

STUDIES IN THE HEBREW VERBAL SYSTEM

**HEBREW AS A SYSTEM OF RELATIVE TENSE AND THE ORIGINS
AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CLASSICAL CONSECUTIVE FORMS**

The defence will take place on Thursday 14 June 2018, 13:15.

STUDIES IN THE HEBREW VERBAL SYSTEM

**HEBREW AS A SYSTEM OF RELATIVE TENSE AND THE
ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CLASSICAL
CONSECUTIVE FORMS**

Kasper Siegismund

PhD dissertation
Section of Biblical Studies
Faculty of Theology
University of Copenhagen
2018

Studies in the Hebrew Verbal System
Hebrew as a System of Relative Tense and the Origins and Development of the Classical
Consecutive Forms
Publikationer fra Det Teologiske Fakultet nr. 81
© Kasper Siegismund 2018

ISBN: 978-87-93361-47-8

Printing and binding by:
Publikom
Karen Blixens Plads 8
2300 København S.

Published by:
The Faculty of Theology
University of Copenhagen
Karen Blixens Plads 16
2300 København S, Denmark
www.teol.ku.dk

Preface and abbreviations

When Qoheleth lamented the endless number of books and the weariness of the flesh caused by much study,¹ he may not have been thinking about the growing amount of scholarship on the Hebrew verbal system. Still, scholars trying to keep up with all the work being done in this area of research could be excused for imagining that the poet is indeed speaking directly to them. The Hebrew verbs seem to be able to provoke a steady stream of books, dissertations, and research articles, yet in spite of this effort, many of the basic questions remain unanswered – or rather, precisely because of the many different approaches and methods applied to the subject and the different aims pursued by scholars, the questions have been answered in many and often mutually exclusive ways. However, rather than joining Qoheleth in despairing at this situation, we should rejoice in the fact that our field of study forces us to take into account an amazing combination of literary, theological, and linguistic approaches if we want to understand ancient Hebrew and the texts that have been handed down to us in that language.

There is an intimate relationship between exegetical work on the texts and the analysis of the language used. It is obviously impossible to understand the texts and their theology without understanding the language in which they were written but this also applies in the other direction, a fact all too often forgotten. The language cannot be properly analyzed and described without due attention to the interpretation of the contents of the texts, i.e., exegesis, including textual criticism etc. As will be stressed repeatedly in the course of this dissertation, scholars often seem to simply presuppose a certain interpretation of the text and a corresponding translation and end up analyzing not the Hebrew language, but rather their own (or the traditional) translation of the text. This connection between linguistic analysis and exegesis and theology seems to be one of the main reasons for the many and widely diverging views on the Hebrew verbs. The continued interest in a text of such immense theological and cultural import as the Old Testament seems to guarantee that this dissertation will not be the last word in this matter. Quite the contrary, it is hoped that the present study will stimulate further discussion of this fascinating field of research.

I want to thank my supervisor, associate professor Søren Holst, and the rest of the Section of Biblical Studies at the Faculty of Theology, University of Copenhagen. Peter Brylov Christensen deserves special thanks for his un-failing support in all computer-related matters.

Parts of this dissertation were presented in embryonic form in my 2014 master's thesis, "Hebraisk *wegatal* – funktion, form og oprindelse" (especially parts of ch. 5). Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 are based on work published

¹ עֲשׂוֹת סִפְרִים הַרְבֵּה אֵין קֵץ וְלִמְגַד הַרְבֵּה יִגְעַת בְּשׂוֹר (Ecc 12:12).

in the journal *Hebrew Studies* (Siegismund 2017) and parts of the excursus on word order (appendix 11) are based on my forthcoming article in *Dead Sea Discoveries* (Siegismund forthcoming a). Parts of the treatment of so-called gnomic *qatal* and the criticism of Penner and Andrason build on my forthcoming article in *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* (Siegismund forthcoming b). At the OTSEM conferences in Uppsala (2015), Turku (2016), and Helsinki (2017), I presented papers, the main points of which I have incorporated to varying degrees in the present dissertation (especially in parts of ch. 3 and sections 6.2.3, 6.2.4, and 7.1). I want to thank all of the participants in the discussions at the conferences and especially my designated respondents Ola Wikander (Lund University) and David Reimer (University of Edinburgh). In addition, Robert Rezetko kindly took the time to read the 2017 paper.

Particularly in the description of the relative temporal character of the HVS (ch. 4) and the discussion of unclassical interference in various corpora (ch. 6) it has been necessary to treat a substantial amount of textual material. For this reason, the PhD board has kindly allowed me to exceed the 250 page limit by 50 pages. In addition, a considerable amount of material has been relegated to appendices. These include supplementary details, mostly in the form of lists of occurrences of various verbal forms and discussion of longer passages. Reference will be made to the appendices where appropriate.

Abbreviations and terminology

BA = Biblical Aramaic.

BH = Biblical Hebrew.

C = Consonant.

CBH = Classical BH.

CH = Classical Hebrew.²

² The term Classical Hebrew (CH) is used to designate the language of most of the texts of the period before the Mishnah (traditional date 200 AD), a usage followed by several scholars. E.g., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* "records the language of all texts written in Hebrew from the earliest times down to the second century of the common era," divided into four corpora, viz., "(1) The Hebrew Bible (excluding the Aramaic portions); (2) Ben Sira; (3) the Qumran manuscripts (Dead Sea Scrolls) and related texts; (4) inscriptions and other occasional texts" (Clines 1993, 14). In this dissertation, I prefer to use the term CH in a more restricted sense, rather than as a merely chronological designation. If all biblical texts (including atypical ones like Ecclesiastes) and documents like the Bar Kokhba letters are included in CH, the term "classical" loses its meaning, especially when the focus of the investigation is the verbal system. Such texts do not align with the majority of the other texts in the four corpora. Similarly, Schniedewind's inclusion of early RH in the category CH is highly problematic. He takes *The Dictionary of*

Preface and abbreviations

CS = Central Semitic (Arabic, the ancient South Arabian languages, and Northwest Semitic, which comprises Aramaic, Ugaritic, and Canaanite, including Hebrew).

CSH = Copper Scroll Hebrew.

DSS = Dead Sea Scrolls.

E = Point of Event.

EA = (Tell) El Amarna, referring to the texts found at that location.

EBH = Early BH.

ES = East Semitic (Akkadian and Eblaite).

GKC = Gesenius, Kautzsch, Cowley = Kautzsch 1910.

GQH = General Qumran Hebrew.

HVS = Hebrew Verbal System.

KAI = *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, referring to inscriptions contained in Donner and Röllig 1964, 1968, 2001.

KTU = *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*, referring to the Ugaritic texts contained in Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín 2013 (3rd ed., KTU³).

LBH = Late BH.

LXX = The Septuagint Greek translation of the OT.

Classical Hebrew to task for using the word "Classical" without including RH in the dictionary. According to Schniedewind (2013, 6), "[t]he definition of classical Hebrew as spanning the period when Hebrew was a living, spoken language in a defined locale is a defensible linguistic definition that must include the first stage of Rabbinic Hebrew." However, by this logic, Modern English could be included in a dictionary of Old English. As far as Hebrew is concerned, though Elwolde (1997, 51) might be right in pointing to "a *constantly* developing, seamless, Hebrew language," most scholars do recognize a clear distinction between RH and the language found in most of the earlier texts. Not least in the field of the verbal forms and their usage, we are dealing with quite different systems. Thus, when discussing the verbal system, it seems preferable to reserve the use of the term "classical" for the language of texts where, e.g., the system of so-called consecutive forms is used in more or less the same way as in the majority of the biblical books, i.e., in what can be called SBH. However, often SBH is used with a primarily chronological meaning, instead of the term EBH, as opposed to LBH (e.g. Schniedewind 2013, 6). This is a problematic usage since, as will be discussed in chs. 6 and 7, there is no necessary connection between an early date of a biblical book and "standard" language and between a late date and "non-standard" language. When there is a need to refer to the entire corpus of Hebrew writings before ca. 200 AD, without distinguishing the different types of Hebrew attested in the various sub-corpora, a term like "Early Hebrew" as used, e.g., by Qimron (1992), might be better suited than CH. Often, in the course of the following descriptions, I simply refer to "Hebrew," either in the all-encompassing sense of all phases of the language or specifically in reference to a specific type, as will be evident from the context.

MH = Mishnaic Hebrew.³

ModH = Modern Hebrew.

MT = The Masoretic text of the OT.

OT = The Old Testament.

PS = Proto-Semitic (the ancestor of all the Semitic languages).

PTC = Participle.

QA = Qumran Aramaic.

QH = Qumran Hebrew.

QL = Qumran Literature.

QM = Qumran Mishnaic.

R = Point of Reference.

RH = Rabbinic Hebrew.⁴

S = Point of Speech.

SBH = Standard BH.

SV = Subject-Verb word order.

TAM = Tense, Aspect, Mood.

V = Vowel.

VS = Verb-Subject word order.

WS = West Semitic (all the Semitic languages that are not part of ES, viz. the Ethiopian Semitic languages, Modern South Arabian, and CS).

When referring to the verbal forms, it has become customary to use the standardized third singular masculine forms as designations (at least for most of the finite verbal forms). I follow this usage and refer to the forms as *qatal*, *yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*, *weyiqtol*, and *weqatal*. When necessary, the first person singular is used to distinguish between "converted" and "non-converted" forms, *weqatalí* and *weqatálti*. The reason for this widespread usage, no doubt, is that it allows scholars to discuss the system using neutral terms rather than terms whose etymological or traditional meaning might give associations to particular interpretations of the meaning of the verbal forms, which are not necessarily shared by the scholars using the terms. The participle, imperative, jussive, and cohortative are not referred to as *qōtel* etc., as would seem logical, but rather by the traditional terms, since they are (relatively) free from terminological controversy.⁵

³ Or, alternatively, Middle Hebrew (note that in other contexts, MH may be used to designate Modern Hebrew, but not in this dissertation). I prefer the term RH instead of MH for the language of the Rabbinic literature. However, many scholars use the latter term and it will often occur in citations.

⁴ See n. 3.

⁵ As noted by Gzella (2004, 66–67), the use of terms like *qatal* etc. is difficult to uphold when comparing different languages since these forms are specifically Hebrew. The

Preface and abbreviations

I refer to root types as, e.g., II-*w* (rather than ע"ו). Other grammatical terminology and abbreviations should be self-explanatory.

The abbreviations for the Hebrew inscriptions are the ones used in Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005.

Note that I refer to the larger Qumran documents with Arabic numbers for both column and line (e.g. 1QM 18:3 instead of 1QM XVIII 3).

"same" form would be called *qatal* in Aramaic and *qatala* in Arabic. In these cases it would, indeed, be more efficient to be able to refer to the form as "Perfect." However, it is possible to get around this problem by referring to, e.g., "*qatal* and its cognate forms in other languages" or "the reflexes of WS **qatala*" or simply "**qatala*." An alternative approach would be to adopt the use of the terms prefix conjugation (= *yiqtol*) and suffix conjugation (= *qatal*), as used by German scholars in particular (PK vs. SK). However, when we need to talk about the consecutive forms as well, the purely formal terms (*way-yiqtol* etc.) seem to be preferable.

Table of contents

1 Introduction	13
1.1 Main questions in the history of research	14
1.1.1 The standard view of the early period	14
1.1.1.1 Early Jewish grammarians	17
1.1.1.2 Other early grammarians (pre-Ewald)	19
1.1.2 Ewald and "aspectual" theory	23
1.1.3 The semantics of the verb forms (post-Ewald)	26
1.1.3.1 Later aspectual approaches	28
1.1.3.2 Modal approaches	29
1.1.3.3 Temporal approaches	30
1.1.3.4 Text linguistics/discourse-prominence	31
1.1.3.5 "Universal tense"	33
1.1.4 The consecutive forms	33
1.1.4.1 The "relative (consecutive)" approach of Koolhaas and Schröder	35
1.1.4.2 "Relative (consecutive)", inductive and consecutive approaches	38
1.1.4.3 The historical-comparative approach	43
1.2 Tense, aspect, and mood	45
1.2.1 Mood/modality	46
1.2.2 Aspect	48
1.2.3 Tense/temporality	54
2 The search for validation: Methodological considerations	63
2.1 Penner and statistics	63
2.1.1 QH as a system of absolute tense?	67
2.2 Cook and typology	69
2.3 Andrason and path theory	72
2.4 General observations	76
3 The verbal system of CH	79
3.1 Relative tense in the OT	79
3.2 Inherent and general meaning	83
3.3 Non-anterior <i>qatal</i> (and <i>wayyiqtol</i>)	86
3.3.1 "Prophetic perfect"	87
3.3.2 "Gnomic perfect"	89
3.3.3 "Performative perfect"	90
3.3.4 "Precative perfect"	91
3.3.5 Problematic cases	93
3.4 The verbs in poetry	94
3.5 Aspect- and mood-prominence: A critical discussion	98
3.5.1 The aspect-prominent approach	99
3.5.2 The modal approach	104
3.6 The consecutive forms	106
3.6.1 Do <i>qatal</i> and <i>wayyiqtol</i> have the same meaning?	112
3.7 The volitive system	115
3.8 The PTC	120
3.8.1 The PTC and aspect	128

4 Relative tense in the extra-biblical corpora	131
4.1 The inscriptions	132
4.2 Qumran	135
4.2.1 Relative temporal use of <i>qatal</i> in QH	135
4.2.1.1 "Precative" <i>qatal</i> in QH?	137
4.2.2 Relative temporal use of <i>wayyiqtol</i> in QH	138
4.2.3 Relative temporal use of <i>yiqtol</i> , <i>weqatal</i> , and the PTC in QH	139
4.3 The late documentary texts	140
4.4 The Rabbinic literature	142
5 The origins of <i>wayyiqtol</i> and <i>weqatal</i>	149
5.1 The prehistory of <i>wayyiqtol</i>	149
5.2 How to explain <i>waCC-</i>	154
5.2.1 Jussive <i>*yaqtúl</i> , anterior <i>*yáqtul</i> ?	156
5.3 The origins of <i>weqatal</i>	163
5.3.1 The analogical explanation and the origin of final stress in <i>weqatalí</i>	176
5.3.2 Final stress in <i>weqatal</i> ?	182
6 The decline of the consecutive forms: Unclassical usage in various corpora	187
6.1 Consecutive forms in the inscriptions and documentary texts	188
6.2 Unclassical interference	192
6.2.1 Anterior <i>weqatal</i> in the OT	193
6.2.2 Anterior <i>weqatal</i> in QH	198
6.2.3 <i>Weyiqtol</i> in the OT	201
6.2.4 <i>Weyiqtol</i> in QH	206
6.2.5 Remarks on the biblical Qumran scrolls	214
7 QH, spoken Hebrew, and the character of CH	217
7.1 What is QH and (how) does it reflect spoken language?	217
7.1.1 "Antilanguage"?	223
7.2 The ancient inscriptions and spoken Hebrew	230
7.2.1 Artificial consecutive forms?	233
7.3 CH as a standard literary language and the question of dating	236
8 The decline of the consecutive forms: Steps towards an explanation	241
8.1 Aramaic influence	243
8.2 Internal developments	247
9 Conclusions	255
Appendices 1–51	259
Bibliography	361
Dansk resumé	407
Summary	411

1 Introduction

This dissertation examines two central questions that have dominated much of the history of research on the HVS. The first is the semantics of the finite, non-volitive verb forms and the basic character of the system regarding tense, aspect, and mood. The second is the origins, functioning, and development of the system of so-called consecutive forms (*wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*).¹

Chapter 1 is an overview of previous research, focusing on two questions that are often treated in an imprecise way (the views of the early grammarians; Ewald's supposedly aspectual turn). The second part of ch. 1 introduces the categories of tense, aspect, and mood. Ch. 2 is a critical discussion of recent scholarship claiming to solve the problem of the basic character of the HVS through statistical or typological methods. Ch. 3 gives an overview of the verbal system of CH as a system of relative tense, including a critical discussion of the aspectual and modal interpretations of the HVS. The ch. also treats the use of the consecutive forms, the predicative use of the PTC, and the volitive system. Ch. 4 demonstrates that a relative temporal approach is necessary for all stages of the language as attested in the main corpora (ancient inscriptions, OT, Qumran, late documentary texts, Rabbinic literature).

Ch. 5 treats the origins of the consecutive forms (arguably the most characteristic feature of CH). This includes the prehistory of the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol*, the origin of the vocalization of the prefixed conjunction and the doubling of the initial consonant of the personal prefix, the background of non-anterior *weqatal* as well as the stress shift associated with this form under certain conditions. Ch. 6 examines two characteristic deviations from classical usage (unclassical anterior *weqatal* and non-volitive *weyiqtol*), focusing on the attestation of such usage in the OT and in Qumran documents. Ch. 7 is a critical discussion of the character of CH, including the status of QH, the question of the relationship between spoken Hebrew and QH, the nature of the language of the ancient inscriptions, and the artificiality attributed by some scholars to the consecutive forms. Ch. 8 discusses the possible reasons for the disuse of the consecutive forms at the later stages of the language and tentatively presents various factors that may have contributed to this development. Ch. 9 presents the main results.

The aims of the dissertation can be summarized as follows: 1) to argue that the fundamental opposition in the finite HVS is one of relative tense at all stages of ancient Hebrew, 2) to describe the functioning, 3) origins, 4) and later development of the system of consecutive forms, 5) to critically

¹ Though the consecutive forms are not consecutive in the strict sense of the word (see 3.6), I will continue to use the traditional term.

evaluate the status of Hebrew as a spoken language in the various periods and the use of CH as a literary language.²

1.1 Main questions in the history of research

Several key areas of the HVS have been the subjects of intense discussion among scholars for many years. Two problems seem to have attracted most attention, viz. the basic character of the system (tense, aspect, mood) and the functioning and origins of the consecutive forms. First, I will focus on the earliest period of research on these questions in an attempt to correct a widespread but too simplistic view of the ideas of the early grammarians working on the HVS (1.1.1). Second, I will treat the ideas of Ewald in some detail (1.1.2). Later scholarship on the semantics of the verb forms and the consecutive forms will be presented in the form of a brief selection of prominent advocates of various positions (1.1.3–4). In the course of the following chapters, many aspects of previous scholarship will naturally be treated where appropriate.³

1.1.1 The standard view of the early period

A main question in the history of research has been the most adequate way to describe the semantic difference between the central forms of the finite verbal system. Concerning the earliest period of scholarly work on the HVS (pre-Ewald), the standard view seems to be that a three-part absolute tense system was universally accepted as the best way to account for the semantics of the forms in BH. According to McFall (1982, 6), the grammarian Ibn Ezra (twelfth century) "thought in terms of a true tense system." On a general level, McFall claims that early grammarians thought that "Hebrew had the

² In anticipation of the discussion of CH in ch. 7, please refer to "CH" in the list of abbreviations in the preface.

³ A standard work on the history of research is McFall 1982, who treats the period before 1954, criticizing the various approaches and advancing his own views along the way. There are some omissions (cf. Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 457, with n. 8) – coupled with remarkable bonus information like the statement that Menaḥem ben Saruq was "a very gentle person" (McFall 1982, 4). In any case, for the period after 1954, other works must be consulted (e.g. Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 455–478; Penner 2013 and 2015, 37–62; Cook 2012, 83–175; Holst 2008, 33–77). When interpreting the theories of other scholars, one should not rely on second hand information, but rather go straight to the actual sources, especially when it comes to theories of a more or less obscure character. McFall's explanations of the various theories do not always make them clearer. Analyzing the views of the early Jewish grammarians is no easy task, and the remarks in the following section are merely intended as an initial attempt at a critical questioning of the standard description.

same three tenses as any other language," viz. "(עָבַר) *qtl* = Past, (בְּנוּנִי) *qōtēl* = Present, (עָתִיד) *yqtl* = Future" (ib., 17).

Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 458) hold a similar view: "The chief, indeed only, idea behind the earliest views on the Hebrew verb was tense." Ib., 459: "The medieval Jewish grammarians thus saw three tenses: *qtl* past, *qōtēl* present, and *yqtl* future."

As will be discussed in 1.2.3, tense systems are of two quite different kinds, systems of absolute tense and systems of relative tense. The quotations above (e.g. McFall's use of the phrase "a true tense system") seem to indicate that the early Jewish grammarians saw the HVS as a system of absolute tense, i.e. a system in which the "past" form is a simple past tense ("did"), and the "future" a simple future tense ("will do"). Some scholars use the term absolute tense explicitly to describe the views of the early grammarians. Cook (2012, 83) claims that the dominant theory before Ewald had an "absolute-tense basis" with an "understanding that BH has three absolute tenses corresponding to the three times." Bergström (2014, 27) holds the same view ("first described as absolute tenses by the Jewish grammarians of the Middle Ages").

Since many (or most) scholars think that RH had a system of absolute tense, it is hardly surprising that this has been seen as the reason why Jewish grammarians more familiar with this type of language would analyze the language of the OT in terms of the same system. Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 458) state: "Biblical Hebrew has no such simple tense forms, but because Mishnaic Hebrew and most European languages do, for at least eight centuries, from ca. 1000 C.E. on, the medieval Jewish grammarians and Christian scholars of the Hebrew Scriptures thought that *qtl*, *qōtēl*, *yqtl* signified past, present, and future times respectively. Such a system is basically that of Mishnaic (and later) Hebrew, which is thus a tense language" (cf. Holst 2008, 34). McFall, too, explains Ibn Ezra's supposed perception of the verbal system as "a true tense system" by way of Mishnaic influence (1982, 6). He cites European languages as another factor, claiming that the medieval scholars looked "for the Indo-European tense system in BH" (ib., 16). Chomsky (1952, 361, n. 628) remarks that David Qimḥi, "under the influence of the Romanic languages, introduced consistently the idea of three tenses, which lead him and the subsequent grammarians into many misunderstandings."

Of course, influence from other languages leading to the introduction of foreign categories into the analysis of BH (or of any other language, for that matter) is a widespread phenomenon. It is evident that early Jewish scholars

must often have relied on knowledge of RH or contemporary spoken languages. However, the claim made by the scholars quoted is more specific. Because RH and the European languages spoken by the grammarians in question had a (simple/absolute) tense system, the same kind of system was imported into their interpretation of BH.

There are some weak points in this theory. First, as will be argued in 4.4, the verbal system of RH is not a system of absolute tense. There are striking differences between the systems of BH and RH but not of a sort that necessitates the designation of the later verbal system as a system of absolute tense. Second, the reference to European (or Indo-European) languages is very vague. There are substantial differences between Latin, Old French, the contemporary varieties of German, and other languages the Jewish scholars might have known, and it is not clear where the supposedly simple three-part absolute system would come from. Furthermore, in the earliest period, the Jewish scholars were part of an Arabic linguistic environment and the first works of Hebrew grammar that have come down to us were written in Arabic. Later works in Hebrew were often translations from Arabic or influenced by works in Arabic (cf. Schippers 1997; Owens 1997). The Arabic verbal system is not a simple three-part absolute system.⁴ Third, and this is the most important point – the claim that the early theories about the BH verbal system specifically focused on absolute tense is much too simplistic. A closer look at a few statements on the question of the meaning of the verb forms found in works of scholars from the early period seems to indicate that it is simply not correct that everyone before Ewald's "aspectual" turn in 1831–35 thought of BH as a system of absolute tense with three simple tense forms. Early scholars were well aware that what they called "past" was not always a simple past tense and that their "future" was not just a simple future tense. Furthermore, the interpretation of the PTC as a present tense was not universal.

⁴ According to Versteegh (2001, 84), the Arabic grammarians did think in terms of tense in the sense that the "verb's main feature was the indication of time." The earliest grammarian, Sībawayhi, distinguished three tenses (past, present and future), but these "are expressed by only two verbal forms, called by him *māḍī* 'past' and *muḍāriʿ* 'resembling'. The latter term refers to the resemblance of the imperfect verb to the noun, which is the cause of its declension. Later grammarians called the prefix conjugation *mustaqbal* 'future' and denied the existence of a special form for the physical present." On different schools of thought concerning the interpretation of the PTC as a verb or noun, see Owens 1988, 136–137. The problems concerning the proper designation of the verb forms in BH also apply to classical Arabic (and to Semitic in general), but it is clear that a simple absolute interpretation is out of the question. E.g., Arabic *yaqtulu* is used in past contexts to indicate habitual or durative action in the past, like Hebrew *yiqtol*. See further ch. 4.

1.1.1.1 Early Jewish grammarians

Consider a statement from the work of Ibn Ezra (ca. 1089–1165). It seems clear that this early scholar did not think in terms of a system with three absolute tenses.

הזמן יתחלק לשלשה עבר ובינוני ועתיד ואין בלשון הקדש סימן לבינוני כאשר ימצא בלשונות אחרות לכן מנהגם כאשר ירצו לספר הזמן הבינוני יערבו דבריהם. פעם עבר ופעם עתיד כמו וַיִּנְעוּ אמות הספים והבית יִמְלֵא עשן (ישעי' ו' ד').⁵

While time as such is divided in three (עבר, "past," future, "future," and בינוני, "present"), he states that Hebrew does not have any sign (סימן) for the third of these divisions.⁶ According to Prijs (1950, 34), סימן here refers to "Personalprä- und suffixe," and the point seems to be that because Hebrew does not possess a finite present tense, but only a PTC, it is possible to use the עתיד as well as the עבר to express הזמן הבינוני, which in this case cannot signify "present tense," but rather "ongoing" or "concomitant action," as in the examples from Isa 6:4 (cf. Prijs' translation: "wenn sie gleichzeitige Handlung ausdrücken wollen"). While the logic behind Ibn Ezra's thought is not entirely clear,⁷ it seems obvious that his views are hard to reconcile with the standard description of the early grammarians' approach to the system. He posits no real present tense and acknowledges the use of the "future" in a past context.

In his *Mikhlol*, David Qimḥi (1160–1235) presents a similar view:

ותדע כי מנהג העוברים בלשון הקודש להשתמש בו [...] ועתיד ועבר במקום בינוני, כלומר שהיה עושה זה תמיד, ואינם צריכים להזכירם כי רבים הם ולפי הענין תכיר כל אחד מהם [...] וכתב החכם ראב"ע כי כן המשפט בלשון ישמעאל, וכתב כי כן יתכן לדבר בהם לזמן העומד והוא כדרך יְכֹסֶה פניו. וַיִּנְעוּ אמות הספים. בעבור כי אין בלשון סימן לזמן אמצעי, ידברו בו בלשון עבר ועתיד...⁸

⁵ This quote from Ibn Ezra's *Sefer Moznayim* 47a is found in Prijs 1950, 34. See also Patón 2002, 99* (Hebrew) and 204–205 (Spanish).

⁶ Note the similarity to the views attributed to the Arabic grammarian Sībawayhi in n. 4 above.

⁷ Cf. Prijs' cautious remark: "Diese schwierige Stelle muss wohl so verstanden werden" (1950, 34).

⁸ Qimḥi 1862 (ed. Rittenberg), 37a-b. Chomsky 1952 is a translation of *Sefer Mikhlol* (or rather a paraphrase and rearrangement; the passage above is found on pp. 340–341, with notes on pp. 361–362). McFall (1982, 8) provides a more direct translation than Chomsky's (including McFall's comments in brackets): "And you must know that it is the custom of the tenses in the Holy Language to be employed [...] a future or a past in the place of a participle, as if to say one was doing such and such (a thing) continually; there is no need to illustrate them as they are so numerous, and you can recognize every one of them by the context. [...] And the sage Rabbi Abraham Aben Ezra wrote that this is the custom

He mentions the use of עבר and עתיד to indicate habitual action in the past ("as if saying" היה עושה זה תמיד).⁹ He refers to Ibn Ezra (abbreviated: החכם; ר"אב"ע; Aben Ezra in McFall's translation is the same person) who is quoted to the effect that the use of עבר and עתיד to indicate זמן העומד is the norm in Arabic. This is also allowed in Hebrew, illustrated with two examples (one with a *yiqtol* and one with a *wayyiqtol*, from Isa 6:2; that *wayyiqtol* is called עבר seems to show that Qimḥi saw *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* as expressions of the same meaning). McFall translates זמן העומד as "a present tense" (Chomsky: "the Present") but the term clearly does not signify an absolute present tense since it refers to a past expression of continuous action, which must be the literal meaning of the term ("standing time"). Indeed, a persistent problem is the way the Hebrew terms for the verb forms are translated. When עבר is rendered as "past," עתיד as "future," and בינוני, זמן העומד, or similar terms as "present," an absolute tense interpretation seems to be already implied. However, the etymology of these words does not preclude the use of the terms as expressions of relative tense. E.g., עבר is anything that has passed (in any time frame). At the end of the quote, Qimḥi repeats the point from Ibn Ezra that there is no real present tense in the language.

As was the case with Ibn Ezra, the central point to note is that Qimḥi's view is not the simplistic system of three absolute tenses that modern scholars usually ascribe to the early Jewish grammarians. Quite the contrary, there is no simple present tense, and there is a clear realization that *yiqtol* can be used to express both habitual and ongoing action in the past.

It might be added that Qimḥi, in his own RH, does not use the verb forms as simple, absolute tenses (as would be expected following the standard view that RH is an absolute tense system causing interference in the interpretation of BH). In the passages omitted from the quote above, *qatal* is used as irrealis (כמו אם עבר; McFall: "as though it had already passed") and in a clause which McFall translates as a present perfect (כי כבר נגזר, "that it has already been

in the language of Ishmael (D. Kimḥi did not know Arabic), and he moreover wrote that so it is allowable to use them (i.e. the past and future tenses) in speaking of a present tense in the same manner as (we read) יִכְסֶה פָּנָיו (Isa. 6:2 'he was covering his face'), וַיִּנְדְּעוּ אֲמוֹת הַסְּפִיִּים (Isa. 6:4 'and the foundations of the thresholds were shaking'); for seeing that there is no form in the language for the intermediate tense (i.e. the present tense), they refer to it by means of a past or future tense [...]."

⁹ As will be explained in 3.1, the expression of past habituality is one of the functions of the non-anterior forms (*yiqtol* and *weqatal*) in a past context. There is no rule in the language dictating that what is habitual (from an objective point of view) *must* be expressed explicitly as such. This means that *qatal* or *wayyiqtol* can often be found in contexts that can or must be interpreted as habitual without being specifically marked. The important point here is that Qimḥi recognizes the use of *yiqtol* in a past context.

decreed"), while the *yiqtol* ידברו in the final part of the quote is used not as a simple future, but rather as a general/habitual tense.

Further on in Qimḥi's text, we find the following statement:

אבל בינוני במקום עבר ועתיד לא מצאנוהו ומה שאמר ר' יונה כי ופרעה חולם. הוא בינוני במקום עבר אינו אלא בינוני בעצמו ופירושו היה חולם...¹⁰

In contrast to Ibn Janah (ר' יונה), who apparently thought that the PTC could be used as a simple past tense (i.e. with the same meaning as a *qatal*), Qimḥi argues that a simple PTC can be used in a past context to indicate ongoing action in the past (which could be expressed more explicitly with היה+PTC). Again, Qimḥi clearly does not view the verbal system as a system of absolute tense in which the PTC = simple present tense.

More work must be done on this part of the history of research but what has been said here suffices to show that the standard view of the period cannot be taken for granted. In this connection, also note Chomsky's reference (1952, 361, n. 627) to the talmudic discussion in b. Ber. 52b on the interpretation of בורא in the blessing. Beth Shammai maintained that the PTC refers to the future, while Beth Hillel maintained that it refers to the past. Yet again, the point is that a PTC was not necessarily seen as an expression of absolute present tense.

1.1.1.2 Other early grammarians (pre-Ewald)

Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 459) note that the the "earliest Christian Hebraists accepted the medieval Jewish view," and McFall (1982, 11) remarks on Reuchlin's 1506 grammar that it "was based almost entirely on Qimḥi's grammar." In fact, Reuchlin (1506, 585) states that Hebrew has "Tempora tria" ("praesens"; "praeteritum"; "futurum"), though he does not seem to go deeper into the topic. However, as has been indicated, this was not Qimḥi's point of view. A few examples will illustrate that the general picture is less clear than assumed.

¹⁰ Qimḥi 1862 (ed. Rittenberg), 37b. Chomsky (1952, 340–341, with notes on p. 362): "The Present tense (participle), however, is never employed for the Perfect or the Imperfect. The instance of ופרעה חולם Gn 41:1 [...], adduced by Ibn Janah (*Rik.* 187) in proof to the contrary is irrelevant, for these are essentially forms of the (Past) Present, the former in the meaning of הָיָה חולם." Note Chomsky's annoying practice of "translating" the Hebrew terms into modern terms, "Perfect" and "Imperfect" etc. (criticized by McFall 1982, 7–8).

The view that Hebrew does not have a real present tense (but may *use* the PTC as such) is expressed by Münster (1524)¹¹ and Buxtorf (1609, 95).¹² Münster recognized modal uses of the "future" (*yiqtol*) and the occasional use of *yiqtol* in the past for Latin Imperfect (Gen 2:6, וַיֵּצֵא יְעֻבָּהּ; Job 1:5, כָּה יֵצֵא אִיּוֹב).¹³ Buxtorf (1609, 94–95) notes that Hebrew "Præteritum" and "Futurum" have to express all the different past and future forms of Latin, although he erroneously connects Latin Imperfect (*visitabat*) with *qatal* and Latin Futurum Exactum (*visitavero*) with *yiqtol*. This is in contrast to the Jewish scholars and Münster, who were well aware that *yiqtol* is used for ongoing or habitual action in the past.

Koolhaas (1748) attempts to show the incorrectness of the widespread view of "enallage" found among his predecessors and contemporaries. "Enallage" is a Greek term for a more or less promiscuous use of verb forms to express every meaning.¹⁴ Koolhaas cannot accept this view and strives to introduce a coherent understanding of the Hebrew system on its own terms. He appears to have been the first to introduce an explicit distinction between absolute and relative tense in the study of Hebrew.¹⁵ His definition of the two types is surprisingly close to modern definitions. "Absoluta tempora" are those "*quae in se spectata, sine ulla relatione ad aliquod præcedens aut consequens tempus, vel præsentia, vel præterita, vel futura sunt*" (Koolhaas 1748, 6), while "tempora relativa" are those "*quae non adeo absolute, seu in se spectata, sed in relatione ad aliquod sive præcedens sive consequens tempus vel ut præsentia, vel ut præterita, vel ut futura consideranda, veniunt: qualia præsertim sunt Præteritum Imperfectum & Plusquam-perfectum*" (ib., 6–7). He explains the Latin Imperfect as a present tense in the past, "*Præsens relativum*" or "*Præsens in re præterita*" (ib., 7), while the Plusquamperfectum indicates a past event "in relatione ad aliud tempus præteritum," i.e. "*Præteritum in re præterita*" (ib., 11–12).

Koolhaas states that Hebrew has three tenses (*Præsens*, *Præteritum*, and *Futurum*; ib., 5). These are stated to be absolute (ib., 6), which, at first glance, seems to align Koolhaas with what is traditionally said about the entire early period of scholarship. However, Koolhaas's view is actually much more

¹¹ No page numbering (p. 98 in the PDF available on archive.org).

¹² Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 459) seem to present Buxtorf as the first scholar to hold the view that Hebrew has no present tense. However, as illustrated above, this is not the case.

¹³ P. 103 and 121 in the PDF (see n. 11).

¹⁴ E.g. Buxtorf 1609, 9. The earliest Jewish grammarians, too, often noted the use of one form for another (like "prophetic perfect").

¹⁵ According to Binnick (1991, 40), Scaliger was apparently the first to distinguish absolute and relative tense in the description of Latin (in 1540).

complex and should not be taken to mean that Hebrew is a system of absolute tense. When he says that Hebrew does not have relative tenses, he specifically adds "saltem speciali quadam verborum flexione" (ib., 6), i.e., Hebrew does not have separate, specifically relative tense forms like the Latin past perfect. Because of the restricted number of Hebrew forms, the language is forced to use its absolute tense forms to express relative tense, and the same forms must be used to indicate what would be marked by the Latin subjunctive (ib., 25: "atque adeo fere coguntur temporibus suis absolutis etiam relative vel subjunctive uti"; cf. ib., 127). Hence, though he uses the term absolute tense for the Hebrew verb forms (and many details of his analysis of specific clauses are difficult to follow), it is clear that Koolhaas does not see the system as such as a system of absolute tense. E.g., in contrast to Buxtorf, he recognizes that the future perfect (Futurum Exactum) is expressed by Hebrew *qatal* (ib., 60), and he sees that *yiqtol* can be used "pro Futuro relativo, seu Futuro in re praeterita" (ib., 10).¹⁶ Though he calls the PTC a present tense, he states that its meaning should rather be considered to be continuity, potentially in any time frame: "*Præsens* quoddam, seu *continuum* quid, sive in Præterito, sive in Futuro Tempore" (ib., 212).¹⁷ In sum, the system as such, according to Koolhaas's conception, must be a system of relative rather than absolute tense.

Jahn's view of the HVS is clearly focused on relative tense.¹⁸ This is evident from his comparison of the Hebrew verb forms with their Latin counterparts (1809, 200). *Qatal* ("Aoristus primus") covers the Latin perfectum stem (*amavi, amaveram, amavero*), i.e. "omnem rem perfectam," and *yiqtol* ("Aoristus secundus") covers the infectum stem (*amo, amabam, amabo*), "omnem rem infectam," whether in relation to the past, present, or future. In contrast to the erroneous interpretation of the future perfect and the imperfect made by some earlier scholars (e.g. Buxtorf), Jahn correctly connects these meanings with *qatal* and *yiqtol*, respectively. Ideas similar to Jahn's were expressed by Gesenius (1817, 760): "Bey der Armuth der hebräischen Spra-

¹⁶ See below for Koolhaas's views on *wayyiqtol*, where the idea of relative future plays a major role (1.1.4.1).

¹⁷ Schröder's approach (1772) is very similar to Koolhaas's. Note how he describes the relative use of *qatal* as a past perfect ("res proponitur ut praeterita, in relatione ad tempus praeteritum"; ib., 269).

¹⁸ Bergström (2014, 46) attributes the beginning of "aspect analysis of Biblical Hebrew" to Jahn. However, as is clear from the quote above and the discussion of the definition of relative tense and aspect in 1.2.2–3, Jahn's approach must be described as relative tense, quite different from a modern aspectual approach, as indicated by the criticism that Bergström directs at the "weakness" of Jahn's system from his own aspectual point of view.

che an bestimmten Formen für die vielen absoluten und relativen Zeitverhältnisse, ist es nicht anders zu erwarten, als dass eine gewisse *Vieldeutigkeit* derselben entstehen musste," and he refers to Jahn's distinction between "die *noch nicht geschehene* oder *angefangene* Handlung" and "die *vollendete Handlung*." Lee (1827, 342–343) distinguishes between absolute ("with reference to the period at which his statement is made") and relative use of tenses (the reference is to "some other period or event already introduced into the context"). As is the case with Koolhaas and Schröder (1.1.4.1), Lee's use of the term relative is complicated to a large degree by his interpretation of the *waw*-prefixed forms. However, he clearly sees that *qatal*, *yiqtol*, and the PTC can be used in any time frame, "speaking of a time either past, present, or future, with reference to some other period or event already introduced to the reader's notice" (ib., 343).

To conclude this brief survey of early (pre-Ewald) thought on the semantics of the Hebrew verbs it bears repeating that the standard claim seems to be too simplistic. Not everybody assumed that the system was a simple three-part absolute tense system. Quite the opposite, several early scholars show an awareness that there is no simple present tense and that the forms termed "past" and "future" (or similar) have functions that cannot be subsumed under absolute tense. Furthermore, some scholars mentioned above see a close connection between the "future" and modality. Of course, the scholars surveyed here use the word "tense" (תנ"ך or "tempus"), but this does not necessarily mean what a modern scholar has in mind when using the term absolute tense. Rather, these terms probably have the general meaning "time," and since absolute tense, relative tense, and aspect all deal with "time" in one way or another (cf. 1.2), this usage does not prove that early scholars thought in terms of absolute tense. What seems clear is that the finer distinctions made by modern scholars were not part of the theoretical framework of the medieval grammarians and their followers. Until the time of Koolhaas, there seems to have been no terminology for indicating whether the theories should be classified as relative or absolute. Even when Koolhaas uses the specific term absolute tense about the Hebrew tenses, he is clearly aware that this is not the whole story and as illustrated above, his description of the system as a whole does not present it as a system of absolute tense.

It must be borne in mind that it is often very difficult to decipher the terminology and views of the medieval and later pre-modern grammarians (of course, this is often the case with modern scholars too). While a full-scale examination of the views expressed on this topic by the early grammarians is beyond the scope of this dissertation, the few examples adduced here il-

illustrate that the entire pre-Ewaldian period of research cannot simply be subsumed under the label absolute tense. The way they speak about the language and the uses of various forms clearly indicates that they were well aware that there was more to the verb forms than absolute tense.¹⁹

1.1.2 Ewald and "aspectual" theory

The introduction of the aspectual approach to the HVS is usually attributed to Ewald and his use of the terms "perfectum" and "imperfectum." DeCaen (1996), however, challenges this view. He argues that Ewald's theory is in fact a theory of relative tense, not aspect. Though parts of DeCaen's treatment can be questioned,²⁰ the general point seems to be corroborated by a close reading of the relevant parts of Ewald's work.

The terms as such occur in earlier works on the HVS written in Latin but with another meaning. In earlier terminology, "perfectum" and "imperfectum" could be used to indicate strong and weak verbs, respectively (e.g. Reuchlin 1506, 585; Schröder 1772, 32 and 62). What was new was the use of the terms in reference to the semantics of the verb forms and as designations for the forms. According to McFall (1982, 43), Jahn used the terms before Ewald, not as designations for the forms (for which he used the terms "Aoristus primus" and "Aoristus secundus"), but as descriptions of their semantic content. McFall (*ib.*, 44) attributes the following statement to Jahn: "Aoristus primus sistit rem perfectam, jam praesentem, jam praeteritam, jam futuram. Aoristus secundus sistit rem imperfectam, jam praesentem, jam praeteritam, jam futuram." The source for this quotation, curiously, is not Jahn, but Martin's book from 1876.²¹ Martin's quotation is the same as the one found in McFall (Martin 1876–1878, 4). He gives no references, but if the original quotation is looked up in Jahn's work, it becomes clear that Martin was not very accurate. The first half of the quote is the same (Jahn 1809, 204). However, the second half uses the word "infectam," not "imperfectam" (*ib.*, 211; cf. the quote in 1.1.1.2). Thus, though the meaning may have been

¹⁹ Sometimes, in the interest of furthering an exegetical agenda, the Rabbis interpret verbs in a way that seems to indicate a total lack of understanding of the way the system works. E.g., as noted by Goldfajn (1998, 7–8), Rabbi Meir in b. Sanh. 91b uses the *yiqtol* in Exod 15:1 as proof for the existence of the doctrine of resurrection in the Bible, since, apparently, Moses will sing in the future. Of course, there must have been a general awareness that ׀ plus *yiqtol* can indicate a past event (Qimḥi, e.g., clearly states this).

²⁰ See Cook's criticism of DeCaen (2012, 86–88, especially n. 9 and n. 13).

²¹ See McFall's footnote 44-1 (1982, 221): "For the text see Sir W. Martin, 1876:4. This text is from J. Jahn's 3rd ed. 1809."

the same, the terminological pair "perfectum" and "imperfectum" did not originate with Jahn.²²

Prior to 1835, Ewald called the verb forms "Modi." In the first version of his grammar (1827), *qatal* and *yiqtol* were "der erste Modus" and "der zweite Modus," respectively, and he notes that the language really does not know "den regelmässigen Unterschied der Tempusbildungen." Rather, "der erste Modus [gleich] am meisten unserm *Indicativ*, der zweite dem *Conjunctiv*" (ib., 219; cf. ib., 523ff.). The two forms are also called "Tempora aorista," i.e. forms that "die Handlung ohne Beziehung auf eine andre Handlung oder Zeit, d.h. aoristisch setzen" (ib., 524). According to Ewald, the first "Modus [= *qatal*] setzt die Handlung ohne Bedingung und Einschränkung" (ib., 524), while the second (= *yiqtol*) "spricht das *Bedingte*, von den Umständen oder dem Gefühle Abhängige aus" (ib., 526).²³ In the first edition of the abridged version of the grammar from 1828 (with a new title), the ideas expressed are similar, though the words "das Vollendete" and "das Unvollendete" are added to the description of the two "Modi" (Ewald 1828, 223). These words point in the direction of the second edition of the grammar, in which Ewald uses the terms "perfectum" and "imperfectum" as designations for *qatal* and *yiqtol* instead of first and second "Modus" (Ewald 1835, 131).²⁴ However, he still uses modal notions to describe the difference between the forms, in addition to the notion of completion. *Qatal* is "schon vollendet, vorliegend" and "bestimmt und gewiss," while *yiqtol* is "noch nicht vollendet und vorliegend"; "bloss werdend"; "das von den Umständen Abhängige und Unbestimmte" (Ewald 1835, 131–132). He stresses the fact that perfectum and imperfectum are not to be understood in "dem engen Sinne der latein. Grammatik" (ib., 131). This means that *qatal* does not merely have the same meaning as the Latin verb form Perfect (which specifically designates simple past and present perfect rather than completed events in any temporal sphere) and *yiqtol* is not the same as the Latin form called Imperfect (which is restricted

²² The quotation including the word "imperfectam" as well as the claim that Jahn was the first to use these designations is taken over by Cook who states that it is uncertain whether "Ewald relied on Jahn for his terminology or arrived at it independently" (2012, 86). However, as argued here, Jahn and Ewald did not use the same terminology. Waltke and O'Connor also pass on the quotation with the word "imperfectam" (in English translation), though they mistakenly attribute it to Ewald instead of Jahn, as Cook points out (Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 463). Cohen 2013, 35, n. 36, makes the same mistake.

²³ In addition to the two Modi or aoristic tenses, there are three so-called relative tenses, viz. the PTC and *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* (Ewald 1827, 524). See below in 1.1.4.2 for this use of the term relative tense and Ewald's view of the system.

²⁴ Ewald already used the terms "perfectum" and "imperfectum" in his Arabic grammar a few years earlier (Ewald 1831, 112–113; cf. 1855, 302).

1 Introduction

to a past temporal frame).²⁵ Rather, "in welcher Zeitsphäre der Redende die Begebenheit denken mag, er kann sie da entweder als vollendet oder unvollendet setzen" (1835, 131).

In the later editions, Ewald seems to become more temporal. In 1827, he stated that there really is no distinction of tenses in the usual sense and that the two central forms of the system "mehr den Unterschied des *Modus* als des *Tempus* haben" (Ewald 1827, 219). According to the quote presented above, he explicitly calls them "Tempora aorista," which do not relate the event to another event or time. What he calls relative tenses are the *waw*-prefixed forms (n. 23 above). However, from 1844 he is quite clear that simple *yiqtol* and *qatal* do indicate tense, only relative to the context. He says that "die unterscheidung der zeiten" is a fundamental part of the verb (Ewald 1870, 348–349).²⁶ "Die einfachste unterscheidung der zeit des handelns ist aber die dass der redende zunächst nur die zwei grossen gegensätze unterscheide unter denen alles denkbare handeln gedacht werden kann. [...] So fasst denn der redende in beziehung auf das handeln alles entweder als schon *vollendet* und so *vorliegend*, oder als *unvollendet* und *nochnichtseiend* möglicherweise aber *werdend* und *kommend* auf" (ib., 349). He states that the forms can be used in any temporal frame (past, present, and future), thus indicating that the system is not one of absolute tense, without using that term. However, he clearly indicates that "die begriffe des vollendeten und unvollendeten" can be used "beziehungsweise (relativ)" in any of the three time frames to indicate something finished or unfinished in relation to the temporal context (ib., 350). Thus, since the forms do not indicate absolute tense, the terms "Praeteritum" and "Futurum" should not be used, but rather the new terms "Perfectum" and "Imperfectum" (ib., 350).

²⁵ In later editions, there is an indication of the way the remark should be understood. When Ewald illustrates one of the specific functions of the "imperfectum," viz. the use of *yiqtol* to indicate habitual or concomitant action in the past, he explains what he means by the "narrow sense" of the terms: "Hier entspricht das hebräische Imperf. also fast ganz dem was man im Lateinischen im engern Sinne *Imperf.* (eigentlich Imperf. Praeteriti) nennt" (Ewald 1855 [= sixth edition], 306; the fifth edition [1844] has the same sentence without the "fast"). I.e., what is called Imperfect in Latin is specifically limited to a past context, while this is only one of the many functions of Hebrew *yiqtol*, which simply indicates that the event is not finished relative to the temporal context.

²⁶ This and the following quotes from the eighth edition (1870) also occur in the fifth (1844), sixth (1855) and seventh (1863) editions in substantially the same form (except mainly for variation in the style of German orthography, e.g. lack of capitalization of nouns).

Clearly, Ewald's view is not aspectual in the modern sense. He does not use the term *aspect*, which was only introduced much later.²⁷ This, of course, does not necessarily mean that Ewald's view cannot be aspectual. It might be a case of having "the idea (though not the vocabulary) of aspect," as Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 458) claim concerning nineteenth century scholars in general. The question is whether the idea behind Ewald's use of the terms *perfect* and *imperfect* is aspectual. As has been illustrated, the earliest incarnations of Ewald's theory primarily focused on mood, while the later editions place more emphasis on the temporal side of the verb forms. Modern aspectual theories typically use the terms *perfective* and *imperfective* to indicate events viewed as a single whole or as having internal structure, i.e. as complete or not (viewpoint aspect, cf. 1.2.2). This is not the way Ewald uses the words. He clearly describes his "Perfectum" as "vollendet," i.e. "completed" (with a *-d*) or "finished," and his "Imperfectum" as "unvollendet" ("unfinished"). Such usage suggests that the idea is one of relative tense (in the sense that the verb forms express tense relative to a contextually indicated point of time). Thus, the central point of DeCaen's reevaluation of the standard view on Ewald's theory seems to be sound. Cook, who is quite critical of DeCaen's approach and repeats the standard view of Ewald's theory as "an early aspectual type," admits that by using the word "early" he intends "to distance Ewald's concept of aspect from the more-recent, Slavic-influenced understanding of aspect that correctly distinguishes perfective and imperfective from the related notions of complete(d) and incomplete(d)" (Cook 2012, 88). Since Ewald in the later phase of his work clearly uses the terms in reference to what is finished or not in a temporal sense (what modern advocates of relative tense would call anteriority and non-anteriority), it seems better to simply avoid using the designation "aspectual" about Ewald's theory.²⁸

1.1.3 The semantics of the verb forms (post-Ewald)

Though the fundamentals of a relative tense theory had been implicit in the work of earlier scholars (as illustrated above), Ewald's (and Jahn's) explicit

²⁷ DeCaen (1996, 133–134) observes that the term occurs in the English translation of the eighth edition. Kennedy (Ewald 1891, 1) renders the German "die zwei grossen gegensätze" as "the two grand and opposite aspects under which every conceivable action may be regarded." However, whether this is intended as "aspect" in the grammatical sense or merely as a non-specialized way of saying "point of view" is not quite clear.

²⁸ Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 464) accuse Ewald of confusing "the concept of *complete* with that of *completed*." However, as DeCaen (1996, 131, n. 9) observes, Ewald was not confused since he clearly did mean "completed." The confusion only arises when one attempts to read later aspectual theory into Ewald's work.

expression of this idea, as well as the use of the new terms for the verb forms, had a huge impact on later scholarship.

