summary); 3.28; 6.10; 8.20, 28, 33–35 (2 ×, focal result); 10.6 (same-event addition); 11.17, 18, 19f., 28; 12.2; 13.20f.; 14.6 (sequential), 9 (focal negative clause, no sequentiality); 15.1; 16.9; 19.23–25; 20.12f.; 21.14.

<sup>144</sup> Some instances when *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* alone expresses focal result: Gen. 9.15; 17.5 ‘Therefore your name will no longer be Abram’; 41.31 (less clear case); Exod. 10.5; 12.13; Lev. 11.44.

<sup>145</sup> Other supporting result clauses coded by *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* (can often be translated with an initial ‘in this way’), many of the type *וְכֵן*: Gen. 41.36 (*wa-qatal* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*); Exod. 28.35; 30.12, 21; Lev. 8.35; 14.36; 15.31; 16.13; 18.28, 30; 20.22, 25; Num. 4.19 (second part of a result complex, *wa-X-IMP* + ***wa-qatal*** + ***wa-lō-yiqtol(u)***); 11.17 (second part of the result complex, *wa-qatal* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*); 18.5; 35.12; Deut. 19.10; 22.8.

<sup>146</sup> Examples of a *wa-qatal* clause carrying over the preceding temporal reference: Gen. 50.25; Exod. 8.7; 13.19; 16.12; 17.6; Lev. 25.6; Num. 28.19; 28.27; 29.7, 12; 32.17.

<sup>147</sup> Another example of *wa-qatal* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* carrying over the temporal reference from the preceding clause is Exod. 12.23: instead of translating the preceding *wa-qatal* as ‘and when he sees the blood’ (thus NET), it can be translated with a simple ‘and will see the blood’ (thus Propp 1999, 356), and the following *wa-qatal* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* both carry over the temporal reference: ‘at that moment the LORD will pass over the door, and he will not permit the destroyer’.

<sup>148</sup> Another example of *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* carrying over the preceding temporal reference point (outside the corpus): Amos 9.15 (*wa-qatal* + *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)*).

<sup>149</sup> Similar examples of *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* alternating with *wa-qatal* as a substructure in protases: Exod. 21.22, 29; Deut. 21.18.

<sup>150</sup> An example of temporally successive *wa-qatal* and *wa-lō-yiqtol(u)* in apodosis: Exod. 22.10.

<sup>151</sup> Another instance of discourse-continuity negated jussive clause: Gen. 44.18 ( $\emptyset$ -ADV-VOC-*yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ )-*nā* + *wa-ʾal-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ) + *kī-X* $\emptyset$ ). An example in archaic poetry: Deut. 33.6 ( $\emptyset$ -*yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ )! + *wa-ʾal-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ )! + *wa-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ )!; Notarius 2013, 248).

<sup>152</sup> For the ‘long’ form of the jussive, see §3.4.4.6 and cf. Sjors (2023).

<sup>153</sup> More instances of *wa-ʾal-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ) as negated continuous imperative: Gen. 22.12; 45.5; Exod. 20.19; Lev. 16.2 (semantic complement); Num. 11.15—purpose, with ventive clitic, but according to Dallaire (2014, 116), cohortative; Num. 16.26 (elaboration); Deut. 1.21; 2.9, 19; 21.8 ( $\emptyset$ -IMP + *wa-ʾal-yiqtol*( $\emptyset$ ) + *wa-qatal*); 31.6; Judg. 13.7.