S. R. Driver is often credited with popularizing Ewald's approach but as DeCaen (1996, 142, n. 31) points out, this mainly concerns the introduction of the terms "perfect" and "imperfect." Driver's theory, in fact, represents a "massive epistemological break" in comparison with Ewald, according to DeCaen (*ib.*, 142). DeCaen emphasizes the fact that Driver was "the first to introduce the concept as well as the term 'kind of time' (*Zeitart*) [...]. In a real sense, then, Driver is the father of Biblical Hebrew aspectology" (*ib.*, 146). Driver uses the word "tense" but is quite explicit that the Hebrew "tenses" do not mark simple temporal location or "order of time," i.e. whether an event occurs "prior or subsequent to some date otherwise fixed by the narrative" (Driver 1874, 2; *ib.*, 3–4, with n. 2, he notes that the "tenses" might "almost more fitly be called *moods*," yet he retains the "customary titles"). The "tenses" mark "kind of time" (the term "aspect" was introduced later from Slavic studies), the way "an action may be contemplated, according to the fancy of the speaker, or according to the particular point which he desires to make prominent, either as *incipient*, or as *continuing*, or as *completed*" (*ib.*, 2). The categories of incipiency (represented by *yiqtol*), continuance (PTC), and completion (*qatal*) are clearly modelled after the work of Curtius on the Greek verbs. Driver's term "incipient" for *yiqtol* ("nascent" and similar terms are also used) is based on Curtius' term "eintretend" for the Greek aorist stem, while "continuous" for the PTC corresponds to the Greek present stem and "completed" for *qatal* to the Greek perfect stem.²⁹ DeCaen (1996, 144) notes that the German word "eintretend" indicates both "entry as beginning as well as successful entry as an end-point." As Bergström (2014, 47) points out, the use of a term originally applied to the Greek aorist for *yiqtol* hardly means that Driver attributed the meaning of the Greek aorist to *yiqtol*: "On the contrary, as Driver himself notes, aorist meaning is often expressed by *qatal*, a form that Driver connects with Curtius' *vollendete Zeitart*, i.e. perfect meaning. It is possible that Driver misunderstood Curtius' term *eintretende*." The use of the term "incipient" should probably be seen in relation to Driver's perception of *wayyiqtol* (see 1.1.4.2).

In the present context, the important thing is that "kind of time" clearly brings us closer to an aspectual view in a stricter sense, and it is explicitly stated that the verb forms do not indicate temporal location – not even "prior or subsequent to some date otherwise fixed by the narrative," as opposed to Ewald's relative tense. However, it should be noted that Driver's three-way analysis of the system, especially the way *yiqtol* is presented, is a long way

²⁹ Cf. DeCaen 1996, 142–146, and Cook 2012, 90–91.

from the outlook of modern aspectual theory, and his use of "completed" to describe *qatal* points in a more temporal direction.³⁰ In fact, according to DeCaen (1996, 147–148), the introduction of the aspectual approach in the modern sense should be attributed to Brockelmann in 1951, following independent "false starts" by Landsberger (in 1926) and Kuryłowicz (in 1946 and 1964; later Kuryłowicz adopted a theory of relative tense, 1.1.3.3).

1.1.3.1 Later aspectual approaches

The decision to call a theory aspectual or not obviously hinges on one's definition of aspect and its relation to relative tense. Different definitions exist (1.2.2) and scholars using the word aspect do not always have the same thing in mind. In the period after Ewald and Driver, when the use of "perfect" and "imperfect" as designations for the verb forms became standard, the "aspectual view" became widespread. In fact, it has been noted that subsequent scholarship on the HVS has been dominated by this approach, as have most introductory textbooks (Joosten 2002a, 50; Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 475, n. 91). The adoption of the theory into Cowley's translation of Gesenius-Kautzsch has been regarded as the starting point of the spread of the "aspectual" theory (Penner 2015, 45). However, the way the theory is expressed in this work is far from "aspectual" in the modern sense. On the contrary, like Ewald's view, the approach presented is more obviously one of relative tense, *qatal* being "*concluded, completed, and past*" and *yiqtol* "*the beginning, the unfinished, and the continuing, that which is just happening, which is conceived as in process of coming to pass, and hence, also, that which is yet future; likewise also that which occurs repeatedly or in a continuous sequence in the past (Latin Imperf.)*" (GKC, 125, §47a, n. 1).

A "tenseless view" of Hebrew, as Penner (2013, 919) calls the view transmitted from Driver to GKC, is not necessarily tenseless as such, but merely a view that recognizes that Hebrew is not a system of absolute tense. Not all such theories are aspectual. E.g., while Ungnad (1912, 110) states that "Tempora im Sinne der indogermanischen Sprachen hat das Hebräische nicht," his explanation of what it does have is not specifically aspectual but much closer to a relative tense approach (though not explicitly so).

Later adaptations of the non-absolute tense approach clearly are aspectual in a stricter sense of the word. Still, the terminologies and the interpretations differ considerably among scholars. Some refer to "constative" vs. "cursive" aspect (Brockelmann 1956, 39; 1951; Rundgren 1961, 45; Meyer 1972, 40).

³⁰ In the very first note in the book, however, he uses the word "complete" instead of "completed" (as used elsewhere) to explain the etymological meaning of the term "perfect" (Driver 1874, 1).

Others use terms like "independent" vs. "dependent" action (Michel 1960, 254: *qatal* is "selbstgewichtig" and "absolut," *yiqtol* "relative"; ib., 256: *qatal* "drückt eine unabhängige Handlung aus, es konstatiert," *yiqtol* "bezeichnet eine abhängige Handlung"; Kustár 1972, 55: *qatal* "determinierend," *yiqtol* "determiniert"; cf. also Pedersen 1926, 216).

Other scholars see a basic opposition between perfective and imperfective aspect as used by many general linguists, i.e. viewpoint aspect. This is the modern aspectual (or aspect-prominent) approach in the strict sense (see, e.g., Pardee 2012, 287). Cook is arguably one of the most outspoken recent advocates of this kind of aspect-prominent approach. He combines the "classical aspectual view" with modern linguistic method (particularly typology), stating that his "answer to the long-standing debate of 'tense or aspect' is not drastically different from Ewald's, though our understanding of the perfective:imperfective opposition encoded in Biblical Hebrew *qatal* and *yiqtol* is distinguished by the century and a half of intervening discussion and the rise of modern linguistics" (Cook 2012, ix). As argued, Ewald's view was not aspectual but Cook's explicitly is. The opposition between a "Perfective (*qatal*)" and an "Imperfective (*yiqtol*)" is the central opposition in "the aspect-prominent verbal system of Biblical Hebrew" (ib., x); "*qatal* and *yiqtol* form a central opposition of the TAM system of BH and [...] this opposition is best described as perfective (*qatal*) and imperfective (*yiqtol*) viewpoint aspect" (ib., 200; cf. Cook 2006).³¹

1.1.3.2 Modal approaches

The view that modal notions play a role in the semantics of the central verb forms is quite old. Already the medieval Jewish scholars saw a connection between the "future" and the imperative, and some early Christian hebraists clearly ascribed modal meaning to *yiqtol* (e.g. Münster, as noted in 1.1.1.2). Ewald, in his early work, took a clearly modal approach, and several later scholars have noted the role of modality as part of the meaning of the verb forms, especially *yiqtol*. Some modern scholars have taken this approach further, claiming that modality is the central category in the system. Zuber uses the early Greek and Latin translations to argue that modality is the category best suited to describing the Hebrew forms. He divides the verb forms into two categories, "recto" (*qatal*, *wayyiqtol*, "unconverted" *weqatal*) with indicative meaning, and "obliquo" (*yiqtol*, "converted" *weqatal*, "unconverted" *weyiqtol*) with modal meaning (Zuber 1986, 27; on Zuber's method, see 2.4 and appendix 2). Modality also plays a prominent role in Hatav's theory

³¹ Cook's work will be treated in detail in 2.2 (a criticism of his use of typology) and 3.5.1 (arguments against the aspectual interpretation of the HVS in general).

(1997, 142ff.), in addition to a peculiar distinction of three aspects, viz. sequentiality, inclusion, and perfect (ib., 6 and 196; cf. 29). Tense is claimed to be unmarked in Hebrew (ib., 6 et passim).

One of the most prominent recent advocates of a modality-based approach is Joosten. He outlines a realis vs. irrealis distinction with *wayyiqtol*, *qatal* and the predicative PTC belonging to the first category and *yiqtol* and *weqatal* to the second. Apart from *yiqtol* and *weqatal*, the modal subsystem also includes a separate cohortative-imperative-jussive group (Joosten 2012a, 32–33; cf. 1999a, 2002b, etc.).³² Recently, Penner has used a statistical method to argue that the verb forms in 1 Sam 1–2 are best explained by a modal approach (Penner 2016, 25–27).³³

1.1.3.3 Temporal approaches

The absolute temporal approach has a recent advocate in Penner, whose statistical analysis of QH leads to the verdict that absolute tense is probably the fundamental category (modality being a close second; Penner 2015, 154–156).³⁴ Most other scholars with a temporal view recognize that relative tense (taxis) is the appropriate category, though the term itself may not always be used. According to this approach, the verb forms indicate temporal location relative to a point indicated by the context (which may be the time of speech). *Qatal* marks everything that is anterior and *yiqtol* everything that is not (i.e. simultaneous or posterior events). As noted, the line between aspect and relative tense is not easy to draw. Some earlier theories often presented as aspectual seem to belong to the group of relative tense theories. Relative tense was often recognized implicitly in the descriptions of the system long before the modern period.

Among modern advocates of relative tense we find Revell (1989, 4): "time reference [...] in relation to the speaker/narrator is not absolute, but is conditioned by the time reference of the context in which the verb form is used." Gropp (1991, 54) regards "'relative tense' as the most basic opposition between the perfect and the imperfect. [...] Following Kuryłowicz, then, the opposition between the perfect and the imperfect can be aptly defined as one of +ANTERIOR versus –ANTERIOR, with reference point to be established

³² Joosten's theory will be considered in more detail in 3.5.2 (with general arguments against the modal approach).

³³ A modal view of the HVS (using the terms "måder" ["moods"], "realis," and "irrealis") is presented in the grammar used at the introductory level at the Faculty of Theology, Cph. (Nielsen [with Ehrensverd] 2014, 117).

³⁴ Penner 2015 is a revision of Penner's dissertation (2006). His method yields a modal result for 1 Sam (1.1.3.2). On Penner's methodology, see 2.1.

by context."³⁵ Rogland (2003, 132) notes the relative temporal nature of *qatal*. According to Cohen (2013, 19), "Hebrew verbs are indeed full-fledged relative forms."

1.1.3.4 Text linguistics/discourse-prominence

Several theories based on text linguistics/discourse analysis have emerged. The different yet related viewpoints are typically described as belonging to two different "schools" following Longacre (e.g. 1989 and 1992) or Schneider (1978; based on the work of Weinrich [1964]). The common element is a focus beyond the sentence, on how verb forms function on the discourse level and on notions such as foreground vs. background, main-line vs. off-line, sequentiality, and word order variation. Longacre posits (at least) four discourse types (narrative, predictive/procedural, hortatory and expository; 1989, 60).³⁶ In contrast, Schneider (1978, 182–183) uses Weinrich's two "Sprechhaltungen" and sees only two types: "erzählende Rede" and "besprechende Rede," the latter in laws, prophecy, psalms, etc. Opinions differ as to which verb form indicates the main-line in non-narrative discourse types, *yiqtol* (Schneider) or *weqatal* (Longacre). Cook (2012, 155) notes that the different theories within this approach "give precedence to describing the verbal forms in terms of their discourse-pragmatic functions rather than their semantic meanings" and sometimes seem to "serve for some as an escape from the morass of traditional semantic and (predominantly) diachronic approaches" (ib., 150). Hence, these theories are of a different kind than the aspect-, mood- or tense-prominent theories introduced above. In fact, some variants of the text linguistic approach explicitly deny that the verb forms have any inherent semantic content in the way that scholars have traditionally assumed. In other variants, such far-reaching claims are not made. E.g., though Longacre notes that "each discourse type has its own characteristic constellation of verb forms" and that "the uses of given tense/aspect/mood form are most surely and concretely described in relation to a given discourse

³⁵ Kuryłowicz does not use the term relative tense, stating (1973, 115) that the basic opposition is neither aspectual nor temporal. However, his description of the basic opposition as "*simultaneity* (or *non-anteriority*) versus *anteriority*" clearly places him in the relative tense camp as understood by other scholars. Cf. 1972, 80ff.

³⁶ Other types are added in, e.g., Longacre 1992, 177–178 ("juridical," plus further types in poetry); 1995, 23 ("instructional"). As Cook (2012, 171) observes, it is difficult to see how to utilize this variety of discourse types and how to distinguish them from the notion of literary genre.

type" (Longacre 1989, 59), he does seem to accept that the forms have semantic content (e.g., 1992, 178–179 and 181).³⁷ Similarly, Niccacci combines his description of the discourse-pragmatic functions of the verb forms with a temporal/aspectual analysis of the meaning of the forms (2002, 197: "Main-line constructions are tenses while secondary-line constructions indicate aspect"; 1994, 129: "fixed temporal reference" in the main-line and "relative temporal reference" in the "subsidiary line of communication" – in the next paragraph, he uses the term "aspect" instead).

The claim of Schneider and some other proponents of text linguistic approaches that the verb forms do not have any inherent meaning is highly problematic (3.2). Schneider (1978, 84, n. 5) states that the designation "Tempora" and the traditional terms perfect and imperfect are "irreführend, weil diese Formengruppen weder etwas mit Zeit (lat. tempus) noch mit 'vollendet' (lat. perfectum) oder 'unvollendet' (lat. imperfectum) zu tun haben."³⁸ He distances himself from temporal and aspectual approaches (ib., 183, n. 3, and 206–207): the main tenses ("Haupttempora") of narrative discourse (*wayyiqtol*) and non-narrative discourse (*yiqtol*) merely serve to mark the text as belonging to those particular discourse types. However, he still translates *wayyiqtol* with "das deutsche Erzähl-Tempus Präteritum" (ib., 184) and *yiqtol* with "das Präsens als Haupttempus der besprechenden Rede" (ib., 188), not because this is what the Hebrew forms mean but because these are the forms used in the equivalent German discourse types. Even when *yiqtol* is used in narrative texts (in what is usually described as iterative or habitual function), Schneider translates with the present tense. He sees such usage as a kind of historic present, albeit not in the strict sense, of course, since the function is not one of tense, but merely to mark that "der Autor aus seiner Sprechhaltung als Erzähler heraustritt und mit seinen Hörern etwas bespricht, eine Anmerkung macht, die sie auch ausserhalb der erzählten Welt interessieren soll" (ib., 195; cf. 196–197).³⁹

Baayen's version of the discourse-prominent approach posits a similar lack of "intrinsic semantic value" in *qatal*, which merely serves a pragmatic

³⁷ Longacre (1992, 182) notes that *yiqtol* has future reference in predictive discourse, but past continuous reference in narrative. A relative tense approach (see ch. 3) would subsume both types of reference under the same heading (non-anterior) and stress the fact that these are not separate meanings but context-induced interpretations of the same basic semantic content (non-anteriority relative to the context). Note that *yiqtol* in past contexts is only rarely continuous but may indicate future in the past, habitual action, etc. (also functions of non-anteriority).

³⁸ According to Schneider (1978, 185, n. 5), *qatal* used as temporal background/past perfect is the only case of time reference in the system.

³⁹ See 3.1 on the "historic present" in Hebrew.

function, "signaling to the hearer that the event or state expressed by the verb cannot be tightly integrated into the discourse representation of the hearer, given the speaker's estimate of their common ground" (Baayen 1997, 245; see Cook 2012, 158, n. 66).

1.1.3.5 "Universal tense"

Other scholars have claimed that the verb forms lack real semantic content. As Waltke and O'Connor note (1990, 461), such a "universal tense" theory "has surely been held briefly by every student of elementary Biblical Hebrew."

Sperber (1966, 592) claims that "[e]ach of these tenses (the suffix tense and the prefix tense) may indicate any and every time." Many scholars with an aspectual, relative temporal, or modality-prominent view would agree to this claim (if "time" is taken to mean absolute tense). Sperber, however, goes further than this and claims that there is *no* difference in the meaning of the forms. They "run parallel to one another, representing two possibilities of expressing one and the same thing." In addition, the *waw*-prefixed forms mean the same thing too, according to Sperber.

Hughes (1970, 13) claims that there "seems to be no difference between the two tenses – form excepted – as they appear in the Hebrew Scriptures." Instead, he unconvincingly argues that various particles influence the use of the verb forms and their interpretation as different tenses (ib., 15–23). E.g., the relative particle is claimed to lead to a past interpretation of a verb (ib., 17–19), which is obviously not always the case, and the particle ׀ is claimed to lead to both past and future interpretations (ib., 20 and 21–22). Further, his claim that parallel texts with different verb forms illustrate the semantic equivalence of the forms is baseless.

1.1.4 The consecutive forms

The second main problem in the HVS is the system of so-called consecutive forms (*wayyiqtol*, *weqatal*). This system is arguably the most characteristic trait of CH. At first glance, the addition of the conjunction *waw* ("and") to a verb form changes the meaning of the form into its opposite, a phenomenon that has puzzled scholars and fostered all kinds of clever attempts at explanations. The answer given to the question of the primary category to be used in the description of the meaning of the verb forms (aspect, tense, mood, etc.) is not necessarily connected to any specific view on the question of the consecutive forms. There are two basic approaches, 1) the meaning of the *waw*-forms are "converted" in relation to the simple forms, or 2), no such "conversion" takes place and the *waw*-forms and the simple forms share the same

basic meaning. Note that one does not have to follow the same approach with *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*.

Approach 1) is the oldest. According to McFall (1982, 2–3), the first description of something like the conversive *waw* (as opposed to simple copulative *waw*) is found in the work of Japheth ha-Levi in the beginning of the tenth century. He uses the term *waw* עתידי ("future *waw*").⁴⁰ A little later, Menahem ben Saruq (910-970) expressed similar views (ib., 4).

Of course, those are merely the first explicit mentions of the phenomenon in extant grammatical works. Long before Japheth ha-Levi wrote about it, readers of the OT must have been aware of the facts that a standard *weqatal* does not have the same meaning as a simple "and"+*qatal* and that *wayyiqtol* does not mean "and he will kill." Otherwise, it would have been impossible to make sense of the texts. Furthermore, the people responsible for the early translations into Greek and other languages clearly knew the system, not in an analytical, theoretical manner (as far as we know), but in practice (but see ch. 6, n. 55).

Ibn Ezra (12th cent.) remarks that the "past" tense is formed in two ways. 1) By using *qatal*, on which he notes that sometimes (פעם) a preposed *waw* is used in a merely copulative way (להבור), while sometimes it turns the meaning into the "future" (ופעם ישיבנו הו"ו לעתיד). 2) By adding *waw* to a form with "preformative servile letter" (האות הנוסף המשרת), i.e. *yiqtol*, which changes the form into a "past" tense (וישוב עבר).⁴¹

A little later, Qimḥi introduced the term *waw* השירות ("waw of service").⁴² Like Ibn Ezra, he notes the two types of *weqatal* (one points the *qatal* לעתיד, the other merely seems to "add to the subject," (להוסיף הענין). He describes the difference between "converted" *wayyiqtol* and "unconverted" *weyiqtol* and their different vocalizations (Qimḥi 1862 [ed. Rittenberg], 48b and 49a). In another context (ib., 5a), he mentions the stress on the final syllable in *weqatal* with "waw of service": וכשתכנס עליהם וא"ו השמוש ישובו מלרע ברוב. Note the alternative term for the "waw of service" (וא"ו השמוש). Qimḥi (ib., 44a–b) was aware that *wayyiqtol* is not always strictly sequential but may

⁴⁰ As observed above, one should be cautious when using a word like "future" since it implies an absolute tense analysis, which is not necessarily the case.

⁴¹ For the text, see Patón 2002, 96* (Spanish translation on pp. 201–202).

⁴² See McFall 1982, 8. McFall criticizes Chomsky's claim that Qimḥi was the first to "have sensed the peculiar character of the *Waw* consecutive" (Chomsky 1952, 78, n. 100). However, Chomsky does note that Qimḥi's predecessors, though without using separate designations, were well aware of the functions of the *waw* consecutive and the *waw* copulative.

indicate an event that happened before the event of the preceding verb (ישׁ וי"ו שמורה הזמן שכבר עבר קודם הפעל אשר לפניו).⁴³

Elias Levita introduced what became the standard terms, viz. וי"ו ההפוך (*waw (ha)hippuk*; "waw of turning/change") for conversive *waw* and וי"ו החבור (*waw (ha)hibbur*; "waw of connection") for simple copulative *waw* (Levita 1767 [1518], 3b).⁴⁴ Like Qimḥi, he describes the formation of the forms, noting the peculiarities of stress and vocalization (ib., 4a–b). Levita (ib., 3b) equates the "converted" *weqatal* with *weyiqtol*: וְשָׁמַר "is like" (כמו) וְשָׁמַר. This is obviously not the general case in BH (*weyiqtol* regularly has jussive meaning in contrast to *weqatal*, see 3.7). Levita is clearly "translating" the BH *weqatal* into *weyiqtol* as used in RH, where the consecutive forms are not found.

Early Christian hebraists followed the same line of thought as their Jewish predecessors (e.g. Reuchlin 1506, 145). Münster translated Levita's work and gave the two types of *waw* Latin names: "uau הַבּוּר id est, coniunctionis" vs. "uau הַפּוּךְ id est, conuersionis" (1532, 17). Buxtorf (1609, 537) used the terms "*Vau copulationis* sive copulativum" and "*Vau conuersionis* sive conuersivum."

1.1.4.1 The "relative (consecutive)" approach of Koolhaas and Schröder

The view that *waw hippuk* changes the meaning of a form into its opposite was challenged from the 18th century onward. According to McFall (1982, 13), Schröder represents "a new departure from the Jewish view of the HVS." To be fair, McFall notes that other voices of dissent had been heard before. According to McFall (ib., 13), the "first recorded protest against the theory [of conversive *waw*] appears to have been made by Johann Simonis." Simonis (1753, 218), however, points to earlier scholars and he clearly does not present his own view when he says "Sunt tamen, qui eiusmodi vim *Præfixi Vau conuersivam* plane negant, ut I. I. von Einem in *Methodo docendi linguas* p. 31. addita hac ratione: quia id reuera fit impossibile, cum ne quidem Deus tempus *præteritum* in *futurum* convertere possit."⁴⁵ Simonis (ib., 219) refers to several other scholars with views that differed from the conversive *waw*: Chrysander, Florentius de Bruin, Meinerus, and Koolhaas,

⁴³ He mentions Isa 64:4, Job 14:10, Lev 9:22, Judg 4:21, Exod 16:20, and Exod 14:21 (not all of which seem to be good examples of the point; he also notes Gen 7:11 which includes no *wayyiqtol*). Cf. Chomsky 1952, 353; McFall 1982, 9.

⁴⁴ McFall (1982, 10) notes that the terms were used by Abraham de Balmes around the same time.

⁴⁵ McFall notes (1982, 217, n. 13-1) that the reference is to Johann Justus von Einem, though "this could not be traced or verified." I have not been able to find the book by von Einem.

to whom he ascribes the view that the "Vau Conversivum Futuri" designates "revera *Futurum* [...] sed *Relativum* sive *Futurum in re præterita*."⁴⁶ In addition, McFall (1982, 219, n. 14-1) mentions Lee's protest that the idea of *waw* relativum did not originate with Schröder, but came via Robertson from "Koolhaus" (sic), though apparently McFall did not have access to Koolhaas's book and missed Schröder's own acknowledgement of influence from Koolhaas.⁴⁷ In McFall's main text, however, the impression is given that Schröder was the first to introduce the "relative" explanation of the *waw*-forms, which seems to be the reason for the erroneous statements to this effect in some surveys (Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 460; Bergström 2014, 28). In order to differentiate the views presented here from modern relative tense approaches, it seems helpful to use the term "relative (consecutive)" about the views of Koolhaas, Schröder, and their followers.

Koolhaas's view of the *waw*-prefixed forms must be seen in light of his general use of the word relative. In Koolhaas's view (cf. 1.1.1.2), Hebrew does not have specific relative tenses, hence the few tenses available have to be used with absolute and relative reference. The meaning of Koolhaas's relative future is an action that is past seen from the time of speech but which happened after the action indicated by a preceding verb ("quod posterius, adeoque futurum est respectu Temporis præcedentis Præteriti"; Koolhaas 1748, 156). If seen from the time of the preceding event (relative to the preceding event), the second event is future. Though "Futurum Relativum" may be found with simple ("nudo") *yiqtol*, this sense is most often expressed by *wayyiqtol* (ib., 157). In this form, the connection with the preceding verb form is marked by the special vocalization, which Koolhaas (following Schultens) compares to the vocalization of the definite article (ib., 154–155). For this, he uses the term *waw* "*Demonstrativum* seu *Emphaticum*" (ib., 158), alongside the term *waw* "*Relativum*" (ib., 157). He acknowledges that in most cases the absolute time reference of *wayyiqtol* is past, as can be seen from the change from *wayyiqtol* to *qatal* whenever something comes between *waw* and the verb (ib., 156). However, he rejects the traditional term "Conversivum," because no "conversion" takes place as the verb still indicates future tense, only relative to the preceding verb (ib., 157).

Concerning *weqatal*, Koolhaas admits that *weqatal* often indicates future tense, based on the systematic interchange between *weqatal* and *yiqtol* (ib.,

⁴⁶ Except for Koolhaas, the works of the scholars referred to by Simonis have so far been inaccessible to me.

⁴⁷ See Lee 1851, 470. Koolhaas (1748, 128 and 157) acknowledges the influence of de Bruin. Schröder (1772) mentions Koolhaas in his "Praefatio" and Schröder's dependence on Koolhaas seems evident in many cases.

71). Yet he denies that this has anything to do with "conversion" in the strict sense. Rather, the future sense is taken over from the preceding verb. Therefore, he suggests the terms "Vav Relativum" or "Vav Subjunctivum" for *weqatal* (ib., 73). The latter term seems to fit his description better, since he does not see *weqatal* as relative in the same way as *wayyiqtol* (the form does not mark past in the future, as would be expected from a relative meaning of the form along the lines of *wayyiqtol*, which is said to designate future in the past).

Schröder's relative view of *wayyiqtol* as a "Futurum relativum" is very close to Koolhaas's view. The form marks "rem revera praeteritam," not "per se, & absolute sed in relatione ad praecedens aliquod Praeteritum, spectatam" (Schröder 1772, 274). In narrating a series of past events, the Hebrews express only the first event "per Praeteritum"; the following events, "quas, ratione praecedentis, tamquam futuras considerant," they express "per Futurum."⁴⁸

Modern scholars are mostly (and rightly) skeptical towards the "relative (consecutive)" theory. As Binnick (1991, 130) points out, referring to Schröder's version, this type of explanation is really "conceptual gymnastics" (Bergström 2014, 28: "mental acrobatics"). In some cases, to be sure, the logic may seem sound enough. Koolhaas (1748, 163) uses Prov 30:4 as an example (מִי עָלָה-שָׁמַיִם וַיֵּרַד). It seems obvious that the descent happens after the ascent. If we plot the events onto a timeline with the past to the left and the future to the right, obviously the second event designated by the *wayyiqtol* occurs farther to the right than the first event. Consequently, it is future in relation to the *qatal*. However, there are serious problems with this approach, apart from the fact that this would seem to be a very strange and unparalleled way of organizing a verbal system. Qimḥi already noted *wayyiqtol*s indicating events that happened before a previously mentioned event. In other cases, a *wayyiqtol* with clear past meaning follows a non-past referring verb. Hence, relative future makes no sense and such cases are quite problematic for the "relative (consecutive)" approach to *wayyiqtol*. Koolhaas (ib., 173) is aware of such instances and tries to explain them away without much success. E.g., he unconvincingly proposes a future interpretation of

⁴⁸ The past tense form, to which a "Futurum relativum" is supposed to relate, may be suppressed "per ellipsin" (Ps 144:3) or the preceding verb may be an infinitive or PTC expressing past tense (Schröder 1772, 275). In addition, Schröder states that when the preceding verb is "Future" or PTC, *wayyiqtol* has the same temporal reference as this verb (ib., 276; this was also Koolhaas's view). Though such future or present tense *wayyiqtol*s probably do not exist (3.3.5), it makes sense in the framework of Koolhaas's/Schröder's theory since a future relative to a future or a PTC with present tense or general meaning is, of course, (absolute) future.

Job 2:3 (וַתְּסִיחֵנִי), which most scholars treat as having past reference following a PTC referring to present time.

Further, how do we distinguish the supposedly "relative future" usage in *wayyiqtol* from a real future in the past ("he would do") or from an ordinary future tense following a verb with past reference? Koolhaas (1748, 131) gives an example of a real future in the past from 2 Kgs 13:14 (וַאֲלֵי־שָׁעָה הָלָהּ (אֶת־תְּהִלָּתוֹ אֲשֶׁר יָמוּת בּוֹ), which he translates as (among other proposals) "moriturus erat." In Koolhaas's theory, the reason why *wayyiqtol* does not have this meaning must be the close link between *wayyiqtol* and the tense of the preceding verb marked by his *waw* "*Demonstrativum seu Emphaticum*" mentioned above, which must consequently be seen as pivotal in his theory. Otherwise, there would be no reason why *wayyiqtol*s would not generally indicate real future in the past or just absolute future. Schröder does not seem to share this point with Koolhaas. Thus, when he cites Ps 30:3 as an example (שָׁוַעַתִּי אֵלֶיךָ וַתִּרְפָּאֵנִי), giving the translation "clamavi ad te, et sanasti me" and paraphrasing the sentence as "quando clamavi, futurum fuit ut me sanares" (Schröder 1772, 275), we might ask how we know that the final part is "et sanasti" ("and you saved me") and not "and you will save me."

Modern scholars often assume that Schröder uses the same relative approach for *weqatal* as for *wayyiqtol*. According to McFall (1982, 22), Schröder explains *weqatal* with a claim that "the Past used for a future event was, in reality a relative Past tense." Similarly, Bergström (2014, 28) states on Schröder's theory: "Thus, the future use of *weqatal* meant that the speaker transposed himself mentally to a future vantage point and regarded the events as if they were already past, albeit still future in relation to the time of speech." Cook (2012, 84) refers to Schröder's "relative-tense understanding" of both *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*.⁴⁹ However, Schröder (like Koolhaas) does not use the same explanation for both forms (but see Lee, Ewald, and others below). Rather, he explains the future meaning of *weqatal* by claiming that *qatal* is originally an infinitive ("ab Infinitivo non fuerit diversum") and hence easily takes over the sense of another verb (Schröder 1772, 270).

1.1.4.2 "Relative (consecutive)," inductive and consecutive approaches

The theory of Koolhaas and Schröder was taken over by Bellamy (1818, xxxvi on *wayyiqtol* as relative future; ib., xxxviii on *weqatal* taking over the meaning of a preceding form). Gell (1821, 76) introduced the term "*waw* inductive" ("if *any* peculiar appellation must be given to it"), "as it is the mean of leading into its verb the communicated time, &c." However, he

⁴⁹ Cook claims that Schröder treats the *waw*-prefixed forms as relative, while the simple forms are absolute. This is not the case.

1 Introduction

notes that this is really a misnomer, since the *waw* is merely a connective particle, and the meaning we give to the verb after the *waw* "belongs, not to the γ , but to the relation, whether of congruity, contrast or dependence, &c. which the sentences connected may bear to one another" (ib., 76). Because of the term "inductive," McFall (1982, 21–26) places Gell's theory (and Bellamy's) under the heading "The *Waw* Inductive Theory," separate from the "Relative Tense Theory" (attributed to Schröder). However, such a clear distinction may be unwarranted. On the one hand, "induction" from the preceding verb was already part of Koolhaas's and Schröder's theories (and, as regards the interpretation of the two different types of *weqatal*, in the theories of earlier scholars). On the other hand, both Bellamy and Gell use "relative" terminology. Gell's position is basically the same as Koolhaas's and Schröder's. *Yiqtol* in *wayyiqtol* "besides having the communicated temporal power of the Governing Verb [...] is used to express, in general, by its own proper power, relative futurity" (Gell 1821, 9); the "Preterits" in *weqatals* "appear without any proper temporal power of their own, and are *Indefinite*," expressing "their own verbal action in the abstract with personal distinctions," together with "the communicated time of the Governing Verb" (ib., 12).

Lee distinguishes relative from absolute use of verbs, and this is the basis for his view of the *waw*-prefixed forms. He sees no connection between prefixed *waw* and the meaning of the form (Lee 1827, 361). In contrast to Koolhaas and Schröder (who recognized that the meanings of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* were usually "past" and "future," respectively), Lee claims that a writer using *wayyiqtol* situates "both himself and his reader in times contemporary with the events of which he is treating" (ib., 350). Consequently, Lee translates *wayyiqtol* with the present tense, producing odd shifts like Gen 1:5, "so God calls the light day; but the darkness he called night" (ib., 351; cf. ib., 362 on *wayyiqtol*s introducing whole books, e.g. Lev 1:1, "so *Jehovah* CALLS to Moses, and SPEAKS"). *Weqatal* is accounted for by the claim that "the Hebrews, in common with some other nations of the East, often represent events, of the future occurrence of which they have no doubt, as *having already taken place*" (ib., 352). When *weqatal* is used after an imperative, he calls the usage "*emphatical*" ("and thou SHALT (surely) LOVE," Deut 6:5; ib., 355).

A combined "relative (consecutive)" and "inductive" approach became widespread in the following period. Ewald's and Driver's theories of the *waw*-prefixed forms mainly derive from this view of the system, though both introduced new ideas.

Ewald (1870, 595, n. 2) prefers the name *waw* "consecutivum conversivum."⁵⁰ For "consecutivum," he uses the German word "fortschreitend," calling *wayyiqtol* "das bezüglich-fortschreitende imperfectum" and *weqatal* "das bezüglich-fortschreitende perfectum," indicating both the relative and consecutive character of the forms (ib., 593 and 599). The *waw* is not "das einfache *und*." Rather, like German "da" or "so," it indicates more emphatically that the event is a consequence or result ("folge") of a preceding event (ib., 593). Ewald states that the special form of the conjunction in *wayyiqtol* and the doubling of the initial consonant of the *yiqtol* part (*waCC-*) is to be derived from ordinary *wə-* plus the particle וְ , and because of this origin, the *wayyiqtol* is located directly in the past (ib., 593).⁵¹ The *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol* is explicitly stated to be the voluntative (jussive/cohortative), which, according to Ewald (1870, 594, with n. 1), already indicates "das abhängige und bezügliche." He describes the combined form as a form, which "eine werdende handlung rückwärts in die vergangenheit verlegt und hier an irgend einem schon gegebenen orte in ihrer nothwendigen *folge* só anknüpfen lässt dass man sie von da aus wie in ihrem werden entstehend sehen kann. Dies ist das von irgend einem schon gegebenen orte oder gedanken *fortschreitende*, folglich nie für sich sondern immer *bezüglich* gesezte *imperfectum perfecti*" (ib., 594). While this sounds much like the "relative (consecutive)" approach of his predecessors, Ewald's insistence that *wayyiqtol* includes a specifically voluntative form/meaning indicates that the picture is more complicated. Furthermore, he refers to *weyiqtol* as "der bezüglich-fortschreitende voluntativ" (ib., 602), which underlines the importance of the prefixed *waCC-* for the meaning of *wayyiqtol*.

Ewald states that there is a complete correspondence between the "bezüglich-fortschreitende perfectum" and the "bezüglich-fortschreitende imperfectum." Though he does not use the term analogical for *weqatal*, he notes that *wayyiqtol* "ruft [...] vonselbst" *weqatal* "hervor" (ib., 599–600; see 5.3.1). His description of the meaning of *weqatal* is not entirely clear when he claims that "das werdende sofort als ins seyn tretend gesezt wird" (ib., 600). This is a strange claim. The event marked by *weqatal* is obviously not restricted to the very near future, as might be imagined from this quote ("sofort"?). Further on, Ewald states that *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* indicate that

⁵⁰ According to Driver (1874, 76, n. 2), the term "consecutivum" was originally used by Böttcher in 1827.

⁵¹ Earlier, Ewald (1827, 539) thought that *waCC-* had its origin in וְ plus *yiqtol*, "*et factum est, fit (ut) scriberet, woraus sich der II. m. [= yiqtol] gleich erklärt.*" There are several differences between Ewald's conception in earlier and later editions. E.g., in 1827, he states that *wayyiqtol* "keiner bestimmten Zeit angehört" (ib., 541), as opposed to the later view that *waCC-* points directly to the past.

"die handlung in eine *neue folge* tritt, nämlich das wirkliche (*perf.*) zum neuen werden und sich entwickeln (dem *conseq. imperf.*), das noch-nichtseiende (*imperf.*) aber in der vorstellung zum wirklichen (*conseq. perf.*) fortschreitet" (ib., 839).

Driver explains *wayyiqtol* in terms of the meaning of simple *yiqtol* (incipient, ingressive, etc.). The event indicated by a *wayyiqtol* can be "viewed as *stepping in*" after the preceding event (Driver 1874, 75). Time reference is determined by the prefixed *waCC-*, which "connects the new event with a point previously assigned in the narrative: the goal at which it sets out, the starting-point from which it takes its origin, and to which it therefore is *relative*, is fixed at the termination of the action denoted by the preceding verb" (ib., 75). According to Driver (ib., 77), the usual meaning of the term "conversive" must be given up, since, from his "kind of time"-point of view, there is "now no longer any 'future' or 'past' to need 'conversion'."⁵² *Wayyiqtol* is "*ingressive, emergent, or nascent*" like simple *yiqtol* (ib., 75). Yet, the term "conversive" can be retained because it is "a sign admirably adapted to keep the thing signified separate from anything which it may superficially resemble" (ib., 77). Note his statement that, while the *waw* "conversive" "does not change the meaning of the tense, it does alter the aspect under which an action is conceived" (ib., 78). In this sentence, one must really keep the terminology clear. What Driver calls "tense" is his "kind of time" (more or less modern aspect), while what he calls "aspect" is not aspect in the modern sense, but simply another word for point of view, as he explains in the following sentence: "it [the form with *waw* "conversive"] presupposes a point of view which demands on our part an effort of thought before it can be appreciated and realised: it effects a modification sufficiently marked to render the retention of the old distinctive title [*waw* conversivum] not merely defensible but desirable" (ib., 78). This "point of view" is the relative connection to the preceding verb. Driver recognizes that his theory of the *waw*-prefixed forms is essentially the same as Ewald's ("with a little expansion"), and he further refers to Schröder for the same view (ib., 78).⁵³ He acknowledges that it might seem strange that successive events in the past should be marked, not for pastness, but for their character as nascent or ingressive, but he ascribes this to "the mode of thought peculiar to the people," as "reflected

⁵² In this case, there clearly is a connection between an "aspectual" view of the semantics of the verb forms and the abandonment of the "conversive" view of the *waw*-prefixed forms. However, such a connection is not necessary. An aspectual view can be combined with a "conversive" conception of *waw*-forms.

⁵³ Driver (1874, 88) rejects Ewald's view that the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol* is voluntative – the correspondence between *wayyiqtol* and the jussive is "one of those *accidental coincidences* not unknown to language."

in their language" (ib., 79). However, he also states that due to the common and constant use of *wayyiqtol*, "it is probable that a distinct recollection of the exact sense of its component parts was lost, or, at any rate, receded greatly into the background, and that the construction was used as a whole, without any thought of its original meaning, simply as a form to connect together a series of past events into a consecutive narrative" (ib., 79).⁵⁴

Similarly, he claims that "[n]o fact about the Hebrew language is more evident than the *practical equivalence* of ויקרא and ויקרא...: these are the two alternative formulae which in countless passages interchange with one another: the peculiar point of view which determined the selection of the construction with ו (even if then always consciously preserved) was entirely dropped when the verb parted company with its conjunction" (ib., 108). In this case, "peculiar point of view" must mean the "aspectual" meaning of *yiqtol/wayyiqtol* as opposed to *qatal*.

Driver notes that *weqatal* is "the direct antithesis" of *wayyiqtol* (ib., 125). The meaning of the form is a product of the union of the verb with the conjunction. He rejects the view that *weqatal* is to be explained as "prophetic perfect" and instead (like Lee and Ewald above) includes the *weqatal* in the "relative (consecutive)" approach. *Wayyiqtol* causes "an already completed action to be viewed as passing into a new phase" – similarly and conversely, *weqatal* occasions "a nascent action to be viewed as *advancing to completion*, as no longer remaining in suspension, but as being (so to say) precipitated" (ib., 128). Thus, the central meaning of *qatal* ("completion") is preserved in *weqatal*, but this must be understood relative to the preceding verb: "An action described by this construction is regarded, it is true, as completed, but *only with reference to the preceding verb*, only so far as the preceding action necessitates or permits" (ib., 130). On the one hand, Driver states that *weqatal* takes over the shade of meaning of the "dominant" verb, passing "under the sway of the verb to which it is connected" (ib., 130). This is clearly the reason for Cook's claim (2012, 92) that Driver used a *waw* "inductive" theory to explain *weqatal*. On the other hand, however, as indicated by the quotes above, Driver presupposes the meaning of simple *qatal* in *weqatal*, further illustrated by his "literal" translation of פן, למען, אם, אולי, למה, איך יבא as "lest, that, if he come – *then* or *so* (i.e. upon the supposition that the first statement is realised) – *has* or (as our idiom would prefer on account of the *condition* implied) *had he smitten me*" (1874, 131). He also refers to the *waw* in this construction as *waw* "relativum," and the whole construction as

⁵⁴ Cf. the third edition of the book (Driver 1892, 94): the use of *wayyiqtol* in historical books, "times without number, renders it inconceivable that it should have suggested anything except the idea of a *fact done*."

"relatively-progressive perfect" (cf. Ewald's "bezüglich-fortschreitend") (ib., 132). Sometimes, however, the connection to a preceding verb is lost: "[...] the perfect with *waw*, from constant association with a preceding imperfect, became so completely invested with the properties of the latter that, though not originally belonging to it but only *acquired*, it still continued to retain and exhibit them, even when that in which they had their proper seat was no longer itself present" (ib., 152–153).

GKC presents a "relative (consecutive)" approach of the type that claims that both *waw*-prefixed forms preserve the meaning of the simple forms. *Wayyiqtol* may represent everything which follows "from the idea of the imperfect" (ib., 328, §111n). Similarly on *wegatal*: "even the *perfect consecutive* originally represents a finally completed action, &c." (ib., 330–331, §112b, n. 2).⁵⁵

1.1.4.3 The historical-comparative approach

New ways of dealing with the *waw*-prefixed forms (and the verb forms in general) became possible by the use of input from the expanding field of historical-comparative Semitic linguistics from the second half of the nineteenth century. The modern discoveries of Akkadian, Amarna-Canaanite, and Ugaritic – as well as the continued investigation of the Semitic languages that had been known all along – shed new light on many aspects of the HVS (for a comprehensive overview, see Cook 2012, 93–120). Though some scholars in the earliest period of historical-comparative research on the Semitic verbs seem to have been preoccupied with the (in retrospect) rather pointless discussion about the "oldest verb form" or with variants of the "Mischsprache"-theory, valuable insights have been gained, without which no satisfactory explanation of the problems can be given.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Cf. also, e.g., Brockelmann 1956, 39–45.

⁵⁶ According to Haupt (1878, 246), the "Assyrian Present (*iqátal*) [= *iparras*] and the Ethiopic Imperfect (*yěqátēl*) [= *yəqattəl*]" are "the oldest verbal forms of the Semitic family of speech." Bauer (1910, 8), on the other hand, argued for the "Ursprünglichkeit des Imperfekts [in the form *yaqtul*]," while G. R. Driver gave priority to the predecessor of Hebrew *qatal*, viz. *qati/ul* (Driver 1936, 25ff.). The reasons adduced for the various views often betray a naïve belief that the origin of the Semitic languages coincides with the origin of language as such. Driver argues that it would be "*a priori* likely that primitive man would be occupied rather with the present than with past events" (ib., 28). A corollary of the assumption of an "original verb form" is that this form must have had universal meaning (e.g. Bauer 1910, 10). On these questions, cf. McFall 1982, 120–121, and the criticism of this approach by Andersen (2000, 19 and 26). On the theory that Hebrew is a "Mischsprache" combining Eastern and Western verb forms and meaning, see G. R. Driver 1969. Similar views were expressed by Knudtzon, Bauer, and others. Cf. McFall's criticism (1982, 141). There is no reason to suppose that the HVS is the result of a special

The most solid result of the comparative approach for the present question must be the realization that the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol* is not the same as simple *yiqtol* (see 5.1). It has become clear that the "conversion" implied in the term *waw* conversive never happened, diachronically speaking, in the sense that a single verb form shifted from one meaning to another. Yet, synchronically, there *is* a "conversion" between simple *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* since they derive from two different forms with opposite meanings, *yiqtol* from a non-anterior (or present-future or imperfective, depending on theoretical outlook) form and *wayyiqtol* from an anterior (or past or perfective) form. Most modern scholars seem to share a view along these lines, in contrast to the views presented in 1.1.4.2 (cf. Holst 2008, 48). However, some disagree.

Robar (2013; 2014, 78ff.) ignores the comparative evidence and argues that *wayyiqtol* is some type of narrative present. Hataav (2004, 494) assumes that, synchronically, "the base verb in *wayyiqtol* is the regular form *yiqtol*" – without considering the evidence to the contrary. Furuli (2005, 117) claims that there is no such evidence. Niccacci (1990, 164) highlights the strictly synchronic character of his work, arguing that "even if the problem [i.e., how to derive the *waw*-prefixed forms from earlier forms] had been solved the need for checking whether in practice the use of verb forms at the synchronic level corresponds to their origin as established diachronically would remain" (cf. Saussure's famous distinction [1995, 117] between synchrony and diachrony and the necessity of disregarding the latter when describing the state of a given language). Clearly, we have to describe the functioning of the HVS by examining actual Hebrew usage, yet it would be a mistake not to consider all the available information, including insights gained from comparative-historical research. If the purpose is to give a comprehensive view of the HVS, including its origins, and to explain the system, rather than merely describe it, the results achieved in this field cannot be ignored.

Bauer (1910, 39) proposed the term "*waw* conservativum" rather than "conversivum" or "consecutivum" because – in his view – both *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* preserve earlier meanings of the forms while the simple forms underwent semantic shifts. This terminology fits *wayyiqtol* well (though Bauer erroneously thought the "original" verb form was "zeitlos," cf. n. 56 above). In contrast, the claim (ib., 30) that the *waw* in *weqatal* is a "*waw*

mixture or borrowing of some kind as opposed to the general diachronic evolution that is evident in other languages. As McFall observes, if Hebrew is a "Mischsprache," we would have to claim the same for Ethiopic, Ugaritic and many other languages (cf. Anttila 1972, 177: "Since all languages are mixed, the notion 'mixed language' is not very useful in classification").

conservativum" is unfounded. This was noted by Fenton (1969, 39), who argued that "*waw* conservativum" should be reserved for *wayyiqtol*, while *weqatal* should be called "*waw* analogicum."⁵⁷ In fact, Fenton does not propose an analogical explanation as such for the existence of *weqatal*. He states that the "*wāw* in *wāw+qātal* used of the future is irrelevant to the future signification of the construction" (ib., 37). Only the "pervasive use" of the construction and specifically the use of *weqatal* to indicate continuous or habitual action in the past are covered by the analogical explanation (ib., 39).⁵⁸ However, many other scholars (also before Fenton), have perceived *weqatal* in analogical terms: the form acquires a meaning that is more or less the opposite of the one associated with simple *qatal*, through analogy with the interchange between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*. Ewald and Driver both saw some kind of analogy at work in the development of *weqatal*, although (like Fenton) they also thought that the meaning of simple *qatal* was preserved in the *waw*-prefixed form. Other scholars stress the "conversive" result of the analogical development, though the starting point for the analogy may be found in an earlier (non-temporal, stative) meaning of *qatal* (on which, see 5.3), cf. Bergsträsser 1929, 14, §3g. Birkeland (1940, 74) includes the stress shift in *weqatalti* in his analogical explanation, while other versions of the analogical approach are presented by Blake (1944) and Hetzron (1969) among others (for further discussion, see 5.3.1–2).

Important work has been done on non-Hebrew material that might elucidate the background of *weqatal* (Smith 1991). Yet, widespread disagreement remains on *weqatal*, as opposed to the relative consensus on the background of *wayyiqtol*. In Bauer's view (1910, 28), *weqatal* constitutes the most difficult question in Hebrew syntax. However, several undecided questions remain concerning *wayyiqtol* as well (*waCC*- and the stress shift attested in *wayyiqtol*, the connection between *wayyiqtol* and the jussive and between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*, etc.). Ch. 3 and ch. 5 treat several questions related to the functioning and origins of the consecutive forms in detail.

1.2 Tense, aspect, and mood

Terms like aspect, tense, modality, relative tense, and absolute tense do not always signify the same thing when used by different scholars. Hence, before proceeding, some terminological clarification is needed.

⁵⁷ Like Bauer, Fenton thought that *wayyiqtol* is "omnitemporal" (1969, 33).

⁵⁸ In Fenton's view, the use of *weqatal* as past habitual etc. is much stranger than its use as a future tense. However, both meanings can be subsumed under the general category of non-anteriority (3.1).

It is important to distinguish between semantic content and grammatical expression of such content. All languages can express modal, temporal, and aspectual meaning. The question is how they do it (adverbs, particles, affixes, word order, etc.) and whether the marking of such meaning is an obligatory part of the grammatical system. E.g., a language with no tense forms may mark temporal information through adverbs that situate an event at a specific time. Deo (2012, 155) remarks on tense and aspect: "As *morphological categories*, they refer to grammaticalized, obligatorily encoded distinctions that express temporal properties of situations. As abstract *semantic categories*, they refer to temporal properties that may or may not have a morphological reflex in a given language." If we call a language "aspectual," this implies something more than mere capability to express aspect in some way. It specifically means that the language in question obligatorily encodes aspect grammatically.⁵⁹ As Binnick (1991, 127) remarks, the major difference between languages is not whether they are able to make certain distinctions, but whether "they require the speaker to do so."

The terminology for distinguishing between the semantic content and the grammatical expression is not always clear. "Mood" often indicates a morphological form that grammaticalizes the semantic content of modality (e.g. Binnick 1991, 73), though some scholars use the words differently (e.g. Trask 1999, 125–127). Similarly, "tense" refers to the grammaticalization of temporal relationships (temporality; cf. Cook 2012, 256). However, the situation is less simple with the term "aspect," which seems to be used as a designation for the grammatical forms as well as the semantic category. Comrie (2001, 6–7, with n. 4) notes that the term "Aktionsart" might be used for the semantic category, but this word has other uses too (1.2.2). Some scholars use the word "aspectuality" to refer to the semantic category (Mair 2012, 803) but it is perhaps better to note that aspect – like tense – refers to temporal relationships (temporality), tense and aspect being two different ways of grammaticalizing notions related to time.

1.2.1 Mood/modality

Modality is a category of meaning that has to do with the opinion or attitude of the speaker (Palmer 1986, 2) or with the "status" of a proposition (Palmer 2001, 1). Other notions such as subjectivity, non-factivity or non-factuality, non-assertion, possibility and necessity, etc. are often added (Palmer 1986, 4), yet the definition remains vague. Indeed, Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca

⁵⁹ Cf. Filip (2012, 726): "Not all languages have grammatical aspect, but certainly all have some means of expressing the semantic notions carried by perfective/imperfective verbs or verb forms, as in Modern Greek or Slavic languages, for instance."

(1994, 176) note that "modality notions range far beyond what is included in this definition [= 'speakers' (subjective) attitudes and opinions'] [...] it may be impossible to come up with a succinct characterization of the notional domain of modality and the part of it that is expressed grammatically" (cf. Cook 2012, 54 and 233).

Different subdivisions of the category have been proposed. Lyons (1968, 307–308) introduces three "scales" of modality in declarative sentences, the first concerning "wish" and "intention," the second "necessity" and "obligation," the third "certainty" and "possibility." A more widespread terminology is the distinction between epistemic and deontic modality as the two basic types of modality, to which a third type, dynamic, is often added (see Palmer 1986, 11–12). Epistemic modality has to do with "the degree of commitment by the speaker to what he says" (ib., 51), with "belief, knowledge, truth, etc. in relation to proposition" (ib., 96), while deontic modality is "concerned with action, by others and by the speaker himself," containing an element of will (ib.). The third category, "dynamic," has to do with ability and disposition (as in "John can speak Italian") (ib., 102). Each of the main types is divided into subcategories with specific meanings and may include a grading into stronger and weaker degrees (ib., 98).⁶⁰ Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994, 177) distinguish between agent-oriented, speaker-oriented, epistemic, and subordinating modality, each with further subdivisions.

However, when discussing the basic character of the HVS, the attempts to divide the categories into fine shades of meaning (with differing terminology used by different scholars) is not particularly relevant. The move in the opposite direction is more interesting, viz. the attempt to subsume all types of modality under two main headings, typically called *realis* and *irrealis*,⁶¹ or simply non-modal/indicative and modal, as is often done in studies of the HVS.

While mood and modality are more clearly distinguishable from tense and aspect than the latter categories are from each other (since both tense and aspect have to do with time), time does have a connection with modality as well. Cook (2012, 46) refers to the view that "modality has to do with the *temporal existence* of an event – whether it exists at a particular time, has no existence, has potential existence, etc." Conversely, Lyons (1977, 820) sug-

⁶⁰ For a different categorization, see Palmer 2001, 8–10 (propositional modality vs. event modality, the former including epistemic and evidential modality, the latter deontic and dynamic modality).

⁶¹ Cf. Cook 2012, 53–54. In the second edition of Palmer's book (2001, 1), the *realis/irrealis* distinction plays a prominent role, in contrast to the first edition.

gests that tense in some languages, if not all, is in fact "more properly regarded as the grammaticalization of epistemic modality." Hence, the "present tense" would be the product of "non-remoteness ('now') and factivity," the "past tense" of "remoteness and factivity," and the "future tense" of "non-remoteness and non-factivity." However, Palmer (1986, 12) notes that most languages do distinguish tense from modality. Still, there is some overlap between the two categories.

In fact, scholars have noted specific reasons to see a connection between moods (or other ways of indicating modality) and tenses. E.g., Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994, 280) note that "the central functions in future grams [gram = grammatical morpheme] are intention and prediction. It follows from this that future is less a temporal category and more a category resembling agent-oriented and epistemic modality, with important temporal implications" (cf. Bhat 1999, 176). It is true that markers of future reference may derive diachronically from modal expressions of will or desire (like English "will"). However, the grammaticalization process may reach a point where "the so-called future tense in English makes a clear prediction about some future state of affairs, and is in this way clearly distinct from modal constructions that make reference to alternative worlds" (Comrie 2006, 44–45; cf. Cook 2012, 75).

In a similar vein, there is an oft-noted connection between past tense forms of various type and irrealis/counterfactual modality. Cook (2012, 250) refers to the "past-irrealis metaphor" ("that which is temporally removed from the speaker's present is irrealis").⁶² Palmer (1986, 210ff.; cf. 2001, 207ff.) notes the connection but finds no explanatory power in the suggestions made by various scholars. A variant of the same usage is polite use of past tense forms, e.g. the "politeness *imparfait*" in French, which, according to Caudal (2012, 275), allows the speaker to "attenuate her statement by relegating the described event into the past." Similar usage exists in other languages.

1.2.2 Aspect

The meaning associated with the category of aspect has to do with temporality. Unlike tense, however, aspect does not locate an event or situation in relation to some other time. Rather, according to a widely cited standard definition, "aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation" (Comrie 2001, 3).

⁶² "Irrealis" in the sense of counterfactuality may be problematic in light of the use of the word as part of the general realis/irrealis distinction (cf. Palmer 2001, 203). Elsewhere, Cook uses irrealis as a designation for modal *yiqtol* and *weqatal*, cf. 3.6.

The type of aspect described with this definition is called "viewpoint aspect" (cf. "ways of viewing") or often simply "aspect." However, as noted in 1.1.3.1, "aspect" has been used with other meanings and other terms have been used for the same or a similarly defined category. Comrie (2001, 6, n. 3) makes the important observation that there is "a tendency, once aspect has been distinguished from tense, to refer to all verbal categories that are neither tense nor mood as aspect." Thus, if Ewald specifically rejects absolute tense, the assumption is that his approach must be aspectual. However, as illustrated above, this is not necessarily the case. The variety of terminology and approaches makes it difficult to be sure of the meaning intended by scholars using "aspect" in relation to the HVS (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova, 2012, 943, on the "proliferation of ideas, frameworks, formats, and terminology" in aspectual studies in general).

Viewpoint aspect is also referred to as grammatical aspect. This type of aspect is distinguished from lexical/semantic aspect, though the two types may interact in various ways. The latter type has to do with aspectual distinctions inherent in the lexical meaning of the verb and is referred to in many different ways, other terms being event structure, situational aspect, Vendlerian aspect, inner aspect, eventuality type, Aktionsart (see Richardson 2012, 962). Particularly the use of Aktionsart as a term for aspect as such may create confusion. Cook (2012, 19) helpfully provides a list of different terminologies and argues for a division into three types of aspect, distinguishing between situation aspect and phasal aspect in addition to viewpoint aspect. Situation aspect describes situations as states, activities, accomplishments, or achievements, which differ according to parameters such as the presence of an inherent endpoint (telicity) and different stages in the situation.⁶³ Phasal aspect refers to "alterations to one or another of the phases of development through which a situation progresses," such as inchoative, completive, iterative, etc. (ib., 25).

On viewpoint aspect, Cook notes that "[a]s metalinguistic categories, perfective and imperfective viewpoint aspect may be illustrated in any number of languages" (ib., 27, n. 24).⁶⁴ Accordingly, viewpoint aspect is not "grammatical aspect" in the sense that it is necessarily grammaticalized by way of

⁶³ This four-way distinction (Vendler 1957) is based on observations going back to Aristotle. Scholars have proposed different orderings of these situation aspects, with partially diverging terminologies (Cook, 2012, 20ff.).

⁶⁴ Both viewpoint aspect and situation aspect may be marked grammatically outside of the verbal system in various languages. Some languages mark aspectual meanings through their case system (Richardson 2012). In Finnish, e.g., the choice between accusative and partitive objects indicates an aspectual contrast (resultative vs. irresultative/progressive, cf. Karlsson 1999, 85–87).

specific aspectual markers. Similarly, it has been pointed out that "lexical aspect" is a misnomer, at least if the aspectual meaning is understood as being inherent in the lexical meaning of the verb alone, since other parts of speech clearly contribute to the aspectual character of the sentence (de Swart 2012, 754; Verkuyl 1972). E.g., the different objects in "he ate apples" and "he ate the apples/an apple/the apple" lead to different aspectual meanings. In terms of situational aspect, the former is an atelic activity, while the latter is a telic accomplishment.

The discussion of aspect in the HVS is primarily concerned with viewpoint aspect. Accordingly, we must look closer at the definition of this type of aspect and its two subcategories perfective and imperfective. What is meant by "different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation"? Comrie (2001, 3) uses the sentence "John was reading when I entered" and its equivalents in Russian and three Romance languages as illustration. The second verb ("entered" and its equivalents) represents a "single unanalysable whole, with beginning, middle, and end rolled into one," with no reference to the "internal temporal constituency." This is perfective meaning. If a language has a specific verb form to indicate such meaning, the form is a perfective aspect form. The first verb in the sentence ("was reading" and its equivalents), on the other hand, refers to the "internal temporal constituency" and not to the beginning or end of the situation. This is imperfective meaning, and verb forms that mark this meaning are imperfective aspect forms (ib., 4). Comrie states that the perfective looks at the situation from the outside and the imperfective from the inside. Other ways of describing the difference between perfective and imperfective include bounded vs. non-bounded, or packaged and unpackaged (Richardson 2012, 963; cf. Cook 2012, 27).

Comrie (2001, 21) notes that the perfective does not explicitly deny any internal structure of the situation. A situation may well be "internally complex" (having duration or internal phases), yet be referred to in the perfective, "provided only that the whole of the situation is subsumed as a single whole." The fact that the perfective merely has to do with lack of explicit reference to internal structure while the imperfective explicitly refers to such structure may explain why the imperfective can be subdivided into different aspectual categories. Some of these have separate grammatical forms in some languages, while other languages subsume them all in a single category (ib., 24).⁶⁵ Comrie makes a primary distinction between habitual and continuous

⁶⁵ The English distinction between Progressive ("be ...-ing") and Non-Progressive is not always equivalent to the imperfective/perfective distinction found in other languages (ib.,

and a secondary division of the latter category into non-progressive and progressive, as a representation of the most typical subdivisions of the imperfect (ib., 25).⁶⁶

The perfective/imperfective distinction is not objective. A speaker merely *presents* a situation as complete or incomplete and it is possible to refer to the same situation by both aspects in consecutive sentences without contradicting oneself (ib., 4).⁶⁷ Likewise, viewpoint aspect does not depend on inherent aspectual meaning (situation aspect). E.g., a speaker may express the sentences referred to above ("he ate apples" and "he ate the apples") in either viewpoint aspect, presenting the situation as complete or incomplete.

The distinction between "complete" and "completed" is important. The latter term "puts too much emphasis on the termination of the situation" (ib., 18), i.e. on something that has more to do with tense than with aspect. The term "complete," to reiterate, merely signifies a view of the situation as a single whole. Though the two words are often used indiscriminately, the distinction must be kept in mind, especially when trying to decide whether the Hebrew verb forms primarily express aspect or something else. Perceiving Ewald's theory as aspectual also hinges on a failure to realize that he probably did mean "completed" (and not "complete") when he used the terms "vollendet" and "Perfectum" (cf. 1.1.2).

Aspect is distinct from tense in the sense that it does not locate a situation in time but refers to the internal temporal characteristics of the situation. Yet, the two categories are connected in various ways. As Comrie remarks (2001, 72), the present tense is typically imperfective since a present situation is most often in progress, while the past is typically interpreted as having perfective meaning.⁶⁸ Since imperfective situations in the past are far from impossible, however, a specific aspectual distinction between perfective and imperfective is most frequently needed when referring to the past. Consequently, many languages have separate aspectual forms in the past tense only (cf. Deo 2012, 160). Similarly, in languages without grammatical tense, there is a clear tendency for sentences to be interpreted by default as having either

3–4, n. 3). Though the progressive can be described as a specific subcategory of imperfective aspect, the English Progressive has a wider range of meanings than progressive forms in many other languages (ib., 33).

⁶⁶ According to some scholars, habituality is a kind of modality (Palmer 2001, 179).

⁶⁷ The example is "John read that book yesterday; while he was reading it, the postman came."

⁶⁸ In Russian and other Slavic languages, what is formally the perfective present is a perfective future. Imperfective meaning in the future is marked by a periphrastic construction (cf. Comrie 2001, 66–67).

past or present reference, depending on their perfective or imperfective meaning, respectively (Comrie 2001, 82–83).⁶⁹

The terms for the two basic aspects are liable to be confused with other terms. The imperfective should be kept distinct from specific verb forms called Imperfect(um) or similarly in various languages, such as Latin and the Romance languages. These forms are specifically past imperfective forms, and though there is a connection, the distinction should be observed.⁷⁰ Similarly (and this relates to the distinction between "complete" and "completed" already mentioned), some languages have a form traditionally called Perfect(um), as in Latin, and there is also a semantic category called perfect or present perfect ("I have done"). The Latin Perfect corresponds to English present perfect and simple past tense (where it can be described as perfective aspect in opposition to the past imperfective Imperfect). Should we describe the present perfect (and past perfect etc.) in (viewpoint) aspectual terms or in terms of (relative) tense? Though Comrie (*ib.*, 52) admits that it is an aspect "in a rather different sense from the other aspects treated so far," he finds it more "convenient" to treat it as an aspect because of the traditional terminology. In contrast, other scholars have claimed that it is impossible to fit a third aspect into the opposition between perfective and imperfective.⁷¹ I treat the perfect as a relative tense (1.2.3).

The Slavic languages are often presented as typical aspectual languages. To be sure, the distinction between perfective and imperfective viewpoint aspect is a dominating factor in their verbal systems, yet their "typicality" may be questioned. In general, perfective forms are marked by prefixes, and, conversely, imperfective forms can be derived from perfective forms by suffixes. The prefixes originally carried distinct meanings, being in origin prepositions or adverbs contributing the same kind of meaning as in English "drink up" etc. (Comrie 2001, 89–90). Thus, this system was originally one

⁶⁹ However, see below on tenseless languages. Situation aspect is important too. States and dynamic activities are typically interpreted with present reference while achievements and accomplishments are typically interpreted as past, as illustrated for Chinese by Lin (2012, 681).

⁷⁰ Some scholars do not consider the Romance Imperfect an aspect (de Swart 2012, 769). Gvozdanović (2012, 791) notes that Bulgarian has the perfective/imperfective opposition as well as an opposition similar to Romance *Passé Simple/Imparfait*. This would tend to support the view that the distinction in Romance should not be described in terms of aspect but rather tense (Bulgarian and, to a lesser degree, other Slavic languages preserve the distinction between Aorist and Imperfect from Old Church Slavonic; cf. Comrie 2001, 31).

⁷¹ Rix 1977, 137: "Doch sind die Aspekte perfektiv und imperfektiv kontradiktorische Gegensätze, wie die modernen slavischen Sprachen zeigen; einen dritten Aspekt kann es gar nicht geben. Bezüglich des Aspektes ist das Perfekt einfach imperfektiv."

of situation aspect, which evolved in a system that already had a (viewpoint) aspectual distinction between Aorist and Imperfective (as in Old Church Slavonic, Ancient Greek, and other Indo-European languages). Some Slavic languages have preserved both distinctions (n. 70 above) whereas languages such as Russian have lost the older distinction. What was originally a distinction of lexical/situation aspect "has taken up the job of conveying the aspectual contrast perfective vs. imperfective [...] However, since the originally actional meaning is not obliterated, the combined result is a syncretic system, where actional and aspectual meanings are inextricably intertwined" (Bertinetto and Lenci 2012, 874; cf. Binnick 1991, 137).

Gvozdanović (2012, 785 and 790) further remarks that the perfective/imperfective distinction in Slavic is far from uniform. By comparing translations of the same texts, she shows that the use of the perfective is most frequent in Western Slavic. Thus, the precise semantics of the categories differ, even among closely related languages. On a general level, however, it is evident that in these languages (and others with similar systems, like the Baltic languages, Georgian, etc.) "aspect is clearly distinct as a morphological category from the other morphological categories in the verb" (Comrie 2001, 94). The distinction is an obligatory feature that pervades the entire verbal system. Past and future (but not present) tense as well as infinitives and imperatives (and some PTCs) occur in contrasting aspectual pairs.

A partially similar, but also more complex, situation obtains in Ancient Greek (and other Indo-European languages with a similar system, e.g. Classical Armenian). Here a perfective/imperfective opposition is expressed in the distinction between the aorist stem and the imperfect/present stem but in contrast to Slavic, the forms are less clearly analyzable into separate markers of aspect, tense, modality, voice, etc. As in Slavic, the Greek distinction not only concerns the finite forms, but also extends to the infinitive and PTCs, as well as the imperative, subjunctive etc. As Comrie remarks (*ib.*, 94–98), in languages without verbal morphology it might be a straightforward task to isolate aspectual markers since they typically occur as separate particles,⁷² and in languages like Slavic and Greek (Modern Greek to a higher degree than Ancient Greek) it is also possible to separate aspectual markers from markers of tense and other categories. However, in languages with verbal morphology but only one central opposition (as in Semitic in general) it is far more difficult to decide whether the relevant category is really aspect or something else.

⁷² However, in many cases, the precise classification of such markers as aspectual or (relative) temporal may be open to debate.

1.2.3 Tense/temporality

Tense is the grammaticalization of temporality, in the sense of location in time (cf. Comrie 2006, 9). In relation to the HVS, the interesting thing is the way verb forms indicate such reference to temporal location and this is usually what is meant by the word tense. Indeed, tense is often seen as a purely verbal phenomenon. As Ibn Ezra noted, you cannot make a "past" or "future" out of the word "house."⁷³ In the most typical instances, tense markers are bound morphemes on verbs (i.e. verbal tense forms), particles in connection with verbs, or auxiliary verbs. However, some languages mark tense distinctions on other parts of speech (e.g. the two variants of the definite article in Somali; cf. Orwin 1995, 43; Lecarme 2012).⁷⁴

It might be helpful to reiterate the importance of the distinction between tense and lexical/contextual indications of time. All languages can refer to location in time. However, some languages do not possess specific grammatical forms for this purpose, in contrast to tensed languages, which obligatorily require "the presence of a morpheme that locates a situation in time whether or not similar temporal information is conveyed by other temporal expressions" (Lin 2012, 670).

The seemingly basic distinction between past, present, and future is far from universal even in tensed languages. Many languages make a past vs. non-past distinction, while some distinguish future and non-future. Some languages have separate forms for degrees of remoteness, e.g. "hodiernal" vs. "hesternal" past ("today" vs. "yesterday"), or a "crastinal" future ("tomorrow"). Generally, remoteness distinctions are most widespread in the past (Comrie 2006, 85).⁷⁵

Tenseless languages have been the subject of debate, with some scholars defending tensed interpretations of languages that other scholars claim are tenseless.⁷⁶ However, regardless of the classification of specific languages,

⁷³ See Patón 2002, 82*: לא תוכל לעשות מן בית עבר או עתיד.

⁷⁴ All languages may express similar notions by lexical means ("ex-president"; "bride-to-be"). Maori provides an example of temporally distinct locative prepositions (Harlow 2007, 146).

⁷⁵ Note Cook's statement (2012, 2) that Priscian's analysis of Greek and Latin "became the model for subsequent European relative-tense theories, the hallmark of which was their distinction of verb forms in terms of their relative temporal distance." While Priscian did refer to relative temporal *distance*, this is clearly not the hallmark of what is usually referred to as relative-tense theory (which has to do with the relative *location* in time and not the degree of remoteness).

⁷⁶ On West Greenlandic/Kalallisut, see Bittner 2005 vs. Fortescue 1984. On Burmese, cf. Comrie (2006, 50–51) vs. Gärtner 2005. If a language has no obligatory marking of anything like tense or aspect, a tenseless (and aspectless) interpretation is more straightforward, e.g. in Indonesian (Sneddon 1996, 197; however, several non-obligatory particles

there is no reason to suppose that the phenomenon of tenselessness does not exist. Hence, we cannot rule out a tenseless interpretation of the HVS a priori. However, it is necessary to take into account the huge typological difference between Hebrew and other Semitic languages on the one hand and the most obvious candidates for tenselessness on the other hand. Highly polysynthetic West Greenlandic is obviously very difficult to compare directly to Hebrew and so are the analytic systems of other proposed tenseless languages like Chinese and Indonesian without verbal morphology of the type found in Hebrew.

When describing tense, it is necessary to distinguish between absolute and relative tense (axis). Though Reichenbach does not use these terms, his analysis has had a profound influence on all later approaches to the question. He notes that if only the "point of speech" (the time of speech) and the "point of the event" are included in the analysis, only three tenses are possible (before, at, or after the point of speech) while in reality the number of tenses is greater. Hence, we need a "point of reference" in addition to the two other points (Reichenbach 1947, 288). In the simple tenses (what may be referred to as absolute tense), the point of the event and the point of reference are simultaneous. In the simple past, both are before the point of speech, in the simple present they are simultaneous with the point of speech, and in the simple future they are after the point of speech (*ib.*, 289). Reichenbach uses a formal system of notation with S (point of speech), R (reference), and E (event). The signs " , " and " – " are used for indicating simultaneousness and non-simultaneousness, respectively. The past is to the left and the future to the right. Thus, the simple tenses are E, R – S (simple past; E and R are both located to the left of S, with which they are not simultaneous, i.e., they are in the past); S, R, E (simple present); S – R, E (simple future) (*ib.*, 297).⁷⁷ When R and E do not coincide (i.e. relative tense), Reichenbach adds "anterior" (when E precedes R) or "posterior" (when E follows R) to the terms past, present, and future (the latter terms referring to the position of R relative to S). The traditional past perfect is "anterior past," the present perfect is "anterior present," the future in the past is "posterior past," the future perfect is "anterior future," etc. (*ib.*, 297). In formal terms, two of the tenses have several possible notations, since the position of E relative to S is irrelevant

mark temporal/aspectual distinctions). On tenseless vs. tensed approaches to Chinese, see Lin 2012, 671 and 688–691.

⁷⁷ Reichenbach first refers to the simple future as having the point of reference at the point of speech (S, R – E; *ib.*, 290, 293, and 295). Later he calls this constellation "posterior present" while reserving "simple future" for cases where the point of reference as well as the point of the event are after the point of speech (S – R, E; *ib.*, 297).

in these cases. Thus, the posterior past ("he said that it *would happen*") might refer to an event that happened between R and S, at S, or after it. Similarly, the anterior future ("by tomorrow he *will have done* it") does not explicitly indicate whether the actual doing happens before, at, or after S. The notations for the non-simple tenses are as follows: E – R – S (anterior past); R – E – S or R – S, E or R – S – E (posterior past); E – S, R (anterior present); S, R – E (posterior present); S – E – R or S, E – R or E – S – R (anterior future); S – R – E (posterior future) (ib., 297).⁷⁸

Especially the triple notation of certain tenses and the impossibility of noting multiple reference points have led to revisions of Reichenbach's approach (see Cook 2012, 10–18).

Comrie (2006, 6) points out that, in a sense, "all time location is relative, there being no absolutely specified points."⁷⁹ He states that "strictly speaking, absolute time reference is impossible, since the only way of locating a situation in time is relative to some other already established time point; the present moment is in principle just one of an infinite number of such time points that could be chosen as reference point" (ib., 36). Rather, absolute tense in the strict sense would seem to require separate tense forms for notions such as doing something "at 7:04 p.m., May 3, 1962 AD" and every other absolute point in time, which is, of course, not a viable option for a language used in real communication. Yet, in established usage, tense is absolute when it relates to the present time, i.e. the moment of speech, and it is relative when it does not relate explicitly to the present time. However, "one of the possible deictic centres for a relative tense is the present moment, especially when the context does not suggest any other reference point" (ib., 22; cf. ib., 58: "The difference between absolute and relative tense is not that

⁷⁸ The posterior present is a future tense with reference to present time. Reichenbach's example is "Now I shall go," as opposed to simple future "I shall go tomorrow." A better example for the posterior present might be "I am about to go" or similar. The posterior future is a future relative to a future reference. The examples given are "I shall be going to see him" and the Latin periphrastic construction "abiturus ero." Note that Reichenbach does not use the term aspect explicitly in his analysis, but operates with an "additional indication [...] concerning the time extension of the event," when describing the English progressive forms (ib., 290). He shows this by placing a rectangle representing E above R on a time line, indicating that R is included in E (which, in this case, is not a "point"). The distinction between perfective and imperfective aspect may be described in such terms of inclusion: in the imperfective aspect, R is included in E; in the perfective aspect, E is included in R.

⁷⁹ It bears repeating that the word "relative" is used in a related, yet distinct way in some theories of the Hebrew consecutive forms discussed in 1.1.4.1–2. Interpreting the semantics of the HVS in terms of relative tense does not entail the view that the *yiqtol* in *way-yiqtol* is a future relative to the preceding verb.

between the present moment versus some other point in time as reference point, but rather between a form whose meaning specifies the present moment as reference point and a form whose meaning does not specify that the present moment must be its reference point").⁸⁰

The major difference between Reichenbach and Comrie is that Comrie does not posit a separate R in the absolute tenses; rather, these tenses simply include as part of their meaning the present moment as deictic centre (ib., 36). In formal terms: E simul S (present); E before S (past); E after S (future) (ib., 123). The relative tenses are formalized as E simul/before/after R (relative present/past/future) (ib., 124–125).

Comrie mentions the English non-finite verb forms as typical relative tenses, whose interpretation is completely dependent on the context (like the PTC in "the passengers awaiting flight 26 proceeded to departure gate 5"), but he also refers to finite relative tense forms (Classical Arabic) (ib., 56–57). Such forms are located in time relative to an R derived from the context. Specific relative tenses may exist for all three basic temporal locations: relative present, past, and future, indicating that the situation occurs at the same time as, before, or after another situation indicated by the context. Other languages merely have a relative past vs. non-past distinction or a relative future vs. non-future distinction (ib., 124–125). In contrast to other scholars who (implicitly or explicitly) refer to only absolute and relative tense, Comrie introduces the type absolute-relative tense. This type includes the past perfect and the future perfect, which other scholars would refer to as relative tenses. In Comrie's theory, the meaning of such tenses combines an absolute time location of R with a location of E relative to this R. Thus, "the possible absolute-relative tenses are determined by a reference point being before or after the present moment, and by the situation being located before or after that reference point" (ib., 65). Hence, past perfect: E before R before S (ib., 125).⁸¹ Future perfect ("he will have done"): E before R after S (ib., 126).

⁸⁰ Comrie's definition of "deictic" includes relative tense ("A system which relates entities to a reference point is termed a deictic system, and we can therefore say that tense is deictic"; ib., 14). In contrast, some scholars use the terms "deictic tense" and "non-deictic tense" for absolute and relative tense, respectively (e.g. Bhat 1999, 14).

⁸¹ Comrie (2006, 79) notes that past perfect is interpretable in two ways (also future perfect). "John had arrived on Tuesday" may indicate that Tuesday was the day he arrived or that he arrived prior to that. Bergström argues that "the relative tense or taxis approach, which has been applied to Biblical Hebrew, tends to confuse aspect and tense, with the result that it cannot adequately describe the difference between, for example, past perfect meaning (*By the time the dinner was ready, I had set the table*) and a true past in the past (*She knew that I had set the table the day before*), but calls both meanings 'anteriority'.

Further, Comrie mentions the future in the future (E after R after S) and the future in the past (E after R before S), corresponding to Reichenbach's posterior future and posterior past. Furthermore, Comrie explicitly incorporates the possibility of multiple reference points (e.g. E before R₁ after R₂ before S, "he would have done") (ib., 76 and 128).⁸²

In contrast to Reichenbach, Comrie excludes the present perfect (Reichenbach's anterior present) from the domain of relative (or, in Comrie's terminology, absolute-relative) tense. As noted above, he sees the present perfect as an aspect of a special type. According to Comrie (2006, 78), both absolute past tense and the present perfect locate the situation prior to the present moment and they do not differ in terms of time location. He notes that some languages have a separate present perfect and no past perfect or future perfect, or the other way around, and in some languages, the function of the present perfect is different from the function of the (other) absolute-relative tenses (ib., 80–81). However, this hardly invalidates Reichenbach's general analysis. Furthermore, Comrie argues that the present perfect differs from the past perfect and future perfect in that time adverbials can refer to E or R with the latter tenses, while time adverbials with the present perfect can only refer to the present moment. As Comrie notes, however, this seems to be mainly the result of the peculiar behavior specifically of the English present perfect (ib., 78–79). His central claim that, in terms of tense, both simple past and present perfect merely locate the event prior to the present moment is also less than persuasive, since, using the logic of Comrie's argument, the

By the same logic, simple past meaning (*I set the table yesterday*) as well as present perfect meaning (*I have set the table*) must be said to express anteriority with regard to the time of speech" (Bergström 2014, 162; cf. also ib., 25–27). In contrast, Binnick (1991, 64) states "that in the familiar European languages, at least, the pluperfect (past perfect) and this ante-preterite always coincide in a pluperfect (past perfect) tense," and he suggests that the coincidence of these two meanings may not be coincidental, but rather a "systematic fact." On the other hand, Bohnemeyer (2014) has argued that some languages do in fact have verb forms with only one of the possible readings of the English past perfect. However that may be, Bergström's insistence on making this distinction is irrelevant in an analysis of the HVS, which clearly does not distinguish such meanings. In fact, the point of view expressed at the end of the quote, which Bergström presents as a more or less absurd consequence of a wrong approach, is close to the truth. Hebrew does not distinguish past perfect, "past in the past," simple past, and present perfect (or future perfect, for that matter). These notions are subsumed under the notion of anteriority in relation to a point determined by context (cf. 3.1).

⁸² Comrie (2006, 76) also refers to French "Passé Surcomposé," on which cf. Saussure and Sthioul 2012 (e.g., "il a eu mangé," lit. "he has had eaten"). Such doubly composed perfects occur in other languages, e.g. Danish "din mor har haft ringet" (lit. "your mother has had called").

same would seem to apply to the past perfect (ib., 78). It seems better to follow Reichenbach in this case. Simple past, past perfect, and present perfect all represent situations that occurred in the past, but they differ according to the location of R. Reichenbach's approach seems to be capable of explaining the difference between simple past and present perfect. Simple past refers "directly" to the past (in the sense that R is located in the past simultaneously with E), while in the present perfect, E (which is in the past) is mediated by an R located at S, which accounts for the present relevance that seems to be characteristic of this tense.

Comrie's distinction between two types of relative tense, on the other hand, is a big step forward in comparison with Reichenbach. While the terminology itself (relative and absolute-relative) is not decisive, the important thing is to make a distinction along these lines, especially when discussing the overall character of a verbal system (absolute tense system vs. relative tense system). A system of absolute tense must have specific ways of indicating time relative to different reference points (Comrie's absolute-relative tenses). If it does not have such specific ways and uses the same forms when indicating time relative to R and when indicating absolute time location, the system as such ought to be called a system of relative tense. The point is that such a system does not distinguish relative, absolute-relative, and absolute tense.⁸³ Comrie (2006, 67) states that Russian only has absolute tenses. To be sure, there are no specific present perfect or past perfect forms etc., i.e. no absolute-relative tense forms. However, this does not mean that the Russian tenses have absolute tense reference as such, e.g. that the past tense always indicates a simple past "he did." Rather, the same form expresses the notions of simple past, present perfect, and past perfect. There is no such distinction in the morphology. Neither is the future tense merely an absolute future, as shown by Comrie's example of indirect speech with lack of tense shifting (ib., 109).⁸⁴ Hence, the Russian system is not a system of absolute tense.

⁸³ Hendel (1996, 159) remarks that some "tense relations expressed clearly in a relative tense system cannot be conveyed unambiguously in an absolute tense system." Since Hendel clearly defines absolute tense systems as systems with separate forms or constructions for marking relative tense (like English), the real situation is obviously the opposite of the one he describes in the quotation. Relative tense systems lack the separate forms that absolute tense systems have and are not able to mark the tense relations referred to by Hendel unambiguously.

⁸⁴ The sentence translated as "John said that he would leave the following day" uses the same form as in "that he *will* leave." Note the general relevance of indirect speech and sequence of tenses/*consecutio temporum* (Comrie 2006, 104ff.). In English, tense in indirect speech is shifted back in the past as compared to the original direct speech if the

Languages differ in the way they use the absolute-relative tense forms available. Although Ancient Greek has a past perfect, its use in relative and temporal clauses is much more restricted than the use of the similar form in English or Danish (cf. Goodwin 1965, 18; Greek often uses an aorist PTC where English would use a past perfect). Similarly, though English, Danish, and other languages have a future perfect construction, present perfect is often used instead (obligatorily in subordinate clauses).⁸⁵ Comrie (2001, 53–54, n. 2) notes the use of present perfect in different varieties of English. American English often prefers simple past where British English prefers or requires present perfect. Such observations indicate that the distinction between relative and absolute systems of tense is not either/or. Some languages have no absolute-relative tense forms at all, while others have only a present perfect, and still others have a bigger repertoire. There are differences in actual usage of the forms in various languages. Even in languages with systems of absolute tense (with separate forms for absolute, relative, and absolute-relative tenses), the absolute tense forms do not always behave as such.

The notion of relative tense, however, is even more complicated than this presentation might suggest – particularly the connection between relative tense and aspect. Some scholars analyze the relative (absolute-relative) tense forms described above in aspectual terms. E.g., Hewson (2012, 508) refers to Comrie's absolute-relative tense as "just a simple combination of tense and aspect." In fact, several scholars interpret the relationship between R and E as an expression of aspect rather than relative tense, most prominently Klein (1994, 131): "relative tenses are a combination of TENSE and ASPECT."⁸⁶ However, Klein does not make a binary distinction between imperfective and perfective viewpoint aspect. Rather, he refers (ib., 119) to four aspects, viz. imperfective, perfective, prospective, and perfect, the latter two corresponding to what was called posterior and anterior relative tense above. It seems clear that the presumed prospective and perfect aspects are unlike the other two aspects, which refer to the *internal* temporal constituency of a situation. The relative (absolute-relative) tenses as described by Comrie (including the present perfect, which Comrie does not describe as such) *locate* a situation relative to R, and hence seem to be describable in terms of tense, which refers to location in time. Further, it is possible to combine viewpoint aspect and

main verb is in a past tense (ib., 114). However, in languages like Russian or Hebrew, this is not the case (cf. also Ogihara and Sharvit 2012).

⁸⁵ Cf. the use of present tense ("futate") in subordinate clauses instead of future tense ("he will do it when you leave," not "when you will leave"). The use of present perfect instead of future perfect is a similar "futate" usage.

⁸⁶ See Cook's overview of scholars with similar views (2012, 28ff.).

relative tense. This seems to indicate that two different categories are involved (cf. the sentences "he had built" vs. "he had been building" vs. "he built" vs. "he was building"). Hence, a temporal rather than an aspectual analysis seems preferable for such forms (cf. Deo 2012, 163).

The notion of relative present tense might merit a comment. In Reichenbach's system, E in the relative tenses occurs either before or after R, giving anterior and posterior tenses, i.e. relative past and relative future. In Reichenbach's terms, the coincidence of E and R is called a simple tense, i.e. absolute tense. Contrary to this, Madvig's description of the Latin verbal system (1841, 317) uses the term present in the past, "præsens in præterito," to designate the Latin Imperfect (cf. n. 70 above on Romance). This approach, however, would seriously confuse aspect and tense. As noted above, Reichenbach (1947, 290), without using the term aspect, refers to special "extended" tenses indicating "that the event covers a certain stretch of time." Similarly, in Comrie's system of absolute-relative tenses, none of the tenses explicitly referred to is relative present. On the one hand, he mentions the simultaneousness of E and R as one of the permitted relative relations (Comrie 2006, 126). On the other hand, he states that the coincidence of E and R in the past or future is indistinguishable from absolute time reference, and that absolute-relative tenses are located either before or after (not at) R (ib., 65). Thus, describing "he was doing" as an absolute-relative present in the past (E simul R before S) is ruled out. In fact, the meaning of this form has to do with the internal structure of the situation and hence with viewpoint aspect, as defined by Comrie, rather than relative tense. In the system of pure relative tenses (like the English PTC), however, Comrie does refer to a relative present (E simul R), indicating simultaneousness with the reference point (ib., 59 and 124).

What this underlines is the close conceptual relation between aspect and relative tense, which is especially problematic in a language with only one central opposition in its verbal system. The lack of consensus on the HVS may be partly and to a certain extent ascribed to mere terminology. This difficult question will be the subject of further discussion in 3.5.1. The central point to note is the basic definitions – aspect marks internal structure, relative tense marks temporal location. Which of these provide the most fitting description of the use of the Hebrew verb forms?

2 The search for validation: Methodological considerations

Scholars analyzing the HVS have approached the problems from very different angles, with varying theoretical outlooks, sometimes using more or less idiosyncratic terminology and/or alternative ways of understanding terms shared with other scholars. Add to this the fact that the system is attested in texts with a long and complicated history of transmission, reception, and interpretation. This means that different scholars can hold widely diverging views on the meaning of the texts, including the best way to interpret whole books, longer passages, sentences, clauses, and single verb forms. If one scholar understands a passage with *qatal*s as a reference to future events while another scholar understands the same passage as past narration, they will likely produce very different analyses of the HVS and very different accounts of the semantic potential of *qatal*.

On this background, scholars have attempted to introduce new methods designed to overcome the impasse. Penner uses a supposedly empirical method based on statistical correlation between the verb forms and their meanings, while Cook and Andrason use linguistic typology. What these scholars seem to have in common is the belief that some kind of external control can act as a "judge" between different analyses of the HVS. I will argue that none of these methods solves the old problems.

2.1 Penner and statistics

Penner's aim (2015, 4) is to decide which of the categories tense, aspect, or mood is the most prominent in QH. He uses an "empirical method of statistical correlation between form and meaning," based on an analysis of the finite verbs in 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, CD, 1QM, the Pesharim, 1QH^a, 4QMMT, and 11QT (ib., ix).¹

Several aspects of Penner's approach are problematic. One of his "six significant ways" of seeking "methodological rigour" is "determining the semantic function of each verb form from its context rather than from presuppositions regarding the forms" (ib., 125; cf. ib., 86). To be sure, context is of immense importance but Penner's emphasis on context seems exaggerated: "In order to avoid circularity, one must not let the form of the verb influence one's interpretation of the verb's semantic functions" (ib., 94; cf. ib., 104). Avoiding circularity is, of course, important but the question is whether it is possible or even advisable to disregard the forms when determining the meaning of a verb. Penner concedes that the context is sometimes ambiguous and that such cases should be treated separately, giving two sets of data, one

¹ I.e., the least fragmentary texts. Penner rightly observes that we cannot analyze verbs in isolation convincingly (ib., 83).

with verbs tagged with certainty and one including uncertain cases (ib., 94). This is a good point, but then he claims that in most cases "the context of the communication is sufficiently redundant to permit a confident interpretation" (ib., 104). However, if we rely solely on context and completely disregard information derived from the form and from our theoretical concepts, the ambiguity will be overwhelming.

Verb forms are part of the context and they contribute their own meaning to the interpretation of the combined context. The context consists of words whose meaning must be determined from context too. Following the "context only"-approach, every word in the context would have to be understood solely from its context. Hence, we would never get anywhere since all words are part of the context, and therefore we would never be able to decide the meaning of any word. Instead, we need to use our ideas about the repertoire of forms available, our theoretical understanding of the functioning of the system as a whole, and our knowledge of the use of the forms in the combined context of the entire corpus as well as in other corpora of texts, as part of the background to our interpretation of the actual verb forms in individual sentences.

Accordingly, a strictly empirical rather than theoretical approach (Penner's point 2; ib., 125) is not feasible. This also touches on Penner's focus on synchrony rather than diachrony (ib., point 1). Since our assumptions about the forms and their meanings are partly influenced by the history of the forms, the diachronic dimension should always be kept in mind, not as a decisive argument, but at least as a heuristic tool.² For some languages no comparative and diachronic information is available, i.e. no background knowledge in the form of tradition, translations, or cognate languages (e.g. Sumerian). In such cases, a comprehensive and clear picture of the meaning of verb forms seems unattainable.³

In fact, Penner repeatedly uses his general knowledge about the forms. E.g., in CD 1:12, he treats the *qatal* עשה in אחרון בדור אחרון as an anterior in relation to the past context, i.e. as a past perfect, "what he had done for the last generation" (ib., 102). This is surely a correct interpretation. However, if we look only at the context (without preconceived ideas about the

² Cf. 3.3.4 on the "precativ perfect." The data from related languages and the diachronic analysis do not prove that this use of *qatal* exists in BH (and the analysis of the proposed instances suggests that, in fact, it does not), yet this background should be part of the considerations involved in the analysis of the Hebrew material.

³ Cf. Zuber 1986, 33: "Wenn wir trotzdem zurecht den Eindruck haben dürfen, den hebräischen Text auf weiteste Strecken ganz gut zu verstehen, so deshalb, weil die hebräische Bibel nicht auf einer sprachlichen und kulturellen Insel entstanden und weitergegeben ist."

anterior meaning of *qatal*), nothing prevents us from interpreting the form as, e.g., future in the past (cf. Kesterson 1984, 28–29). Penner uses the first lines of CD as a demonstration. He takes the verbs in 1:1 (שמעו and בינו) as imperatives. Again, this is surely correct. However, he claims to derive this interpretation solely from context, based on the presence of the particle ועתה. He states that כל יודעי צדק "could conceivably be taken as the subject or object of the verb ('And now, they hear all the knowers of righteousness')," yet "it makes much better sense of the sentence to understand the noun phrase referring to the addressees and the verb functioning as a directive" (Penner 2015, 104–105; cf. *ib.*, 114). However, a translation such as "And now, all the knowers of righteousness have heard and understood" or "will hear and understand" makes sense too. If we disregard the forms and what we expect from them, there is no reason not to propose such interpretations.⁴ Penner treats the *yiqtol* in 1:2 (ומשפט יעשה בכל מנאציו) as future ("and he is going to do judgement"), since "the audience knows from experience that the event, judgement, has not yet occurred at speech time" (*ib.*, 105; cf. *ib.*, 117). Once again, this interpretation is surely the right one, but we cannot know this from the context alone. Depending on the theology of the text, it is perfectly conceivable to see past events as God's judgement and translate "and he has done/did judgement." The *qatal* in 1. 3 (הסתיר) is interpreted as past based on the occurrence of Nebuchadnezzar in 1. 6, who is known to have lived before S (*ib.*, 118). However, if we are not allowed to look at the forms, we might read the whole text as a fictitious prediction situated in the time before Nebuchadnezzar, in which case there would be no reason not to treat the *qatal* as indicating future time. The reason we know that this text treats Nebuchadnezzar as belonging to the past is the use of *qatals* and *wayyiqtols*, which we know indicate anterior tense. According to Penner, the clause is indicative, which is no doubt correct. Yet, nothing in the context precludes some kind of modal meaning (e.g. "he must hide his face"), except for the fact that the form is a *qatal* and we know from our over-all theoretical understanding of the system that this form usually indicates indicative, anterior tense.⁵ In fact, Penner repeatedly needs to use his general knowledge of the forms in his analysis. It seems better to acknowledge such circularity than to pretend that we can do without it.

⁴ Further, if we are not allowed to look at the forms, the person and number of the verb forms will also be quite uncertain in most cases.

⁵ In unvocalized texts, some forms (like ויתנם in 1:4) are ambiguous and we have to rely on context to decide (*wayyiqtol* or *weyiqtol*). However, if the author read his text aloud, the formal difference would be evident and the right interpretation would be clear (cf. ch. 5 on the view that the difference between *wayyiqtol* and *weyiqtol* as found in the MT is a reflection of a real phenomenon and not an artificial invention).

While Penner seeks to describe the verbs as objectively as possible, he does not claim that his method is objective in the strict sense of the word. Rather, by "objective" he means "reproducible by an independent researcher" (ib., 93). As indicated above, this is hardly possible. Theoretical outlook necessarily plays a role, and contexts are not empirical facts but products of interpretation. Interpretation is of immense importance – one scholar's exegesis and translation will lead to a tagging which will in turn contribute to a combined statistical result differing from the result of a scholar with tagging based on another exegetical/translational approach.

Using his statistics, Penner seeks to "calculate exactly how anomalous" the use of *qatal* as a "prophetic perfect" is, as required for Puech's future-oriented interpretation of 1QH^a (Hodayot) as opposed to Kuhn's case for realized eschatology (ib., 161–176 and 194). Without going into the details of these views, it seems clear that if the tagging, from which the statistical information is derived, had been done by Puech, the contested *qatals* would have been tagged as future tense and, consequently, the degree of anomaly would have been lower. According to Penner, "only" 13 *qatals* in 1QH^a are absolute future (ib., 174). From my point of view, this is actually a very high number, since I would expect zero instances. However, Penner's use of the term absolute future is problematic. He simply means that the time of the event is after speech time. Yet this, in itself, does not mean that we are dealing with absolute future tense as this term is usually understood since there may be a reference point in the future, in relation to which the event may be anterior (i.e. future perfect: S – E – R, or one of the other possible sequences of S and E).⁶ This is, in fact, the way Penner analyses some of the 13 instances. In his database, the tagging of some of the cases marks E as coming after S, R after S, and E before R.⁷ In some of the cases, however, real absolute future tense (or even future in the future?) seems to be the intention behind Penner's tagging (E is tagged as being simultaneous with or after R, which is tagged as coming after S). The table in appendix 1 notes the 13 instances with my comments. In no case is a real absolute future interpretation necessary. Especially in poetic texts such as 1QH^a, multiple interpretations are often possible. It is clear that statistical information such as Penner's is not objective, but tends to be a reflection of the interpretation and translation of the researcher.

⁶ Note Penner's similarly confusing use of the term "relative future" (ib., 109) in relation to what is clearly an absolute future (העשׂה in CD 1:2).

⁷ The database is available online (cited 15 May 2017): https://figshare.com/articles/Database_for_Verbs_in_the_Dead_Sea_Scrolls/1434634.

2.1.1 QH as a system of absolute tense?

The main result of Penner's investigation (or rather, the result that is most relevant in the present discussion) is that "the parameter most correlated to verb form is not viewpoint aspect, but absolute tense or modality" (ib., 150). According to his statistics, "perfectivity (aspect) is not one of the categories correlated to form, and therefore aspect is not encoded by the verb forms. However, three [categories] are (absolute tense, relative tense, and modality)" (ib., 154). Which of these categories is most prominent is decided "by examining which verb form is used in contexts that are not all three of absolute past, relative past, and indicative, or not all three of absolute future, relative future, and modal" (ib., 154). Penner claims that absolute tense is more prominent than relative tense because, first, "the combination of absolute non-past and relative non-future ('will have done') is more commonly *obliquo* ('ac' 256 times) than *recto* ('b' 77 times)" (ib., 155).⁸ Second, "the combination of absolute non-future and relative non-past ('would do'; label 'b' in the *obliquo* chart, and labels 'a' and 'ac' in the *recto*) is almost always expressed using a *recto* form (76 times) rather than an *obliquo* form (once)" (ib., 156). Only the single *obliquo* form mentioned last is referenced (CD 10:10), the rest must be searched for in the database (not an easy task).

First, the use of the terms "non-future" and "non-past" simultaneously is confusing. Second, the *yiqtol* in CD 10:10 (ישלימו), which is supposed to be future in the past ("would do"), may be understood as an ordinary present/future expressing a general characteristic of human beings ("and in the wrath of God against the inhabitants of the earth, he has said to remove their knowledge before they complete their days," rather than "before they would complete their days"). Either way, if the meaning of *yiqtol* is non-anteriority (see 3.1), a future in the past interpretation ("would do") is not unexpected. In contrast, such an interpretation of a *qatal* or *wayyiqtol* would be very odd. Hence, the 76 alleged futures in the past ("would do") expressed by *recto* forms are simply a mystery to me and I have not been able to locate them in the database. In his dissertation, Penner does not mention them. Quite the contrary: "The combination of relative future and absolute past ('would do') occurs too infrequently to be significant" (Penner 2006, 175; in n. 356 he mentions CD 10:10 as the only clear case). Concerning the future perfect, the 256 cases of *obliquo* forms expressing this meaning clearly hinge on Penner's use of English future perfect in his translation. In all such cases, the form should be understood as simple future.

⁸ Penner uses terms derived from Zuber 1986. *Recto* means *qatal*, *weqatálti*, and *wayyiqtol*. *Obliquo* means *yiqtol*, *weqataltí*, and *weyiqtol*.

Similar criticism applies to the argument that modality is more prominent than relative tense: "the combination of relative non-future and irrealis modality (e.g., 'if someone should have done...') is *obliquo* (263 times) more often than *recto* (85 times)" (Penner 2015, 156). Again, this argument is based on a specific English translation. Instead, such examples could be rendered as "if someone does/will do/would do" (*obliquo*) and "if someone did/has/had/will have done" (*recto*). Penner sees absolute tense as more prominent than modality because "the combination of absolute non-future and modality is more often *recto* (11 times) than *obliquo* (7 times)," but "the data is too meagre to permit confidence" (ib., 156). Again, the occurrences are not given and it is difficult to see what is meant by this statement.⁹

The main point to note from Penner's statistics is the fact that a *recto* form like *qatal* occurs in future contexts (future perfect). Further, the same form clearly indicates present perfect, past perfect, and simple past as well. When the same verb form has relative and absolute functions and the system does not possess separate specifically relative tense forms (absolute-relative tense forms in Comrie's terms), the system cannot be a system of absolute tense. If it is temporal, it *must* be relative.

Penner's approach does not pay sufficient attention to the system as such. Which forms are available and, consequently, what kinds of distinctions *can* be made? Failing to consider this question leads to a tendency to analyze English rather than Hebrew.¹⁰ It is evident that the HVS simply does not possess specific forms for distinguishing relative and absolute tenses. Penner's statistics (based on English translational equivalents and his interpretation of the texts) merely shows that the same Hebrew form expresses notions, for which English uses several different absolute and relative tense forms. E.g., *qatal* is equivalent to English simple past, present perfect, past perfect, or future perfect. If, e.g., a simple past translation happens to be most frequent, this is primarily a reflection of genre (partly recognized by Penner [2015, 142], though he does not draw the necessary conclusions from it). If

⁹ Penner (2016) applies the same method on 1 Sam 1–2, concluding that "the Hebrew verb forms align themselves much more closely with modality" (ib., 18). However, the only reason modality is considered among the most prominent categories is the interpretation of future tense and habituality in modal terms (cf. Penner 2015, 91, 112–113, 158). Without this theoretical assumption, modality is clearly out of the picture.

¹⁰ Cf. Furuli (2005). E.g., he argues that the PTC from עמד in Gen 41:1 and the *wayyiqtol* from the same root in Gen 41:3 are used "without any visible difference in the meaning that is conveyed" (2005, 330–331). However, this is clearly just because he has decided to translate both verbs as a simple "stood," rather than "he was standing" vs. "and they positioned themselves." There are numerous cases like this. In fact, it is the basis for his entire *modus operandi*.

all the texts happened to be direct speech, most of the *qatal* forms would probably have present perfect as their English equivalent and the conclusion would be different. Similarly, if the texts are predictions of future events, all the *yigtols* will be understood as simple future and translated as such into English. If they are laws or instructions, a modal interpretation will be likely. In sum, this approach does not lead to clarity on the semantics of the verb forms and the characterization of the HVS.

2.2 Cook and typology

Cook is highly critical of Penner's statistical approach. Without providing details, he correctly notes the "misleading sense of objectivity," stating that "in the end the statistics only serve as a tally of the interpreter's subjective and often pre-determined semantic interpretation of the forms of the BHVS. Statistics cannot serve to validate semantic interpretation, which still partakes of human enterprise. Statistics are only valid when they tally objectively measurable things, such as the number of times a distinctly Jussive form of the verb appears clause initially" (Cook 2012, 184).¹¹

However, Cook's typological approach does not lead to better results. He wants to find something that can "validate a theory of the BHVS" (ib., 184), "in order to arbitrate between the competing descriptions" (ib., 185). A theory must be "a 'typologically credible' model of the verbal system in light of the abundance of data on verbal systems in the world's languages" (ib., 149). Typology "provides an external means of judging the results of inductive study – namely: Is the model of the language typologically believable or is it typologically anomalous?" (ib., 175). Typology is "an external means of validation of a model of the BHVS, by placing restrictions on what constitutes possible and impossible verbal systems" (ib., 187).

This approach leads Cook to uphold a "classical" aspectual view since a tense approach is "typologically less credible than an aspectual model of the BHVS" (ib., 149). Basing himself on the work of Bybee and Dahl (1989) and Dahl (1985), he claims that aspect is a more fundamental category in the world's languages, one of the reasons being that "tense forms show more morphological similarity with each other within verbal systems than aspectual forms do" (Cook 2012, 139; cf. Cook 2006). His Arabic example (from

¹¹ Cook includes Furuli in his criticism of the statistical approach, noting that Penner and Furuli end up with contradictory results (Penner's absolute tense vs. Furuli's own brand of aspect) although both scholars "attempt an empirical, statistical analysis of the verb forms in 'context'" (ib., 148). To be sure, Furuli's work is not persuasive, but his approach is not statistical. In fact, he explicitly disregards the statistically predominant usages of the forms and attempts to find the meaning of the forms without interference from context (Furuli 2005, 49, n. 49, 186, 187, et passim).

Dahl) is supposed to show that the aspectual distinction between perfective and imperfective is expressed by morphologically distinct forms (*kataba*, "he wrote," vs. *yaktubu*, "he is writing"), while the past vs. non-past distinction is expressed by grammatical constructions that are morphologically related (past imperfective: (*kāna*) *yaktubu*, "he was writing"). However, this argument only holds if we accept that Arabic *qatala* and *yaqtulu* are aspects – which is the point he is trying to prove. From another angle, the distinction *qatala* vs. *yaqtulu* could be interpreted as one of relative tense (anterior vs. non-anterior). As the translations show, the default difference in meaning between *qatala* and *yaqtulu* is one of tense. *Kāna*, of course, is a *qatala*-form. Since this verb situates the event in the past, a temporal interpretation seems more appropriate, while the aspectual meaning derives from the combination of two forms, which by themselves are best described as relative tenses.¹²

Cook claims that Bybee and Dahl 1989 is based on "an extensive cross-linguistic typological study of verbal systems" and that the aspect-prominent model presented there "represents the most common type of verbal system found in their data." However, the survey on which the conclusion is based is a sample of only 18 languages. Out of these, nine have a basic distinction of perfective vs. imperfective. Of these nine, seven also have a past vs. non-past distinction (Bybee and Dahl 1989, 83). Hebrew, in contrast, has only one main opposition in the part of the system under discussion, viz. *qatal/wayyiqtol* vs. *yiqtol/weqatal*.¹³ Clearly, the languages in the survey are not very similar to Hebrew. We cannot apply such general results to Hebrew and claim that aspect must be a more fundamental category than tense. In fact, according to some scholars, the opposite is the case, i.e., tense is more fundamental than aspect (Kuryłowicz 1972, 83–84; 1973, 115; Blake 1944, 273; Gzella 2004, 35). Though Cook would disagree, it does seem difficult to imagine a language with one mandatorily marked morphological opposition (like *yiqtol/weqatal* vs. *qatal/wayyiqtol*), whose semantics would be most fittingly described in aspectual terms. I know of no such cases. Relative tense seems to be a better description for the meaning marked by such "simple" systems. To decide this question, of course, would require a thorough

¹² Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (whose work is used extensively by Cook) state that a form which co-occurs with an imperfective to make a past imperfective is a past form, rather than a perfective (1994, 95). While I would prefer to describe *qatala* in Arabic as anterior and not simple past, and *yaqtulu* as a non-anterior, the point to note here is that Cook's use of typological studies is not consistent.

¹³ On the connection between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* and between *yiqtol* and *weqatal*, as well as Cook's approach to this question, see 3.6.

knowledge and analysis of the languages involved. In addition, as noted in 1.2, terminology plays a major role in such discussions.

The use of typology as a "judge" is highly problematic. Typology is statistical in nature, based on examinations of a large number of languages (cf. Anttila 1972, 187). Clearly, tense-prominent languages do exist. Hence, even if we accept the statistical preponderance of aspect-prominent languages in the world, we cannot seriously argue that Hebrew has to be aspect-prominent simply because that is what most languages are. Cook (2012, 187) acknowledges that typology is based on "statistical tendencies." Yet, this should lead to a recognition that we cannot use such tendencies to decide what is possible or impossible. The statement (ib., 200) that "a TAM system with a core binary opposition of perfective:imperfective viewpoint aspect is eminently probable based on the extensive typological studies" is not conclusive unless typological studies convincingly show that all languages by necessity must have this kind of system, which is obviously not the case. Typology is not a finished product that gives objective, once-and-for-all answers.¹⁴ There are practically always exceptions to typological "universals" (even implicational ones, "if a language has X, it also has Y").

The work of Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994) is based on existing grammatical descriptions of a large, yet still rather limited number of languages (compared to the number of languages ever spoken in the world). The verb forms used in the survey need to have meaning labels, which means that one has to choose how to interpret them – but often there is disagreement in the field of study of a particular language. If we were to include Hebrew in such a survey, we would have to assign meaning labels to, e.g., *qatal*, as past, perfective, or anterior. A similar lack of consensus obtains in other languages. As Comrie notes (2006, ix), even in a language as thoroughly studied as English, "there remains controversy concerning the definition of the various tenses, and statements that turn out to be erroneous can be found in what are otherwise reliable and insightful sources." We cannot base the choice between competing descriptions of Hebrew on typology, which, in turn, is based on surveys of languages, for which similarly competing descriptions are available. On some languages, only little research exists and there may not be any disagreement, but that is no guarantee that the possibly only available description is correct. Often a language randomly chosen to be included in the survey could not be used because no grammatical descriptions existed (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994, 27–37).

¹⁴ In fact, this is implicit in Cook's use of the expression "ever-increasing data from the world's languages" (ib., 175).

If we use surveys based on interpretations of multiple languages (most of which have been studied far less than Hebrew) to correct the interpretation of Hebrew, the same surveys could be used to correct the interpretation of other languages in order to make them more "plausible." This approach would presumably lead to the extermination of all variation, since all languages would have to be described in the most "typologically credible" way, i.e. all languages would be aspect-prominent. Since this is clearly not the case, a typological approach must explain why Hebrew has to follow the statistically most common type, when other languages are "allowed" to be tense-prominent.¹⁵

2.3 Andrason and path theory

Andrason refers to his method as "dynamic" and "panchronic," describing it as a combination of synchrony and diachrony "into one global general view" (Andrason 2011a, 31). Since this approach uses diachronic typology, much of the criticism levelled at Cook's approach applies to Andrason's as well. In recent articles (Andrason and van der Merwe 2015; Andrason 2016; 2017), Andrason has embraced a type of statistical approach, which shares the same weaknesses that characterize Penner's work. However, there are clear differences between Andrason and the other scholars. Andrason's aim, at least in the earlier articles, is significantly different from the one pursued by Cook and Penner since Andrason does not seek to find the basic meaning of the verb forms and the fundamental categories to which they belong. Quite the contrary, he explicitly rejects the existence of a basic meaning, though he seems to be moving in a slightly different direction in his recent work.

The basis for Andrason's approach is grammaticalization and so-called path theory, which claims that linguistic forms follow universal paths of development. A grammatical morpheme (gram) starts out as a lexical word used in a periphrastic construction and gradually loses its independence and becomes a part of other words as a grammatical affix, becoming part of the morphology, first of the agglutinative, then the fusional type (Andrason 2011a, 22). The meaning associated with grams changes in predictable ways based on the meaning of the original input to the process. Such developmental patterns are called paths (or clines), and these are considered universal and irreversible. For example, an original resultative construction develops along the so-called anterior path towards becoming a simple past tense, acquiring meanings from the categories of taxis, aspect, and tense (in that order) along the way.

¹⁵ Cook's specific aspectual arguments will be discussed in 3.5.1.

2 The search for validation: Methodological considerations

Andrason has criticized Cook's aspectual interpretation of the opposition between *qatal* and *yiqtol*. He correctly notes the lack of logic in Cook's statistical argument for this claim (Andrason 2011a, 43). However, Andrason proceeds to reject the whole idea of forms having an inherent basic meaning, and this is a highly problematic point of view. His "dynamic" approach claims that a grammatical form is "typically an *amalgam* of the meanings up to that particular moment in time" (ib., 38). This means that a form which has moved along the anterior path should not be described simply as an aspectual form or a tense form but rather as having different meanings "which derive from the value of their original lexical input and which correspond to stages on a given path" (ib., 28). This way of describing the HVS is not very illuminating. Andrason's approach "solves" the problem of the basic meaning of the fundamental opposition in the HVS by claiming that there is no fundamental opposition and no basic meaning.¹⁶ According to Cook (2012, xi), Andrason's method of simply listing the different uses of a form without finding a central meaning really amounts to little more than "a taxonomy of meanings with no guidance for the Hebrew philologist to decide which is more or less likely in a given syntagm or discourse context."

However, Andrason does recognize that some meanings are more prototypical than other (2011b, 18, n. 27). In a recent work, he states: "the prototypical sense is not only the most frequent one; it is also a value in terms of which most of the other senses can be explained—a conceptual nucleus of the map from which other senses cognitively emerge. On the basis of this pilot study, it is possible to conclude that the taxis sense constitutes the statistical center of the meaning of the *qatal*" (Andrason and van der Merwe 2015, 87). Statistics are used to show that *qatal* in Genesis is mainly perfect (marks taxis/relative tense). This approach is similar to Penner's. The results, however, are not the same, and, of course, neither are the corpora examined. This would seem to underline the point made above concerning the highly genre-dependent character of this type of work. In principle, Andrason and van der Merwe recognize this factor (ib., 85; cf. Andrason 2016, 32), as does Penner, yet they do not draw the necessary conclusions from this. The basic problem is the same in both approaches – analyzing one's own English translation instead of the Hebrew material.

¹⁶ Andrason seems to recognize that the forms at the starting point of the various paths of development *did* have an inherent basic meaning. Hence, I see no reason why we should refrain from positing an inherent meaning for later phases of the language as well. E.g., Andrason (2013, 9) refers to "the conceptual and diachronic spread from the central point of the network (the original PS sense) to the values observed in BH." This point is noted by Bergström (2014, 58–59).

This problem is pervasive in Andrason 2016 on the difference between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* (based on a statistical examination of Genesis). He claims that linguistics is an "empirical natural science that should be conducted in the spirit of hard sciences rather than in the form of philosophy or literary study" (ib., 11, n. 4), thus disregarding the fact that we need to interpret the biblical texts if we want to analyze the language contained in them. "[E]mpirically measuring senses as they appear," as Andrason would have it (ib., 80), is simply not possible.¹⁷ The senses of the Hebrew verbs do not just "appear" independently of interpretation and translation.

A failure to deal seriously with the material is evident in several cases. Andrason assigns very precise percentages to the distinct senses of *wayyiqtol*: 89.7% perfective past, 4% various types of perfect, 6% durative past, 0.15% present, 0.05% performative, and 0.05% cohortative (ib., 33). The last of these categories demonstrates the problem. The single supposed instance of cohortative *wayyiqtol* is Gen 4:8 (וַיְהִי בְּהִיטָתָם בַּשָּׂדֶה), which Andrason renders as "Let us go out to the field" (ib., 34). Clearly, this is simply the product of mechanically using an emendation of the text found in some translations, rather than reading the actual Hebrew ("and it happened when they were in the field"). Similarly, the claim that *wayyiqtol* can have present tense meaning is based solely on the English translation (Gen 32:6, וַיְהִי־לִי שׂוֹר > "I have oxen").¹⁸

This statistically based attempt to distinguish between different senses of *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* merely counts the English translational equivalents, based on literary (mis)interpretation, and completely disregards the fact that Hebrew simply does not have separate forms for notions like simple past, present perfect, and past perfect. Recognizing the limited repertoire of forms in the HVS is a fundamental prerequisite for a correct analysis.

Andrason's articles typically include a list of all the meanings expressed by a verb form. On this basis, he proceeds to map out all these meanings on the universal path of development to which the form in question presumably belongs. However, in most cases, the point of contention is exactly this list of meanings. Hence, we cannot take it for granted. Even if we assume that the evolutionary paths exist, the task is to situate a given language on a specific stage of such a path.¹⁹ We have to investigate the language itself to find

¹⁷ Andrason, in his n. 72, acknowledges that "we do not have machines to measure senses." This insight should lead to a radical rethinking of the entire methodology.

¹⁸ For further details, see Siegismund forthcoming b.

¹⁹ Andrason (2016, 85) makes the obscure claim that "every gram spans the entire field traced by its grammaticalization cline. Already at the very beginning of its grammatical life, it reaches to the limits of its grammatical universe and spans to the end of the semantic field established by the cline(s)."

out how far it has progressed on the path and, most importantly, to decide whether the presumed relics of meanings associated with earlier stages of the path do in fact exist. When Andrason treats the so-called precative perfect, he assumes that there is such a usage in Hebrew and then points to occurrences of the same (supposed) usage of cognate forms in other Semitic languages as well as similar usage of verb forms in unrelated languages. He then proceeds to find a way to make this usage fit the assumed path. However, the central point is to decide whether the precative usage is attested in Hebrew in the first place (cf. Cook's comments, 2016, 410, with n. 35; on the precative perfect, see 3.3.4).

Describing paths of development that are conceptually logical and attested in the history of many languages is clearly an enlightening project. However, claiming that meanings originating at a preceding stage of the path must necessarily be present at a particular stage of a particular language is quite another matter. We need to look at the entire system at that particular stage of language and see if new forms have developed for the expression of some of the meanings previously expressed by other forms. A verb form may have present perfect and simple past meaning, but then, at a later stage, a new way of expressing present perfect evolves. In this case, we should not expect to find the present perfect meaning preserved in the older form, which would be confined to simple past (cf. the modern Danish past tense as opposed to earlier stages of Germanic).

The interaction between forms in the system is important for the correct interpretation. Because of the intimate connection between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* (and between *yiqtol* and *weqatal*) and the highly systematic interchange between the forms, a good case can be made for the view that *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* share the same semantics (apart from the meaning inherent in "and"; the same applies to *yiqtol* and *weqatal*; see 3.6).²⁰ This means that irrespective of their background, the two forms in each group have the same semantics, which might entail moving backwards on the supposedly irreversible path.²¹

A relevant case from another language is the Latin Perfect. The forms that make up this category (expressing notions rendered by both present perfect and simple past in English) derive from either the Indo-European perfect or

²⁰ Most of Andrason 2016 focuses on finding distinct senses for *wayyiqtol* and *qatal*. Yet, he correctly (though somewhat peripherally to the article as a whole) notes the interaction between the forms as part of a system and the fact that this system is responsible for certain "emergent properties" of the forms (ib., 72, 77, and 84). This insight ought to play a decisive role in the analysis.

²¹ Cf. Joosten 2012a, 75–76: sometimes "water flows uphill for a short while."

the aorist. In terms of developmental paths, the perfect meaning is supposed to be connected to an earlier stage of the path than the aorist meaning, but since the Latin system does not make any distinction between these two original categories, all Latin Perfect forms can have both present perfect meaning and simple past meaning. Hence, original aorists seem to have moved the wrong way. Another example: Afrikaans has abandoned the usual Germanic simple past in favour of what used to be the present perfect form ("I have done"). This periphrastic construction signifies different kinds of anteriority (simple past, present perfect, past perfect). However, a few verbs preserve the old past form, e.g. "to be," yet with all the functions of the periphrastic past construction (Donaldson 1993, 237). Hence, the form has acquired meanings that it did not have when it was simply a past tense (the final stage of the supposed path), and these acquired meanings belong to a previous stage of the path – a supposedly impossible backward movement.²² In addition, a form may shift to another path. Andrason (2011c and 2012) acknowledges this possibility, referring to "modal contamination" in the development of *weqatal*. It seems clear that this form is not a regular development on the "anterior path," but rather an analogical development based on the workings of other parts of the system (see 5.3).

2.4 General observations

None of the methods discussed above provides an external control that would allow us to decide which interpretation of the HVS is correct.²³

How, then, is it possible to reach an understanding of the basic meaning of the Hebrew verb forms? The lack of native speakers – a basic condition for everyone working with an ancient language – has often been lamented (e.g. Holmstedt 2006, 9). In the absence of native speakers, much information may be inaccessible to us. We cannot use intuition to decide what difference it makes if, in a certain clause, we change *qatal* into *yiqtol*, or *weyiqtol* into *weqatal*. Yet, native speakers would not solve all problems – scholars have proposed diverging and mutually exclusive analyses of phenomena in modern living languages, too. Native speaker intuition might help decide which forms are equivalent with which other forms (do *wayyiqtol* and

²² For further criticism of grammaticalization theory, see, e.g., Lightfoot 2006, 38 and 177, with n. 4.

²³ The same applies to Zuber's use of translations of Hebrew into Greek and Latin as external validation for his mood-prominent analysis (Zuber 1986). This approach has been rightly criticized (e.g. Gross 1987a, 426; Cook 2012, 140). For details, see appendix 2.

qatal signify the same thing, e.g.). On other questions, however, the problems would remain, particularly concerning the designation of the basic semantic categories of the system. To answer this question there is no single, objective approach. There is a basic circularity in any attempt at solving this task. First, we might define the categories in ways that allow us to show that the system conforms to our thesis. E.g., we might decide in advance that future tense is modal in order to show that the system is modal, or define relative tense in a way that ensures that the Hebrew forms will fall into this category. Hence, we should strive to use simple, uncontroversial, "common-sense" definitions of the basic difference between tense, aspect, and modality (temporal location, internal temporal structure, status of events). Second, we must take into account the close relation between exegesis/philology and linguistic analysis (cf. Rogland 2003, 1). It is impossible to do serious exegesis without a thorough understanding of the linguistic system in which the content finds expression. Likewise, it is impossible to achieve such linguistic understanding without serious consideration of the content and the various possible interpretations. Thus, exegesis and linguistic analysis must always proceed hand in hand, and here, too, is a source of circular reasoning (as in Furuli 2005). The close connection between exegesis and linguistics means that the best way to ensure a valid result of the linguistic analysis is to engage seriously with the texts and the various possible interpretations. We need a theory to test on the material (cf. Joosten 2012a, 70). Going through the texts with a theory based on aspect or one based on relative tense or modality (defined in simple, uncontroversial terms), it should be possible to decide which one provides the best and most simple description of the largest amount of material in a way that conforms to sound exegetical work on the texts.²⁴ We have to keep in mind the repertoire of forms available and the way the forms interact with each other. A balanced use must be made of all available knowledge derived from the study of other languages, diachrony, typology, ancient translations, exegetical tradition, etc. Happily, Hebrew is not a language isolate, and we should appreciate the fact that there has been a continuous tradition of reading and translation that might help us in our

²⁴ Clearly, our corpora of texts include sentences that are problematic for different reasons and possibly ungrammatical. Different scholars may disagree on the inclusion of specific sentences in this category, yet the existence of dubious passages should be acknowledged. Consequently, one should be careful not to draw conclusions regarding the basic meaning of the verb forms on the basis of highly contested sentences for which widely diverging interpretations have been put forward. Further, a claim such as Furuli's (2005, 463) that his theory is capable of explaining all verbs in the corpus is highly problematic given the fact that the texts contain passages that must be considered corrupt, impossible to understand, or textually very difficult (cf. Kawashima 2010, 28, n. 60).

attempt to understand the system. None of these factors is decisive in and of itself, and none of the approaches relying on any one of these can be used as an objective judge when it comes to determining the basic semantics of the HVS. Rather, all available information should be used carefully as part of the theoretical analysis of the best way to describe the system.

3 The verbal system of CH

The verb forms of CH do not all function on the same level. Rather, the system of finite verb forms consists of two layers, so to speak, or of two different subsystems. The first consists of explicitly volitive or directive forms (the jussive, the imperative, and the cohortative), which mark the will of the speaker in some way (3.7). The second, non-volitive, system consists of the remaining finite verb forms, which are four in number: *qatal*, *yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*, and *weqatal*.¹ According to the interpretation presented here, the four forms indicate only two, not four different meanings. They belong together in a system of systematic interchange, in which *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* mark the same anterior meaning, while *yiqtol* and *weqatal* mark non-anterior meaning. The choice between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* or between *yiqtol* and *weqatal* depends on the presence or absence of the conjunction "and" and on the placement of other elements in front of the verb for various reasons (3.6).

In the following discussion of the basic character of the system (aspectual, modal, temporal), the forms under consideration are the forms that make up the non-volitive system. The volitive system is obviously modal in nature and if one were to consider the entire system at the highest level, it seems quite clear that the main opposition between the two subsystems, i.e. between the volitive and the non-volitive system, is indeed an opposition expressing modal meaning. However, the question that needs to be answered is the character of the semantic difference between *qatal/wayyiqtol* on the one hand and *yiqtol/weqatal* on the other hand. The PTC, too, though not part of the system of positionally determined interchange between the finite forms, must be included in the discussion of the non-volitive subsystem (3.8).²

3.1 Relative tense in the OT

Based on the discussion of absolute vs. relative tense systems in 1.2.3, it was argued in 2.1.1 that an analysis of the HVS as a system of absolute tense does not make sense. Relative tense is a category better suited as a description of the semantic content of the main Hebrew verb forms. In this section (and the relevant appendices), the relative temporal character of *qatal/wayyiqtol* and

¹ The *weqatal* referred to here is the "converted" *weqatalí* as opposed to "unconverted" *weqatalí*. The latter form, though attested sporadically in CH, seems to be oddly out of place in the system and might be considered an unclassical intrusion, apparently carrying the same meaning as classical *wayyiqtol*. On the distinction between the two forms, see 5.3.2; on the use of *weqatalí*, see 6.2.1.

² In addition to the PTC, the HVS includes the infinitives (construct and absolute). However, unlike the PTC, which seems to have successfully competed with and partially replaced the non-anterior finite verb forms, the infinitives play no decisive role as substitutes for the finite forms. See appendix 3 for further details.

yiqtol/weqatal will be illustrated with examples from the OT. It will be clear that Hebrew does not possess separate relative tense forms (Comrie's absolute-relative forms) and uses the same set of verb forms to indicate all kinds of anteriority (*qatal* and *wayyiqtol*; "before-tense") and non-anteriority (*yiqtol* and *weqatal*; "not-before-tense").³

Qatal and *wayyiqtol* often indicate simple past tense – numerous examples can be found on every page of narrative prose. However, the meaning of the forms is clearly not restricted to cases where an event in the absolute (often distant) past is referred to (as in Gen 1:1). The event may be past in relation to another event in the past or to an event in the future, or it may have a relation of relevance to the present time, i.e. what would be expressed in languages with a larger repertoire of tense forms through the use of past perfect, future perfect, and the present perfect, respectively. Hebrew does not have such specific forms. Hence, the same verb forms may be used in connection with adverbs referring to a point of time in the absolute past with no implication of direct present relevance (e.g. בַּשָּׁנָה+X, Gen 7:11; 1 Kgs 15:25, 33) as well as with adverbs referring to the present moment with clear present relevance (e.g. עָתָה, Gen 26:22; 27:36). Deut 20:5ff. provides several good examples of *qatal* of the present perfect type (e.g. v. 5: מִי־הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר בָּנָה בַּיַּת־ (הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה רָאִינוּ כִּי־יָדְבַר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם וְחָי) (הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה רָאִינוּ כִּי־יָדְבַר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם וְחָי), cf. also Deut 5:24 (הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה רָאִינוּ כִּי־יָדְבַר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם וְחָי). The adverb הַיּוֹם, which emphatically draws attention to the contextually determined here and now, frequently occurs with *qatal*. Such cases often refer to the actual present (present perfect) but may also refer to a past or future point of time, in relation to which the event is anterior.⁴ E.g., Lev 14:44 (וְבָא הַכֹּהֵן (וְרָאָה וְהִנֵּה לֹא־פָשָׁה הַנִּגְעָה בַּבַּיִת (וְאִם־בָּא יָבֹא הַכֹּהֵן וְרָאָה וְהִנֵּה לֹא־פָשָׁה הַנִּגְעָה בַּבַּיִת) and 48 (וְרָאָה וְהִנֵּה לֹא־פָשָׁה הַנִּגְעָה בַּבַּיִת) indicate anteriority in relation to a future or potential/general point of time. The final verb of Lev 14:48 illustrates the same usage in a *כי*-clause (וְטָהַר (הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַבַּיִת כִּי־נִרְפָּא הַנִּגְעָה), and in Lev 15:11 the *qatal* שָׁטַף refers to an action (not) done prior to the preceding *yiqtol* (וְגַם לְגַמְלִיךָ אֲשֶׁר יִגְעֹבוּ הַזָּב וְיָדָיו לֹא־שָׁטַף בְּמַיִם) (וְכִבֵּס בְּגָדָיו כִּי־לֹא (גַּם לְגַמְלִיךָ אֲשֶׁר יִגְעֹבוּ הַזָּב וְיָדָיו לֹא־שָׁטַף בְּמַיִם). Cf. Gen 24:19 (אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתִּי לָךְ (אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתִּי לָךְ) (אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתִּי לָךְ) (אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתִּי לָךְ). In the latter example, the first *qatal* is logically future perfect, while the second one is present perfect. See appendix 4 for further examples.

In contrast to the anterior meaning of *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* express anything that is not anterior to a point of time indicated by the context. However, at the classical stage of the language, this general non-

³ For lists of various usages of the verb forms, see, e.g., GKC 309ff., §106–107; Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 330ff., §112–113; Cook 2012, 78–79, 201, 218.

⁴ Cf. the helpful overview of verbal usage with various adverbs and particles in Joosten 2012a, 95ff.

3 The verbal system of CH

anteriority most often refers to the future, future in the past, or general, habitual, iterative events in any time frame. In CH, the non-anterior forms rarely indicate ongoing, durative, progressive events (including the real present), for which CH prefers the PTC. The term non-anteriority must have applied better to Hebrew at an earlier stage. In CH, the term posterior instead of non-anterior might be more precise, at least if general, habitual, and iterative events can be seen as a type of "prediction" (i.e. a type of posteriority). Yet, the PTC has not taken over completely the expression of ongoing action from *yiqtol* and *weqatal* (e.g. Gen 2:6, וַיִּשְׁקַח אֶת-כָּל-פְּנֵי יַד יְעֹזֵב הָאָדָם; cf. the discussion in 3.8), hence it seems better to keep the designation non-anterior. Non-anteriority is often close to different shades of modal meaning, although the notion of explicit volition is expressed by the separate volitive system.⁵ *Yiqtols* and *weqatals* referring to the (absolute) future are ubiquitous in the OT. Whether the verb expresses simple future tense (a prediction) or some modal shade of meaning (translatable with, e.g., "can"; "shall"; "must") has to be decided from the context. What is grammatically marked by the verb form itself is that the event is not (yet) anterior, relative to the time of reference.

The use of non-anterior forms in a past context are of different types. Or rather: in different contexts, they are liable to be translated in different ways (Hebrew, of course, does not have separate forms for the different functions). The general notion of non-anteriority may indicate future in the past (e.g. Exod 2:4, וַתִּתְחַצֵּב אֲחֵתוֹ מִרְחֹק לְדַעַת מֵהַיַּעֲשֶׂה לוֹ; 2 Kgs 3:27; 13:14),⁶ or iterative or habitual action in the past (e.g. Exod 33:7ff., וּמֹשֶׁה יָקַח אֶת-הָאֹהֶל וַנִּטָּה-לוֹ מִחוּץ

⁵ I do not share all of Joosten's modality prominent analysis of the HVS (as will be clear in 3.5.2 below), yet modality and the various types of non-anteriority (future, habituality, etc.) are clearly connected. A further reason for the modal connotations of *yiqtol* (and *weqatal*) seems to be the loss of formal distinction between jussive and ordinary *yiqtol* in most cases (cf. Cook 2012, 248). Shulman somewhat misleadingly claims that ordinary *yiqtol* conveys "the speaker's certainty or knowledge that the act will be performed" (2000, 174). To be sure, there is no explicit volitive meaning in the "indicative imperfect," yet the form clearly does not always indicate an absolutely certain future event/prediction. In fact, Shulman's example (Exod 20:3, לֹא יִהְיֶה-לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל-פְּנֵי), which is stated to convey "God's knowledge that this is what will happen" (ib., 177), is hardly a prediction. Rather, the Israelites will repeatedly follow other gods. Hence, a broader characterization of the form (as non-anteriority, with various modal connotations derived from the context) seems necessary.

⁶ For further examples, see Joosten 2012a, 282. The second *yiqtol* in Job 3:3 (יֵאבֵד יוֹם בּוֹ אֲנִלֵּד בּוֹ) probably belongs here as well (cf. GKC, 316, §107k). Bergström (2014, 110 and 112) distinguishes between "preparative meaning" (e.g. 2 Kgs 3:27) and "real future in the past" (e.g. 2 Kgs 13:14). This distinction has no basis in the HVS, which uses the same non-anterior form for both meanings.

לְמַהֲרָה; Num 9:16ff.).⁷ In the latter cases, the use of *yiqtol/weqatal* is an explicit way of describing how things used to be done or were repeatedly done in the past but it is not mandatory to use such forms. Often there is no explicit marking of actions that, according to the logic of the wider context, must be iterative or habitual. Instead, anterior forms are used (cf. Num 10:35, וַיְהִי בְנִסְעַת הָאָרֶץ וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה וּבְהִנָּחָה יֹאמֶר, vs. 10:36, variant mss. may differ in the explicit expression of habituality. Cf., e.g., 2 Sam 15:2ff. in the MT (two *weqatals*, *wayyiqtol*, *yiqtol* in a relative clause, *wayyiqtol*, *weqatals*) vs. 4QSam^c (partly reconstructed [הָאִישׁ וְאָמַר וַעֲנֵה in v. 2,⁹ instead of MT וַיֹּאמֶר) vs. 4QSam^a (the first MT *weqatal* in v. 2 is probably a simple *qatal*; three MT *wayyiqtol*s in v. 2 are *weqatals*).¹⁰

Some scholars see the use of non-anterior forms in past context as equivalent to the "historic present" known from e.g. Latin or English.¹¹ However, there is a fundamental difference. In English, the use in a past context of the present tense, which otherwise refers specifically to the absolute present (or future), tends to provide a certain dramatic effect, involving the listener or reader directly in the narrative. This is the case because the meaning of the form itself is not, strictly speaking, compatible with the past context. In contrast, the non-anterior forms of the relative tense system of Hebrew, in a past context, seem to serve the more specific purpose of indicating the notions of iterativity etc. outlined above.

⁷ In Siegismund 2013, 268, I followed the widespread characterization of the past habitual/iterative use of *yiqtol/weqatal* as aspectual (e.g. Hendel 1996, 164; Blau 2010, 192). The use of the term aspect to describe certain usages of *yiqtol* in a past context is an unnecessary complication of the matter since such usage can be adequately described within the framework of non-anteriority.

⁸ Noted by Ewald (1863, 355). Cf. Joosten 2012a, 174. For וַיֹּאמֶר in 1 Sam 2:16, Driver (1913, 31) would prefer "וַיֹּאמֶר", in accordance with the other tenses before and after: but Hebrew is sometimes negligent in such cases to maintain the frequentative tense throughout." The word "negligent" seems ill-chosen – the point is that the explicit expression of iterativity etc. in a past context is never mandatory in Hebrew. In addition, in 1 Sam 2:12ff., the shift from iterative/habitual to a single event makes sense in v. 16 (the person addressed would not habitually reply in this manner). The non-mandatory expression of iterativity etc. often makes it extremely difficult to decide whether *weqatals* in past contexts are anterior or non-anterior (i.e. *weqatalti* or *weqatalti*). Cf., e.g., Num 11:8ff.

⁹ See Ulrich 2010, 308.

¹⁰ Ulrich 2010, 309. The *weqatals* in the scrolls may not be habitual but rather unclassical anterior *weqatals* (cf. 6.2.5 and appendix 49). Alternatively, the MT may represent a late misvocalization of a consonant text that really contained (unclassical) *weyiqtol*s indicating habituality in the past.

¹¹ E.g. Schneider 1978, 196; Zevit 1988, 31. Cf. the similar description of certain uses of the PTC in past context in Joosten 2012a, 243.

It bears repeating that the verb forms merely indicate anteriority or non-anteriority. In Reichenbachian terms (cf. 1.2.3), Hebrew does not distinguish R and S. *Qatal* and *wayyiqtol* merely indicate that E is before *something*, either S or R. Similarly, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* mark that E is not-before either S or R. Hebrew does not possess morphological means to distinguish between R and S. In Deut 23:16 (לֹא-תִסְגֵּיר עֶבֶד אֶל-אֲדֹנָיו אֲשֶׁר-יִנְצֵל אֵלָיו מֵעַם אֲדֹנָיו), the second *yiqtol* indicates simple future in relation to S, not in relation to the first *yiqtol*. In many cases, one may find either anterior forms or non-anterior forms in similar contexts (instead of the attested *yiqtol*, we might have expected a *qatal* indicating future perfect in relation to תִּסְגֵּיר in Deut 23:16). In conditional clauses, anterior forms (referring to the fulfilment of the condition before the result, i.e. relative to a future R) as well as non-anterior forms (referring to something that is future or general present in relation to S) may be used. The same is the case in relative and temporal clauses. Such use of varying verb forms represent different ways of expressing similar notions, depending on which point is taken as the point of reference. The distinctive meaning associated with each category (anteriority/non-anteriority) remains the same.¹² E.g., the *qatal* הִבִּיאוּ in Lev 17:4 indicates present perfect or future perfect meaning in a clearly future/general context (cf. v. 3, (אִישׁ אִישׁ מִבֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁהֶט שׁוֹר). In contrast, the *yiqtol* in the similar passage in 17:9 indicates simple future in relation to S. Similarly, instead of using present perfect for both עָשָׂה in Lev 24:19 and יָתַן in v. 20 (ESV), a present perfect in v. 19 and present tense in v. 20 reflects Hebrew usage better. After some conjunctions, anterior and non-anterior forms are equally possible, depending on whether S or the context-induced R in the future is taken as the point to which the verb form refers (e.g. Ezek 34:21, (עַד אֲשֶׁר תִּשׁוּב תִּמַּת אֶחָדָה, vs. Gen 27:44, עַד אֲשֶׁר תִּפְּצוּתֶם אוֹתָנָה). Likewise, though Jer 31:29 (אָבוֹת אָכְלוּ בֶסֶר וְשָׂנִי בָנִים תִּקְהֶינָה) and Ezek 18:2 (... יֹאכְלוּ ...) are often translated the same (ESV: "have eaten"), there is no reason to disregard the meaning associated with the forms elsewhere.

3.2 Inherent and general meaning

As noted in 1.1.3.4–5, some scholars deny that the verb forms have inherent meaning. Most treatments of the HVS, however, rightly presuppose (explicitly or not) that it does make sense to search for the meaning that the verb forms carry in themselves. Two clauses may be the same except for the verb form used. If verb forms derived their meaning solely from context, such clauses would presumably have the same meaning. Of course, as noted by

¹² In Furuli's work (2005), such varying usage is claimed to "prove" that all verb forms have the same temporal meaning.

Cook (2012, 183), our lack of native speaker intuition makes it impossible to devise definite tests for the grammaticality of different constructions and the difference in meaning between different passages. Yet, Hebrew has distinct morphological forms in its verbal system and it is mandatory to choose between these forms. While the difference between *yiqtol* and *weqatal* (and between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*) seems to indicate no semantic difference (3.6), there is no reason to suppose that the difference between the main categories (*qatal/wayyiqtol* vs. *yiqtol/weqatal*) would carry any less meaning and be any more context dependent than, e.g., the difference between pl. and sg. forms or the difference between one noun and another. The verb forms should not be treated as the only part of the context that does not contribute its own meaning. In fact, the meaning of the context is the product of all its parts, as well as the meaning that emerges from specific combinations of these parts. The combined context, in turn, interacts with the meaning of the verb forms (and other elements), selecting certain shades of meaning from the potential of the inherent meaning.

The idea is occasionally met with that *wayyiqtol* is a specifically narrative form whose past meaning is merely derived from the narrative context. However, as Joosten shows (2012a, 191), not all passages with *wayyiqtol*s are narrative. The verb form does not refer to past events *because* it is used in narrative contexts. Rather, the reverse must be the case. The form carries the inherent meaning of referring to something that happened before something else (as well as the meaning of the conjunction "and," which is a part of the verb form). Since general anteriority is what is available in the HVS for referring to events in the absolute past, *wayyiqtol* is the obvious choice for continuous narrative passages, interchanging with the other anterior form (*qatal*) when something interrupts the flow of verb-first clauses introduced by "and." We have to proceed from the assumption that verb forms have inherent meaning. If not, how would the forms that are characteristic of various types of discourse have come to be associated with their respective discourse types in the first place?¹³

How, then, do we describe the inherent meaning of a verb form? Comrie (2006, 29) remarks: "the investigation of the use of a grammatical category in discourse should not be confused with the meaning of that category; instead, the discourse function should ultimately be accounted for in terms of the interaction of meaning and context." Cook (2012, 183) makes a good case for the need to posit an inherent "invariable 'general' meaning for each

¹³ Cf. Cook 2012, 273–274: "many biblical scholars have been content with identifying *wayyiqtol* as a sequential narrative form without examining a possible semantic motivation for its narrational use."

3 The verbal system of CH

conjugation from among the various discrete TAM categories" and to derive the various "specific meanings" of the forms from this invariable meaning in combination with different "contextual factors, either syntactic or pragmatic." Of course, "invariable meaning" does not mean that it remains the same forever. Rather, the meanings of verb forms change over time. Part of such change is attributable to the interaction between the inherent semantics of a form at a certain stage and the meanings derived from various contexts. A meaning that was originally associated with a verb form only because of its occurrence in a particular context may occur so frequently that it becomes associated with the verb form itself and becomes part of the inherent meaning of the form even when not used in the context in which the specific meaning originated ("conventionalization of implicature"). Similarly, what was once a specifically marked meaning of a form (such as progressive, ongoing action) may become less specific over time (e.g. to become a mere indication of present tense). Such developments are, in general, cognitively derivable from the basic meaning as posited for an earlier stage of the language, although the processes may be complex (cf. 2.3).

The term "invariable" refers to the basic meaning discernible behind the various uses of a form in the system as attested in the corpus or period under investigation. Hence, when trying to establish the best description of the inherent meaning of a verb form, a certain level of abstraction is required. On the one hand, as noted by Andrason (2016, 13 and 15), reality is immensely complex and constantly changing, with various parts interacting all the time. Hence, ideally, a model of such a complex reality should be equally complex. On the other hand, an immensely complex model would not be very helpful. Scholars need to make "approximations, simplifications, generalizations" (ib., 15). While the precise meaning of a verb form (or any other word) may never be exactly the same when uttered at two different times, the goal is to find an abstract meaning that covers all occurrences of a particular verb form (but cf. ch. 2, n. 24). If we describe the main (non-volitive) finite verb forms of CH as expressing anteriority vs. non-anteriority, we should be able to derive the attested uses of the forms from these basic meanings. The various uses of the anterior forms for the expression of simple past, past perfect, present perfect, and future perfect are clearly subcategories of the main category anteriority. The use of anterior forms to express counterfactual irrealis is metaphorically derivable from the basic anterior meaning (cf. 1.2.1). Other uses can be described in a similar way, as metaphorical or stylistically motivated derivations from the basic meaning, or by presupposing a specific context of speech. Pragmatics play a decisive role and verb forms can be used in more or less idiomatic ways to indicate a wide variety of meanings that

may seem to be far removed from their basic meaning (cf. Joosten 2012a, 22). In Danish, e.g., if the equivalent of "then you left" ("så gik du") is uttered at the right time (and preferably in a threatening voice), the meaning seems to be close to a very emphatic imperative. Likewise, it is possible to use the absolute past tense form in reference to the future in certain contexts ("han kom i morgen, ikke?," lit. "he came tomorrow, right?"; the implication is that this is something that has been discussed before and agreed upon). Such usage does not mean that we have to analyze the Danish verbal system as a system without tense forms. Rather, we can maintain the description of the past tense form as a past tense as long as such apparently deviant usage can be derived from the basic meaning in a cognitively plausible way. The same applies to Hebrew.

Grammars and works specifically devoted to the HVS usually feature inventories of meanings for each verb form. E.g., the list of meanings typically attributed to *qatal* as presented by Cook (2012, 201) includes "(1) present or past state (with statives), (2) simple past, (3) past perfect, (4) present perfect, (5) present (gnomic), (6) performative, (7) future perfect, (8) counterfactual, (9) so-called prophetic perfect, and (10) optative/precative."

While (2), (3), (4), (7), and (8) are easily subsumable under the general heading of anteriority, it seems to be more difficult to fit (1), (5), (6), (9), and (10) into this interpretation. However, on closer inspection, (1) can be accounted for in anterior terms and the other alleged instances of non-anterior use of the anterior forms can be explained as products of specific exegetical and translational choices in the rendering of the passages into English (or other languages) using present or future tense or the imperative. A different exegetical approach and a corresponding translation leads to the view that the verbs under consideration are in fact completely regular instances of the usual anterior meaning of *qatal*.

3.3 Non-anterior *qatal* (and *wayyiqtol*)

The most ubiquitous of the allegedly non-anterior uses of *qatal* is the present tense usage of stative verbs like adjectival פָּרַח as well as the verbs יָדַע and זָמַר etc.¹⁴ This usage partly reflects the original non-temporal character of the ancestor of *qatal*, a PS nominal construction similar to the Akkadian stative/permansive (for details, see 5.3). In WS this construction, when formed from verbal roots, developed into a proper tense form (**qatala*) with anterior meaning. This form gradually replaced the old anterior form **yaqtul*. In this light, stative *qatals* in Hebrew (and WS generally) can be seen as relics from a period when the form merely signified that the subject is (or was or will

¹⁴ See 3.6.1 for the use of *wayyiqtol* in this function.

be, according to context) the notion expressed by the root (e.g. "I am old").¹⁵ However, when the form became an anterior tense form, these verbs must have been reanalyzed as part of the new system. "I am old" could be reinterpreted as if derived from "I have become old" (although that is not the origin of the form).¹⁶ Similarly, "I know" could be reanalyzed as "I have come to know," etc. Stative verbs in *qatal* are also interpretable as referring to the past, and they are open for a non-stative (fientive) interpretation as well. This means that the same form (when translating into languages that make such distinctions) can signify "I was old"; "I became old"; "I had/have become old"; "I am old." Similarly, "I knew" or "I got to know," etc. Hence, the situation is parallel to the one that obtains with non-stative verbs, which are always interpretable as present perfect (with present reference) as well as simple past (with past reference). The choice between the two (or between other types of anteriority) is only relevant when we translate into a language that makes more distinctions than Hebrew in the field of anteriority. In Hebrew, the general category of anteriority covers all such cases. The anterior meaning attributable to a stative *qatal* is not always readily apparent (cf. Joosten 2012a, 201–202). Yet, a distinction is clear between the state expressed by such a form and a corresponding *yiqtol* with non-anterior meaning (e.g. Gen 12:11, *בְּמָה אָדַע כִּי אֵירָשְׁנָה*, with Gen 15:8, *יָדַעְתִּי כִּי אֵשֶׁה יַפְת־מְרָאָה אֵת*). Thus, the use of *qatal* with stative verbs in a present context is not an argument against the anterior label for *qatal* (and *wayyiqtol*).

3.3.1 "Prophetic perfect"

Apart from statives, the allegedly non-anterior uses of the anterior forms belong to four main groups: so-called prophetic, gnomic, performative, and precative *qatal*. Rogland (2003) has treated the first three of these in an admirably clear way, explaining how they fit into a (relative) temporal analysis of the system.¹⁷

The prophetic perfect is a supposedly absolute future use of *qatal*, already noted by the earliest grammarians (Qimḥi 1862 [ed. Rittenberg], 37a: the עבר is frequently used במקום עתיד, mostly in the Prophets). Most later scholars have recognized this usage, yet often correctly remarking that a stylistic or psychological explanation should be sought, rather than claiming that *qatal* signifies future tense as such. GKC (313, §106n) ascribes the usage to the

¹⁵ Cf. nominal clauses with adjectives, e.g. Gen 25:29 (וְהָיָה עָיִף); 30 (כִּי עָיִף אָנֹכִי). V. 29 is part of the narrative ("and he was tired"), v. 30 is direct speech ("I am tired").

¹⁶ Cf. Fenton (1969, 36) on the "resultative error."

¹⁷ Rogland mentions the precative perfect briefly, suggesting a connection between the supposed precative usage and the prophetic perfect (2003, 132–133).

prophet transporting "himself in imagination into the future" in such a way that "he describes the future event as if it had already been seen or heard by him." Rogland takes this approach one step further and argues convincingly that this use of *qatal* should not be considered "non-past" in the strict sense. Rather, the cases that have been proposed by various scholars can be interpreted within the meaning normally associated with *qatal*. They may be past relative to a future R (future perfect) or indicate absolute past events, sometimes as part of something that will be uttered in the future, sometimes because the verb refers to a past decision or to something seen in a vision or dream (Rogland 2003, 113).¹⁸ If an author wants to give the impression that he has seen the events in a vision, it makes sense to render them in the past tense since the vision is past, even though the content is future.¹⁹

Other cases noted by Rogland are described as "idiomatic tense mismatches" with the purpose of fulfilling some rhetorical intention, e.g. Num 17:27 (הוּ גָּוַעְנוּ אֶבְדָּנוּ כָּלְנוּ אָבָדְנוּ). The speakers are clearly not dead yet, but the exaggeration produces a rhetorical, dramatic effect, and Rogland (2003, 92–95) refers to similar cases in other languages with clearly grammaticalized tense forms, which means that this usage is hardly a reason for claiming that Hebrew is "tenseless."

Many prophetic perfects noted by scholars are clearly products of specific exegetical approaches. A scholar may interpret a passage as referring to the future and accordingly translate the verb forms as future tense. Subsequently, he may claim that *qatals* in such a passage express this sense. However, a different approach to the passage could indicate a past setting, leading to another interpretation and hence another analysis of the semantic potential of the verb form (e.g. Isa 5:13, לָכֵן גָּזְלָה עַמִּי). In other cases, we find isolated *qatals* in passages that are clearly future tense descriptions with non-anterior tense forms (*weqatals* and *yiqtol*s). Such occurrences (e.g. Isa 11:8, גָּמַוּל יָדוּ הָדָה, or 25:8, בְּלַע הַמַּוּת לְנִצָּחַ) are interpretable as a kind of dramatic outburst (translatable with the present perfect).²⁰

Klein (1990) has surveyed the cases adduced by various scholars. He eliminates some due to textual problems or because the verb may be interpreted

¹⁸ Cf. Koolhaas 1748, 98 on the visionary nature of many of the cases. Bergström (2014, 119, n. 309) sees a historical problem in assuming "that prophecy was always visionary." However, Rogland does not claim that the visionary explanation holds for all cases.

¹⁹ In modern fiction, of course, past tense forms are regularly employed in narrative contexts situated in the future (see Fludernik 2012, 82–83). Fludernik also mentions the use of future tense as a narrative tense in modern experimental fiction. This is clearly a stylistic, literary device, but it does not, of course, mean that the future tense form can "be made to signify 'pastness'" (ib., 95).

²⁰ Note that 4QIsa^c has a *yiqtol* in Isa 11:8 (יהדה; Ulrich 2010, 477).

as modal or referring to the past. Yet, Klein finds it possible to "prove the 'Prophetic Perfect'," by adhering to three principles: "the text must be sound"; "the mood must be neutral, that is, indicative"; "the Perfect must unquestionably be future, a sense one hopes to see confirmed by converted Perfects and Imperfects in the context" (ib., 59). To this he adds that the third factor is the most difficult to determine. In fact, all of Klein's "legitimate" cases are interpretable as various types of anteriority, and the presence of *weqatals* or *yiqtol*s in the vicinity clearly does not constitute valid proof. See appendix 5 for further details on Klein's "legitimate 'Prophetic Perfects'" (and cf. the alleged absolute future *qatals* in 1QH^a discussed in 2.1 and appendix 1). The so-called prophetic perfect is a stylistically determined use of the ordinary anterior meaning. Especially in poetry and prophetic discourse, seemingly strange shifts in temporal reference are quite regular. If, in some cases, we feel compelled to translate such instances with a future tense, even after reevaluating the interpretation of the wider passage (and discarding textually problematic cases), this ought to be attributed to the stylistic preferences in the language into which we translate.

3.3.2 "Gnomic perfect"

The gnomic perfect is the alleged use of *qatal* for the expression of generic/general or habitual statements, usually in proverbs and sayings. According to Rogland, the supposed instances of this usage do not constitute an argument against a temporal analysis of *qatal*. He cites similar sayings from English and other languages and illustrates how past tense forms can be used to express general statements without undermining the temporal analysis of the languages in question (Rogland 2003, 49–51). He prefers to see such sayings as reports "of a particular, and often extraordinary, experience or observation" or as generalizations from the way "things have typically occurred in the past" (ib., 131). Previous scholarship has explained the usage in similar terms, as a type of experiential perfect (e.g. Ewald 1844, 261). Hence, the general present sense clearly derives from the anterior meaning of the form – this has always or often been the case, therefore this is how it is. To underline this analysis, Rogland often inserts a "never" or "ever" in his translations (e.g. in Ps 9:11; Rogland 2003, 38). Tropper (2006, 418) criticizes this and various other "Kunstgriffe" in the translations offered by Rogland. However, inserting a "never" or "ever" merely serves to underline the interpretation. It is not required for Rogland's general point to be valid. Indeed, this "Kunstgriff" highlights a very important fact, which Rogland never seems to state in explicit terms. The Hebrew anterior forms have to fulfill all the functions for which English and other languages use simple past, present

perfect, past perfect, etc. As emphasized above, the distinction found in English is simply not a part of the HVS. Accordingly, every *qatal* is always potentially interpretable as "he did" and "he has done," as well as other types of anteriority. The use of "never"/"ever" in a translation merely stresses the present perfect reading. Rogland's conclusion that the usage under consideration does not invalidate the analysis of *qatal* as a "past" (i.e. anterior) form is surely correct.

Cook (2005) follows Rogland's lead on the gnomic perfect. Though he retains the use of the terms "genericity" and "generic statements" for the passages in question, he correctly states that in most cases "the usual translation" (the way such forms are usually translated in other texts) is acceptable (ib., 130). Sometimes the passages should be interpreted as "past tense anecdotes whose moral message is left for the reader to discern" (ib., 131).²¹ This is a very good description. Indeed, we must conclude that the gnomic perfect only exists when we choose to translate the *qatals* in proverbial passages as present tense.²² E.g., Prov 16:26 (נִפְּשׁ עֵמֶל עֵמֶל לֹא כִי־אָכַף עָלָיו פִּיהוּ) could be rendered with a past tense, as a short anecdote from which the wise will draw his own conclusion. Similarly, Prov 22:13 (אָמַר עֲצֵל אָרִי בַחֲוִץ בְּתוֹךְ רְחִיבוֹת אֲרָצָה) can be understood as a minimal unit of narrative, illustrating a point of general relevance.

3.3.3 "Performative perfect"

The notion that the well-known performative perfect (e.g. Gen 1:29, הִנֵּה נָתַתִּי לְכֶם אֶת־כָּל־עֵשֶׂב) attests to a special present tense meaning of *qatal* is problematic as well. Performativity refers to actions performed through the utterance itself ("I hereby give you"). According to Rogland (2003, 126), the use of *qatal* in such clauses seems to be simply "a convention and has no bearing on the semantic analysis of *qatal*." However, it is possible to be more specific. In fact, since the meaning of *qatal* is not absolute past but anteriority, events that have happened "just now" as a result of the speaker's utterance (or thought or determination, etc.) naturally fall under the domain of this verb form. In contrast, the use of the PTC would stress the event as ongoing and *yiqtol* would have future and/or modal implications (on the use of participial "performatives," see 4.2.1). Several scholars have noted the basic anterior character of performative *qatal* (Joosten 2002b, 62–63: "with the utterance,

²¹ Cf. Alter (1985, 169) on "narrative vignettes" with "some minimally etched plot" as part of hortatory passages. Curiously, in spite of this characterization, Alter uses the present tense in his translation of the example used as illustration (Prov 11:8).

²² Cf. Siegismund forthcoming b, on the use of *qatal* in Prov 31:10–31, the general question of the "gnomic perfect," and translation-based interference.

the main component of the action is past"; Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 334, §112f.).²³

The choice of present tense when translating these *qatals* into English or similar languages is a product of the need to produce an idiomatic translation and not an argument against the basic anterior semantic content of the Hebrew form itself.²⁴

3.3.4 "Precative perfect"

The precative perfect allegedly expresses wishes, prayers, commands, etc. However, a closer look reveals that it is in fact another example of translation-based interference in the analysis of the HVS. Though the existence of precative *qatals* in BH is far from universally accepted, the majority position seems to be that cases do occur in the OT, albeit in very low numbers.²⁵ As part of his "dynamic" investigations of the HVS, Andrason argues for the existence of precative *qatal* in the OT using comparative and typological evidence to show that other Semitic languages use forms cognate with Hebrew *qatal* in the same function and that unrelated languages exhibit a typologically similar use of a single verb form for both past tense and optative or imperative.²⁶ He describes a plausible path of development that connects the

²³ The so-called "epistolary perfect" might be considered a distinct phenomenon (see Rogland 2000). However, the use of *qatal* in letters is clearly just a reflection of the general anterior meaning of the verb form, as is the performative usage. Pardee and Whiting (1987,1) correctly point out that the epistolary perfect is not an overtly marked grammatical category but a translational category needed because letter writing usage differs between English and Hebrew.

²⁴ Bergström (2014, 16) argues that in Gen 17:16 ׀ comes "in between the conjunction and the verb, without, apparently, making it non-consecutive [sic]" (׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀) (׀ ׀ ׀ ׀). However, if ׀ is performative, this interpretation is unnecessary.

²⁵ Andrason (2013, 3–5) provides an overview of previous scholarship on the question, mentioning defenders (the majority position, according to Andrason) and deniers of the existence of this use of *qatal*. One scholar cited in defence of precative *qatal* is G. R. Driver with a quotation from 1936. In a later work, however, Driver reached a different conclusion: "all the supposed instances in the Old Testament are doubtful; none are unavoidable and all can be otherwise explained" (Driver 1969, 60; cf. Cook 2012, 250, n. 87).

²⁶ Some of the Semitic evidence is ambiguous. In several languages, some or all of the alleged instances are dubious or interpretable as other forms or as having other meanings. In the remaining cases, what we have is a usage that is either clearly marked as precative through the use of specific particles (the real carriers of the precative meaning) or belongs to a more or less restricted set of greetings, religious blessings, or "fixed expressions." Cf. Driver 1969, 52. Weninger (2001, 102) shows that there probably is no "Wunschperfekt" in Classical Ethiopic. Neither is the Akkadian evidence decisive. The Akkadian stative is a nominal formation and there is nothing odd about the fact that it can be used with

different uses and succeeds in arguing that it is not intrinsically implausible that precative *qatal* might exist in the OT. What he does *not* show, however, is that this is in fact the case. In his examples from the OT, Andrason merely assumes that the *qatals* are precative, without considering other interpretations of the texts.

According to Andrason (2013, 14, n. 13), there are 18 precative *qatals* in the OT, of which he considers 12 to be the most evident and convincing. In most cases, the precative interpretation is based on a preceding overt deontic form (e.g. an imperative) but in other "very sporadic and still controversial examples," there is no preceding modal form, in which cases Andrason derives the precative interpretation from "the meaning of the whole situation" (ib., 11). However, "the meaning of the whole situation" is rarely clear-cut. This is the problem with the entire notion of precative *qatal*, including the instances with preceding modal forms. Since most of the cases occur in poetry (mostly Psalms) it is necessary to consider the general style of biblical poetry, especially the tendency to switch between different temporal planes (see 3.4). When we encounter a *qatal*, we should try to make sense of the passage by reading the form as it is usually read in other cases (simple past, present perfect, etc.). In Niccacci's words (2010, 117), we should respect "the verbal forms for what they are and try to interpret them accordingly, even when one finds abrupt transitions."

With this approach, we can explain all the supposed precative *qatals* (in some cases, textual issues are relevant too). E.g., Andrason (2013, 11) translates פְּדִיתָהּ in Ps 31:6 (אֶל אֲמַתְּ) (פְּדִיתָהּ רִוְחִי אֶפְקִיד רִוְחִי פְּדִיתָהּ אוֹתִי יְהוָה אֵל אֲמַתְּ) as "may you redeem." However, the verb probably refers to a previous act of God, stressing the belief of the Psalmist that he is among the redeemed, regardless of his present suffering. There are other instances of such previous events as part of the prayers in vv. 8–9. Likewise, Andrason (ib., 14) renders אָבְדוּ in Ps 10:16 (יְהוָה מְלִךְ עוֹלָם וְעַד אָבְדוּ גוֹיִם מְאֹרְצוּ) as "may perish." However, other approaches are possible. We can follow the LXX and read the form as 2pm imperative (with גוֹיִם as a vocative). Alternatively, we should recognize the clear break in the structure of the poem in v. 16, which is a declaration about the way Yahweh is king (Driver 1969: 57), as opposed to the second person forms in vv. 14–15 and 17. Accordingly, there is no reason to let the imperative and *yiqtoles* in v. 15 influence the interpretation of the *qatal*, which can

the precative particle *lū* (or the corresponding negative particles) just like ordinary nouns and adjectives. In all of Andrason's examples, one of these particles occur. The same seems to be the case in the Ancient South Arabic example (yet this and similar cases have been interpreted as infinitives; Nebes and Stein 2008, 174). On Arabic, see 5.3.

be rendered as "the nations have perished from his land."²⁷ Appendix 6 contains details on the remaining alleged precatives from Andrason 2013. All of them are interpretable as ordinary anterior *qatals* without recourse to an extremely rare and contested type of *qatal* whose meaning is at odds with the one attested elsewhere.

3.3.5 Problematic cases

There are other cases where translators find it difficult to render *qatal* (and sometimes *wayyiqtol*) in the usual way and opt for a present or future translation. Some might be textually problematic but often it is possible to uphold the anterior interpretation of the Hebrew forms if we recognize that the Hebrew forms are relative tenses and that the stylistic conventions of Hebrew may differ from English (and other target languages). Consider Exod 10:3 (עַד־מָתַי מֵאֲנֹתָ לְעֹנֹת מִפְּנֵי) vs. 10:7 (עַד־מָתַי יִהְיֶה זֶה לָנוּ לְמוֹקֵשׁ). Does the *qatal* in 10:3 have non-anterior meaning (as one would assume from translations such as "how long will you refuse")? Joosten (2012a, 209, n. 23) prefers a modal interpretation of the *qatal* here and in similar passages, while GKC (311, §106h) defends an anterior reading: "*how long hast thou already been refusing* (and refusest still...? which really amounts to *how long wilt thou refuse?*)." The latter option seems preferable – it allows us to interpret a problematic verb without blurring the distinction between the verb forms or attributing exceptional meanings to specific cases.

Another problematic example is Exod 9:15 (כִּי עָתָה שְׁלַחְתִּי אֶת־יָדִי וְאָף אוֹתָהּ) (וְאֶת־עַמְּךָ בְּדָבָר וְתִפְחַד מִן־הָאָרֶץ). Is the *qatal* "performative"? Are the *wayyiqtol*s supposed to be *weyiqtol*s? Is the entire passage an expression of counterfactual irrealis? Is it "prophetic"? The LXX has $\nu\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$ γὰρ ἀποστείλας τὴν χειρὰ πατάξω σε καὶ τὸν λαόν σου θανάτῳ καὶ ἐκτριβήσῃ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. Jer 38:9 is another case (אֵת אֲשֶׁר־הִשְׁלִיכוּ אֶל־הַבּוֹר וַיָּמָת תַּחֲתָיו מִפְּנֵי הַרְעָב). Obviously, Jeremiah had not died at this point, and in light of v. 10 it seems unlikely that the messenger thought so. The messenger, of course, is the Nubian eunuch. Hence, the "foreign factor" may play a role (foreigners using deviant language as a means of characterization), the *wayyiqtol* perhaps intended as a *weyiqtol* instead of the expected classical *weqatal*. Alternatively, we might speculate that the original verb was an ordinary non-anterior *weqatalti*,

²⁷ It is not necessary to identify the גוֹיִם from v. 16 with the evil and godless people who are the focus of the preceding part of the psalm. If the גוֹיִם are foreign peoples thought to have been eradicated from the land in the past, this might serve as a good basis for the belief that Yahweh will also deal with the interior enemies, the wicked among his own people. If we read the verb as an imperative, the vocative גוֹיִם would refer to people living in Yahweh's land in the present.

which (because of the preceding simple *qatals*) was misinterpreted as an unclassical anterior *weqatálti* and then "corrected" into a *wayyiqtol*. The LXX has no verb corresponding to this one in its rendering of the passage. In general, it is not sound methodology to base far-reaching conclusions on a few isolated oddities, whose grammaticality may be uncertain.²⁸

A special case is the use of *qatal* after the conjunction או ("or") in passages referring to the future. According to Kawashima (2010, 31; based on Zuber 1986, 157–159), such *qatals* are "converted" like *weqatal* (e.g. Exod 21:37, כִּי יִגְנוֹב־אִישׁ שׁוֹר אֹו־שֶׁה וַתִּבְחֹו אוֹ מִכְרוֹ). However, once we realize that *qatal* is not an absolute past tense but a general anterior form and further allow a degree of abruptness in certain styles of writing, we might not need any "conversion" (Exod 21:37: "when/if a man steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters it, or (when/if) he has sold it, he shall repay, etc."). For further details on the attested cases, see appendix 7. In any case, even if we follow Zuber and Kawashima, the alleged non-anterior meaning is not a "natural" feature of simple *qatal* but seems to be taken over from *weqatal*.

In sum, none of the alleged non-anterior uses of *qatal* (or *wayyiqtol*) is convincing. Though precative, gnomic, etc. readings do make sense in many passages, the disputed verbs are practically always interpretable in terms of the invariable meaning of the form. This approach seems preferable to using a comparatively small number of ambiguous passages as the basis for positing separate functions of a verb form that go directly against the general meaning of the form. A certain number of truly "odd" (possibly ungrammatical) cases must be acknowledged but in most cases, a different exegesis or a better appreciation of the differences between Hebrew and English usage allows us to follow Rogland in rejecting the supposedly non-anterior uses of the anterior forms.

3.4 The verbs in poetry

According to a widespread view among scholars and ordinary readers alike, verbs in prose and poetry follow different rules. Specifically, verbal usage in poetry has been seen as more or less random (e.g. Bergsträsser 1929, 29, §6i; Berlin 1979, 23; Buth 1986, 26–28). Of course, as in other languages, we must allow Hebrew poets a degree of poetic licence. Metrical considerations, too, might influence the use of verbs, though far too little is known about this for us to draw any clear conclusions (the fluidity of the textual material probably guarantees that nothing decisive can be said on this point). However,

²⁸ Other problematic *wayyiqtol*s are found in 1 Sam 2:6 and similar passages (cf. Joosten 2012a, 187, who refers to several cases; they are interpretable in the same way as gnomic *qatals*, i.e. as ordinary anteriors).

3 The verbal system of CH

poetic licence pertains to the stylistic use of the system. It does not involve arbitrarily attributing a meaning to a verb form that might be the exact opposite of the meaning of the form elsewhere – at least, the latter type of poetic licence would seem to guarantee that nobody would be able to understand the poet.

Accordingly, several scholars have challenged the view that verbs in poetry are used indiscriminately (cf. Notarius 2013, 26–27). Niccacci has abandoned his earlier position (1990, 193–197; 1997) and argues convincingly that the verbs in poetry have the same basic meaning as in prose, more specifically in direct speech (2006 and 2010). Rogland (2003, 13, n. 70) notes that the difference between poetry and prose is not the semantics of the forms as such ("poetics, not grammar"; cf. Joosten 2012a, 416: "style, not grammar"). If (as seems to be the case) we can make sense of poetry in this way, positing one grammatical system with the same semantics for poetry and prose is clearly preferable to claiming the existence of separate grammatical systems or separate semantics for the verb forms (cf. Rogland 2003, 14).

The frequent abrupt transitions between *qatal* and *yiqtol* or between other verb forms in poetry might pose a challenge to this approach. However, once we realize that Hebrew verbs are marked for relative rather than absolute tense and keep in mind the non-linear and segmental character of most poetry (cf. Niccacci 2010, 114) such transitions are, in most cases, quite unproblematic. In fact, we noted similar shifts in prose (3.1 and 3.3.5). The use of different verb forms in similar sentences does not force us to conclude that the forms have the same inherent meaning. Likewise, the occurrence of different verb forms in a poetic passage does not mean that the inherent semantics of the forms must be the same.²⁹

The segmental nature of poetry makes it possible to shift between hope or prayers for the future and statements about past events such as God's previous acts of mercy (cf. Notarius 2013, 58 on "discursively non-homogeneous" poetry). A shift to a narrative sequence may have dramatizing purpose rather than necessarily relating events that have actually occurred (cf. "prophetic perfect" in 3.3.1; an example may be the shift to *wayyiqtol* in Ps 18:8/2 Sam 22:7b). Such shifts of temporal reference are frequent (cf. several "precative" passages in appendix 6). In other cases, the absolute temporal reference seems to be constant, though different verb forms are used. Since the Hebrew

²⁹ Berlin (1979, 24) recognizes that, e.g., a *nif.* and a *hif.* from the same root in parallel stichs have different meanings – in contrast to her claim that there are no semantic reasons for the shifts between *yiqtol* and *qatal* (ib., 23). She provides no arguments for the assumption that the latter shifts have no semantic content.

verbs indicate relative rather than absolute tense, this does not pose a problem for the claim that the semantic content of the verb forms is the same as in prose. Non-anterior forms occur in past as well as present and future contexts. Anterior forms are often used where English or similar languages use present perfect, i.e. the temporal reference is the "now" of the psalmist. Often, it is difficult or impossible to decide whether to translate a sequence of *qatal* and *yiqtol* as simple past plus concomitant/durative past or as present perfect plus present/future tense (e.g. Ps 18:5, אֶפְפוּנִי הַבְּלִיָּמֹת וְנִהְלִי בְּלִיעַל, (יְבַעְזוּנִי)). The HVS simply does not make such distinctions.

Appendix 8 provides a few examples of the way the clash of different verbal forms may be treated within the standard system. There is no reason to doubt the fundamental point that verb forms have the same meaning in prose and poetry and function according to the same basic rules. These rules, however, are exploited in different ways in various types of literature, depending on stylistic needs. Yet, a cautionary note is in order – just because it is possible to make sense of poetic texts in this way, there is no guarantee that this is the correct approach. In poetry, alternative readings abound. In many cases, interpreting the verbs following a different set of rules than the ones that hold in prose may make perfect sense. It is hardly possible to prove that the *qatals* in, e.g., Ps 1 or 2 *must* have anterior meaning (see appendix 8). However, it is clearly desirable to have a theory that explains as much as possible. Alternatively, we would have to posit a separate grammatical system every time our preferred exegesis leads us to a translation that violates the rules otherwise established for the language.

Note two points. First, it seems likely that textual corruption and scribal misunderstandings are liable to be found in poetic passages, which were possibly highly ambiguous to start with, to an even higher degree than is the case in prose.³⁰ Hence, some passages may not fit the rules – not because they follow a definite set of different rules but because the text as transmitted is not in order. In practice, there is no way to decide objectively when this is the case and before accepting such a claim, all possibilities for an interpretation within the standard system should be exhausted. Second, archaic verbal usage may be attested in certain poems, notably the use of *yiqtol* with anterior meaning as a relic of PS **yaqtul* otherwise only attested in "frozen" form in *wayyiqtol* (see 5.1). Commonly noted in this connection are passages such as Gen 49; Exod 15; Num 23–24; Deut 32–33; Judg 5; 2 Sam 22/Ps 18 (see, e.g., Notarius 2013; Vern 2011; Robertson 1972). There seems to be a connection between the supposed archaic (or archaizing) character of a passage

³⁰ Stipp (1991, 540): it is sometimes hard to decide if a shift between verb forms is due to "hochpoetische, finessenreiche Sprache" or "hochgradige Textverderbnis."

3 The verbal system of CH

and the degree of textual ambiguity attested. Rezetko and Young (2014, 168 et passim) note that unusual linguistic traits (such as supposed archaisms) are the most likely to be lost or added during the process of transmission. Their comparison of Ps 18 and 2 Sam 22 shows "*almost no overlap* between the less common linguistic forms of these two parallel texts of the same composition" (ib., 158; cf. also Young 2017).

It is difficult to decide whether the supposedly archaic *yiqtol*s in fact have anterior meaning (and whether the "archaic" poems are in fact old). In most cases, the general approach to poetry outlined above allows us to interpret the texts without recourse to such claims. For an excursus on verbal usage in several "archaic" poems, see appendix 9. The *yiqtol*s in question may have ordinary non-anterior meaning, or in some cases, they may represent sudden dramatic volitive outbursts (jussives). However, in some texts it seems difficult to eliminate all the supposed instances (notably Deut 32). Hence, a total rejection of the idea (cf. Niccacci, e.g. 2006, 252) might be going too far. Other languages exhibit archaic linguistic traits (or conscious linguistic archaizing) in various types of texts, like the pl. form of verbs in Danish hymns and Christmas carols, or the French Passé Simple, which is confined to literary (not just poetic) usage. However, in such cases it is clearly not a question of one form having the opposite meaning of its usual meaning in a certain genre. Rather, a separate verb form or certain morphological traits of a verb form are preserved in specific stylistic contexts. In fact, this is also the case with supposedly anterior *yiqtol*s in BH. Rogland (2003, 13, n. 70) states: "Even an observable difference between Hebrew poetry and prose such as the use of the free-standing preterital *yiqtol* (**yaqtul*) relates not to the semantic value of the verbal form itself but rather to its frequency of use and distribution in different literary genres." Some anterior *yiqtol*s may occur in prose as well but most can be interpreted otherwise (see appendix 10 for examples). To the extent that convincing instances of the usage are identified in poetry (and prose), they are not cases of ordinary *yiqtol* with anterior meaning, but relics of another verb form belonging to the anterior category rather than the non-anterior category to which other cases of *yiqtol* (< **yaqtulu*) belong.³¹

³¹ The ancestor of *wayyiqtol* and supposedly anterior *yiqtol* must have had a different stress placement from non-anterior *yiqtol* (cf. 5.1–2.1). This distinction may have been in existence when the supposedly archaic poems were first composed. We do not know how long this stress-based distinction existed (cf. Notarius 2013, 83, on Deut 32). In any case, regardless of the background of the forms, in the texts as we have them we are able to interpret the forms as non-anteriors in virtually all instances, as must have been the case for the people reading and transmitting the texts in antiquity.

3.5 Aspect- and mood-prominence: A critical discussion

The types of usage discussed in the previous sections do not constitute decisive evidence against the relative temporal interpretation of the system. It is possible to handle alleged cases of non-anterior *qatal* (and *wayyiqtol*) as well as apparently different meanings in poetry within the confines of such an interpretation (a basic opposition between anterior *qatal/wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *yiqtol/weqatal*).

Before proceeding, it is important to reiterate what is meant by the claim that the HVS is a system of relative tense rather than aspect or modality. It does *not* mean that Hebrew is incapable of expressing aspectual or modal notions – it merely means that relative tense is the best way to describe the fundamental notion expressed by the opposition *qatal/wayyiqtol* vs. *yiqtol/weqatal*. When attempting to determine the basic meaning of the verb forms and characterize them as aspectual, temporal, etc., the notion of "prominence" must be borne in mind. Much (probably most) recent scholarship is well aware of this and rather than categorically stating that Hebrew is "aspectual," scholars prefer to describe the language as "aspect-prominent" (or "tense-prominent," etc.). Bhat (1999, 91) argues that "languages generally do not give equal prominence to all these three categories [tense, aspect, mood]. Instead, they select one of them as the basic category and express distinctions connected with it in great detail; they represent the other two categories in lesser detail and further, they use peripheral systems like the use of auxiliaries, or other indirect means, for representing these latter categories."³² In Hebrew, the various categories may be marked by the lexical meaning of roots, the different *binyanim*, adverbial phrases, etc. The question in the present context is which categories are marked grammatically in the verb forms. In 3.5.1–2, I will argue that the aspect-prominent approach (that the main difference between the non-volitive finite forms is primarily aspectual) and the mood-prominent approach (that the difference primarily pertains to modality) are less adequate than a tense-prominent approach based on relative tense when analyzing the basic opposition in (this part of) the HVS.

³² Bhat (1999, 92) notes that the typological distinction is an idealised one, "Natural languages do not fall into sharply differentiated language types. There are different degrees of prominence that these categories receive in different languages; further, in the case of some languages, two or more of these categories may receive equal prominence, and hence we would not be able to select the most prominent category in them."

3.5.1 The aspect-prominent approach

As noted in 1.2.3, terminology plays a role when choosing between a relative temporal and an aspectual interpretation of the HVS. Both categories have to do with time and what some scholars call relative tense others may refer to as aspect. However, the fairly uncontroversial basic definition (tense = *location* of a situation relative to some point; aspect = *internal structure* of a situation) is a good starting point. It should be possible to decide whether the difference between *yiqtol/weqatal* and *qatal/wayyiqtol* typically pertains to the former or the latter way of looking at the event marked by the verb. In many instances, the most straightforward reading points in the direction of relative temporal location without any discernible focus on the internal structure of the situation. This is evident in the numerous cases of *yiqtol* (or *weqatal*) that simply mark future situations that must be interpreted as single, punctual events, rather than specifically imperfective meaning. Cook's aspect-prominent analysis will be treated in detail below, as a prime example of the aspectual approach. The flaws in Cook's general methodology (linguistic typology) were discussed in 2.2. As it turns out, the specific arguments presented by Cook do not add much in the way of persuasiveness if one rejects the central typological argument. He summarizes the arguments in favour of aspect-prominence in five points:

1) Such a system is "eminently probable" from the point of view of typological studies (Cook 2012, 200). As stated in 2.2, this is no argument.

2) "[T]he 'basic-ness' of aspectual oppositions versus tensed oppositions" and the "integration of TAM morphology with the discontinuous-root morphology of the Semitic (and BH) verb in contrast to the periphrastic means of denoting tense in some Semitic languages [...] make it much more plausible that the *qatal:yiqtol* opposition is one of viewpoint aspect and not tense or mood" (ib., 201). This is simply a variant of the first argument, i.e. no argument.

3) "[T]he pattern of interaction of *qatal* versus *wayyiqtol* with stative roots is mutually confirming of the dynamic-stative analysis of the *a-i/u* theme-vowel distinction as well as a perfective analysis of *qatal* and past tense analysis of *wayyiqtol*" (ib., 201). According to Cook, the interaction between stative verbs and *qatal* shows that *qatal* marks perfective aspect. However, as will be illustrated in 3.6.1, the arguments for separating *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* and ascribing different inherent semantics to each form are not persuasive. Further, stative verbs in *qatal* do not always indicate present stative meaning (cf. Cook's numbers [2012, 199]: 46% past reference, 22% in direct speech). Present stative *qatals* are interpretable in the framework of a theory of relative tense, which recognizes the nominal origin of the form (cf. 3.3). Further,

stative meaning ("I am old"; "he is heavy") is not perfective. A suitable aspectual label would be imperfective. Hence, this argument does not support the perfective vs. imperfective interpretation of *qatal* vs. *yiqtol*. The same problem arises with the present perfect use of *qatal* (which, in my analysis, is not fundamentally different from the stative present use). It seems preferable not to follow those scholars who see the perfect as a third aspect next to perfective and imperfective. If we were to assign an aspectual label to present perfect verbs, it would have to be imperfective, since these verbs refer to the state resulting from a past event. In Hebrew this leads to the paradox that *qatal* – the supposedly perfective verb form – is imperfective as well, since it often functions as a present perfect.³³ The way to solve this paradox is to recognize that aspect is not an inherent part of the meaning of the verb forms and that the primary function of *qatal* (and *wayyiqtol*) is the marking of relative tense, viz. anteriority (cf. Gzella 2004, 95).

4) "[D]espite the intermingling of meanings between past tense and perfective aspect, the predominate past temporal reference for *qatal* can be accounted for within an aspectual analysis in light of Smith's analysis of 'default temporal interpretation' of aspectual forms" (Cook 2012, 201). This is not an argument, but a defence against an objection to the aspectual approach. The point is correct – there is a connection between perfectivity and past tense interpretation, yet this does not prove the aspect-prominent character of the HVS.³⁴

5) "[T]he viewpoint-aspect analysis of the *qatal:yiqtol* opposition is consonant with the diachronic data and contributes to a coherent and typologically feasible TAM system for BH" (ib., 201). This is a reiteration of the first and basic typological argument (which does not prove anything), only with more emphasis on the diachronic development. According to Cook, "by the end of the Tannaitic period, the conjugation [*qatal*] becomes restricted to past temporal reference, even with stative roots. Even more importantly, the patterning of *qatal* with stative predicates in BH and RH strongly disposes one to identify the TAM of *qatal* as perfective aspect in BH and past tense in RH" (ib., 204). He reiterates the claim that "we can identify *qatal* in post-BH (i.e., the Mishnah and beyond) as a simple past verb" (ib., 208), although

³³ Cook (2012, 207) recognizes that *qatal* often has present perfect meaning. He explains "the perfect as a meaning that persists from the earlier stage when it was its [= *qatal*'s] primary meaning." This hardly eliminates the problem for the perfective interpretation of *qatal*. Cf. Bergström 2014, 60.

³⁴ Binnick's statement (1991, 437) against the aspect theory that it "falsely predicts that, out of context, the verb forms should have no tense value" is not conclusive.

he notes one example of present perfect *qatal* in RH (ib., 208, n. 47). However, such cases in RH are not isolated oddities (see 4.4). The verb forms in RH indicate relative tense in a manner broadly similar to BH. The question of stative verbs has nothing to do with the characterization of the verb forms as aspectual or temporal but indicates that the nominal relics of the ancestor form of *qatal* gradually receded. In fact, in contrast to Cook's view, I will argue that RH is *more* aspect-prominent than BH (see 3.8.1 and 4.4).³⁵

In the course of his analysis of *qatal* and *yiqtol*, Cook provides further arguments. He states that the wide range of temporal meanings generally attributed to *qatal* "forms the strongest objection to a past tense analysis of *qatal*" (ib., 202). Specifically he notes that "[e]vidence to distinguish *qatal* as a perfective aspect gram instead of simple past is amply supplied by its appearance in present and future temporal spheres, as illustrated by the performative and future perfect examples" (ib., 207). This is a good point against an *absolute* tense interpretation of the HVS but, as illustrated above, this objection does not rule out an approach based on *relative* tense (which is clearly capable of explaining such usage).

Similarly, Cook's claim that the lack of tense shifting aligns the HVS with aspect rather than tense (ib., 200) does not seem to recognize the distinction between systems of absolute and relative tense (on tense shifting, see 1.2.3).³⁶

In the performative *qatal* Cook finds "an additional typological argument" – "in languages where tense is grammaticalized, a present tense form is used (e.g., English), but in languages where aspect is grammaticalized, perfective aspect grams are used, as in BH" (ib., 208). This is not a decisive argument. Tense-prominent languages do not always use simple present tense (cf. Bergström 2014, 84) and aspect-prominent languages do not necessarily use the perfective (Greek uses imperfective present tense; Russian likewise, though perfective present [which normally has future reference] may be used, see Gattnar, Heininger, and Hörnig 2016). As argued in 3.3.3, the anterior meaning of Hebrew *qatal* and the lack of a simple present tense in the language sufficiently explain the performative use of *qatal*.

Another typology-based argument used by Cook is the encoding of adjectival predicates, i.e. the use of "normal" adjectives ("nouny" encoding) vs.

³⁵ Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994, 93) state that they "know of no clear documented case of a perfective that has become a simple past." See Cook's reply to Robar on this point (Cook 2016, 415).

³⁶ Cook refers to Endo in support of his claim. However, Endo (1996, 301) clearly states that lack of tense shifting "does not support the view that the Hebrew conjugation expresses the aspect and that only the context signals the 'tense'."

stative verbs ("verby" encoding). Both strategies are used in BH, while RH prefers the former. According to Cook (2012, 230), aspect-prominent languages tend to use the verbal strategy, whereas tense-prominent languages tend to use a nominal strategy. He uses this to argue for a drift from more aspect-prominent BH to more tense-prominent RH. The claim is based on Stassen's "tensedness parameter" (Stassen 1997, 347–357). However, the use of this parameter is not as straightforward as Cook seems to assume. First, Stassen clearly states that aspect marking and the "verby/nouny split" are "largely independent" (ib., 349). There are "verby languages" with and without aspect-marking and "nouny languages" without aspect-marking. The only fairly clear tendency is that the combination of aspect-marking and nouny encoding is infrequent (ib., 349–350). Yet, Stassen notes that this combination does exist (e.g. Russian, Ancient Greek, Classical Arabic). Even a more cautious restatement of the tendency does not live up to his requirements for correlational parameters (ib., 350).³⁷ Stassen arrives at a final statement on the relationship between "tensedness" and "nouny/verby" encoding: "(a) If a language is TENSED, it will have NOUNY adjectives. If a language has NOUNY adjective, it will be tensed. (b) If a language is NON-TENSED, it will have VERBY adjectives. If a language has VERBY adjectives, it will be NON-TENSED" (ib., 357). However, his definition of "tensedness" (ib., 350–351; 356) excludes relative tense. According to Stassen, "a tensed language should have a verbal form which is employed exclusively to refer to past time" (ib., 355). This means that Hebrew clearly is "non-tensed" in all of its phases (including RH, see 4.4). Hence, in addition to its typology-based and therefore dubious character (in fact, Stassen finds several exceptions to his final formulation of the tendency; ib., 569–570), this correlation is unhelpful in relation to Hebrew since it only tells us that there are no absolute tense forms in the HVS – which was obvious all along.³⁸

Cook's treatment of *yiqtol* as an imperfective gram is problematic too. According to Cook (2012, 217–218), perfectives develop only in languages that already possess an imperfective gram. Hence, since *qatal* is perfective, the

³⁷ "(a) If a language has nouny adjectives, it will tend to lack aspect-marking on verbs. (b) If a language has aspect-marking on verbs, it will tend to have verby adjectives" (ib., 350).

³⁸ Stassen does note a drift from more aspect-prominent to more tense-prominent in the history of Semitic but since BH clearly has many "nouny" adjectives, his conclusion seems to be less than useful for Cook's purposes. In fact, Stassen states that compared to Akkadian, BH and Classical Arabic have proceeded further towards temporal orientation – "maybe even up to a point where a nonpast/past distinction is the more prominent parameter" (ib., 495). However, I argue that the HVS never became an absolute tense system (not even in ModH, contrary to Stassen, ib., 497 and 657, n. 8).

"imperfective identity of *yiqtol* follows almost inevitably." However, as argued above, Cook's case for perfective *qatal* is unconvincing. He further claims that modal and temporal theories cannot account for *yiqtol*'s "wide-ranging semantics," such as (1) past progressive, (2) past habitual/iterative, (3) present progressive, (4) present gnomic, (5) general future, (6) future past (= English Conditional), (7) deontic modality, (8) contingent modality, and (9) simple past (with certain adverbs) (ib., 218). *Yiqtol*s with past temporal reference are "inherently at odds with identifying the form as an opposite, tensed gram" (ib., 219). Again, this is a fine criticism of an absolute tense approach. With a relative tense approach, all the points can be subsumed under the label non-anteriority, except possibly for (9). If *yiqtol*s with טָרַם and יָאָרַם have "simple past" meaning, they must be relics of **yaqtul* (i.e. irrelevant when discussing the meaning of *yiqtol* < **yaqtulu*). Alternatively, they are in fact non-anteriors (see 5.1). Either way, point (9) in the list should be deleted. In fact, Cook (ib., 263) describes the meaning of *yiqtol* after טָרַם as "relative future in the past" – rather than imperfective. This is a good description from my point of view but quite strange in Cook's aspectual framework.

In other cases too, some of Cook's actual interaction with the texts points in a temporal direction. He admits that *yiqtol* has lost many of its "prototypical imperfective functions" to the PTC (ib., 233).³⁹ Similarly, Cook states, "*yiqtol* is preferred for future and subjunctive (irrealis) expressions, which tend toward perfective aspect" (ib., 267). Also, rather than using *qatal*'s alleged perfectivity in explaining its gnomic use, Cook uses the default past tense reference when reading his example (Prov 21:22) as a "past-time anecdotal proverb" (ib., 215.; cf. Cook 2005). This is clearly the right path (see 3.3.2). The admission that the default reading of verb forms is in general temporal rather than aspectual (Cook 2012, 268) ought to lead to a reconsideration of the aspectual interpretation of the HVS. In fact, apart from the dogmatic typology-based argument, Cook provides no real arguments for aspect-prominence.

That aspect is not the dominant category may be seen from the use of *yiqtol* in reference to single, punctual, instantaneous events in the future (e.g. Exod 9:5, וַיִּשְׂם יְהוָה מוֹעֵד לְאָמֹר מָחָר יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה בְּאֶרֶץ, Josh 3:7 (בְּאֶשֶׁר (הַיְיָ עִם־מֹשֶׁה אֲהִיָּה עִמָּךְ) provides another illustration of the fact that tense and not aspect is central. Both situations must be continuous, the only difference being that the first is past, the second future. Josh 11:6 (אֶת־סוּסֵיהֶם תַּעֲקֹר וְאֶת־)

³⁹ The lack of prototypical imperfectivity in *yiqtol* is Joosten's main argument in his criticism of the aspectual approach, e.g. Joosten 2002a, 53.

(מִרְכַּבְתֵּיהֶם תִּשְׂרֹף בְּאֵשׁ אֶת־סוּסֵיהֶם עֶקֶר וְאֶת־) is a command or prediction with two *yiqtol*s.⁴⁰ V. 9 describes the actual event with the same verbs in *qatal* (מִרְכַּבְתֵּיהֶם שָׂרַף בְּאֵשׁ יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הִצְלִנִי מִיַּד הָאֲרִי וּמִיַּד הַדָּב הוּא יִצְלִנִי (מִיַּד הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי הַזֶּה) is another example of the temporal rather than aspectual character of the basic opposition. The *qatal* (הִצְלִנִי) refers to the past, probably to several past incidents (unmarked iterative/habitual). The *yiqtol* (יִצְלִנִי), in contrast, clearly refers to a single, "perfective" event in the future.⁴¹

3.5.2 The modal approach

The modal approach has a certain appeal. In fact, it is necessary to acknowledge the close interrelation between different types of modality and temporal notions. While it was rather clear that aspect plays no role in Josh 11:6 in the preceding paragraph, it was more difficult to decide between tense and modality. However, there are reasons for not considering modality the defining parameter in the opposition *qatal/wayyiqtol* vs. *yiqtol/weqatal*. Hebrew has a separate modal subsystem of an explicitly volitive character (imperative, jussive, cohortative; see 3.7). This in itself is not an argument against the mood-prominent interpretation of the overall system but the frequent use of *yiqtol/weqatal* for marking simple future temporal location is problematic for the modal theory. Of course, if future tense (or even tense as such, cf. 1.2.1) is defined in modal terms, the latter point hardly constitutes an argument either. With such an approach, however, the question of the basic semantics of the HVS would be answered in advance since virtually all verbal systems would seem to be modal by definition. If it is argued that modality is a more basic category than tense (cf. Penner 2016, 28), this, too, would apply to most languages, including languages that would not normally be described as "modal." Though most scholars regard English, Danish, and similar languages as tense-prominent, there is a more basic distinction between modal and non-modal sentences. However, this is a distinction on another level and does not relate directly to the difference between, e.g., "does" and "did."⁴²

⁴⁰ The decision is difficult to make, especially when God is the speaker.

⁴¹ Cf. the translation into a language with universally recognized aspect-marking (Russian Synodal Version): "Господь, Который избавлял меня от льва и медведя, избавит меня и от руки этого Филистимлянина." The *qatal* is rendered as a past imperfective (избавлял), the *yiqtol* as a perfective present (избавит), which regularly has perfective future meaning (a periphrastic imperfective future is available).

⁴² According to Bhat (1999, 176), the decision to classify the future form in a given language as modal or temporal depends on the general characterization of the language as

3 The verbal system of CH

A prominent defender of the modal approach is Joosten, according to whom the main distinction in the system is between the indicative forms *wayyiqtol*, *qatal*, and the predicative PTC with realis meaning and the modal forms *yiqtol* and *weqatal* with irrealis meaning (in addition, the modal subsystem includes the volitive system of imperative, jussive, and cohortative; Joosten 2012a, 32–33). He convincingly argues that the PTC is the usual marker of the real present and past concomitant action rather than *yiqtol/weqatal*. This is indeed the case most of the time, though not always (see 3.8). However, his claim that the difference is best described by seeing irrealis modality as the basic meaning of *yiqtol* (and *weqatal*) is less convincing (ib., 60–61). The difference between *yiqtol* and the PTC can be explained by analyzing *yiqtol* as a general non-anterior and the PTC as an explicit marker of progressive/concomitant action, gradually relegating *yiqtol* to a predominantly posterior domain.⁴³

As Cook (2012, 219) has pointed out, the attempt to interpret *yiqtol/weqatal* as modal forms forces Joosten to "make the category 'modal' endlessly elastic, such as by the claim that 'there is something inherently modal about questions' (Joosten 2002a, 54). If *yiqtol* is a modal gram, the precise extent of modal should be more clearly delineated than he has hitherto done." Likewise, Bergström (2014, 50) correctly notes that if the modal approach is to be taken seriously we need to know what is meant by modality – "what *specific* modality lies behind all the various meanings of *yiqtol*-L [= ordinary, non-volitive *yiqtol*]" (cf. also ib., 112). There is some truth in Joosten's claim that questions are inherently modal (cf. Palmer 1986, 89) but this hardly means that any verb form occurring in a question should be analyzed as inherently modal. Indeed, as Joosten (2012a, 279) notes, "the predicative participle is just as idiomatic as YIQTOL in questions referring to the present."⁴⁴

mood- or tense-prominent. This is not very helpful in deciding the fundamental character of a verbal system. The circularity is evident.

⁴³ Note what appears to be a slip from the otherwise consistent mood-based interpretation of futurity, seemingly implying that simple futurity is not a modal nuance: "In these examples, YIQTOL may be taken to express simple futurity, or a modal nuance may be attributed to it (commitment, menace)" (Joosten 2012a, 96).

⁴⁴ Joosten (2012a, 279) seems to modify his earlier statements on the inherent modality of questions somewhat, "Although questions always have a modal tinge, there is no reason to think that YIQTOL presents the process as unreal in the examples enumerated above. Thus, the usage described in the present section does not entirely tally with the basic *irrealis* function of YIQTOL." He suggests that the use of *yiqtol* in questions might be "residual."

Another argument against the modal approach is the counterfactual use of *qatal/wayyiqtol*, a usage that seems to be accepted by practically all Hebrew grammarians.⁴⁵ This usage is often referred to as irrealis. It seems problematic that this notion should be expressed by the members of the realis group. In fact, the use of past tense forms to indicate different types of counterfactual modality is very widespread cross-linguistically and it seems clear that this simply makes no sense if the verb form used has realis as its inherent, invariable meaning. As Palmer (2001, 219) argues, "the modal function of past tense can occur only in languages that have a tense system that differentiates past from present or non-past [or similar relative tense forms, KS]. It does not occur in languages [...] that deal with time relations within the category of Realis/Irrealis mood." Note that the argument here is not typological but based on the lack of logic in analyzing a form as "real" when that form is in fact preferred for the expression of events as not real.

Deriving the simple future use of *yiqtol* and *weqatal* from a supposedly inherent modal meaning constitutes a fundamental problem for the modal approach. It hardly makes sense to posit one of the modal shades of meaning as the basic, invariable meaning of the forms and then claim that this meaning is cancelled in certain contexts without explaining which contexts and how. In contrast, the opposite derivation makes more sense, i.e. positing simple non-anteriority or posteriority as the invariable, inherent meaning and ascribing the various attested modal shades of meaning to the context. Similar modal interpretations of tense forms are observable in many languages. E.g., Danish present tense may mark necessity, ability, command etc., yet it makes no sense to ascribe such shades of meaning to the inherent meaning of the form. Hence, we ought to treat the modal shades of meaning associated with *yiqtol* and *weqatal* as contextually induced readings of basic non-anterior temporal reference.⁴⁶

3.6 The consecutive forms

In this section, I will argue that the inherent meaning is the same in *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* (anterior) and in *yiqtol* and *weqatal* (non-anterior). The observable differences in usage derive from the obligatory presence of the various shades of meaning associated with "and" in the *waw*-prefixed forms and the related differences of position in discourse. In a continuous flow of clauses

⁴⁵ E.g. Gen 26:10, referred to by Cook (2012, 202) who rightly notes the problems caused by this usage for the interpretation of *qatal* as realis.

⁴⁶ Modal notions may be indicated in various more explicit ways. In addition to the volitive modal forms, there are various particles, conjunctions, lexical words (like יכול), word order, etc., all of which seem to play a role in this connection.

introduced by "and," an author (or, presumably, a speaker) uses *wayyiqtol* or *weqatal*. If something interrupts the flow (or in clauses without "and"), *qatal* or *yiqtol* is used. Such interruption may be due to the introduction of a new subject with some kind of focus or contrastive emphasis, a focused object or adverbial phrase, or simply a wish for variation. A real "break" in the flow is not necessarily implied, nor does the use of *w+X+simple* form necessarily imply that the information is "off-line" or backgrounded. For a brief excursus on the question of word order and the HVS, see appendix 11.

Several points must be discussed.

The traditional designation "consecutive" is a misnomer. The *waw*-prefixed forms do not necessarily continue the meaning of a preceding verb, nor do they necessarily indicate sequentiality or temporal succession. Rather, the forms have inherent meaning, and this meaning is simply anteriority (*wayyiqtol*) or non-anteriority (*weqatal*), plus the meaning inherent in "and." To be sure, *weqatal* often follows a *yiqtol* (or a volitive form) but this is not a necessary condition. *Weqatal* may introduce a non-anterior segment even when the preceding verb is simple *qatal* (cf. Joosten 2012a, 293–294). In Lev 17:4 (דָּם שָׁפַךְ וְנִכְרַת הָאִישׁ הַהוּא) and Num 19:13 (אֶת-מִשְׁפַּח יְהוָה טָמֵא וְנִכְרְתָהּ) (הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהוּא), the texts shift from anterior *qatal* (explaining that a person who does certain things has thereby committed some specific sin) directly to non-anterior *weqatal*. Judg 13:3 (הֲגֵה-נָא אֶת-עֶקְרָהּ וְלֹא יִלְדֶּה וְהָרִית וְיִלְדֶּה בֶן) shifts from a stative *qatal* and a fientive *qatal* (past or present perfect reference) to a prediction about the future. See appendix 12 for further examples. Some cases occur after כִּי, other subordinate clauses, or direct speech, in which case the *weqatal* cannot be said to function on the level of the preceding verb (appendix 13). Yet, such cases remain relevant – through its inherent meaning, *weqatal* indicates the end of the subordinate passage and a return to the non-anterior line of thought.

Likewise, *wayyiqtol*s do not merely continue an ongoing past narrative. As often noted, several books begin with *wayyiqtol*: Lev, Num, Josh, Judg, 1 Sam, 2 Sam, 2 Kgs, Ezek, Jonah, Ruth, Esth, 2 Chr. In some cases, of course, the division into books is secondary and the narrative clearly continues from the preceding book. However, *wayyiqtol* may occur after various non-anterior forms or nominal clauses and yet indicates anterior temporal reference (cf. Joosten 2012a, 182; see appendix 14 for a few examples). Further, in numerous cases, *wayyiqtol* marks the return to past narrative after a passage of direct speech (e.g. 1 Sam 24:5, וַיִּקָּם).⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Robar argues that *wayyiqtol* is not a "preterite," i.e. never indicates a shift to past tense reference. E.g., to account for the *wayyiqtol* in 1 Kgs 3:17 (אָנִי וְהָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת יֹשְׁבֹת בְּבַיִת אֶחָד) (וְאֵלֶּךְ עִמָּה בְּבַיִת), she claims that the preceding PTC sets the stage in the past (2014, 84; cf.

Wayyiqtol and *weqatal* do not take over the meaning of a preceding verb. Rather, because of the meaning inherent in the *waw*-prefixed forms they are typically employed in continuation of other verb forms with the same meaning or a meaning that is logically congruent with that meaning. If *wayyiqtol*s tend to follow *qatals* and *weqatals* mostly follow *yiqtol*s, it is simply due to the textual logic whereby a writer will tend to keep the same time frame when he introduces a new verb with "and." However, this is not always the case.

The alleged inherent temporal succession or sequentiality of the *waw*-forms is problematic as well. Hataav (1997, 56–85) claims that *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* represent a distinct sequential "aspect" and that these forms only appear in sequence while the other verb forms are considered non-sequential. According to Hataav, sequential forms move reference time forward, marking their own reference time in which the situation is included; in contrast, a non-sequential form like *qatal* is "parasitic" on another reference time and does not move reference time forward (ib., 6). However, such a neat distinction does not catch the essence of the Hebrew system. In a sense, all the Hebrew verb forms are "parasitic." E.g., *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* indicate that the event or situation occurred before something else. Context decides whether we interpret this as before S or R.

To be sure, most *waw*-prefixed forms clearly occur in sequential contexts, yet sequentiality cannot be inherent in the forms as such since there are numerous counterexamples. Further, simple forms occur in sequential contexts. In fact, as Hataav notes (ib., 83), the use of an explicit adverb indicating sequentiality (ואז, "and then") excludes the use of the allegedly sequential forms and demands a "non-sequential" *qatal* or *yiqtol* (e.g. Exod 5:1 or Lev 14:19).⁴⁸

The mandatory occurrence of "and" in *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* in combination with the inherent anterior or non-anterior meaning naturally means that the combined meaning is often close to "and then" but this is not always the case (already pointed out by Qimḥi, see 1.1.4). Often *wayyiqtol* does not

2013, 30). Yet, nothing suggests that the women do not live together anymore. Further, even if the past reading of the PTC were correct, we would only infer this from the following *wayyiqtol*. In this case (and the other cases in Robar's argument), the *wayyiqtol* clearly provides the context with anterior meaning.

⁴⁸ Note Goldfajn's unfortunate use (1998, 119) of the term "posteriority" for the meaning of *wayyiqtol* (two past situations follow each other on the time line). This term should be reserved for the use of non-anteriors expressing future (in the past). A similar confusing term is Joosten's "contemporaneous" for the meaning of *wayyiqtol* (2012a, 25). His point is that E coincides with R (both being before S). This is often true, but the term is liable to cause confusion with the notion of real contemporaneousness, expressed by the PTC (ib., 230).

mark a new subsequent event but elaborates on a preceding event (e.g. 1 Kgs 15:26, *וַיִּלֶךְ בְּדָרֶךְ אֲבִיו*, following *וַיַּעַשׂ הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה*). The "and" may function on another level and simply indicate that something else *also* happened (or will happen, in *weqatal*) or the *waw*-form and the preceding verb may indicate a single event, e.g. "answer" and "say" (Gen 18:27 or Deut 26:5) or "eat" and "drink" (1 Kgs 19:6; cf. Joosten 2012a, 167ff. and 290ff.).⁴⁹ Similarly, the ubiquitous use of *wayyiqtol* after introductory *וַיְהִי* does not indicate temporal succession.⁵⁰ In addition, *wayyiqtol* may mark past perfect – or rather, in some cases, this is the most appropriate translation into languages that have a past perfect form – a usage which is clearly not sequential. However, the interpretation of most such cases is contested (e.g. Neh 2:9, *וַיִּשְׁלַח*, or Isa 39:1, *וַיִּשְׁמַע*; for further discussion, see 3.6.1).

When discussing the *waw*-forms, it is necessary to note that simple coordination is more frequent in Hebrew (and several other Semitic languages) than it is in English and many other languages. Hence, from the translational viewpoint, a *waw* is often "superfluous." As is well known, the apodosis of a conditional sentence is typically introduced by *waw*, which can often lead to ambiguities when translating. Since the second or subsequent parts of a protasis may be marked by *waws* just like the apodosis, it can be difficult to decide where the apodosis begins (most of the time, of course, the content makes it obvious). The reason for the use of *waw* in apodoses might be the possible original non-subordinate character of the clause introduced by the conditional conjunction (which might have an etymological connection with *הָהָה*). In any case, even though the "and" must be left out in a translation, this should not influence the analysis of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* as consisting of "and" plus anteriority and non-anteriority, respectively. Likewise, a *waw*-prefixed form is occasionally used after an initial adverbial expression not introduced by *וַיְהִי* (or *הָהָה*), e.g. Gen 22:4 with *wayyiqtol* or Exod 16:6–7 with *weqatals* (for further examples, see Joosten 2012a, 43, n. 3). If judged from the point of view of an English translation, such cases would seem to imply that *wayyiqtol*s and *weqatal*s should be analyzed as units and not as

⁴⁹ On the meaning/meanings of *waw*, see Steiner 2000. The important point is that *waw* is merely a connector. Supposedly adversative cases, the apparent meaning "and then," etc. are the products of interpretation of the context and the need to render this into another language with different usage. Cf. Cook 2012, 314.

⁵⁰ Cf. Joosten 2012a, 165 and 167. According to some scholars, *וַיְהִי* and *וַהֲהָה* are not regular verbs, but rather discourse markers serving a macro-syntactic function (for an overview, see van der Merwe 1999). While the use of *וַיְהִי* (and *וַהֲהָה*) is highly characteristic of CH and often difficult or stylistically problematic to render in other languages, I see no reason to treat the forms differently from other *wayyiqtol*s/*weqatal*s in terms of semantic content. They mark the same combination of "and" and anteriority/non-anteriority.

"and" plus a verb form. However, this would be misleading. Gen 40:9 (אֶף־אֲנִי בְחִלּוּמֵי וְהִנֵּה שְׁלֵשָׁה סְלִי חָרִי עַל־רֵאשֵׁי) and 40:16 (בְּחִלּוּמֵי וְהִנֵּה־גִּבּוֹן לְפָנָי) show similar cases with a preposed adverbial element and a seemingly superfluous *waw* on the following clause. In these cases, however, the following clauses are nominal. Similarly, in 2 Chr 10:5 (עוֹד שְׁלֵשֶׁת יָמִים וְשׁוּבוּ אֵלָי) a preposed adverbial element is followed by *w*+imperative. Such instances underline the fact that the occurrences in Gen 22:4 and other places are not directly relevant for the analysis of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*. Rather, the preposed adverbials should be seen as short, separate nominal clauses (and some might possibly be due to textual error/omission).⁵¹ In translation, the *waw* part of verb forms (as well as in other places) often needs to be disregarded or rendered as a subordinate or adversative conjunction or similarly rephrased. Yet, we cannot set up rules for this. Instead, we should acknowledge that Hebrew usage prefers coordinate constructions and does not regard extensive use of "and" as bad style; in fact, this is the preferred option in many cases (though *waw*-less alternatives also occur, seemingly becoming more normal in the course of time). Thus, while essentially true, Blau's description (2010, 190) of the use of *waw*-prefixed forms seems to be too simplistic, "the forms with 'conversive' *waw* are used in a syntactic environment in which it is possible to apply connective *waw*. Otherwise, the simple forms occur." We should add that "a syntactic environment in which it is possible to apply connective *waw*" is a very broad category in Hebrew.

The claim that *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* on the one hand and *yiqtol* and *weqatal* on the other share the same inherent meaning of anteriority and non-anteriority, respectively, seems to lend support to the other frequent term used for the *waw*-prefixed forms, viz. "conversive." Indeed, from a synchronic point of view, simple *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* have opposite meanings, i.e. meanings belonging to opposite sides of the basic opposition in the non-volitive finite verbal system. The same applies to *qatal* and *weqatal*. As argued in 3.3, there are no convincing cases of simple *qatal* with actual non-anterior meaning. *Qatal* indicates anteriority, while *weqatal* indicates non-anteriority. Similarly, except for possible relics of **yaqtul*, the meaning of simple (non-volitive) *yiqtol* can be subsumed under the heading of non-anteriority, while *wayyiqtol* indicates anteriority. From a diachronic point of view, and when

⁵¹ Joosten (2012a, 43, n. 3) refers to Gen 22:4 etc. as *casus pendens* (cf. Gross 1987b, 50). However, since there is nothing in the following clause that refers back to the preposed element, this seems to be an unfortunate designation (if by *pendens* we are to understand what is usually understood by that term). Note that Joosten (2012a, 292) refers to instances such as Exod 16:6 as "extraposition (left dislocation)" rather than *casus pendens*. In some cases, the preposed element clearly *is* a *casus pendens*, e.g. in Judg 1:12 (אֲשֶׁר־יָבִיחַ אֶת־קַרְיַת־סֹפֵר וּלְכַדָּה וְנָתַתִּי לּוֹ אֶת־עֶכְסָה) where לוֹ refers back to the relative clause.

the details of the formal side of the verbs are taken into consideration, of course, the "conversion" that is synchronically observable between simple *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* is not a good description of the process that actually took place. Since *wayyiqtol* and simple *yiqtol* derive from two different verb forms, historically speaking, no "conversion" has taken place. As will be argued in 5.3.1, the perceived "conversive" character of the relationship between *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* must have been an integral part of the development of the form *weqatal*, which is indeed an analogically based "conversion" of what used to be a single verb form.

The view that *wayyiqtol* has the same meaning as *qatal* (plus the meaning inherent in "and") and that *weqatal* has the same meaning as *yiqtol* (plus "and") is far from universal. E.g., Joosten agrees more or less with the latter claim (*yiqtol* and *weqatal* have the same meaning) but he rejects this view when it comes to *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* (Joosten 2012a, 263–264).⁵² Cook (2012, 256–265) rejects both claims, arguing that *wayyiqtol* is a past tense as opposed to perfective *qatal*, while *weqatal* is in essence an "ordinary" *qatal* (with perfective meaning) in contrast to imperfective *yiqtol*. The special meaning of *weqatal* is claimed to be irrealis and to be derived from the initial position of the verb (ib., 203, 210, 249, 254–256, et passim).⁵³ This theory is clearly untenable. First, the alleged aspectual difference between *yiqtol* and *weqatal* cannot be convincingly demonstrated in the material. Cook (ib., 255) argues that in a past habitual context, "the perfective aspect of *qatal* is maintained throughout its uses, for both realis and irrealis mood expressions." His example is Gen 29:2–3 and he claims that the *weqatals* indicate procedural habitual expressions, while the *yiqtol* in v. 2 expresses the "habituality of the larger situation of watering the flocks" (ib., 255). Nothing supports this position. In fact, the description of "the larger situation" ought to be perfective, providing an overview of the event as a whole. Second, the claim that initial *qatal* is irrealis is disproved by numerous instances of simple anterior initial *qatal* (see appendix 11). Indeed, the general behavior of

⁵² Joosten (2012a, 262) notes a few possible "residual functions" that might set *yiqtol* apart from *weqatal* to a limited extent, viz. the use as a real present in questions and concomitant processes in the past. However, in a question such as *מִה־תִּבְרַק־שׁ*, *weqatal* is excluded. Hence, there is no real difference between the forms here (ib., 263). As will be argued in 6.2.1, some *weqatals* seem to indicate concomitance in the past. In fact, probably more often than *yiqtol* does.

⁵³ Bergström (2014, 119–122), from a different angle, shares the view that *qatal* and *weqatal* (*weqatalti* and *weqatalti*) do not belong to different categories. Note his comment in [], "Go to Pharaoh and [given that you do] you say ['you have said'] to him" (ib., 122). Recognizing that *weqatal* (= *weqatalti*) simply marks non-anteriority just like *yiqtol* frees us from the awkward "you have said."

the forms makes it abundantly clear that *yiqtol* and *weqatal* occur in syntactically conditioned interchange and that the same is true for *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*. In the case of Gen 29, the decisive factor is the presence of כִּי and a prepositional phrase in front of the *yiqtol*.

Lev 4:19–20 illustrates several points:

וְאֵת כָּל־חֲלָבוֹ יָרִים מִמֶּנּוּ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַהּ וְעָשָׂה לֶפָר כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לֶפָר הַחֲטָאת כִּן יַעֲשֶׂה־לּוֹ
וְכִפֹּר עֲלֵהֶם הַכֹּהֵן וְנִסְלַח לָהֶם

The directions are expressed with non-anterior verb forms, *yiqtol*s and *weqatal*s, and there is no obvious semantic difference between the forms, except for the fact that "and" is connected to the *weqatal*s. It seems far-fetched to claim a different inherent semantics for עָשָׂה and יַעֲשֶׂה. In contrast, the difference between עָשָׂה and יַעֲשֶׂה is clear – the former refers to something that he has done, while the latter refers to something that he will or must do. Hence, *qatal* and *weqatal* belong to separate semantic categories, a fact that is readily discernible in numerous places (e.g., Zech 10:8, וְרָבוּ כְמוֹ רָבוּ; 14:5, וְנִסְתָּם כַּאֲשֶׁר נִסְתָּם). In contrast, *weqatal* and *yiqtol* go together as syntactically conditioned expressions of the same category. The fact that *yiqtol* is regularly used in passages otherwise dominated by *weqatal*s whenever a negation is needed merely underlines this analysis.⁵⁴

3.6.1 Do *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* have the same meaning?

Many scholars ascribe different meanings to *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*, typically arguing that *wayyiqtol* is a real past tense, while *qatal* is not (being either aspectually perfective or resultative, or indicating anteriority).⁵⁵ To be sure, when translating into, e.g., English, the simple past is the obvious choice for *wayyiqtol* in the vast majority of cases, while *qatal* needs to be rendered with a larger variety of forms and constructions (simple past, present perfect, past

⁵⁴ Some languages use special forms in negation but it hardly makes sense to claim that the inherent temporal, aspectual, or modal meaning changes when a verb is negated. Arabic *lam yaqtul* is the regular negation of *qatala* but apart from *lam yaqtul* being negative, the meaning ascribed to the two forms is identical. Finnish negation involves using a different form from the one used in the corresponding positive clause; however, this does not change the temporal or aspectual meaning.

⁵⁵ Some scholars claim that Hebrew has only one real tense form, viz. *wayyiqtol* (Cook 2012, 256; Joosten 2012a, 25). It is difficult to accept that *wayyiqtol* can be marked for +TENSE (while all other forms are –TENSE), as Joosten suggests, without specifying which tense is meant. Clearly, *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* have separate origins and at one point their semantics may have differed. However, the system of interchange in the Hebrew that we have access to does not allow us to posit separate semantics for the forms.

3 The verbal system of CH

perfect, present tense with stative verbs, etc.). However, as argued above, the HVS simply does not distinguish these meanings. We must find the relevant interpretation of the general category of anteriority from the context when we translate into a language with more categories available. The distribution of uses between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* does not reflect a different inherent semantics for each form but rather has to do with the difference in position and the presence of mandatory "and" in *wayyiqtol* (on the general question, see Gross 1976).

First, however, note that most uses of *qatal* that are not simple past do in fact occur with *wayyiqtol* as well. Stative *wayyiqtol*s are attested sporadically but the identification of cases is difficult because stative and fientive are not two completely separate categories (see 3.3). In most cases, a fientive reading with a simple past or present perfect translation works just as well as the proposed past or present stative meaning. This is the important point – these are not separate notions in Hebrew but rather contextually derived interpretations of the inherent anteriority of the verb form. Further, since *wayyiqtol*s (with mandatory "and" and occupying front position in a clause) are mainly used in the flow of narrative, where states are rare, the relative scarcity of stative *wayyiqtol*s is unsurprising.⁵⁶ Joosten (2012a, 85) mentions several occurrences of *wayyiqtol* indicating a state in the past (e.g. 1 Kgs 7:14, וַיִּמְלֹךְ; 8:8, וַיִּצְרֹכּוּ). Present statives occur as well but, as noted, most are interpretable as fientives indicating simple past or present perfect (see appendix 15). Clear cases of present perfect *wayyiqtol* are difficult to find too. Cook (2012, 264, n. 100) notes that proposed cases such as Gen 19:19, 31:9, 32:5, Isa 49:7, Jer 8:6, and Prov 7:15 "are more accurately rendered as simple past" (in contrast, see Bergström 2014, 127–128, with n. 325). Yet, this is not necessarily a question of accuracy. In English, we have to choose between simple past and present perfect (some varieties of English preferring the former and other varieties the latter in certain contexts). In Hebrew, to reiterate the basic point, the form merely indicates anteriority. Appendix 16 lists some cases in which context makes the present relevance of *wayyiqtol* stand out.

The past perfect use of *wayyiqtol* is ambiguous as well. In most cases, a past perfect *wayyiqtol* follows a past perfect *qatal* and often a simple past rendering makes sense instead. However, there are some examples of *wayyiqtol*s that seem to require a past perfect interpretation on their own (appendix 17). However, it is possible to interpret most of these and similar cases as simple past, depending on the target language and the way one perceives the narrative flow of the overall passage.

⁵⁶ Correctly pointed out by Joosten (2012a, 84), though he still insists that *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* do not belong to the same category.

There are other cases of *wayyiqtol* not expressing simple past tense. Gen 31:27 (וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת-רָחֵל וְאֶת-לֵוָי בְּעֵינֵי אֱלֹהִים) seems to be irrealis, though Joosten (2012a, 191) prefers to read the form in connection with the negation of the preceding verb. In that case, the irrealis reading is unnecessary. However, this approach is not quite convincing. In any case, the irrealis use of an anterior form is not unexpected, cf. Isa 48:18–19 (וַיִּהְיֶה x2) with a preceding irrealis *qatal*. Similarly, *wayyiqtol* occurs after *qatal* in conditional clauses, e.g. Num 5:27 or 35:16 (cf. Joosten 2012a, 189, for further examples).

On the surface, the rather meagre collection of *wayyiqtol*s alleged to indicate something other than simple past tense would seem to support the view expressed by Cook and other scholars who see a fundamental difference between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*. Cook (2012, 264) states, "it is not evident that these meanings [present perfect/past perfect] are basic to *wayyiqtol* or even semantic rather than contextual." Similarly, "any apparent past-perfect sense is a pragmatic implicature and not semantic" (ib., 294). Joosten (2012a, 185) states that *wayyiqtol* locates a situation in the past, "In direct discourse, however, the context often lends WAYYIQTOL the meaning of a 'present perfect'." However, the central point is that this is also the case with *qatal*. *Qatal* can indicate simple past tense just like *wayyiqtol* (as is evident from the ubiquitous shift between the two forms when negation or a fronted element prevents the use of *wayyiqtol*). Other interpretations of *qatal* (present perfect, past perfect etc.) are not automatic. In contrast to Zevit (1998) and his one-sided focus on what he calls the anterior construction as a clear expression of past perfect meaning (i.e. *w*+subject+*qatal* following another verb with past reference), there are numerous cases where this reading makes no sense (cf. Driver 1874, 92, n. 1).⁵⁷ The various types of anterior meaning that we need to choose from when translating must always be determined from the context. Joosten (2012a, 49) states that the simple past meaning often expressed by *qatal* is "not intrinsic to *qatal*, but forced upon it by the context."⁵⁸ This is clearly correct – but the same should be said about *wayyiqtol*. The

⁵⁷ In many cases, the construction does indicate past perfect. Yet, we should state this differently. The construction itself merely indicates a disruption of the flow of narration and a fronting of the subject for focus. In some cases, the logic of the narrative forces us to choose a past perfect translation when translating into a language that uses such a verb form.

⁵⁸ Joosten (2012a, 137) paraphrases 1 Sam 9:11 (וַיִּהְיֶה עֲלֵיהֶם בְּמַעְלָה הָעִיר וְהֵמָּה מְצָאוּ) as "they were still going up when they had already found," in order to uphold the semantic distinction between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*. If we accept that *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* have the same inherent anterior meaning – in this case interpretable as simple past tense – a less forced reading is possible.

verb form itself merely indicates anteriority, and this applies to *qatal* as well as *wayyiqtol*.

Joosten (ib., 47–48) attempts to illustrate the difference between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* by contrasting narrative and report. 2 Sam 12:26 (וַיִּלְחֶם יוֹאָב בְּרַבֹּת בְּנֵי עֲמוֹן וַיִּלְכֹּד אֶת־עִיר הַמְּלוּכָה וַלְחָמָתִי בְרַבָּה) uses *wayyiqtol*s, while v. 27 (גַּם־לְכַדְתִּי אֶת־עִיר הַמַּיִם) uses *qatals* (cf. 1 Kgs 16:9–10 vs. 16:16). According to Joosten, *wayyiqtol* "projects the event into the past," while *qatal* "connects the events to the time of speaking, presenting them retrospectively" (ib., 48).⁵⁹ Yet, he admits that the use of ׀ plus *qatal* in 2 Sam 12:27 and 1 Kgs 16:16 is not usual and that the normal way to continue a report is by using *wayyiqtol* (ib., 50). Rather than claiming that *wayyiqtol* and *qatal* have different inherent meanings, we must seek an explanation for the observable difference in usage elsewhere. Due to the mandatory "and" and the fronted position of the verb in all cases of *wayyiqtol*, the form primarily occurs in the continuous flow of narrative. Hence, as was the case with present statives, the relatively infrequent attestation of present perfects and past perfects should not surprise us. Since the HVS has no specific past perfect verb form, this notion is typically indicated by a disruption of the regular flow of narration, i.e. by fronting the subject or another element (or rather, the need to translate a Hebrew verb as such typically arises in such contexts). Under these circumstances, *wayyiqtol* clearly cannot occur as the first verb in a past perfect sequence. Other cases of past perfect interpretation typically occur in subordinate clauses (with ׀ or in relative clauses). Again, this excludes *wayyiqtol*, except in continuation of the initial *qatal* in such a sequence.⁶⁰

3.7 The volitive system

As noted above, the finite verb forms of CH belong to two subsystems. The first subsystem consists of the forms described in the preceding sections, while the second subsystem is the volitive or directive-volitive system (Joosten 2012a, 17–18, 313ff.; similar ideas were presented by, e.g., Jouön

⁵⁹ Note Joosten's "rough" description (2012a, 71) of *qatal* ~ "he has killed" vs. *wayyiqtol* ~ "he killed." This distinction is not part of the HVS.

⁶⁰ Cf. Andrason 2016, 84. After arguing that there is a semantic difference between the forms and giving very precise figures for the frequencies of usage (cf. 2.3), in the final part of the article, he suddenly (and quite correctly) stresses the need to take into consideration the interchange between the forms and the difference in possible occurrence of the forms in subordinate clauses etc.

1923, 307, §114; Bergsträsser 1929, 45, §10; Revell 1989). The volitive subsystem is a suppletive paradigm of forms: the cohortative, imperative, and jussive, used for first, second, and third person, respectively.⁶¹

Volition is a type of deontic modality (1.2.1), expressing the will of the speaker. Several shades of meaning are possible in this domain and Joosten (2012a, 121; cf. 319–340) argues that expressions of will are highly sensitive to pragmatic factors such as the status and power of the speaker and the addressee.⁶²

Synchronically, the cohortative is a lengthened version of 1s/p *yiqtol*, with the ending *-ā* (אָ).⁶³ The jussive, in contrast, is a shortened form of *yiqtol*, attested in roots of particular types. At an earlier stage of the language (which can be reconstructed on the basis of evidence from other Semitic languages as well as from Hebrew itself), the ancestor form of "ordinary," non-jussive *yiqtol* must have been **yaqtulu*, pl. **yaqtulūna*, while the jussive (and the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol*) can be traced to reconstructed **yaqtul*, pl. **yaqtulū*.⁶⁴ At some point, Hebrew lost final short vowels (and the *n*-endings

⁶¹ The jussive occurs in the second person, albeit mostly negated (as the negative counterpart of the imperative). Non-negated second person jussives as well as second person *weyiqtol*s are very rare in classical usage. Cf. the non-use of the precative (= jussive) in the second person (and generally in the first person, too) in Akkadian (von Soden 1969, 105, §81c). In Ugaritic and Arabic, too, the use of second person jussive is somewhat restricted, while the corresponding form in Classical Ethiopic is used in all persons. Notarius (2013, 293) suggests that the "archaic" verbal system may have had a full jussive paradigm (but see appendix 9 on "archaic" poems).

⁶² Bergström (2014, 156) uses the term "reduced appeal function" for the jussive and cohortative. Rather than denoting an outright command, "[e]ven when the speaker has authority over the listener, the jussive gives the impression that the listener has the option to grant the wish by his own free will." However, this description seems to owe a lot to the fact that the rendering of Hebrew jussives in English (and other Germanic languages) typically includes a construction with the verb "let." It is doubtful whether permission is relevant.

⁶³ As a rule, III-*h*' roots do not have distinct cohortative forms. The *-ā*-ending (which may also occur on 2sm imperatives) has been compared to different forms in cognate languages. There seems to be a complicated historical relationship between the Hebrew cohortative (and the similar form in Ugaritic), the Arabic subjunctive (*yaqtula*), the Akkadian ventive (*-am*), the "energetic" *n*-forms attested in various languages, and the "emphatic" particle אָזְּ in Hebrew (for a recent overview, see Cook 2012, 238ff.). Note that the Arabic subjunctive and energetic forms are conjugated in all grammatical persons. The same applies to the Akkadian ventive. In Hebrew, the use of *-ā* on *yiqtol* is restricted to the first person (except for two cases in Isa 5:19 and a few other potential cases; Joosten 2012a, 143, n. 55).

⁶⁴ This is more or less uncontroversial (cf. the "hegemonic status" of this view in Hebrew studies, Cook 2012, 257). On the disputed question of a possible distinction between two kinds of **yaqtul*, see 5.2.1.

that were part of some of the forms). Yet, in certain root types in some grammatical persons, the difference between original open and closed syllables (**yaqtulu* vs. **yaqtul*) led to different evolutions of the final vowel in the root (in II-*w/y* and *hif.*), or, in the case of III-*h*, to complete loss of the final syllable (plus subsequent segolisation) in original **yaqtul* vs. preservation of the syllable in original **yaqtulu*. In most roots, however, jussive and simple *yiqtol* have the same form. Still, CH seems to uphold a distinction between jussive and simple *yiqtol*, even in cases where no formal contrast is possible (cf. Joosten 2012a, 314–319). Other traits are characteristic of verbs with volitive meaning: the negation לֹא (rather than לֹא־), the particle אַךְ, the lack of paragogic *nun* (i.e. relics of the ending *-na* in **yaqtulu*, **yaqtulūna*), the non-use of the "energetic" object suffixes, and a tendency for clause-initial position (while ordinary *yiqtol* is mostly non-initial).⁶⁵ Initial position is not the cause of the volitive meaning (cf. Joosten 2012a, 353). Indeed, the reverse seems to be the case. Hebrew uses fronting (initial position) to focus the fronted element (see appendix 11). In clauses with volitive verbs, focus would tend to be on the verb itself in order to highlight the volitive force inherent in the verb, hence the widespread use of initial position (cf. Revell 1989, 21).⁶⁶

There are exceptions to practically all the defining marks of volitive verbs. Marked volitive forms occasionally occur in contexts that seem to be non-volitive, and forms specifically marked as non-volitive occur in contexts that seem to demand a volitive interpretation. Sometimes, initial *yiqtol* lacks volitive meaning and clearly volitive forms may occupy non-initial position (e.g., if another element needs to be focused, the initial position of the volitive verb can be overruled). A Hebrew clause may include only a verb. In such cases, a single *yiqtol* (which must of necessity be initial) is not necessarily volitive (e.g. 1 Sam 23:12, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יִסְגְּרוּ, vs. 2 Sam 2:14, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יִקְרָא).⁶⁷

Special note should be taken of *weyiqtol*, i.e. "unconverted" *w+yiqtol* as opposed to "converted" *wayyiqtol*. In CH in general, *weyiqtol* belongs to the volitive subsystem, indicating a specifically jussive or cohortative meaning (on exceptions and potential chronological implications, see 6.2.3). This is clear from the general functioning of the verbal system. As described above, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* share the same non-anterior semantics, the choice between the forms depending on the occurrence or non-occurrence of focused

⁶⁵ Cf., e.g., Kummerow 2008. The connection between volitives and initial position was noted by Rosén 1969; Niccacci 1987; Revell 1989. Cf. also Orlinsky 1942, 274.

⁶⁶ Other languages show a tendency for placing volitives (especially imperatives) in initial position (English, Danish, etc.; in Danish, non-initial imperatives sound very odd).

elements before the verb. The interchange between the forms is readily observable in innumerable places. In this system, there is no place for *weyiqtol* (as argued by Joosten 2012a, 425). *Weyiqtol* requires some other explanation and indeed, most occurrences are in clearly volitive contexts with other volitive forms in the vicinity. Further, when a formal distinction is possible, most *weyiqtols* are marked as volitives, though many exceptions exist (*weyiqtols* marked as non-volitives, yet seemingly with volitive meaning; likewise, some *wayyiqtols* have unexpected non-shortened form). This blurring of the formal distinction even in roots where it could have been upheld is no doubt a product of the fact that the distinction was lost in most root types.⁶⁷

Often (including in cases where no formal marks can be seen and no other volitive forms occur), a clear distinction between *weyiqtol* and *weqatal* seems to be perceivable. However, since modern readers and scholars are in no position to judge such fine shades of meaning with native speaker intuition, there is a considerable degree of uncertainty in some cases (cf. Holmstedt 2006, 9, n. 26: even the "most gifted philologist" can never be a "suitable stand-in for a true native speaker"). Johnson attempts to establish the difference in meaning between *weqatal* and *weyiqtol*, relying only on some kind of undefined intuition (Johnson 1979, 94). He notes that the stress in *weqatalítí* vs. *weqatálti* and the distinction between *w*+ordinary *yiqtol* and *w*+jussive or cohortative are important issues, yet he does not treat these questions in his study. This omission clearly renders the investigation less than satisfactory. Though he succeeds in establishing a basic difference between *weqatal* and *weyiqtol*, his failure to use the diachronic and comparative evidence means that the conclusion relies on nothing but his own trans-

⁶⁷ Baden (2008) argues for a distinction between *weyiqtol* consisting of *w*+volitive form (formally marked as such) and *weyiqtol* consisting of *w*+simple *yiqtol* not marked as volitive. According to Baden, there are only 11 of the latter type in the corpus Gen–2 Kgs (ib., 151), and he argues for a consistent significance of such forms, viz. the expression of purpose or result (ib., 155). He translates the 11 cases with subordinate clauses such as "so that the dry land may appear" (Gen 1:9), "that she might suckle" (Exod 2:7), etc. However, Joosten (2009, 496) notes that the count of 11 forms is faulty, since first person *weyiqtols* without cohortative ending should be added, which brings the number up to 21. According to Joosten, some of these forms are problematic for Baden's interpretation, in addition to two of Baden's original examples, which also "proved to be somewhat resistant to Baden's thesis (Judg 19:11; 2 Kgs 4:10)." Joosten argues that the formally non-volitive *weyiqtols* noted by Baden should "be regarded as instances of *wə*+volitive, in spite of the unexpected morphology" (ib., 498). Joosten is surely right in pointing out that a considerable amount of levelling of the original distinction has occurred, even in roots where the distinction could be upheld, due to the loss of the formal distinction in the majority of root types.

lations. Since we lack native speaker intuition, we need to use all the evidence available if we seek to answer the question that Johnson asks. Still, his conclusion that *weqatal* marks something that merely follows from the preceding action, while *weyiqtol* marks a new initiative, often implying a wish or expressing a modal sense (ib., 57 and 65), seems to be close to the conclusion that can be reached if the comparative evidence is integrated in the analysis. However, Johnson fails to take account of the important notion of markedness. It may be the case that *weyiqtol* explicitly marks a new initiative, while *weqatal* does not – however, neither does *weqatal* explicitly mark the absence of such initiative, as Johnson seems to think (ib., 57). Clearly, in many cases, *weqatal* logically implies the active initiative of the subject (e.g. וַיִּפְקֹדְתִּי, said by God).

Since the non-anterior meaning of ordinary (non-volitive) *yiqtol* and *weqatal* often has various modal connotations, a certain overlap is to be expected between these forms and the volitives. In fact, the wider context of a non-anterior verb form may lead to a volitive interpretation of the passage as a whole, though this is not explicitly expressed in the verb itself – i.e., the volitive forms are explicitly marked for the expression of speaker's will, while simple *yiqtol* and *weqatal* are unmarked (cf. Cook 2012, 247; Joosten 2012a, 66–67).

Many scholars believe that volitives with prefixed *waw* may have a subordinate function, expressing the purpose or consequence of a preceding verb (e.g. Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 352ff.; cf. Joosten 2012a, 140ff.).⁶⁸ However, such "indirect volitives" need not be interpreted in this way. The subordination is merely a product of translation into languages that do not share the characteristic Hebrew preference for coordinated clauses. There are other explicit ways of expressing purpose (infinitive, לְמַעַן, etc.). While the rendering of a *weyiqtol* clause with a subordinate clause of purpose or consequence might be defensible if the intention is to produce a readable translation, this kind of translational interference should never be allowed to determine the analysis of the HVS.⁶⁹ In the Hebrew system, *weyiqtol* is not subordinate.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ In contrast to most other scholars, Baden (2008) ascribes the alleged final meaning specifically to the non-volitive *weyiqtol* forms (cf. previous n.).

⁶⁹ On the role of translation in the analysis of *weyiqtol*, see Muraoka 2002. For contrast, cf. Kelly's treatment of *weyiqtol* (1920).

⁷⁰ The Arabic subjunctive (*yaqtula*), which seems to share a common origin with the Hebrew cohortative, is indeed a subordinate form (as the name implies), at least most of the time. The form does occur after the coordinating conjunction *wa-*, as in Hebrew, but cannot be used in simple main clauses without *wa-*. The use of the form is required after

Like the volitive forms without *waw*, *weyiqtol* simply expresses volition, i.e. the will of the speaker, in simple coordination with a preceding clause. Various other interpretations are derived from this inherent meaning and the context.

To illustrate the use of *weyiqtol* as a marked volitive, appendix 18 provides an overview of the occurrences in Genesis and Exodus. In the overwhelming majority of cases, *weyiqtol* seems to be volitive and follow the tendencies noted above. This is the case generally in CH, although we have to acknowledge a substantial number of exceptions (with seemingly non-volitive *weyiqtol*s) in all kinds of texts. Unless we want to assume that the volitive character of *weyiqtol* was never more than a tendency, it might be helpful to posit, on the one hand, a classical system (the way the verbs behave in the majority of cases in the texts), and, on the other hand, interference in the texts from an unclassical system (cf. 6.2).

3.8 The PTC

When one compares Hebrew with several other Semitic languages (Akkadian, Ugaritic, Classical Ethiopic), or the Hebrew of the late documentary texts with the ancient epigraphic corpus, it seems clear that the PTC achieved an increasing prominence in the verbal system in the course of time, taking over the expression of ongoing action from the finite non-anterior verb forms (*iparras* in Akkadian; *yəqattəl* in Ethiopic; *yiqtol* and its equivalents [*< *yaqtulu*] in other languages).⁷¹ Hence, Joosten (2012a, 229) refers to the PTC as a "newcomer to the verbal paradigm" (cf. Smith 1999). Steiner (1995) argues that the reason for the rise of the PTC in Hebrew was the loss of final vowels, which led to the eventual total collapse of the modal system in RH. Since it

certain conjunctions, which clearly mark the clause as subordinate, contrary to the situation in Hebrew. On the secondary nature of the subordinate use in Arabic, see Testen 1994. Cf. also the Ethiopic jussive.

⁷¹ On the PTC in Akkadian, see von Soden 1969, 111, §85d ("fast immer nominal"), 201, §148. On Ugaritic, Tropper 2012, 718, §76.61: "gewöhnlich nicht wie eine (imperfektive) 'Tempusform', etwa als Ersatz für die PK^L [= **yaqtulu*], gebraucht." On Classical Ethiopic, Tropper 2002, 98, §44.351: "Das Äth. besitzt kein Partizip Präsens (aktiv) des Typs **qātil* wie andere semit. Sprachen" (the same form, however, appears in the function of ordinal number). The nomen agentis (*qatāli*) is a kind of active PTC but it mostly indicates occupations, e.g. "a writer" (ib., 209, §55.31). In Classical Arabic, on the other hand, "verbal" use of the PTC is more widespread (cf. Fischer 1972, 99–100, §202–203), which is also the case to an even higher degree in Aramaic, as is well known. In Phoenician, too, PTCs may have "verbal" function, see Friedrich and Röllig (Guzzo; Mayer) 1999, 195–196, §270–271. In the restricted corpus of Moabite, the only potential predicative "verbal" PTC (l. 28 on the Mesha-stele, כִּי כָל דִּיבֶן מִשְׁמַעַת) has been interpreted as a noun (Gibson 1971, 82); the simple *yiqtol* in l. 5 (יִאֲנֶה) seems to indicate concomitant action in the past.

3 The verbal system of CH

was no longer possible to distinguish between indicative and volitive future, the use of the PTC became one of several ways of marking the former category. He only mentions the use of the PTC in RH and does not treat the use of the predicative PTC in earlier forms of Hebrew. In CH, many verbs preserve the distinction between original **yaqtulu* and the jussive and the distinct categories were generally kept apart. Hence, the origins of the predicative use of the PTC can hardly be explained as the result of the collapse of these distinctions but Steiner's proposal may still be used as part of the explanation of the later increasingly dominant position of the PTC.⁷²

In the Hebrew inscriptions, the PTC in predicative, verbal use is not widely attested, but at least it seems clear that it was possible to use the form to indicate the real present at this stage.⁷³ Most PTCs in the inscriptions, however, are passive (from the roots ברך and ארר). Only two active, predicative PTCs are clearly attested: Lach 4:8 and 4:11 (the former seems to have context-induced future reference). MHsh 1:3 may contain a case of היה+PTC indicating ongoing action in the past ("your servant was harvesting") but other interpretations of the passage are possible.⁷⁴ This single (uncertain) instance hardly supports Schniedewind's inclusion (2013, 125) of the periphrastic participial construction in his list of "commonly proposed features of epigraphic Hebrew"! When discussing the use of the PTC, however, it must be noted that neither is there any clear case of *yiqtol* indicating ongoing (or habitual/iterative) action in the past (but see 4.1 below on KAjr 20:2). A few *yiqtol*s may refer to the actual present, Lach 6:9 and 6:11 being the most likely, yet not completely certain, cases (and 6:9 is interrogative). In contrast

⁷² Smith (1999, 330–331) discusses Steiner's theory. He notes that Aramaic lost final vowels as well and experienced a similar increase in the use of the PTC (n. 159, with reference to Huehnergard). As is the case with CH, the distinction between jussive and indicative *yiqtol* continued to exist in restricted form in Aramaic after the predicative use of the PTC developed (see Muraoka 2011, 101, §24k, on QA).

⁷³ For the inscriptions, see, e.g., Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005.

⁷⁴ Lines 2–4 (עבדך קצר היה עבדך בחצר אסם) may be read: a) "your servant (was/is) a reaper, your servant was/is in אסם חצר"; b) "your servant (was/is) harvesting, your servant was/is in אסם חצר"; c) "your servant was/is a reaper, your servant (was/is) in אסם חצר"; d) "your servant was/is harvesting, your servant (was/is) in אסם חצר"; e) "(as for) your servant, your servant was/is a reaper in אסם חצר"; f) "(as for) your servant, your servant was/is harvesting in אסם חצר." If קצר is a PTC in a periphrastic construction with היה, Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 360) note that the relative order of the finite verb and the PTC would be "nonnormative." However, this order is found in the OT, cf. Deut 9:7, 22, 24; 31:27; Ps 122:2. 1 Sam 17:34 poses the same problem as the inscription – is it periphrastic ("was keeping sheep"/"used to keep sheep") or nominal ("was/is a shepherd"). Cf. also 1 Kgs 5:15, where אֶהָב might be considered verbal or nominal.

to this corpus of texts, the active PTC is widely used in the documentary texts from later periods (approx. 20 in predicative, verbal usage).⁷⁵

While the use of the PTC in RH is readily observable, the more restricted, yet far from insignificant, role of the PTC in the verbal system of earlier phases of the language has previously been somewhat neglected. However, several scholars have highlighted the importance of this form. E.g., Muraoka (1999, 191) argues that the PTC should be considered "an integral part" of the HVS, despite its "distinct morphology and some aspects of its syntax, which set the participle apart from the imperfect and the perfect." Joosten, especially, has championed an approach that integrates the PTC in the description of the verbal system (e.g. Joosten 1989, 128; 2002b, 59). He observes that the use of the PTC is required for the expression of certain meanings, viz. the real present and past concomitance/attendant circumstances (Joosten 2012a, 20). At the same time, he underlines the difference between the PTC and the finite forms, stressing the fact that, morphologically, the PTC is an adjective, which functions as a verb only in combination with an explicit subject (ib., 229, with n. 1 concerning the few exceptions). Contrary to Cook's claim (2012, 224) that Joosten (1989) understands the PTC "as a finite verb form," Joosten (ib., 128, with n. 4) clearly states that it is not "a conjugated verbal form" (by which he must mean a finite verb form conjugated for person; the PTC is, of course, conjugated for number and gender). Later he explicitly says that the PTC is not a finite verb form (ib., 156, n. 104).

However, Cook (2012, 228) is surely correct when he highlights the continued "intermediate" status of the PTC – it never "stops being adjectival at any time in the history of Hebrew." The PTC's gradual encroachment on domains of meaning previously expressed by the finite non-anterior forms (*yiqtol* and *weqatal*) is referred to by Cook as "a 'nominal takeover' of event predicates," because the PTC remains a nominal form (ib., 228). When deciding how to categorize a specific PTC, several factors need to be taken into account. Muraoka (1999, 189–190) distinguishes three main uses of the PTC – predicative, attributive, and nominal – but Holst (2008, 42) correctly points out that these categories are not mutually exclusive, since "predicative" and "attributive" are syntactical categories, while "nominal" has to do with the semantics. A predicative PTC is not necessarily "verbal" (Holst's example is Gen 14:18, וְהוּא כֹהֵן לְאֵל עֶלְיוֹן) and neither is an attributive PTC (Gen 48:16, וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹנָתָן בֶּן־שָׁאוּל אֶל־הַנְּעִר נִשָּׂא כָלִיו, vs. 1 Sam 14:1, הַמִּלְאָךְ הַגָּאֵל אֶתִּי מִפְּלִדְרַע).

⁷⁵ For the texts, see Yadin et al. 2002, Yardeni 2000 and DJD 2, 27, and 38 (Milik 1961; Cotton and Yardeni 1997; Charlesworth et al. 2000). For further remarks on the verbal system in the inscriptions and the late documentary texts, see 4.1 and 6.1.

3 The verbal system of CH

PTC can have nominal or verbal rection (being in a construct relationship with its object or taking a "real" object) and it might be substantivized or not. See, e.g., Gen 2:11 (הָיָה הַסֶּבֶב אֶת כָּל-אֶרֶץ הַחַוִּילָה) with a substantivized PTC with article and verbal rection, functioning as predicate of a clause.⁷⁶ The cases of interest in the present context are the ones where the PTC is predicative, has verbal rection, and does not have the definite article or other traits characteristic of a nominal function. In many cases, however, it is difficult to decide how to categorize a given PTC. Is Gen 4:17 (וַיְהִי בִנְיָ עִיר) "he was building a city" or "he was/became a citybuilder"? Ps 146:6–9 shows the ambiguity in categorizing PTCs as nominal or verbal. Some of the PTCs might function as appositions to יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ in v. 5, others might be independent predicates in verbal or nominal function. The usage of the language into which the Hebrew text is translated is liable to play a role in the characterization of the PTC, which might lead to distinctions that are not necessarily there in the Hebrew texts.⁷⁷ However, rather than investigating the status of the PTC further, the main point of interest for the present study is the meaning of the predicative (active) PTC and its interaction with the non-anterior finite forms.

The meaning of a PTC in nominal function may simply indicate the agent of an action (e.g. Exod 21:12, מִכָּה אִישׁ אֵישׁ נָמַת מוֹת יוּמַת).⁷⁸ However, in its predicative, "verbal" function, the PTC generally refers to action that is ongoing at R. Less often the PTC is used with a form of הִיָּה in order to situate the ongoing event more directly in the relative past or future, or, rarely, in order to combine ongoingness with an imperative or jussive (cf., e.g., Joosten 2012a,

⁷⁶ Such cases are sometimes referred to as participial relative clauses (cf. Holmstedt and Screnock 2016, 87–89 and 94). If so, we would have to ascribe a verbal function to the PTC in Gen 2:11. However, the rendering of the phrase as a relative clause (with a finite verb) is clearly just a result of translational expediency. On this question, cf. Geiger 2012, 323.

⁷⁷ The fact that clauses with PTCs are often rendered in English or other languages with finite verb forms does not detract from the basic nominal character of the form. Other non-verbal elements in nominal clauses also typically require the insertion of a finite verb in translation.

⁷⁸ Cf. Geiger 2012, 3, with n. 8: "Ein Partizip bezeichnet den Ausführenden (bei passiven Verben den Erleidenden) der Handlung des Verbs, mit dem es verbunden ist, bei Zustandsverben den im Zustand Befindlichen"; "Dauer" is not an inherent trait. Thus, מִכָּה in the example seems to indicate single, non-durative action. Cf. also 2 Kgs 14:5–6 (הַמְצִיִּים). In some roots the PTC may indicate duration, not of the fientive process, but of the resultant state, e.g. נָפַל and מוֹת. This is not always the case, however, cf. 2 Kgs 19:35 (מֵתִים, "dead") vs. 20:1 (בִּי מָת אֶתָּה וְלֹא תִחְיֶה), "dying"). This phenomenon seems to be related to the question of the double potential of stative verbs (3.3) and/or to the basic nominal character of the PTC. Cf. Joosten 2012a, 90.

257–260; Muraoka 1999). This usage becomes much more common in RH (see 3.8.1 on the implications of this development for the characterization of the HVS). The notion of ongoingness can be described in different ways, but some variant of this view seems to be the standard explanation (Cook 2012, 230: "progressive"; "in the midst of an activity" at R; Joosten 2012a, 90: "contemporaneous" with R; *ib.*, 239: "ongoing" at R; Geiger 2012, 27 and 483: "Gleichzeitigkeit").⁷⁹

In contrast to the statement above referring to R, Joosten earlier (1989, 129) claimed that the predicative PTC does not express duration in any time frame, but rather "represents an action as contemporary with the moment of speaking." He noted that the prevailing views "probably result from not distinguishing between main clauses and circumstantial clauses" (*ib.*, 129, n. 6). Referring to Gen 19:1 (וַיְבֹאוּ שְׁנֵי הַמַּלְאָכִים קֹדְמָה בְּעָרֵב וְלוֹט יֹשֵׁב בְּשַׁעַר-קְדָם), he stated that the past reference of PTCs in such clauses is "due to this specific type of subordinate clause (the circumstantial clause), not to the participle" (*ib.*, 129). However, such clauses are not subordinate in Hebrew (regardless of Joosten's translation, "while Lot was sitting"). The fact that the present tense is regularly expressed by the PTC does not mean that the PTC is in essence a present tense form – it clearly occurs in all time frames and a designation of its meaning in relative terms is clearly preferable. In spite of Joosten having seemingly abandoned his earlier analysis of the PTC as a present tense in favor of an analysis of the form as a marker of relative concomitance, he still refers to certain usages of the form as "historic present" (2012a, 243–245).⁸⁰ Yet, he renders the examples in the past tense (e.g. 2 Kgs 11:14; *ib.*, 244) in contrast to the present tense translation of the passages in his earlier work (1989, 143). Since the HVS does not express absolute tense, the term "historic present" has no place in the analysis. The PTC in such cases expresses concomitance in relation to the past context.

The description of the predicative PTC as a marker of progressive, concomitant action also accounts for other uses where the marked progressive meaning seems to have faded somewhat. Thus, futurate (Gen 17:19, שָׂרָה עַל-פְּנֵי אֲנִי זָכָה), general/habitual present meaning (Exod 13:15, אֲשַׁתְּךָ יִלְדֶת לְךָ בֵּן (לִיהוּה)), and habitual action in the past (1 Kgs 10:24, וְכָל-הַיָּמִים מִבְּקָשִׁים אֶת-פָּנָי, שָׁלְמָה; cf. v. 25) can be derived from the basic meaning (cf. English "I am

⁷⁹ Hatav (1997, 89ff.) and Cohen (2013, 127) use the term "inclusion" (i.e. inclusion of R in the event referred to by the verb; but see also Cohen 2013, 140: some PTCs mark "simultaneity which does not entail inclusion").

⁸⁰ Note what seems to be a slip from the general point of view in the book to his earlier position (Joosten 2012a, 60): "The participle is an expression of contemporaneousness with the moment of speaking." Earlier in the book, he expresses the more correct view that the moment of speaking is merely the *default* point of reference (*ib.*, 29; cf. *ib.*, 56).

3 The verbal system of CH

leaving tomorrow").⁸¹ In past contexts, some scholars claim that the progressive or concomitant meaning is absent in some cases, e.g. Joüon (1923, 340–341, §121g), "[d]ans la langue postérieure on trouve la forme périphrastique לְהֵיבָרָה קָטָל au sens d'un pur parfait *il tua* (sans nuance durative ou fréquentative)," referring to Neh 2:13, 15 and 2 Chr 24:12, etc. (cf. Eskhult 2000, 89; Van Peursen 1997, 159). This usage is ascribed to influence from Aramaic (cf. Rosenthal 1974, 55, who notes the "free use of the participle as a narrative tense" in BA). However, as noted in later editions of Joüon's grammar (Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 382, §121g), the basic progressive meaning may still be applicable.⁸² A partial bleaching of the marked meaning of the form can occur without forcing us to state that the form has lost its ordinary meaning and acquired an explicitly non-progressive meaning in certain cases. If a new progressive form develops in the language, however, such bleaching might lead to an eventual reinterpretation and loss of the original meaning of the earlier progressive form.⁸³

The relationship between the PTC and *yiqtol/weqatal* is of particular interest. According to Joosten (2012a, 59–65), the latter forms do not regularly express concomitance (real present or past concomitance). As noted above, the PTC seems to have replaced the finite non-anterior forms in many functions. In general, Joosten's examples are quite convincing. Often the distinction between a future *yiqtol* and an ongoing present seems to be quite evident, though sometimes conflated in translations. E.g., Ezek 3:7 (וְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יִשְׁמָעוּ אֵלַי) is rendered with two identical verbal constructions in KJV ("will not hearken"x2) and NIV ("are not willing to listen"x2). However, a distinction between יִשְׁמָעוּ with future reference and יִשְׁמָעוּ with actual present reference makes sense (cf. ESV: "will not be willing"; "are not willing").⁸⁴

⁸¹ Further examples: Joosten 2012a, 241–242 and 246, n. 60; cf. Muraoka 1999, 192.

⁸² The terms "inchoative imperfect" and "graphic historic present" are used. However, it seems better to simply state that the basic progressive meaning is still essentially there.

⁸³ Koller (2012, 272) states that in "the Hebrew of the Mishnah, unmarked participles were *usually* punctual, not durative." However, his example from m. Naz. 6:4 is not very persuasive, and the case from b. Soṭah 40b commenting on m. Soṭah 7:8 seems to have more to do with the change of meaning of the root עָמַד than with the inherent meaning of the PTC (ib., 286).

⁸⁴ Joosten (2012a, 382 and 394) states that the PTC in 2 Chr 18:7 (אֵינְנוּ מְתַנְבְּא) "replaces" the *yiqtol* in 1 Kgs 22:8 (לֹא־יִתְנַבֵּא) for the expression of habitual present tense. Both clauses are translated as "for he never prophesies anything favorable about me." Yet, how do we know that the *yiqtol* in 1 Kgs does not have a future/modal shade of meaning? As will be illustrated in 6.2.3 (on the use of *weyiqtol*), Joosten's attempt to distinguish sharply

Some cases are problematic (and Joosten mentions some of them). E.g., Gen 37:7 (וְהָיָה תְּסַבֵּינָה אֶלְמַחֲתֵיכֶם) or 1 Sam 1:10 and 13 (וּבְכֹחַ תְּבַכֶּה and וְקוֹלָהּ לֹא יִשְׁמָע) indicate ongoing action in the past. 1 Sam 1:15 (הֲיָנָה תִּרְאוּ אִישׁ מִשְׁתַּגֵּעַ) seems to indicate ongoing present tense.⁸⁵ According to Joosten, such cases might be interpreted modally or, alternatively, as traces of an earlier usage. Since "modality" is such a broad and vague category, it is virtually always possible to find a way to read a given form as modal. However, often such attempts appear far-fetched (e.g. 1 Sam 13:17–18, יִפְּנֶה x3; 2 Sam 15:37, וְהַבֵּית יִמְלֵא עֶשֶׂן, Isa 6:4, יְבֹא יְרוּשָׁלַם). In all three cases, Joosten (2012a, 133–134) suggests a prospective reading. However, only in the second case does this appear possible (yet hardly convincing). In Isa 6, at least, the meaning is clearly one of ongoing action in the past, and this seems to be the most obvious reading of the other cases as well (in fact, Joosten's translation of Isa 6 is not prospective). The *yiqtol*s and *wegatals* in Isa 6:2–3 are possibly ongoing as well, rather than iterative or habitual. At least, it illustrates the fact that a clear distinction is difficult to make.

1 Kgs 21:6 (כִּי־אָדַבֵּר אֶל־נְבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאֵלִי) seems to be another case of ongoing action in the past ("when I was speaking"), though Joosten (2012a, 287) suggests that this and other occurrences (2 Kgs 8:29/9:15; Gen 37:7 [also referred to as present tense, cf. above]; Deut 2:12; Judg 2:1; 1 Kgs 7:8; 20:33) may be "preterite," i.e. relics of archaic **yaqtul*.⁸⁶ This approach is problematic. In fact, all the forms may be past progressives or, in some cases, attributable to scribal mistakes (cf. appendix 10).

In Jer 36:18 (מִפְּיִי יִקְרָא אֵלַי אֶת כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וְאֲנִי כֹתֵב עַל־הַסֵּפֶר בְּדִיּוֹ), we find a *yiqtol* and a PTC side by side. Joosten (2012a, 118 and 281) interprets the former in a habitual sense and the latter as a progressive ("He used to dictate"; "while I wrote"). It might be claimed that the *yiqtol* marks the iterative reading of single words, while the PTC marks the writing as continuous. In

between CBH and so-called LBH leads him to treat the forms according to different criteria in the two corpora of texts. In fact, it seems possible to uphold Joosten's general view of the distinction between *yiqtol* and the PTC in this particular case.

⁸⁵ See Joosten 2012a, 279–280. He further mentions 2 Kgs 6:19; 9:20; Job 2:10. Joosten ascribes real present meaning to all of these, including Gen 37:7 because "dream reports have a tendency to use the present-tense" (ib., 279, n. 51). However, since *yiqtol* is not an absolute tense form, such terminology is not appropriate. He mentions other cases of *yiqtol* that are difficult for his approach (ib., 62–63, n. 50): Exod 19:19; 1 Sam 1:10; 13:17–18; 2 Sam 15:37; 23:10; with negated *yiqtol*: Gen 2:25 and 2 Sam 2:28.

⁸⁶ Bergström (2014, 110, n. 294) sees the cases mentioned in the preceding paragraph – 1 Sam 13:17–18; 2 Sam 15:37; Isa 6:4 – as "aoristic" (at least 1 Sam and Isa). A durative, ongoing reading seems more probable. In Aramaic, Joosten seems to follow the same line of thought, preferring to interpret past *yiqtol* as "preterite" rather than durative/progressive, cf. Joosten 2010b, 80 (on *yiqtol*s in Daniel and the Genesis Apocryphon).

view of 36:4, however, it seems unlikely that this was a habitually repeated event, as suggested by Joosten's translation.

Other scholars have noted further cases of *yiqtol* for ongoing events in the past (e.g. Gen 2:6, 25; 48:10; Exod 8:20).⁸⁷

In his analysis of the verbs in poetry, Niccacci often uses past durative/progressive readings to account for the use of *yiqtol* (e.g. Niccacci 2006, 256ff.). Indeed, following the approach to the verbs in poetry outlined above (3.4), it seems necessary to accept a large number of *yiqtols* indicating concomitant action. Otherwise, in many cases, they would have to be interpreted as relics of archaic **yaqtul*. The use of *yiqtol* in a past context after the particle וְ is also problematic. If, as seems to be the case, the *yiqtol* form in this construction is not $\langle *yaqtul \rangle$ but $\langle *yaqtulu \rangle$, the most likely explanation for the use of a non-anterior form is that it marks ongoingness (cf. 5.1). Of course, in defence of the overall validity of the distinction between *yiqtol* and the PTC, we may note that past $\text{וְ} + \text{yiqtol}$ is a fixed construction in which an older usage of the verb form remains. Outside of past contexts, Joosten (2012a, 280) notes that *yiqtol* in poetry often expresses the real present, which might be attributable to archaizing. The archaizing approach, of course, might also be used for *yiqtols* in past context in poetry, but this approach is hardly applicable to another problematic set of cases, mainly attested in prose – as will be discussed in 6.2.1, many *weqatals* are interpretable as indicating non-anteriority of the progressive, durative, concomitant type. Alternatively, such occurrences need to be interpreted as examples of unclassical anterior *weqatal*. If they are in fact non-anterior, they pose a challenge for Joosten's distinction between the PTC and the finite forms.

Note also a certain blurring of the distinction in the other direction when the PTC expands its area of usage into the domain of *yiqtol* even further. Joosten (2012a, 243) notes that the PTC sometimes indicates general present or iterative or habitual action. In 1 Kgs 17:6 ($\text{וְהָעֲרָבִים מְבִיאִים לוֹ לֶחֶם וּבָשָׂר בְּבִקְרָר}$) both PTC and *yiqtol* seem to indicate habitual events. In a similar past habitual/iterative sense, *yiqtol* is used in 1 Sam 18:5 ($\text{בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחֵנּוּ שָׂאִיל יִשְׁכִּיל}$) while the same root with (seemingly) the same

⁸⁷ See GKC, 314, §107b. Some of the additional examples in the same paragraph, however, seem to be habitual/iterative (e.g. Exod 1:12). Joosten (2012a, 285) explains Gen 2:6 as iterative/repeated, 2:25 as "possibly" implying the volition of the subject (ib., 284), while 48:10 and other cases with יָכַל are ascribed to the particular semantics of the verb, which is modal in itself (ib., 62 and 93). In Exod 8:20 he suggests reading a *wayyiqtol* (ib., 62, n. 50) or possibly understanding it as a prospective (ib., 282). None of these suggestions seems very convincing (e.g. on יָכַל – why double modal marking?).

meaning occurs as a PTC with היה in 18:14 (וַיְהִי דָוִד לְכָל־דְּרָכָו מִשְׁפִּיל).⁸⁸ Cf. Exod 13:21 (הַלֵּךְ) and v. 22 (יָמִישׁ). Similarly, as noted above, there seems to be an overlap in the use of the forms in questions relating to the present (while the PTC is used in the answer to such questions), cf., e.g., Jer 1:11, 13; 24:3; Ezek 12:9; Amos 7:8; 8:2; Zech 4:2; 5:2.

To sum up, in the majority of cases, Joosten's main point is valid. *Yiqtol* and *weqatal* do not regularly indicate concomitance. In most cases, this domain has been taken over by the PTC. However, a certain blurring of the distinction is attested and the distinction between different functions is not always easy to make.⁸⁹ Because of this (and especially because of the likely durative, concomitant use of *weqatal*), it seems unnecessary to use a more specific term for *yiqtol/weqatal* (such as "prospective" or "posterior"). The general terms "non-anterior" and "non-anteriority" remain the most fitting designations to cover all the meanings of the forms as long as we add that, typically, this non-anteriority does not include the expression of ongoing action, which is, in general, the domain of the active, predicative PTC.

3.8.1 The PTC and aspect

According to Joosten (1989; 2012a, 29–31, 56–59, and 230–257), word order in participial clauses has aspectual implications. He suggests that the most widespread order of elements, viz. subject before the PTC ("Su-Ptcp"), indicates an event in actual progress (imperfective aspect) while the opposite order ("Ptcp-Su") presents the situation as a complete whole (perfective aspect). Other scholars have been reluctant to accept this proposal (but see Warren 1998). Buth (1999, 81 and 90–94) rejects the thesis and argues that Su-Ptcp is the basic order and that the fronting of the PTC in Ptcp-Su is pragmatic rather than semantic. It marks focus or a "contextualizing constituent" (orienting the clause to the larger context). Cook, too, finds Joosten's approach unconvincing (2014, 385–386). Appendix 19 discusses the evidence in some detail. Only in very few cases is the alleged distinction (relatively) clear. It seems wiser to follow Buth and others who argue for a pragmatic, focus-based explanation of the order of elements rather than an inherent semantic distinction. In fact, it seems that the vast majority of cases of Ptcp-Su

⁸⁸ The same root (in *qal*) is found in 18:30 in *qatal* in a passage clearly marked as iterative with the expression "every time" (וַיְהִי מִדֵּי צִאתְכֶם שְׂכַל דָּוִד מִכָּל עֲבָדֵי שְׂאוּל). In similar cases, iterative/habitual *yiqtol* or *weqatal* is typically used (e.g., 1 Sam 1:7 or 7:16). However, as noted before, the explicit expression of this shade of meaning is never mandatory.

⁸⁹ Cf. Fokkelman 1991, 49: "no watertight partition between the durative and the iterative"; "repetition and duration easily coalesce, every now and then." According to Joosten (2012a, 286), *yiqtol* marks durative meaning, not iterative, with stative verbs. The problem is, of course, that the category of stative verbs is not clearly demarcated.

on Joosten's list (1989, 158) are interpretable as marked for some kind of focus on the preposed PTC. Hence, the argument that the two sequences mark aspect is unconvincing – even with Joosten's admission (2012a, 30) that the alleged distinction "is not central to the system as a whole."

There is, however, a more promising approach to the connection between the PTC and aspect. Joosten (*ib.*, 30–31) refers to another and much more persuasive argument for the aspectual role of the PTC, viz. the use of the PTC in a past (narrative) context. He claims that the PTC represents a type of imperfective aspect in opposition to *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*, which – in their relationship to the PTC – might be called perfective. He refers to 1 Sam 7:10 (וַיְהִי שְׂמוּאֵל מֵעֵלָה הָעוֹלָה וּפְלִשְׁתִּים נִגְשׂוּ לְמִלְחָמָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל) and 2 Sam 18:24 (יָוֵשֶׁב בֵּין-שְׁנֵי הַשָּׁעָרִים וַיִּלְדֹּ הַצֶּפֶה אֶל-גִּג הַשַּׁעַר אֶל-הַחֹמָה), which both exhibit a difference between PTC and *qatal* or *wayyiqtol* that seems to mark the same type of meaning that is marked by imperfective and perfective verb forms in other languages.⁹⁰ Joosten only mentions simple PTCs in his argument and not the use of היה+PTC and he does not really follow up on this line of thought.

To me, however, the conclusion appears inescapable. In clear contrast to the widespread view that Hebrew developed from an aspect-prominent system to a tense-prominent system, the opposite seems to be the case. Later phases of Hebrew in which the PTC plays a more decisive role are *more* aspect-prominent than earlier phases in which the PTC only played a marginal role in the system.⁹¹ The use of the PTC never becomes obligatory in the way that the English progressive construction is, and the dominant characteristic of the system remains the opposition between the finite forms expressing relative tense. There are degrees of prominence. The point is that the language becomes more aspect-prominent insofar as the spreading use of the PTC makes it possible to combine tense and the progressive meaning expressed by the PTC. As long as the system only has one basic opposition, viz. *qatal/wayyiqtol* vs. *yiqtol/weqatal*, with the same forms (*yiqtol/weqatal*) functioning as markers of future, future in the past, general present, habituality and concomitance in the past, etc., an aspectual interpretation of the

⁹⁰ Note that 1 Sam 7:10 is probably not an example of periphrastic היה+PTC, but rather of introductory וַיְהִי plus a participial clause. On this question, see n. 19 in ch. 6.

⁹¹ While scholars of BH typically see ModH as a system of absolute tense, scholars dealing specifically with the modern language are not so sure – some argue that aspect plays a prominent role (see Boneh 2016).

system is difficult to maintain, as argued above.⁹² To the extent that the simple PTC merely replaces *yiqtol*, the same situation would seem to hold in relation to the PTC, i.e. we should describe it as a non-anterior relative tense form (cf. Cohen 2013, 130). However, the use of היה+PTC allows for two distinct anterior tense forms ("simple" *qatal/wayyiqtol* vs. היה/ויהי+PTC) and two non-anterior tense forms ("simple" *yiqtol/weqatal* vs. ויהי/יהיה+PTC). The latter member of each pair is explicitly marked for imperfective (progressive) aspect, the former member unmarked for this aspect – which in opposition to the marked counterpart will tend to be interpreted as non-progressive (perfective). See, e.g., Judg 16:21 (וַיְהִי טוֹחֵן בְּבַיִת הָאֲסִירִים) vs. Exod 32:20 (וַיִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ וַיִּטְחֵן עַד אֲשֶׁר-דָּק) vs. Ezek 34:4 (וַיִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ וַיִּטְחֵן עַד אֲשֶׁר-דָּק) vs. Ezek 34:4 (וַאֲתֵת-הָאֲבָדֹת לֹא בִקְשָׁתָם) vs. 2 Sam 7:6 (וַאֲהִיָּה) vs. Gen 5:22 and 24 (וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנוּךְ אֶת-הֶאֱלֹהִים) vs. 2 Kgs 6:8 (וַהֲוֹא נִלְחָם בְּמֶלֶךְ מוֹאָב הָרֵאשֹׁן) vs. Num 21:26 (וַיִּבְרָא עֲמֶלֶק וַיִּלְחָם עִם-יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרַפְדִּים) or Exod 17:8 (וַיְהִי מִבְּדִיל בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם) vs. Deut 19:2 (וַיְהִי מִבְּדִיל בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם).⁹³ Such usage is much more prevalent in RH (cf. 4.4).⁹⁴ The fundamental point bears repeating, since it runs counter to the generally accepted point of view: RH is *more* aspect-prominent than BH (or CH in general).⁹⁵

⁹² Clearly expressed by Joosten (1989, 154): "In fact, a language needs to have more than one verbal form expressing the same tense before we can attribute to it the category of aspect." Joosten's approach is based on Kuryłowicz (1972; 1973; cf. 2.2 above).

⁹³ Such aspectual distinctions are subjective and reflect the way the writer wants to present the events. E.g., Ezek 34:4 might very well refer to something that extended over a lengthy period but the text presents it as a single, whole event. Cf. 1.2.2.

⁹⁴ On the aspectual character of היה+PTC in RH, see, e.g., Van Peursen 1997, 161 and 173. Note his statement that "היה is more than a copula and time indicator. It also indicates durative or iterative aspect" (ib., 173). However, the aspectual meaning clearly does not derive from the form of היה but from the PTC (and from the combined construction). For an aspect-prominent view of the verbal system of RH, see Bar-Asher Siegal 2017. According to this view, "the verbal system of Tannaitic Hebrew systematically marks both aspect and tense. The primary opposition is between *perfective* and *imperfective* aspect" (ib., 67).

⁹⁵ The similar combination of the verb "to be"+PTC in Aramaic is interpretable in the same way, as is the combination of "to be" (in the *qatala* form) and *yaqtulu* (Classical Arabic) or *yəqattəl* (Classical Ethiopic). Such constructions indicate a heightened aspect-prominence within a system of relative tense (cf. 2.2; ch. 4). On a similar note, modern English must be more aspect-prominent than earlier phases of the language. As is well known, the progressive construction was once less widespread and not obligatory in the same way that it is today (see Elsness 1994; Mair 2012, 810).

4 Relative tense in the extra-biblical corpora

In the previous chapter, I argued that a relative tense approach is the best way to describe the main opposition in the verbal system of CH, illustrated with examples from BH. Ch. 4 briefly demonstrates that the same approach provides the best account for the system in the other corpora of CH (inscriptions and QH) as well as the later corpora of texts (late documentary texts and RH). Of course, there are many differences between the various stages and corpora of the language (and between texts within the corpora), most conspicuously the development of the consecutive forms (see ch. 6). Here, the focus is on the relative temporal character of the verb forms. At no point did the HVS cease to be a system of relative tense. The language never developed specific relative tense forms or constructions (absolute-relative forms, in Comrie's terminology) and the various verb forms continued to be used in all time frames, indicating anteriority and non-anteriority (of different types; with different shades of modality) relative to the contextually determined point of reference.

In contrast, several other Semitic languages developed means of indicating specific types of relative tense, thereby potentially allowing the system as a whole to be interpreted as more absolute tense prominent. Classical Arabic has several constructions of this type, viz. the use of *sawfa* or *sa* to enhance the posterior/future meaning of *yaqtulu*, the combination of *kāna* ("to be") and other finite verb forms, or the addition of the particle *qad* to indicate various more specific notions of absolute-relative tense (see Fischer 1972, 94–96, §187, §189–191, and §193). As noted above (2.2), the combination of *kāna+yaqtulu* (vs. simple *qatala*) also provides the language with a more explicit way of marking aspectual distinctions. This system is also used in Modern Standard Arabic, for which Holes (1995, 189–190) gives examples of future in the past (*kāna+sa-yaqtulu*), past perfect (*kāna+qatala*), and future perfect (*yakūnu+qatala*; *sa-* optional before *yakūnu*, *qad* optional before the *qatala* form).¹ The use of *qad* signifies some kind of "pragmatic relevance to the current discourse topic" (i.e. typically present perfect) (ib., 190). Holes notes that such constructions are much more widespread today than in earlier periods; even today, however, their use is somewhat restricted. In narratives, once the time frame has been established, the auxiliaries will typically not be used. Likewise, sequence of tense is usually left unmarked in sentences of the type "after he had done that, he did this" (ib., 191). Some modern dialects have a very sparing use of such constructions (ib., 192–194).

¹ On the modern "dialects," see ib., 192 (and ib., 180, on the active PTC of dynamic verbs as a kind of present perfect in some dialects).

Though the language has developed means to potentially function as a system of absolute tense, actual usage indicates that the relative character of the system has been maintained to a large degree. Constructions similar to the Arabic ones are attested in other Semitic languages as well, notably Ethiopic and Aramaic.² Hebrew, however, never developed such constructions.³

4.1 The inscriptions

The epigraphic corpus is deplorably small. For this reason and because of the genres of the documents, some uses of the verb forms known from BH are not attested. Most conspicuously, there seem to be no clear cases of *yiqtol* in a past context. The cautious formulation is needed because much of the material is quite fragmentary and often open to alternative readings and/or interpretations. KAJr 20:2 (ישאל) may have past reference. Renz (1995, 64) uses a past tense ("erbat") in his translation but does not elaborate.⁴ It might be an archaic anterior *yiqtol* (< **yaqtul*) or an iterative/habitual use of ordinary non-anterior *yiqtol*. The latter option seems more likely since the sentence is a generalized relative sentence (Renz: כל אשר ישאל מאש חנן, "Mit allem, was er erbat von irgendjemandem, hat [man ihn] gnädig bedacht"). Gogel (1983, 415), however, gives another translation, with present reference for the *yiqtol* ("Whatever he asks from a man, may it be favored").⁵ In contrast, Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 296) read כל אשר ישאל מאל חנן, which also leads to a non-past context ("all that he asks from the Gracious God"). Hence, this verb is not a convincing case of *yiqtol* in past context. The lack

² On Classical Ethiopic, see Tropper 2002, 199. On Amharic, Hartmann 1980, 155. On Syriac, Nöldeke 1898, 197–198, §263, 200–201, §268.

³ This applies to ModH as well. Contrary to what is often claimed, ModH is not a system of absolute tense (cf. Hatav 2010 and 2012). Only in the passive we might have something that looks like a distinction between simple past and past or present perfect (*pu. qatal* vs. היה+*pu. PTC*), cf. Berman 1978, 168. This, however, does not seem to be very systematic, and there seems to be no clear evidence for such a distinction in BH (further investigation is needed). Zewi and Oren (2015, 415; referring to Goshen-Gottstein 1951/2006) mention some cases of Arabic influence in medieval Hebrew. They note the use of compound tenses consisting of forms of *qatal* or *yiqtol* of the root היה in combination with *qatal* or *yiqtol* of the main verb, as well as the use of the adverb כבר. Thus, past perfect can be expressed explicitly as היה כבר עשה, and future perfect as יהיה כבר עשה, corresponding to similar Arabic usage.

⁴ Renz refers to the text as KAgr(9):10/Pithos 2, the line number being 1 in his edition. In general, different editions present a confusing variety of designations and systems of numbering. I follow Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005.

⁵ Gogel refers to the text as K. Ajrud 16:1. See below on her translation of חנן as a "precativ perfect."

of this usage in the corpus must be a result of genre, notably the near total lack of narrative sequences.

In total, the corpus contains about 52 *yiqtol*s. Some of these are volitives. They are rarely formally marked as such in the unvocalized script, but quite consistently follow the classical positional rule (see appendix 20). Non-initial *yiqtol*s are interpretable as ordinary, non-jussive *yiqtol*s expressing non-anteriority (with context-induced modal shades of meaning), referring to the present or future. Similarly, most *weqatal*s indicate non-anteriority with present/future reference. Two contested instances (the same word) might be non-anterior *weqatal*s in a past context indicating durative or concomitant action, viz. םסא in MHsh 1:5 and 6–7. However, there are several competing interpretations.⁶ The *weqatal* in KAJr 20:2 (ונתן) might be interpreted as indicating habitual or iterative action in the past (following the possible iterative/habitual *yiqtol* mentioned above) but the context is too unclear. Most of the remaining non-anterior *weqatal*s seem to have modal connotations derived from the context (see appendix 21). Of the seven clearly non-anterior cases (Arad 2:5–6, 7–8; Arad 3:8; Arad 7:5–6; Arad 17:3–4; Arad 24 Rev:2, 3–4), the six first are second person, in contexts of command. Arad 24 Rev:3–4 is third person and might function as a simple future. As will be discussed in 6.1, the remaining forms are ambiguous as to whether they should be regarded as non-anterior *weqatalí* or anterior *weqatáti*.

If we were to use a statistically based method (cf. Penner) it would probably show that *yiqtol* and *weqatal* (excluding the potential anteriors) virtually always refer to the future or have modal meaning, which might lead to the conclusion that they mark absolute tense or mood. However, it would be a mistake to let the restricted corpus and the genre of the texts determine our conclusions in this regard. Everything we know from other phases of Hebrew indicates that if the writer of an inscription had felt a need to express future in the past or past habituality, he would have had to use *yiqtol* or *weqatal*.⁷

⁶ For the non-anterior *weqatal* solution, see Weippert 1990 or Schüle 2000, 133–4 ("wobei/während"). Renz (1995, 325) mentions this possibility, though he prefers to follow Cross and others who see the forms as absolute infinitives used as stand-ins for finite verbs. Alternatively, the forms are anterior *weqatal*s (*weqatáti*), cf. Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 361). They mention Naveh's interpretation of the form as a *wayyiqtol* 1s, stating that the sudden shift from 3sm to 1s, which would be the result of such an interpretation, is awkward. However, since the third person forms are clearly used as a polite way of referring to the first person (as is often the case in the inscriptions), the possibility remains open. In other inscriptions, we see similar shifts (e.g. MHsh 1:8 and Lach 4:3). On םסא, see also Young 2003b, 294–295.

⁷ On the use of the PTC in the inscriptions, see 3.8.

A fuller range of usage is attested for the anterior forms (*qatal* and *wayyiqtol*). All cases are interpretable within the framework of the relative temporal approach as different types of anteriority. The corpus contains about 57 *qatals* and six *wayyiqtols* (in relatively clear contexts).⁸ While most of the *wayyiqtols* are found in simple past contexts, Lach 4:6–7 may have present relevance (= present perfect when translating into English; see appendix 22). As expected, *qatal* exhibits a broader range of anterior functions. About 15 "epistolary" and/or "performative perfects" are attested (appendix 23).⁹ Two seem to be stative verbs in a clearly present context, while a few additional cases may variously be interpreted as present stative, simple past, or present perfect (appendix 24). Most of the remaining *qatals* express simple past tense though in some cases the context indicates that the meaning may be anteriority relative to some other point of time (future/present/past perfect; see appendix 25). As argued repeatedly, such shades of meaning are not separate categories in Hebrew but merely different contextual interpretations of the basic category of anteriority that we need to make when we translate. This clearly illustrates the relative temporal character of the system.

According to some scholars, the alleged precative use of *qatal* may be attested in the inscriptions. Gogel (1983, 415) renders KAjr 20:2 (כל אשר יאמר מאש חנן) as follows: "Whatever he asks from a man, may it be favored," apparently understanding חנן in a precative sense. As noted above, other (more likely) readings and interpretations are available, viz. as an ordinary anterior (Renz) or as an adjective (Dobbs-Allsopp et al.).¹⁰ Likewise, the proposed precative interpretation in Qom 3:2 is highly uncertain. Some scholars read ברך, others ברכה, and different interpretations are possible (passive PTC, ordinary anterior 3sm or 2sm *qatal*, 1s *qatal*, possibly with performative meaning; cf. Zevit 1984). The precative reading "may you bless" is one among several suggestions made by O'Connor (1987, 228–229; cf. Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 494, n. 22). Nothing necessitates such an interpretation. As was the case in the OT, there is no secure attestation of the precative perfect in the inscriptions, nor is there any convincing case of other types of non-anterior simple *qatal*. Hence, though the full range of non-anterior functions of *yiqtol* and *weqatal* is not attested in the corpus, it must be concluded

⁸ On the relatively low number of *wayyiqtols*, see 6.1.

⁹ On the distinction between the two usages and why both should be interpreted as part of the same grammatical category, see 3.3.3.

¹⁰ Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 296) use the term "precative perfect" for the *weqatal* in the same line. This is a misunderstanding. The so-called precative perfect is an alleged – but (as argued in 3.3.4) probably non-existent – use of simple *qatal*.

that the use of the verb forms in the inscriptions fits the description of the system as a system of relative tense.¹¹

4.2 Qumran

The relative temporal character of QH was already discussed in 2.1.1. Like Penner, Hendel (1996, 158, with n. 26) sees absolute tense as dominant in QH. Like many other scholars, he claims that RH and ModH are absolute tense systems, adding that QH is "an early exemplar of this phase" with reference to Qimron's description of QH (especially the short chapter on syntax = Qimron 1986, 70–86). However, Qimron does not treat this question in detail. In fact, when he does mention tense usage, the only thing he notes is a tendency in QH to use *qatal* in conditional clauses as a future perfect to a greater extent than is the case in BH (ib., 84–85). This is clearly a relative tense usage that does not fit Hendel's description. Here I present a selection of examples that illustrate the relative temporal character of the system in QH.

4.2.1 Relative temporal use of *qatal* in QH

In numerous cases, *qatal* marks types of anteriority other than simple past. The stative present usage is quite frequent (appendix 26).¹² Present perfect *qatals* are extremely numerous (particularly in poetry like Hodayot) but in most cases simple past readings are possible as well, reflecting the fact that all types of anteriority are "the same thing" in Hebrew (see appendix 27 for cases in which the present relevance of a past event and hence the present perfect interpretation seems clear).

Likewise, future perfect usage is often ambiguous. Most cases are translatable as present perfects and sometimes it is difficult to decide whether the form marks anteriority in relation to the present or the future. Several likely candidates are listed in appendix 28. Furthermore, past perfects and irrealis usage are attested (appendix 29). As noted above, the use of *qatal* in conditional clauses referring to the future or to general present conditions is quite widespread in QH (appendix 30). However, as noted by Qimron (1986, 84–85), the use of *yiqtol* (and *weqatal*) is more widespread. Both usages may occur in the same passage (e.g. CD 15:3–4; 4Q415 fr. 11 10–11; 4Q416 fr. 2 iii 5–6; cf. the discussion in 3.1). Qimron (ib., 85) notes that in some cases,

¹¹ On the use of the system of consecutive forms and *weyiqtol* in the inscriptions, see 6.1.

¹² In contrast, in some cases the PTC occurs in contexts where a stative *qatal* could have been expected, mostly with the root עָיַן , e.g. in 1Q18 fr. 1–2 3; 1QS 6:25; 4Q200 fr. 4 3; 4Q261 fr. 3 3; CD 14:20; 4Q271 fr. 3 6, 7; 11Q11 III 7 (cf. also מֵאֲמַנָּה in 4Q200 fr. 4 4?). This usage, of course, is also frequent in BH.

a scroll has a *qatal* where a corresponding passage in the MT has a *yiqtol*, e.g. 11QT^a 66:4 (וּאִם בְּשֹׁדֶה מִצֵּאָה הָאִישׁ אֶת הָאִשָּׁה) vs. the similar passage in Deut 22:25 (וְאִם-בִּשְׂדֵה יִמְצָא הָאִישׁ אֶת-הַנְּעָרָה). The use of verbs in fixed contexts such as conditional clauses is not a decisive argument, yet the extended use of *qatal* as compared to BH clearly does *not* suggest a development in the direction of a system of absolute tense.

As is the case in the other corpora of texts, the analysis of a given verb depends on the interpretation of the context – and on the language used by the researcher or into which the Hebrew verb is translated. The Hebrew form marks only the notion of anteriority. Consequently, the appendices are not exhaustive lists but merely serve as illustration. One type of *qatal* that seems to be virtually unattested in the corpus is the performative usage. The most likely case is 4Q504 fr. 1-2r vi 5 (רְצִינוּ), though an "ordinary" present perfect reading makes sense as well.¹³ Likewise, the *qatal* in 1Q22 fr. 1 ii 11 (צוּה) may be a kind of performative (cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:61). However, "ordinary" present perfect is probably more likely. 4Q522 fr. 9 ii 11 (וְהַ[נְ]ה נַחְתִּי עִבְדִּי) may be performative too. In addition, one possible example of "epistolary" *qatal* has been found, viz. 4Q398 fr. 14–17 ii 2, כְּתַבּוּ (on the relation between "performative" and "epistolary," see 3.3.3). In contexts that seem to allow a performative reading (in a broad sense), mostly PTCs are found (cf. Rogland 2003, 129).¹⁴

Except for the possible example from 4Q522, there are no cases of clearly performative נַחְתִּי in the scrolls – the typical example of the usage in BH. However, neither are there any cases of the PTC of this verb used in a clearly performative function. There are several occurrences of the type אֲשֶׁר אֲנוּכִי (similar sequences occur quite often in the OT as well); however, it is not clear that this type should be considered performative. Of course, as has been argued in 3.3.3, the performative use of *qatal* (and of the PTC) is not a special meaning but merely reflects the general anterior meaning of *qatal* of the present perfect type (or the "bleached" present/future meaning of the PTC). In light of the numerous examples of present perfect use of *qatal*, the lack of performative *qatals* is not an argument against the relative character of *qatal*. Rather, it seems to attest to the growth in the use of the

¹³ García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:1017) use the present tense. This is the only possible case noted by Rogland (2003, 127).

¹⁴ 1Q22 fr. 1 i 6 (מְגִיד); 1Q22 fr. 1 i 9 (מְצוּר); this type is frequent in the OT, e.g. Exod 34:11; Deut 4:40; 6:6); 1Q22 fr. 1 ii 2 (מְצוּר); 4Q200 fr. 4 4 (מְבַקֵּשׁ); with preceding וְעַתָּה); 4Q216 I 12 (מְגִיד); 4Q216 I 14 (כִּוְרָת); 4Q223–224 fr. 2 iv 6 (מְלִבֵּר); 4Q390 fr. 1 3 (מְצוּר); 4Q510 fr. 1 4 (מְשַׁמֵּעַ?). Note the *yiqtol* in 1Q18 fr. 1–2 2 (אֲבִי[ק]ֵשׁ), which may be a kind of performative, though it might have future reference. The form in 1QH^a 8:29 (וְאִחְלָה) may be *weyiqtol* or *wayyiqtol*. In the latter case, it might be performative (cf. 4.2.2)?

PTC. The fact that the few instances of possible performatives are mostly PTCs seems to illustrate the development of the PTC as a more central player in the HVS and the "bleaching" of its concomitant meaning.¹⁵

4.2.1.1 "Precative" *qatal* in QH?

It seems clear that *qatal* always indicates some sort of anteriority. Like the alleged absolute future *qatals* in Hodayot (2.1), other supposedly non-anterior *qatals* are interpretable in anterior terms. Some scholars seem to presuppose the existence of precative *qatal* in QH. García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:1045) render the expression גלה ה[אר]ץ (4Q521 fr. 2 iii 4) as "May the [ea]rth rejoice." Similarly, they translate 11QPs^a 22:6–7 (שקר ועול נכרתו (ממך יגילו בניך בקרבך וידידיך אליך נלוו) as "may lying and sin be eradicated from you. Your sons will rejoice in your midst and your loved ones will be united with you" (ib., 2:1177). Sanders (1965, 87) translates both *qatals* not as precatives but simple future ("will be cut off" and "will be united").

Yet, nothing in these passages demands a precative or absolute future interpretation. The context in 4Q521 is fragmentary and it is entirely possible to read the form as a simple past or present perfect (Puech 1992, 496) or possibly as a present tense (stative-type verb). In 11QPs^a, there are two preceding *yiqtol*s in the second person sg. feminine (spoken to Zion). However, immediately before the supposed precative *qatal*, we have the form טהר, which is translated as an imperative ("purge") by both Sanders and García Martínez and Tigchelaar. As Sanders (1965, 88) points out, the form does not have the expected ending for an imperative 2sf – either we should read טהרי or the form might be an infinitive with imperative force; alternatively, he notes that it could be vocalized as a *pu. qatal*. The latter possibility seems most likely. The *qatals* can be read as ordinary markers of anteriority, in this case future perfect in the description of the future blessings of Zion (at that point in the future, "violence has been cleansed from your midst, lie and sin have been eradicated from you. Your sons will rejoice in your midst, and your beloved ones have been united with you").

Lange (2000, 415) translates a potential *qatal* (לחם) in 4Q468g 5 as "he will make war," stating that it is probably a prophetic perfect. However, nothing in the fragmented context prevents an ordinary past reading ("fought" in García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:947 [4Q468i]). Further, the form may be an imperative (cf. Ps 35:1). Similar cases occur in 4Q438 fr. 3 3 (הביאותי; Weinfeld and Seely 1999, 329: "and my neck I will submit to your

¹⁵ While the general process seems clear enough, Eskhult's claim (2007, 34) that the linguistic development *forces* the author to use the PTC rather than a *qatal* in 1Q22 fr. 1 i 6 (he writes 7) might be an exaggeration.

yoke") and 4Q524 fr. 25 7 (לֹא יִרְשָׁתֶּמָה; Puech 1998, 110: "vous n'hériterez pas"; cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1053). Such translations result from one specific interpretation of contexts that are open to standard anterior interpretations as well.

Jones (2015, 302) claims that the *qatals* at the beginning of the inscriptions on the trumpets in 1QM 3:9 (נָגַף אֶל), 3:10 (אָסַף אֶל), and 4:3–4 (חָדַל מֵעַמֵּד) indicate general truths or habitual actions. This view is based on the unconvincing argument that initial *qatal* is modal (see 3.6 and appendix 11). Nothing speaks against a standard anterior reading of the forms in 1QM (cf. Holst 2008, 104).

4.2.2 Relative temporal use of *wayyiqtol* in QH

As expected (cf. 3.6.1), most *wayyiqtol*s refer to the simple past. Yet, some cases may mark other types of anteriority. E.g., a stative present usage of *wayyiqtol* seems to be attested in 1QH^a 6:36–37 (וְזָהָבָה וְתִשְׁנֵא) and 7:23 (וְזָהָבָה).¹⁶ Several cases of what appear to be *wayyiqtol*s from the root ידע are interpretable as stative presents (e.g. 1QS 10:16; 1QH^a 7:26,¹⁷ 36; 17:14; 4Q511 fr. 42 7). Also, 4Q184 fr. 1 7 (וְתִשְׁכֹּן) seems to indicate a present state or result (stative present or present perfect), rather than narrating a simple past event. The same applies to CD 20:2 (וְיִקְוֶן). In CD 20:28, the *w+iyqtols* (וְיִתְוֹדוּ and וְיִשְׁמְעוּ) could be *wayyiqtol*s with present reference as indicated by the preceding PTC ("and they have listened to the voice of the teacher and have confessed"). However, the forms might be *weyiqtol*s. Likewise, וְיִשְׁלַח in 1QM 17:6 might be a *wayyiqtol* with present reference. The preceding clause is nominal, referring to the present time ("today is his appointed time"). Hence, depending on the target language, a present perfect rendering seems more appropriate than a simple past narrative tense. 4Q385 fr. 2 2 (וְיִלְכֹוּ) may be another example. Recall that the point here is not that *wayyiqtol* is a present perfect, but merely that the form potentially covers the entire category of anteriority, for the expression of which some other languages have separate verb forms. Alternatively, the form could be a *weyiqtol*. Further, if the *w+iyqtol* in CD 14:19 (וְיִכְפֹּר) is not a *weyiqtol* it may be a future perfect use of *wayyiqtol* ("until the rising of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel and (until) their sin has been atoned"; cf. 6.2.4). Similarly, וְיִשְׁיִשׁוּ in

¹⁶ Cf. Newsom's translation (Stegemann 2009, 96 and 106), "you hate"; "I love you." Alternatively, the forms may be *weyiqtol*s. 4Q511 fr. 30 2 (וְיִעֲמִקוּן) is another potential example.

¹⁷ Note l. 25 with וְאֲנִי יֹדְעָתִי. The form וְאֲדַעָה in l. 26 seems to express the same meaning, i.e., it must be a *wayyiqtol* referring to present knowledge, rather than a *weyiqtol* ("and let me know" or "I will know").

11QPs^a 22:4 may be a *wayyiqtol* following a PTC with the definite article ("those who long for the day of your salvation, and they have [= who have] rejoiced in ..."). Again, it may be a *weyiqtol* (Sanders 1965, 87, "that they may rejoice" [volitive]; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1177, "and who rejoice" [non-volitive]). Often, of course, *wayyiqtol*s continue a present perfect reference initiated by a *qatal* (e.g. in CD 8:4ff.). In 4Q504 fr. 6 6–7, the *w+iyqtols* follow a nominal clause (כִּי־א עֲמָכָה כּוֹלְנֵנוּ וְתִשְׂאֵנוּ [...] וְתִבְיֵאֵנוּ) and probably represent *wayyiqtol*s (to be interpreted/translated as present perfects; again, of course, they might be *weyiqtol*s).

4.2.3 Relative temporal use of *yiqtol*, *weqatal*, and the PTC in QH

Most *yiqtol*s and *weqatals* clearly refer to the future or indicate some shade of context-induced modal meaning in relation to the present or future. Due to the lack of long passages of narrative prose, the use of non-anterior forms in a past context (habitual, iterative, future in the past, etc.) is rare – but not unattested. In most cases, however, alternative interpretations are possible. Appendix 31 is a critical discussion of several instances, some of the more convincing cases being 4Q377 fr. 2 ii 11 (past habitual or iterative *yiqtol*), 4Q385a fr. 18 i a–b 7 and 9 (past future/modal *yiqtol* and *weqatal*), 4Q422 III 9 (past habitual *yiqtol*). Several potentially durative or concomitant *weqatals* will be discussed in 6.2.2 and appendix 45.

The predicative active PTC is quite frequent in QH. Most cases refer to the moment of speech/writing, indicating action ongoing at this time or, often, a more "bleached" type of ongoingness (general/habitual present or future reference), e.g. 1QpHab 6:4 (פִּשְׂרוּ אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה זְבָחִים), 6 (פִּשְׂרוּ אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה) (מַחֲלָקִים). PTCs referring to the past are rather rare (as are finite non-anterior forms with past reference).¹⁸ However, appendix 32 shows that some cases clearly indicate ongoingness in a past context. The comparatively low number must be a result of genre. It is not an argument that the temporal reference of the form is absolute rather than relative.

The periphrastic construction with הִיָּה and active PTC has an uneven distribution in the corpus.¹⁹ Most documents do not attest to this usage while a few texts exhibit numerous instances, with the vast majority occurring in a single (very long) text, viz. 11QT. In all the cases, the meaning seems to be a combination of explicit ongoingness or habituality etc. and the meaning inherent in the form of הִיָּה (see the list in appendix 33). Comparatively few

¹⁸ Kesterson (1984, 11) finds only one PTC referring to the past in his corpus (the Serakim and CD), viz. CD 3:1, which is, in fact, a passive (*nif.*) PTC.

¹⁹ Cf. Muraoka 1999; Geiger 2012, 350–367. Qimron (1986, 70) states very briefly that the periphrastic construction is attested "about 50 times, chiefly in TS [= 11QT]."

cases refer to the past (due to the lack of long narrative texts, as was the case with the simple PTC) while many occur with the non-anterior forms, mostly *yiqtol*. Some cases include the infinitive of הִיהַ and one (fragmentary) case has a PTC following an imperative.²⁰ This distribution is quite different from the one in BH, where the use of the PTC with *yiqtol*, *weqatal* or volitive forms of הִיהַ is rare in comparison with *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*+PTC (Joosten 2012a, 260). This seems to be primarily a question of genre (cf. Muraoka 1999, 197).

In sum, with regard to all the verb forms, the relative temporal character of the system is clear. The HVS uses the same form in different time frames – and this is the case for QH as much as it is for BH.²¹

4.3 The late documentary texts

The documents from the Bar Kokhba period and the other (somewhat earlier) documentary texts constitute an even smaller corpus than the early inscriptions. In addition, some texts are very fragmentary and difficult to read.²² Many aspects of the verbal system are unattested and divergent interpretations of specific lines may lead to divergent analyses of the meaning and use of verb forms. In 6.1, the use of the consecutive forms in these texts will be addressed, and while certain points are debatable, the general impression is that the classical system of consecutive forms and the classical rules for distinguishing between volitives and simple *yiqtol* are no longer operative in these texts. Hence, the forms to be dealt with here (in order to illustrate the relative temporal character of the system) are *yiqtol* and *qatal* (not *weqatal* and *wayyiqtol*; *w+qatal* is "and" plus ordinary *qatal*, *w+yiqtol* is "and" plus *yiqtol*).

No *yiqtol*s occur in a clearly past context (no future in the past or past habitual, iterative, etc.). A potential exception is Mur 46:9 (עמד עליו שיפטר).

²⁰ 8–10 cases refer to the past (six with *qatal* of הִיהַ: 1Q17 fr. 1 6; 1Q22 fr. 1 iii 9; 2Q20 fr. 1 3; 4Q177 fr. 1–4 8 (2x); 4Q221 fr. 5 6; one with *wayyiqtol*: 4Q385a fr. 18 ii 4; one with anterior *weqatal*: 4Q200 fr. 6 2–3; the PTCs in 4Q477 fr. 2 ii 2 and 11QPs^a 21:14 with *qatal* might be nominal). Another ten occur with the infinitive of הִיהַ (1QS 5:2, 24; 1QM 2:1; 1QH^a 23:10–11; 4Q174 fr. 1–2 i 6; 4Q258 I 2; II 3; VIII 7; 4Q503 fr. 64 5; 11QT^a 40:2). One seems to occur with an imperative (4Q200 fr. 2 3; Muraoka [1999, 199] states that there are no such cases). The rest (50+) use mostly *yiqtol*, plus a few *weqatal*s and one *weyiqtol*. Note that some simple PTCs with past reference in appendix 32 occur in such fragmented contexts that we cannot exclude the presence of a form of הִיהַ.

²¹ The same applies to the Hebrew of Ben Sira (some of which is also included in QH, of course). See Van Peursen 2004 for numerous examples.

²² On the language of some of the documents, see Nebe 1997. For a recent, thorough treatment of the material, see Mor 2016.

The preceding verb is (possibly) a *qatal*. However, the larger context is unclear. Yardeni (2000, 2:65) translates the sequence as "insist/insisted on it that he should break(?) into it." The rest of the approx. 34 more or less clear *yiqtol*s seem to refer to the future – or possibly (?) to the present in Mur 30:23 (לעשות בו כל שתחפץ) and Mur 44:6 (לבוא = לבו; אם יהפצו לבו) – with various shades of context-derived modal meaning. However, as in the inscriptions, the lack of future in the past etc. is probably a matter of genre and content. No PTCs with past reference are attested.

Compared to the earlier epigraphic corpus, the active PTC in predicative function is very widespread (about 20). Several occur in the periphrastic construction with a form of היה but never in a past context. All seem to mark the combination of future tense or some shade of modal meaning and ongoing or habitual meaning: Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 44:17, 19, 22 (all seem to be connected with the *yiqtol* 3p, יהיו, in l. 16); Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 45:16 (twice, with a *yiqtol* 2sm, תהיה); Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 49:6 (with an imperative, הוא). The PTC in Mur 43:5 seems to represent a "bleached" version of the progressive meaning of the PTC, apparently indicating a simple future event (שאני נתן תכבלים ברגלכם), "that I will put the chains on your feet"). A similar "bleached" progressive meaning seems to be attested in Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 49:6 (הוא ידעין) with an unexpected spelling of the pl. imperative of היה, "be knowing" or simply "know"?). This is the only clear case of the root ידע as an active PTC and the root does not occur as a *qatal*. Likewise, other roots that are often used with stative present meaning in BH are unattested in the present corpus, except for the root ישב, which occurs a few times as a PTC (Mur 42:4, יעקב בן יהודה שיושב אבית משכו, and Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 49:3, (בטב אתן יושב[י]ן). However, with this meaning, the PTC is used in BH as well, rather than *qatal* (e.g. Gen 24:3, הַכְּנֻעֵנִי אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי יוֹשֵׁב בְּקִרְבּוֹ; with the meaning "to live," *qatal* with present reference seems to be unattested). Hence, there seems to be no clear evidence for the expected development away from stative *qatal*.

Some PTCs may be interpreted as performatives: XHev/Se 49:7 (תסלע);²³ Mur 43:3 (מעיד אני עלי תשמים); Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 45:6 and Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 46:3 (both מודא אני לך (לכם) היום); possibly Mur 29:9 and Mur 30:9 (both הותמים – which might, however, have a nominal function). Compared to the early inscriptions, this reflects a broadening of the use of the PTC. However, due to the content of many of the papyrus letters (contracts, deeds), several *qatals* are interpretable as some kind of performative as well, e.g. with verbs meaning "sell" or "lease," as in Naḥal

²³ Note the translation (like a *qatal*) "I have received from you this *sela*" in Broshi and Qimron 1994, 288. Yardeni (2000, 2:19) writes "This *Sela*^c I (have) receive(d) from you."

Hever (P. Yadin) 46:4, תללו חכרתי מכם, "These I (hereby) lease from you" (other potential cases are listed in appendix 34). Rendering the clause like this is merely a translational choice. Alternatively – and in most of the cases this is perhaps the better choice – such verbs can be rendered as present perfects. At least, it seems clear that they do not express simple past tense; some of the cases include an adverbial expression like "today," e.g. Naḥal Hever (P. Yadin) 44:3 (היום הזה). As has been stressed repeatedly, these shades of meaning do not belong to separate categories in the HVS. The performative use of *qatal* is always merely a translational convenience for rendering the general anterior meaning of the form in a manner closer to the usage in the target language. The same applies to the present perfect use, the simple past, etc.

Hence, as far as *qatal* is concerned, the relative temporal character of the system is evident. *Qatal* expresses not only simple past tense, but also present perfect. In addition, there are two irrealis (counterfactual) *qatals*, which is just another function of anterior meaning (Mur 42:5–6, ואף אללי שהגיים, "and if it weren't for the fact that the gentiles are near to us, I would have gone up and compensated (?) you"; the second occurrence is a *weqatal* of the unclassical, anterior type).²⁴ At this stage, *qatal* clearly remains an anterior tense form. Though the small corpus and the genre of the texts do not allow us to establish the functioning of *yiqtol* and the PTC in contexts that would illustrate the relative character of the forms, there is no evidence that the language had developed specific absolute and absolute-relative tense forms. In short, nothing in the present corpus indicates that Hebrew at this stage had ceased to be a system of relative tense.

4.4 The Rabbinic literature

The development of the HVS from CH to RH is often presented as a transition from an aspectual system to a system of (absolute) tense or – if CH is not seen as aspectual – at least as a transition to a system that is more focused on absolute tense than CH was. Penner (2015, 3) calls this the "conventional view" (see, e.g., Ewald 1827, 554; Albeck 1971, 195; Hendel 1996, 158 [cf. 4.2 above]; Schniedewind 2013, 47).

Clearly, the verbal system of RH differs fundamentally from CH in several ways. Most notably, the consecutive forms and most of the separate volitive system have been lost while the PTC has partially taken over the domain of *yiqtol/weqatal* to an even larger extent than was already the case in CH. Yet, the inherent meaning of the finite tense forms (and the PTC) seems to be

²⁴ Cf. Yardeni's translation (2000, 2:64).

basically the same in RH as it was in CH. Like the earlier phases of the language, RH does not possess separate relative tense forms (Comrie's absolute-relative forms). *Qatal*, *yiqtol*, and the PTC occur in all time frames, indicating anteriority, non-anteriority (posteriority/modality), and concomitance, respectively, in relation to the given context – with the PTC taking over much of the non-anterior domain of *yiqtol*, specifically concomitance, habituality, etc., while *yiqtol* is being restricted to modal, often subordinate, contexts.²⁵ In other words, the system remains a system of relative tense, and the differences between CH and RH should be seen as alterations within this basic system. In contrast to the "conventional view," if we want to find a shift in prominence, we must accept that RH is in fact more aspect-prominent than CH (see 3.8.1).

Hendel (1996, 162) recognizes that the past perfect use of *qatal* "persists in later stages of Hebrew as a vestige of the CBH relative tense system" but explicitly states that already in LBH, the relative use of *yiqtol* as a future in the past has been lost (ib., 160, n. 36). According to Hendel, the entire relative system "begins to break down in LBH and disappears entirely in Rabbinic Hebrew, where the *Pf.* is restricted to the absolute past (and the pluperfect) and the *Impf.* to the absolute future, with the *Pt.* now the form for present tense. In Rabbinic Hebrew, as in Modern Hebrew, tense is absolute" (ib., 163). However, past perfect *qatal* is not the only relative tense usage attested in RH.²⁶

Even Segal, who generally identifies *qatal* with the past, *yiqtol* with the future, and the PTC with the present (1927, 150), refers to several uses of the verb forms that do not fit this description. In addition to the past perfect, he refers to the widespread use of *qatal* in conditional clauses (ib., 151),²⁷ as

²⁵ Recent scholarship tends to see *yiqtol* as primarily modal/subordinate in contrast to the earlier view (as represented by Segal) that *qatal*, *yiqtol*, and the PTC denote past, future, and present, respectively (cf. Sharvit 1980, 110). However, *yiqtol* has not lost all its non-modal functions and the designation of the form as modal (rather than non-anterior or posterior) might be unwarranted. Consider, e.g., the three *yiqtol*s in m. Pe'ah 5:4 (יָטוֹר, יִקְוֹל, וְיִשְׁלַח). The first seems to indicate permission and the third obligation, while the second one is a simple future (albeit in a temporal, subordinate clause; yet, there is nothing obviously modal about this clause). In any case, the mere designation of the meaning of a form as "modal" is problematic (cf. the criticism of the modal approach to BH in 3.5.2). For a recent argument in support of Segal's view and against the modal characterization of *yiqtol* in RH, see Bar-Asher Siegal 2017 (where further references may be found).

²⁶ On past perfect *qatal*, see Segal 1927, 151, §309; Pérez Fernández 1997, 116. Note Pérez Fernández's general remarks against a too rigid absolute tense interpretation of RH (ib., 107–108).

²⁷ Cf. Pérez Fernández 1997, 215. As in CH, *qatal* is also the form used for marking irrealis (ib., 216–217), often combined with the PTC in the periphrastic construction.

marker of acts that have "just been performed, in which case English would use the present" (ib., 153),²⁸ and, in rare cases (according to Segal, but see below), as a future perfect (ib., 153). Similarly, he mentions the use of *yiqtol* as marker of modality in the past and PTCs without היה referring to the past (ib., 154 and 156).²⁹

The indications that the system is relative are, in fact, quite numerous. RH has one single form for the expression of anteriority, viz. *qatal*. Hence, in many passages, a present perfect (or future perfect) rendering is preferable, although in many cases English usage allows for simple past as well. Thus, participial clauses referring to the general present often follow clauses with *qatal* forms indicating the background for the action expressed by the PTC (e.g. m. Ber. 9:3, 'אומר 'פרוץ שֶהִתְחַיְבוּ – בית קֹדֶשׁ וְקִנְיָה כְּלִים קֹדֶשׁ; m. Pe'ah 3:5, שְׁנֵי שְׁלֶקְחוּ אֶת הָאֵילָן, נוֹתְנִין פְּאֵה אַחַת. While such *qatals* can be rendered in English with simple past tense (cf. the translations in Neusner 1988, 13 and 19), a present perfect translation is more natural in, e.g., Danish which has a more strict sequence of tense and uses the present perfect more often. The point here is not to introduce categories from another language into the analysis of Hebrew – quite the contrary. Such passages show that Hebrew does not possess a separate category of present perfect and has to use the same form for indicating all kinds of anteriority, simple past as well as anteriority with present relevance in relation to clauses in a present or future/general temporal frame.

Several types of anteriority are attested in m. Ber. 2:5.

חָתַן פְּטוּר מִקְרִיאַת שְׁמַע בְּלִילָה הֶרְאִישׁוֹן עַד מוֹצְאֵי שְׁבֵת, אִם לֹא עָשָׂה מִעֲשֵׂה. מִעֲשֵׂה בְּרֵבֶן גְּמִילִיאל שֶׁקָּרָא בְּלִילָה הֶרְאִישׁוֹן שְׁנֵשָׂא. אָמְרוּ לוֹ תַלְמִידָיו: לֹא לַמְדַתְּנוּ...

Segal discusses this type in his section on the PTC (1927, 156) but the irrealis meaning is clearly related to the anterior meaning of the *qatal* part of the construction and not to the inherent meaning of the PTC.

²⁸ Cf. Pérez Fernández 1997, 116, who refers to the frequent expressions אָמַרְתָּ, which he translates as "that's what you say," and לֹא יָבִיטִי מִן הַדִּין, which he renders as "I do not arrive at this through deductive reasoning." As in similar uses of *qatal* in CH, nothing warrants a real present tense or other non-anterior interpretation. Such cases are clearly anteriors (of the present perfect type). Pérez Fernández refers to gnomic use of *qatal* in RH (without using the term), in "declarations of general validity, which allow no exception" (ib., 117). These cases are to be explained in the same way as the similar occurrences in CH (3.3.2).

²⁹ Segal's example of past *yiqtol* is מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה וְרַבּוּ עָלַי (m. Sanh. 3:7, according to some mss.; others have מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה שֶׁחֲבָרִי רַבּוּ עָלַי). An alternative interpretation is possible, whereby the *yiqtol* has future/present reference and the *qatal* is a present stative. In any case, the relative temporal character of the system is evident from such ambiguity.

4 Relative tense in the extra-biblical corpora

First, a *qatal* occurs in a conditional clause relating to a general present/future statement (אם לא עשה מעשה, "if he has not consummated the marriage").³⁰ Second, נִשָּׂא is anterior in relation to the preceding *qatal* (קָרָא), i.e. it can be rendered with a past perfect. Third, the *qatal* in the direct speech (לַמְדָּתָנוּ) clearly has present relevance to a higher degree than the preceding narrative *qatal* (אָמַר) and might be rendered as a present perfect, though English usage might use simple past here.³¹

The use of *qatal* in connection with various conjunctions provides further illustration of the relative character of the form. Note, e.g., m. Pe'ah 7:8 with *qatal* in clauses introduced by עַד שֶׁלֹּא ("before") and מִשֶּׁ ("after") relating to a main clause referring to the general present/future.

הַמְקַדִּישׁ אֶת פְּרָמוֹ עַד שֶׁלֹּא נֹדְעוּ בּוֹ הָעוֹלָלוֹת – אֵין הָעוֹלָלוֹת לְעִנְיֵים; מִשְׁנֹדְעוּ בּוֹ הָעוֹלָלוֹת – הָעוֹלָלוֹת לְעִנְיֵים.

The *qatals* mark present perfect or future perfect rather than simple past tense.³²

For further examples of relative use of *qatal*, see appendix 35.

As was the case in the other non-biblical corpora, *yiqtol*s in past contexts are rather rare in the Mishnah. This is primarily a consequence of genre (the Mishnah being mainly concerned with the way things are done or should be done). Still, some cases do occur though other interpretations are often possible. Consider m. Šeb. 4:1 (... מִשְׁרָבוֹ עוֹבְרֵי עֲבֵרָה הִתְקִינוּ, שְׂיֵהָא זֶה מְלַקֵּט). The *qatal* introduced by מִשֶּׁ marks anteriority in relation to the past or the present, depending on the interpretation of the *qatal* in the main clause (הִתְקִינוּ) as simple past or present perfect. רָבוּ may be rendered as a simple past, a past perfect, or a present perfect. Similarly, in the clause that is the object of הִתְקִינוּ, the *yiqtol* יֵהָא (in a periphrastic construction with a following PTC) can be understood as marking modality in the past or in relation to the general

³⁰ Danby's translation (1933, 3). Again, a simple past rendering is possible in English (Neusner 1988, 5). Blackman (1951, 42) uses the past perfect ("if he had not [by then] consummated the marriage"). The point is clear – Hebrew only possesses one anterior form that has to do the duty of several English verb forms and constructions.

³¹ Cf. Danby's "Didst thou not teach us" (1933, 4) vs. Blackman's "thou hast taught us/hast thou not taught us" (1951, 42–43).

³² Other examples include m. Šeb. 3:8 (אֵין בּוֹנִין מִדְּרָגוֹת עַל פִּי הַגְּאִיּוֹת עָרַב שְׂבִיעִית מִשְׁפָּסְקוֹ) and 9:9 (הָאוֹכֵל מֵעִסַּת שְׂבִיעִית עַד שֶׁלֹּא הוֹרְמָה חֲלָתָהּ, חֵיב מִיָּתָהּ). Note that מִשֶּׁ may also occur with *yiqtol* (cf. m. Pe'ah 8:1). In m. Šeb. 4:7 and 4:8, similar passages with מִשֶּׁ use *yiqtol* and *qatal*, respectively, cf. the discussion in 3.1.

present/future.³³ For further examples, see appendix 36 (m. Ma'as. Š. 5:2 and the ones in 'Abot R. Nat. seem particularly clear).

Scholars often refer to the construction עתיד+infinitive as an explicit, absolute future tense marker. However, as noted by Bar-Asher Siegal (2017, 81–82), this is a "lexical future" (and other similar constructions are occasionally used, such as סוף+infinitive). Furthermore, even in this construction, the meaning is relative rather than absolute future. See, e.g., m. Naz. 5:5, according to Ms Kaufmann (שְׁבִית הַמְקַדֵּשׁ עֲתִיד לְהָרֵב), in a clearly past context).³⁴ Similarly, 'Abot R. Nat. 1 (מִלְמַד שֶׁגִּלּוּי הָיָה לִפְנֵי מִי שֶׁאָמַר וְהָיָה הָעוֹלָם) (שעתידין הדורות לומר כך; Schechter 1887, 3).

The PTC is not a real (absolute) present tense in RH. Most PTCs do occur in present contexts, yet simple PTCs (without היה in *qatal*) sometimes clearly refer to the past, cf. Segal 1927, 156. He states that היה is "omitted" in such cases but this may not be quite accurate. The PTC is not a finite present tense form but – in its predicative, verbal function – simply indicates concomitance or (often) explicit ongoingness in relation to a contextually indicated R. Hence, Pérez Fernández's use (1997, 134) of present tense translation for m. Soṭah 7:8 is unnecessary (cf. the remarks on the "historic present" in 3.1). A few examples are listed in appendix 37 (more may be found in narrative texts like 3 Enoch; see Odeberg 1928).

Some scholars argue that the PTC in RH often has explicit modal meaning (Segal 1927, 159, "a somewhat jussive sense"). Clearly, forms referring to the present or future often receive modal meaning from the context, but Segal goes one step further and states that the transition "to a real jussive or imperative is easy" (ib., 159). Similarly, Sharvit (1980, 112 and 116–117) argues that the PTC in the Mishnah often has various specific shades of modal meaning (obligation, permission, etc.). Cf. also Cohen 2013, 148; Muraoka 1999, 193.

However, deriving the alleged modal connotations from the context seems preferable to ascribing explicit modal meaning to the PTC. Note also that two of the examples used by Segal (1927, 159) to illustrate the use of PTCs with jussive meaning are periphrastic constructions with יהו or יהא (whence the modal meaning). His other examples need not be interpreted as explicitly modal. The reason for not describing CH *yiqtol* in modal terms (cf. 3.5.2) also applies to the RH PTC. Modal shades of meaning can easily be derived from the context whereas the elimination of some sort of inherent modality in unspecified contexts seems more difficult to explain. This question relates

³³ Danby (1933, 43): "...it was ordained that a man might only gather..."; Blackman (1951, 254): "...that one may collect...."

³⁴ Other mss. have שְׁבִית הַמְקַדֵּשׁ הָרֵב (5:4).

4 Relative tense in the extra-biblical corpora

to the genre of the Mishnah. When PTCs are used, is the text prescribing a certain behavior in direct terms or is it merely describing how things are done (and leaving it up to the reader to draw the conclusion that this is what he ought to do as well)? Neusner (1988, xiii, xv, xxvii) argues convincingly for the latter view.

To sum up, there are ample indications that the HVS as a whole remains a system of relative tense in RH. A statistical approach like the one taken by Penner in relation to QH would probably lead to the result that the system is absolute (especially if based on English translational equivalents). However, this is irrelevant. The restricted repertoire of forms available and the usages noted above excludes an absolute temporal analysis of the system, regardless of the number of attestations of various uses. Finally, the point noted in 3.8.1 on the aspectual implications of the use of the periphrastic construction with $\eta\eta$ +PTC should be reiterated. Appendix 38 provides examples to illustrate the distinction between simple finite forms and the participial construction.

5 The origins of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*

This chapter discusses the prehistory of the Hebrew consecutive forms, including the background of *wayyiqtol* and the special form of the conjunction and prefix (*waCC-*) as well as the development of non-anterior *weqatal* and its distinctive stress (*weqatalti*).

5.1 The prehistory of *wayyiqtol*

The field of comparative Semitics has provided firm arguments for the separate origins of the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol* and jussive *yiqtol* on the one hand and non-anterior *yiqtol* on the other. The latter derives from original **yaqtulu* (pl. **yaqtulūna*), while the ancestor of the former had no final vowel and *n*-ending, i.e. **yaqtul* (pl. **yaqtulū*).¹ The short prefix forms are attested in most ancient Semitic languages, with jussive or anterior meaning or both, as in the Canaanite language reflected in the Amarna letters (Rainey 1996, 221–254; for a recent treatment, see Baranowski 2016). The short form is clearly distinguished in the Classical Arabic jussive *yaqtul* (vs. non-anterior *yaqtulu*). In addition, a form synchronically identical to the jussive is used after the negation *lam* to indicate anteriority (in other contexts marked by *qatala*, the cognate of Hebrew *qatal*).² Even in the unvowelled writing of Epigraphic South Arabian (Sabaic), the original distinction between **yaqtul* and **yaqtulu* may be reflected in certain cases, though the real situation remains unclear (Stein 2013, 88, §7.3.1.7; cf. ib., 80, §6.3.4–5). In the oldest stages of Aramaic the distinction between jussive (< **yaqtul*) and non-anterior (< **yaqtulu*) is regularly preserved in the presence or absence of final *-n*, and in

¹ I use the term "anterior" for the meaning of (non-jussive) **yaqtul* in PS, as I do for the corresponding category in Hebrew. Other scholars use "preterite" or "perfective," implying that the form had absolute past or aspectual meaning. To decide this question we would need a full view of the PS verbal system, which is not easy to obtain (if it is possible at all). A crucial question seems to be whether a verb form corresponding to the Akkadian perfect (*iptaras*) existed in PS and which meaning it marked at that stage. In addition, at the WS stage when **qatala* developed into an anterior tense form, it might be argued that the relics of **yaqtul* became more restricted to the simple past. However, in the attested languages, such a distinction does not seem relevant (in the HVS it clearly is not, cf. 3.6). The question cannot be treated further here, but I am not convinced that we have evidence for an absolute tense or aspectual analysis of the verb forms in PS (or WS). I find the general arguments for the relative temporal interpretation of the HVS applicable in most of the attested languages as well. As noted in ch. 4, some languages may be argued to have become more absolute tense prominent or aspect prominent, though without invalidating the fundamental relative temporal character of the system. Hence, I prefer to use the terms anterior vs. non-anterior for all the languages.

² Both short forms are often collectively referred to as the "apocopatus." See Fischer 1972, 96–97, §194–195, and 104, §214.

different forms of III-y roots (Segert 1983, 252–253). The situation in Phoenician seems to be similar though the writing system prevents certainty. Hackett (2004, 379, §4.5.2) thinks that original **yaqtul* and **yaqtulu* are indistinguishable in the attested forms.³ In the mostly vowelless Ugaritic writing system, the short form can be distinguished when the final consonant is *alef*, in which case the writing system is capable of indicating following *-u*, *-a*, or *-i* (also used for zero).⁴ The jussive use of short *yqtl-Ø* seems to be uncontroversial. However, scholars are divided on the anterior use of *yqtl-Ø* in Ugaritic. E.g., Tropper (2012, 454, §73.25) and Hackett (2012) argue in favour, while Bordreuil and Pardee (2009, 46) have adopted Greenstein's view that "the /YQTLØ/ perfective/preterite was no longer used with this function but in free variation with the /YQTLu/ forms." In prose, the supposed anterior usage is attested in a few, uncertain instances, while the cases in poetry are (possibly) much more numerous. Of course, forms in poetry are notoriously difficult to interpret, and Smith (1994, 41) argues that the use of *yqtl-Ø* for the past was "obsolescent already in the time of the written composition of the poetic texts" and thus "a mark of archaism" (cf. 3.4 and appendix 9 on archaic **yaqtul* in BH).

The situation is much clearer in Akkadian. The short form is used as the regular anterior tense (*iprus*) and as a jussive in the so-called precativ, always with a preposed particle (*liprus*). However, there is no contrast with a long form derived from **yaqtulu*, since non-anterior meaning is expressed by means of the form *iparras*, while the *u*-ending known from CS **yaqtulu* is attested as a marker of verbs in (some) subordinate clauses (von Soden 1969, 102–109, §78–83). The non-anterior in Classical Ethiopic is *yəqattəl*, while **yaqtulu* is unattested.⁵ The short form, on the other hand, is preserved

³ A morphological distinction between short and long forms is noted in a few cases in Friedrich and Röllig (Guzzo; Mayer) 1999, 82, §135, and 119, §177.

⁴ Tropper 2012, 620, §75.232. He notes that the interpretation of the writing system is not without problems. Cf. *ib.*, 655–658, §75.531e–f on problems in distinguishing **yaqtul* and **yaqtulu* in III-y/w roots.

⁵ The identification of Ethiopic *yəqattəl* with Akkadian *iparras* is not unproblematic. However, the two forms clearly reflect the same type and function. The majority view seems to be that **yaqtulu* as an expression of non-anteriority (or "imperfectivity" in the terminology of aspectually minded scholars) is an innovation, probably derived from an originally subordinate construction as attested in the Akkadian subjunctive with *-u* (e.g. Hamori 1973; Hasselbach 2012). Other scholars argue that **yaqtulu* is the original non-anterior (or "imperfective") form. According to this view, the use of Akkadian *iparras* and Ethiopic *yəqattəl* in this function is a secondary development, which might have taken place independently in the two separate branches of Semitic (e.g. Andersen 2000; Kouwenberg 2010). So far, none of the approaches appears to have provided a smooth explanation of all the facts. Since the discussion involves the meaning and function of

as the subjunctive or jussive form *yəqtəl* (Tropper 2002, 89–90, §44.13–14). Original *u* is regularly reduced to *ə* in Ethiopic and disappears in final position (hence, *yəqtəl* might theoretically reflect **yaqtulu*), but the original lack of vowel can be seen before second person object suffixes (*yəqtəlka* with no connecting vowel; ib., 94, §44.23). In addition, there is a possible relic of anterior **yaqtul* in the root *bhl* ("say"). Instead of the expected *qatala*, a prefix form marks anteriority (e.g. *yəbe* "he said"). However, the interpretation of this usage as a reflex of anterior **yaqtul* has been challenged, e.g. by Voigt (1997 and 2000) who understands the form as historic present (i.e. as a *yəqattəl*; cf. Tropper 2002, 126–127).⁶ What was stated in connection with the use of the term historic present in Hebrew (3.1) applies here as well – like Hebrew *yiqtol*, *yəqattəl* is a non-anterior form and not a present tense. Still, the point that a non-anterior tense expressing concomitance can be used to introduce direct speech is valid (a similar usage is attested in other Semitic languages). Yet, if *yəbe* is a *yəqattəl* the frequent combination of *wayəbe* ("and he said") with the particle *'ənza* ("while") plus what is obviously a *yəqattəl* of the root *bhl* seems a bit odd (*wayəbe 'ənza yəbəl*, "and he said while saying"; cf. Lambdin 1978, 182). The possibility that *yəbe* is a relic of **yaqtul* probably remains open.

Several other languages preserve relics of **yaqtul* with anterior meaning. In Moabite, a form similar to Hebrew *wayyiqtol* occurs more than 30 times on the Mesha stele (see Dearman 1989). Six occurrences are from III-*y* roots (lines 3, 7, 9 and 10). As in Hebrew, they lack the final radical, probably reflecting the loss, as in Hebrew, of the final vowel that resulted from the contraction of the final *-y* and the preceding vowel to short *-i* (also attested in Arabic and Akkadian), thus representing the original short form.⁷ As in CH, the form is used in initial position, while a form similar to Hebrew *qatal* is used when other elements precede the verb in a sentence. As noted in 3.8

reconstructed verb forms at non-attested stages of Semitic, a solution may not be reachable. On possible Hebrew relics of a form similar to *iparras*, see Meyer 1958 and Rössler 1961. Other scholars have tried to find relics in Ugaritic but few modern scholars embrace such views (see Cook 2012, 98, n. 31). Note that the doubling of the middle radical in Akkadian *iparras* (and the similar Ethiopic form) was not recognized in the early period of research, which partially explains how Bauer could imagine a connection between this form and **qatala* (Bauer 1910, 17; cf. Cook 2012, 100, n. 33).

⁶ Smith (1991, 12–13) notes another relic of anterior **yaqtul* in Ethiopic, viz. *yəqtəl* (identical with the jussive) after words meaning "before." For more on this question, see below (on Hebrew *בְּפָנָיו*).

⁷ III-*w* roots, on the other hand, seem to have preserved the final *waw*, both in *wayyiqtol* and in simple *yiqtol* (3sm *wayyiqtol* וַיַּעַבְדוּ in l. 5, 1s *yiqtol* אַעֲבֹד in l. 6). See Jackson 1989, 106.

(n. 71), the simple *yiqtol* in 1. 5 (יאנף) is hardly an anterior form reflecting **yaqtul*, but rather a non-anterior form (< **yaqtulu*) expressing durativity or concomitance. Other cases of relics of **yaqtul* are attested in Sabaic (Stein 2013, 132, §12.1.3; Beeston 1984, 20, §7.6; according to Beeston, the usage is "markedly frequent in a dozen or so mid period texts" but "otherwise rare"). The earliest stages of Aramaic, too, attest to anterior **yaqtul*, three cases in the ZKR inscription and several in Deir 'Alla and Tel Dan.⁸ In Phoenician, a few cases of anterior *yqtl* may be attested but the evidence is highly uncertain and alternative interpretations are possible (Friedrich and Röllig [Guzzo; Mayer] 1999, 191–192, §266; Hackett 2004, 379, §4.5.2).

Returning to Hebrew, it seems ill-advised to ignore this comparative evidence when describing *wayyiqtol* (in contrast to the scholars mentioned in 1.1.4.3). As outlined in 3.7, the distinction between **yaqtul/*yaqtulū* and **yaqtulu/*yaqtulūna* was preserved (in some grammatical persons) in certain root types (II-*w/y*, III-*h*, as well as generally in *hif.*). Most roots, however, lost the distinction. A certain degree of levelling took place even with roots where the formal distinction could be upheld. Yet, in the majority of cases, *yiqtols* with jussive meaning (including *weyiqtols*) as well as *wayyiqtols* exhibit a form that reflects original **yaqtul* rather than **yaqtulu*. There is no reason, then, to disregard the near-consensus on the background of *wayyiqtol* in PS anterior **yaqtul*. Similarly, there is no reason to disregard a priori the idea of simple *yiqtols* (outside of *wayyiqtol*) being relics of anterior **yaqtul*. As argued in 3.4, however, very few convincing examples exist. Two other cases are often discussed in this connection, viz. the well-known use of *yiqtol* with אָנֹכִי and אָנֹכִי. However, as noted in 3.5.1, the type of *yiqtol* used with these particles (or at least with אָנֹכִי) is probably not the one derived from **yaqtul* but rather "ordinary" *yiqtol* < **yaqtulu*. The basic meaning of אָנֹכִי is clearly compatible with the non-anterior meaning of *yiqtol* (< **yaqtulu*), indicating

⁸ See, e.g., Tropper 1996. Except for two cases in Tel Dan, all the Aramaic cases are *wyqtl*, a fact which has led to a debate (primarily Tropper vs. Muraoka) concerning the relationship between the Aramaic forms and Hebrew *wayyiqtol*. In addition to Tropper 1996 (where further references can be found), see Muraoka's reaction to Tropper (Muraoka 1998). The question is whether the Aramaic forms should be seen as "converted," i.e. whether anterior *yqtl* is only preserved in this specific context. At first glance, the cases without *w-* in Tel Dan indicate otherwise but they may be expressions of concomitance or posteriority in the past (i.e. < **yaqtulu*; cf. Tropper 1996, 641–643). Note that a few scholars consider Tel Dan a forgery (e.g. Gmirkin 2002). Also note that the characterization of the language of Deir 'Alla is debated. Garr (1985, 2) calls it "idiosyncratic." Cf. also Huehnergard 1991.

posteriority in a past context (future in the past).⁹ An event which has yet to happen at R is expressed using the non-anterior form.¹⁰

The formal side of *yiqtol* after וְאֵץ seems to point to a background in **yaqtulu* rather than **yaqtul* in this case as well. In fact, only 1 Kgs 8:1 has a short form (וְאֵץ יִקְהַל). However, the perceived function of the form in connection with this particle is more difficult to reconcile with non-anterior meaning. The usual rendering of the construction ("then" and simple past tense) seems to indicate that *yiqtol* in these cases is indeed a reflex of anterior **yaqtul*. Hendel's attempt to describe it as "relative future" (similarly to *yiqtol* after וְאֵץ) is not persuasive (1996, 159–160). His point is that the event marked by *yiqtol* is future when seen from the point of view of the preceding event, i.e. the same kind of reasoning that was the basis for the "relative (consecutive)" approach to *wayyiqtol* associated with Koolhaas, Schröder, and others. Hendel's use of the term "relative future" is inadequate for the same reason that was outlined above (1.1.4.1). However, this does not mean that *yiqtol* after וְאֵץ cannot be interpreted as a reflex of non-anterior **yaqtulu*. Instead of future in the past, the specific type of non-anteriority marked by the form in this context would be concomitance or durativity in the past (thus, again, the problem is really one of translation; in Hebrew, the same verb form is used for expressing future in the past and all other types of non-anteriority). This was the view of Rabinowitz (1984, 54), "the action is thought of as

⁹ E.g. Hendel 1996, 160; Joosten 2012a, 282. As Cook (2012, 261) points out, three *yiqtol*s occurring after וְאֵץ have paragogic or energetic *nun*. This, too, points towards **yaqtulu*. Kawashima (2010, 17, n. 20, and 19–20, n. 28) stresses the fundamental difference between the usage with וְאֵץ and וְאֵץ. He sees *yiqtol* after וְאֵץ as "retaining the normal tense value of the (unconverted) imperfect" while *yiqtol* after וְאֵץ is seen as "converted" as in *wayyiqtol*, but not as a direct continuation of archaic **yaqtul*. Other scholars make a similar distinction between the two constructions. E.g., Cook (2012, 263) sees וְאֵץ+*yiqtol* as "archaic past."

¹⁰ Akkadian uses its non-anterior tense (*iparras*) with *lāma* ("before") when the reference is to the past (e.g. "*lāma allakam eqlam ipšurū*, "They (m) sold the field before I came"; Huehnergard 2011, 286). This usage is (*mutatis mutandis*) similar to the one attested in Hebrew. In Ethiopic, on the other hand, clauses introduced by words meaning "before," viz. *'amqadma* and (*za*)-*'anbala*, use the synchronic jussive (*yəqtəl*) rather than non-anterior *yəqattəl* (Tropper 2002, 195–196, §54.333–334 and 243, §65.56). As mentioned above (n. 6), Smith sees this as a relic of anterior **yaqtul* and it might be argued that it is problematic to see a jussive meaning in these contexts (however, Ethiopic frequently uses the jussive in subordinate clauses). Alternatively, this usage might be a relic of **yaqtulu*, which is otherwise not attested in Ethiopic (final *-u* would be regularly lost; the *n*-endings in the pl., however, are more problematic to account for). Arabic, too, uses the synchronic jussive/apocopatus after the conjunction *lammā* ("not yet"; Fischer 1972, 96, §194). This, of course, cannot be < **yaqtulu* (since this form is regularly preserved as such in Arabic), but must be a relic of **yaqtul* similar to the use of the same form after *lam*.

having taken place before the completion of, hence as incomplete relative to, the actions described as completed in the preceding context."¹¹ If this is the case, the difference between $\text{וַיִּשְׁרַע} + \text{yiqtol}$ and the more frequent $\text{וַיִּשְׁרַע} + \text{qatal}$ would be equivalent to other cases of anterior forms referring to simple past events vs. non-anterior forms marking concomitant, durative action in the past. As noted in 3.8, this use of *yiqtol* (and *weqatal*) is rather infrequent. However, as was also argued there, the comparative evidence seems to indicate that it was a natural way of using *yiqtol* or its ancestor prior to the rise of the PTC. Such an earlier usage may have been preserved in connection with a specific particle such as וַיִּשְׁרַע . Yet, it is very difficult to demonstrate the supposed difference in meaning between וַיִּשְׁרַע with *yiqtol* and וַיִּשְׁרַע with *qatal* in the texts – why would Exod 15:1 use *yiqtol* ("at that time Moses was singing")?¹² The alternative would be to disregard the formal evidence and claim that *yiqtol*s after וַיִּשְׁרַע in a past context do indeed derive from **yaqtul*, but were possibly later subjected to alteration "in the process of transmission, being written *plene* and then reinterpreted as *yiqtol*s" (Cook 2012, 263, n. 97). In either case we seem to deal with the preservation of an archaic use of a verb form (whether anterior **yaqtul* or the concomitant or durative use of *yiqtol* < **yaqtulu*) in a restricted context with a specific particle.¹³

5.2 How to explain *waCC-*

Much attention has been devoted to the peculiar form of the initial conjunction "and" in *wayyiqtol* (if it *is* the conjunction "and") and to the accompanying doubling of the prefix consonant, i.e. the characteristic *waCC*-element in *wayyiqtol* (in 1s *wā'*-, instead of a doubled *alef*, the vowel is long).¹⁴ As noted in 1.1.4.2, Ewald proposed two theories (*waCC-* contains the verb וַיִּשְׁרַע or the particle וַיִּשְׁרַע), while Schultens and Koolhaas compared the special vocalization to the definite article (also Testen 1998, 183–206; Hatav 2004, 498

¹¹ Joosten (2012a, 110) seems to misunderstand this approach, arguing that if the construction "implied some type of 'backtracking' or 'flashback,' one would expect the QATAL form to be used." Cook (2012, 261) seems to have misunderstood Rabinowitz in the same way. However, Rabinowitz' point is not that the event marked by *yiqtol* happened before the preceding event, but before the *completion* of that event, i.e. simultaneously with it. Revell (1989, 11) follows Rabinowitz' approach, stating that *yiqtol* after וַיִּשְׁרַע in the past represents an event "which is present relative to its past context."

¹² There are a few cases of $\text{וַיִּשְׁרַע} + \text{PTC}$, which clearly refer to this kind of past concomitance. See Joosten 2012a, 112; Bergström 2014, 136.

¹³ Regardless of the real background, it might be argued that writers and readers must have understood the forms as non-anteriors.

¹⁴ A few 1s *wayyiqtol*s resemble *weyiqtol*s with short *wa-*. Cf. Driver 1874, 73, n. 1; Joosten 2012a, 14, n. 13. This may be the result of influence from the vocalization/syllabification of the rest of the word (all the cases seem to be *pi.* or *pol.*).

and 500; van de Sande 2008, 226ff. and 370). McFall (1982, 217–219, n. 13-2) provides a list of suggestions (cf. Cook 2012, 258). Most scholars have interpreted *waCC-* as a reflex of the conjunction "and" plus different particles or as a reduced form of הוה with prefixed *waw* or of an alternate form of the same verb (הוה) without prefixed *waw*. E.g., according to Hetzron (1969, 9), **hawaya* "it was" became first **haway* and then, as a prefix, **way-* > *waCC-*). Others see similarities between *waCC-* and the Indo-European augment.¹⁵ Young (1953) proposed an Egyptian connection. Bauer and Leander (1965, 218–219, §24d) thought that the doubled prefix consonant was a result of the hesitation of the speaker. Apparently the consonant was lengthened while the speaker decided which verb to use – a highly unlikely interpretation, especially given the fact that *wayyiqtol* is mostly used in continuous, sequential narrative. Advocates of the SV approach to Hebrew word order (see appendix 11) prefer an explanation with some kind of extra element in front of the verb since "it can account for the obligatory VS order for *wayyiqtol* in terms of triggered inversion" (Cook 2012, 258; cf. Holmstedt 2006, 20).

In contrast to these more or less fanciful theories, what I believe to be the correct explanation involves neither invisible particles nor compound verb forms that are otherwise unattested in Hebrew. In fact, it is possible to explain *waCC-* as a regular outcome of the conjunction *wa-* ("and") plus the old anterior form **yaqtul*, provided that we accept that this form was stressed on the prefix (at least in some grammatical persons). This was Bergsträsser's view (1929, 22, §5e: "Die Verdoppelung ist entstanden als Vortonverdoppelung"). Likewise, Birkeland (1940, 71) argued that **wayáqtul* would naturally undergo lengthening of the first *a* (pretonic lengthening) but this was replaced by "die mit Vortondehnung gleichwertige Vortonverdoppelung."¹⁶ Instead of **wāyáqtul*, we get **wayyáqtul* > *wayyiqtol* (the timing of the other phonetic developments from **yáqtul* to *yiqtol* is not relevant for the present discussion).¹⁷ However, something else seems to be at work in the process

¹⁵ For a comparison between *wayyiqtol* and the augment (in a typological sense), see Wikander 2010. Testen (1998, 197–198) makes a similar comparison.

¹⁶ McFall (1982, 219, n. 13-2) mentions neither Bergsträsser nor Birkeland as representatives of this approach. He refers to Siedl and Artom for later variants of the theory (Artom 1965, 9; Siedl 1971, 17–19). Also, Blau 2010, 152, §3.5.12.2.16.

¹⁷ On pretonic doubling, see, e.g. Bauer and Leander 1965, 219, §24f, and 238, §26i'; Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 72, §18f; Blau 2010, 124, §3.5.7.4.6. Pretonic lengthening is the change of *a* > *ā* in the syllable before a stressed syllable (under specific circumstances, which are not easy to describe, other vowels may be lengthened). This sound law ceased to be operative at some point. Vowels that wound up in pretonic position after the general

as well. This development does not take place with "and" plus nouns with initial stress (there is no \dagger ִּרְבֹּֿנִי instead of רְבֹֿנִי).¹⁸ The difference is that in the case of *wayyiqtol* the phonetic development was part of a paradigm with conjugation according to grammatical person and number. In 1s, the prefix is a laryngeal, which does not allow doubling, for which reason $w\bar{a}C-$ was the only possible result. In other contexts, there is a regular correspondence between long vowel plus laryngeal and short vowel plus doubled non-laryngeal (e.g. in *pi.*). This correspondence must have led to the conclusion that if we have $w\bar{a}C-$ when C is a laryngeal, we should have $waCC-$ when C is not a laryngeal, viz. in the other grammatical persons.¹⁹

5.2.1 Jussive **yaqtúl*, anterior **yáqtul*?

There is one major problem with the theory described above. If we want to explain why $waCC-$ became the marker of the anterior formation *wayyiqtol* in particular, we need to claim that the initial stress on **yáqtul* was restricted to the anterior usage of this form. The jussive, in contrast, must have been **yaqtúl* at some stage of evolution prior to the development of Hebrew *wayyiqtol*. If this was not the case, the same phonetic development would have

shift of stress from the penultimate to the final syllable were reduced rather than lengthened (e.g. $*qatálū > *qātálū > *qātalú > *qātalu =$ קָטְלוּ). Some scholars see this as an unnatural phonetic process, the later reduction of pretonic vowels being more natural. Hence, the phenomenon has been described as very late, possibly a compensating reaction to Aramaic influence (where reduction is the regular development of pretonic vowels). See the discussion (and further references) in Blau 2010, 123–132, §3.5.7.4–7. Malone (1990, 461), in contrast, sees the phenomenon as a natural development, "a genuine sound change," which "occurred quite early in the history of Hebrew." He refers to similar processes in other languages (ib., 468, n. 26).

¹⁸ The lengthening of pretonic a in the conjunction "and" (outside of *wayyiqtol*) is restricted to certain environments, mostly in positions of pause where the stress, which caused the lengthening, must have been clearly preserved. In context, the stress would often be reduced and caused no lengthening. E.g., in Isa 30:30 we have $\text{וְנִפְצוּ וְנִזְרְמוּ וְנִצְרְמוּ וְנִצְרְמוּ}$, with one $w\bar{a}-$ introducing the final element in a pair (hence in minor pause) and one $w\bar{a}-$ introducing the first part of a construct phrase (with reduced or no stress). The same distinction can be observed in Isa 35:8 ($\text{וְהָיָה שָׂם מִסְּלוּל וְנִדְרָה וְנִדְרָה וְנִדְרָה הַקִּדְשׁ יִקְרָא לָהּ}$). On this question, see Revell 2015. Revell emphasizes the fact that the accents and the vocalization do not always agree on the placement of pause.

¹⁹ Of course, a similar result could have been reached with nouns (e.g. וְנִפְצוּ vs. וְנִפְצוּ), resulting in the use of $waCC-$ before all nouns with stress on the initial syllable, but since such cases were not part of a specific paradigm, there was no incentive for this development. Revell (1984, 443) presents an alternative reason for doubling in *wayyiqtol*. He thinks that the syllable $wa-$ was only pretonic in some cases, and since "other forms did not have initial stress, the consonant following the conjunction had to be doubled to maintain the length of the syllable."

taken place in "and" plus jussive (i.e. *weyiqtol*), which is clearly not the case. At a later stage, as is generally accepted, Hebrew experienced a general shift of stress to the final syllable, but in certain root and conjugation types, the phonetic makeup of the entire formation allowed the stress on the prefix to be preserved in *wayyiqtol* (in words with an open penultimate and a closed final syllable, e.g. וַיִּשְׁפָּט). This does not occur in the jussive (which, with the same root, would be וַיִּשְׁפֹּט). It seems necessary to assume that at some stage prior to Hebrew as we know it, a distinction existed between anterior **yáqtul* and jussive **yaqtúl*.

Hetzron (1969) argued that this distinction goes back to PS. However, while his arguments for positing a stress-based distinction are convincing in relation to the Hebrew evidence (ib., 8–18), the non-Hebrew material is more problematic. In fact, none of the evidence from other languages (Akkadian, Ethiopic, and, in a supporting role, Arabic) is conclusive. Hetzron explains the Akkadian precativ *liprus* as a contraction of the particle *lū* and the jussive **yaqtúl* (Akkadian *iprus*) (ib., 3–5). The same particle with emphatic or asseverative meaning occurs before the preterite *iprus* without contraction. According to Hetzron, the minimal pair *liprus* "may he separate" vs. *lū iprus* "he separated indeed" derives from an original difference of stress. In the jussive with stress on the final syllable, the two vowels (after the Akkadian development of the prefix to *i-*) contracted. In the anterior form, the stress on the prefix prevented contraction. However, Huehnergard (1983) argues that the two particles should be derived from different original forms with different vowels. If this is correct, there is no argument for different stress patterns in Akkadian. In addition, it could be argued that the different outcomes were caused by a difference of stress on the particle, with the asseverative particle carrying a separate stress, while the one used with the jussive had no stress. In any case, the Akkadian evidence for **yáqtul* vs. **yaqtúl* is hardly compelling.

The same applies to Hetzron's use of Classical Ethiopic (1969, 5–8). He argues that the special form of the final syllable in *yābe* ("he said") from the root *bhl* is due to the original non-final stress in **yáqtul*. Final *-e* derives from *-ay*, which Hetzron explains as the result of palatalization caused by the weak final syllable without stress, as opposed to the non-anterior ("imperfect," *yābəl*) and jussive (*yābal*), which retained the *l* because the stress was on the syllable containing it. Hetzron admits that this explanation is "strongly hypothetical and highly questionable," since the presumed palatalization of final *-al* lacks parallels anywhere else in the language. However, he thinks that alternative explanations (which must presuppose an unmotivated dual development of the same form) are even more problematic (ib.,

8). Yet, this isolated case is hardly a convincing argument for a PS distinction between **yáqtul* and **yaqtúl*. As noted above, some scholars see *yəbe* as non-anterior, and Lambdin (1978, 182) has proposed a different explanation for the loss of the final *-l* that would make Hetzron's stress-based approach unnecessary ("an old misdivision when a dative suffix was attached: *yebēlana* > *yebē lana* he said to us"). While none of these approaches disproves Hetzron's idea, they do underline the fact that the evidence from Ethiopic is very weak.²⁰

Some scholars have embraced Hetzron's idea,²¹ while more seem to reject it. In some recent publications on the HVS, it seems to be taken for granted that the idea has been effectively refuted.²² On the one hand, the PS character of the stress distinction is indeed uncertain at best, as argued above. In addition, jussive meaning can in fact be derived from an anterior/past meaning (cf. the connection between irrealis and anterior forms in Hebrew and other languages, 1.2.1, and the discussion of **qatala* below).²³ On the other hand, the attested stress distinction in Hebrew still remains and needs to be explained. In fact, the scholars who have argued against Hetzron have not been able to provide any coherent explanation for the Hebrew evidence. Specifically, they cannot explain why the retracted stress occurs in *wayyiqtol* and not in the jussive.

²⁰ Likewise, Hetzron's Arabic argument is, as he admits, not evidence in the real sense (1969, 3). He refers to the development of the negation *lam* in the sequence *lam yaqtul* (ib., 18–20) but this does not pertain to the alleged distinction of stress.

²¹ E.g. Verreet 1986, 79; Buccelati 1996, 183; Dolgopolsky 1999, 106–107. Lipiński (1997, 184, 336, and 358) bases his version of the theory on very unconvincing evidence from Modern Arabic colloquials, Modern South Arabian, and Berber (Kabyle). He does not refer to Hetzron explicitly but mentions Hetzron's article in the bibliography. Voigt 2004, 44 presents an approach similar to Hetzron's (without mentioning Hetzron or other references).

²² Joosten (2012a, 15, n. 17) refers to Goerwitz and Garr, seemingly as proof of refutation (see below). Cook (2012, 96, n. 26) also refers to Goerwitz (and to Huehnergard for the objection that jussive and past meaning can be derived from the same form).

²³ E.g. Huehnergard 1988, 20; Streck 1997–1998, 320; Kouwenberg 2010, 131. Note also Kouwenberg's misunderstanding of Hetzron's Hebrew evidence. He claims that "there is no reason to question the more common explanation that these forms reflect an original endless perfective and jussive **yáqtVl* and an imperfective **yaqtVlu*." The forms cited as jussives, however, are long forms (e.g., *yāqūm*), i.e. ordinary non-jussive *yiqtol*s, and "everybody" agrees that the difference between long and short forms stems from the original distinction between **yaqtulu* and **yaqtul*. The question about different stress position in the two types of short forms cannot be answered like this.

Garr (1998, lxxvi–lxxvii, n. 240) dismisses Hetzron with the claim that the "distinctive accent in the imperfect consecutive is phonologically induced and is not traceable to an underlying accentual feature of **yaqtul* preterite."²⁴ Like Joosten and Cook, Garr points to Goerwitz (1992) as his reference. Goerwitz points out that most scholars since the early twentieth century posit general penultimate stress in Proto-Hebrew. This naturally means that the jussive as well as anterior **yaqtul* must have been stressed on the prefix (in the forms without suffixes), i.e. both were **yáqtul*. Since there seems to be no decisive arguments against such a general penultimate stress in Proto-Hebrew, and possibly in PS as well, Hetzron's failure to explain the unexpected final stress in the jussive is surely one of the weak points in his theory. However, Goerwitz's approach does not provide a proper account of the attested stress distinction between the forms in Hebrew.

According to Goerwitz (1992, 199), the only way to account for the total loss of the final radical in jussives from III-*y* roots in Phoenician, Arabic, and Hebrew is to posit that the final syllable was unstressed.²⁵ To be sure, the loss of the final syllable in the jussive in Hebrew III-*h* roots is indeed problematic for a theory that posits final stress in such forms (cf. Huehnergard 1983, 587–588, n. 165; Müller 1988, 185, n. 247). Why would a stressed syllable be lost? Hetzron (1969, 14–15) argues that the expected form **yabnî* (with an early reduction from **yabnîy*; the same reduction is attested in Arabic and Akkadian) could not be maintained because the language did not allow final short vowels with stress. Hebrew had to either reinstate the final *y*, in which case the resulting form would be identical with the form developed from **yaqtulu*, or lose the vowel entirely. Since both these possibilities are attested for the jussive (i.e. there are examples of short *and* long forms

²⁴ Garr (1998, lxviii, with n. 204) outlines four phonological terms under which the stress shifts to the penultimate: 1) a closed heavy ultima, 2) an open heavy penult, 3) a closed antepenult, and 4) the underlying vowel of the ultima must be high (**i* or **u*). No. 3 is intended to limit the stress shift to *wayyiqtol*s, but this approach leaves the closed antepenult, i.e. the special form of the conjunction and prefix *waCC-*, unexplained. As argued above, the only satisfying explanation of *waCC-* is to understand it as the result of the stressed prefix, instead of the other way around, as Garr does, deriving the stress from the (unexplained) heavy syllable *waCC-*.

²⁵ Note that the Arabic forms retain the final vowel. They do not necessarily imply lack of stress. The Phoenician orthography is ambiguous but seems to reflect total loss of the final syllable as in Hebrew (Friedrich and Röllig [Guzzo; Mayer] 1999, 119, §177).

with jussive function), whereas the *wayyiqtol* is always short, Hetzron concludes that two different original types were involved (ib., 15).²⁶ Alternatively, we may suggest that the loss of the final syllable spread from prefix-stressed *wayyiqtol* (where it was regular) to the jussive because of a perceived correspondence between *wayyiqtol* and the jussive. The perception of such a correspondence probably originated in II-*w/y* roots where **yáqtul* as well as **yaqtúl* (e.g. ***yáCūC* and ***yaCúC*) had to have a short vowel in the closed syllable, as opposed to **yaqtulu* (i.e. **yaCūCu*). Hence, though the vowel quality developed differently in *wayyiqtol* and the jussive (due to the difference in stress, וַיִּשָׁב vs. וַיִּשָׁב), both forms exhibit a shorter form in contrast to simple *yiqtol* (< **yaqtulu*, i.e. וַיִּשָׁב). This correspondence was apparently taken over by III-*h* where the short form (< anterior **yáqtul*) was, in many cases, taken over by the jussive. The same perceived correspondence between *wayyiqtol* and jussive may be the basis for the occasional occurrence of unshortened 1s/p *wayyiqtol* as well as the use of "cohortative" long forms in 1s/p *wayyiqtol* (in QH quite regularly). As noted (Bergsträsser 1929, 22, §5d; Qimron 1986, 46), since the cohortative is the first person version of the jussive, it makes sense to use this form also in 1s/p *wayyiqtol*, based on a perceived similarity of jussive and *wayyiqtol* in certain root types. The rare cases of jussives with stress on the prefix can be explained as a result of the same perceived correspondence (see Exod 23:1, אֲלֵ-תִּשְׁעַת יְדֵי עַם-יִשְׂרָאֵל).

Goerwitz (1992, 200) argues that all forms ending in consonants at some point underwent a stress shift. Hence, **yáqtul* became **yaqtúl*. This applies to the jussive as well as the anterior function. The only exception to this shift is III-*h* because these forms, according to Goerwitz, had already lost the final radical and hence did not end in a consonant. In Goerwitz's view, only these forms preserve the original penultimate stress. After this near-universal stress shift to the final syllable another stress shift occurred, reintroducing prefix stress in some forms (ib., 202). However, he cannot explain why penultimate stress was reintroduced in *wayyiqtol* and not in the jussive ("for reasons unknown," ib., 203). His paper "does not deal with the question of why retraction occurred mainly in the preterite. I merely demonstrate the linguistic likelihood that it did so." He refers to Revell (1984) for a "plausible explanation" (ib., 202, n. 37). However, Revell provides no such explanation.

²⁶ Hetzron (ib., 14, n. 4) notes that sometimes *wayyiqtol* has a long form, "before laryngals (gutturals)." Some cases, however, occur elsewhere (e.g. 1 Kgs 19:8). As Hetzron observes (ib., 18), in most verbs, all the prefix-forms evolved into identical forms and therefore a certain degree of levelling in both directions should come as no surprise (cf. below).

Revell (1984, 437–439) describes the stress patterns of BH. With some specific exceptions, stress is final in words ending in consonants and penultimate in words ending in vowels. Accordingly, prefix stress in **yaqtul* cannot be considered original – both types must have had final stress, since they ended in a consonant. However, like Goerwitz, Revell highlights III-*h* verbs. In these verbs, "the final syllable was treated as open from an early date, so that the form received penultimate stress under the standard pattern" (ib., 442), i.e., because such forms ended in a vowel. These forms, then, served as a model after which other *wayyiqtol*s fulfilling certain phonetic requirements received penultimate stress, which was "taken as characteristic of the category" (ib., 443). According to Revell, penultimate stress and the characteristic *waCC-* were very late phenomena, which only came into use at a time when *wayyiqtol* was no longer a living part of the spoken language (ib., 444). There are two main problems with Revell's approach. First, contrary to Goerwitz's assertion, Revell does not explain why the supposed retraction of stress occurred in *wayyiqtol* only and not in the jussive. Since according to this approach anterior and jussive **yaqtul* were identical, both must have had prefix stress in III-*h*. Accordingly, there is no reason why this stress should be taken as characteristic of one category and not the other. Second, the general synchronic BH stress pattern as described by Revell is unlikely to have been operative at an earlier stage of the language, for which, as noted above, general penultimate stress must be posited.²⁷

If stress was penultimate at a pre-Hebrew stage, anterior **yáqtul* was perfectly regular, while jussive **yaqtúl* needs to be explained. Janssens (1982, 52) argues that several forms used in contexts of command have what he calls sentence stress as opposed to word stress (the jussive, the imperative and 2sm *weqataltá*). I.e., the special stress is derived from the overall tone of a commanding sentence and is therefore not restricted by the general rule of stress placement. This idea might be improved if we reconstruct the PS imperative not as **qutúl*, as Janssens does, but rather as **qtul* with only one vowel, which must accordingly have been stressed without violating the rule, i.e. **qtúl* (cf. Birkeland 1940, 75; Lipiński 1997, 335). In the various languages, the consonant cluster was resolved in different ways, either as in Arabic with a preposed vowel when necessary, or as in Hebrew with a vowel

²⁷ Before the loss of case endings and the vowels of various personal endings (e.g. $\text{ִּתְּ} < *tumu$) practically no words ended in consonants. Exceptions are 3sf *qatal*, viz. **qatalat*, the imperative, and **yaqtul* in some grammatical persons. The later generalized stress shift towards the end of word (except when prohibited by various phonetic constellations) seems to be the result of levelling since most words had acquired final stress already when final short vowels were lost (e.g. 3sm **qatála > qātál*).

between the two consonants > **qutúl* > קטל. This aberrant stress in a form with a very clear semantic content might have been the model for a similar aberrant stress in the semantically related jussive, which was part of the same volitive system.

As noted above, Hetzron did not think that stress played a role in the development of *waCC-*. It is clear, however, that the simple, phonetically based explanation for the special vocalization and doubling of the prefix consonant outlined above is a major argument in favour of a distinction, at one point in the evolution of Hebrew, between jussive **yaqtúl* and anterior **yáqtul*. Revell (1984, 443) argues against various scholars who posit some verbal or adverbial element as part of *waCC-* and embraces the pretonic explanation. However, in Revell's theory, this only applies to III-*h*. Importantly, from Revell's point of view, this development must also have taken place in the jussive, which makes it difficult to see why *waCC-* would become the mark of *wayyiqtol* specifically. However, if the phonetic explanation of *waCC-* is coupled with the distinction between anterior **yáqtul* and jussive **yaqtúl*, it is easy to see how the special vocalization could become the distinguishing mark of the anterior category. When final stress was generalized and final short vowels had been lost, all types of *yiqtol* (i.e. from **yaqtulu*, **yáqtul*, and **yaqtúl*) became identical in most roots. Hence, the special form of the conjunction and prefix consonant became the main marker of anterior meaning. Jussives with preposed *waw* do not have *waCC-*, not even in short III-*h* forms with prefix stress (see Ezra 1:3 וַיַּעַל and וַיִּבֶן).²⁸

To sum up, a distinction between **yaqtúl* and **yáqtul* in PS is theoretically possible, but far from certain. In fact, there is no real positive evidence. The Hebrew evidence, in contrast, seems to demand such a distinction. As noted above, there is a plausible connection between the jussive and the anterior function (through the irrealis usage of the latter). Hence, the basic starting

²⁸ According to Hetzron (1969, 2), stress in **yáqtul* was on the prefix throughout the paradigm, also in forms with personal suffixes (2sf, 1p, 2p). As a starting point, however, there is no reason to deviate from the basic penultimate stress pattern. I.e., prefix stress and hence the development of *waCC-* may have been restricted to forms without suffixes and only secondarily extended to 2sf, 1p, and 2p (cf. Bergsträsser 1929, 22, §5e). It bears repeating that much levelling has taken place. Since all types of *yiqtol* were alike in most roots, we should not be surprised to find irregular long *wayyiqtol*s (and jussives) once in a while. Such forms do not show that *wayyiqtol* is "an unlikely preterite" (Robar 2013, 37; 2014, 79). Tropper (1998, 167) argues that unshortened III-*h* forms are not necessarily reflexes of **yaqtulu*. However, instead of claiming that long forms can be the regular development of **yáqtul* in III-*h*, it seems preferable to ascribe such forms to simple analogical levelling brought about by the general development of all *yiqtol*s into the same form in most root types. Further, see n. 41 in ch. 6 on the tendency to use short forms after *waw*, regardless of function.

point of both forms could be the same **yáqtul* with the expected penultimate stress. Secondly, either in PS itself (if one accepts Hetzron's arguments) or – more likely – at least at some stage prior to the evolution of the well-known Hebrew system, the jussive must have acquired final stress (probably in imitation of the imperative, as argued above).²⁹ Birkeland (1940, 73) correctly notes that the stress must have moved to the final syllable in the jussive earlier than was the case in the anterior form that formed the basis for *wayyiqtol*.³⁰ In any case, once we accept that stress played a role in the development of *wayyiqtol*, it becomes possible to throw new light on the origins of *weqatal* and the final stress attested in some forms. Taking into account the position of the stress as part of the process allows us to flesh out the analogical approach to *weqatal* and its position in the general system. In addition, if the position of the stress did in fact play a role in the development of the system, it seems necessary to assume that it was part of the real language at a comparatively early stage. Hence, seeing *waCC-* and the final stress in *weqatal* (1s and 2sm) as late, artificial phenomena seems unwarranted, as will be argued in the following section.

5.3 The origins of *weqatal*

In contrast to the relative consensus concerning the origins of *wayyiqtol* (with regard to the derivation of the *yiqtol* part from anterior/past/preterite **yaqtul*), the origins of *weqatal* is a much more open question. As indicated in 3.6, some scholars deny that *weqatal* constitutes a category separate from simple *qatal* (Cook, Bergström). However, as argued there, the non-anterior meaning of *weqatal*, and hence the need to see it as belonging to the same

²⁹ In other cases, the imperative exhibits forms similar to ordinary, non-jussive *yiqtol* (cf. III-*h* and II-*w*). According to Bauer and Leander (1965, 391, §56t), the long vowel in imperative 2sm II-*w* is due to influence from the other forms of the paradigm with vowel endings.

³⁰ Blau (1971, 23) cautiously suggests that the preservation of penultimate stress in some *wayyiqtol*s (in contrast to the jussive) may have been caused by analogy to 1s, 2sm, and 1p *qatal* – because *wayyiqtol* was used in continuation of "perfect forms stressed on the penult." I find Blau's suggestion less convincing than the semantically based explanation above, especially because 1s/1p *wayyiqtol* often does not preserve penultimate stress (cf. the connection between 1s/p *wayyiqtol* and the cohortative). In 3sm, of course, *qatal* (after the loss of final vowels) had final stress, as had 3sf and 3p (after the general shift of stress to the final syllable in most words). Hence, the analogical pressure could not have been great. Further, in Blau's theory, the penultimate stress in simple *qatal* is itself unexpected, possibly preserved due to "rhythmical reasons" (1971, 22). On the latter point, see n. 70 below. In his later work, Blau (2010, 207, §4.3.3.3n.) states that in the jussive, "the stress of the short prefix-tense shifted to the ultima on the basis of the general trend of shift to final stress [...] and the influence of the ordinary prefix-tense."

category as *yiqtol* rather than simple *qatal*, should be evident. Although some have claimed that *weqatal* merely preserves an older meaning of the form or is the relic of an older form with future (or similar) meaning, there is no real evidence for this claim.³¹ E.g., G. R. Driver (1969, 49–50) claimed that there were two original forms, a Western **qatál* with past meaning, reflected in Hebrew simple *qatal*, and an Eastern **qátíl* with future meaning, which is reflected in *weqatal*. The fact that Hebrew has both forms is claimed to be the result of Hebrew being a mixed language with both Western and Eastern traits (cf. ch. 1, n. 56).

According to Andersen (2000, 41–42), *weqatal* is not a relic of a separate verb form but a reflection of a specific meaning of the ancestor form **qatala*. Based on superficial and unconvincing comparisons with Japanese and Dravidian, he claims that **qatala* had progressive meaning with activity verbs and resultative meaning with achievement and accomplishment verbs. Andersen's and Driver's theories have the same basic weakness – there is no evidence for an ES cognate of *qatal* with real future meaning nor for a progressive use of **qatala* anywhere (except in Hebrew *weqatal*). As outlined in 3.3, there are no convincing cases of non-anterior simple *qatal* in Hebrew (for the opposite view, see, e.g., Tropper 1998, 185). The alleged types were explained within the framework of the general anterior meaning of *qatal* or as relics of the earlier nominal, non-temporal, background of the form. A similar approach explains alleged non-anterior uses of cognate forms in other Semitic languages.

In Akkadian, the nominal character of the form (the stative) was largely preserved. It does not have explicitly non-anterior meaning. The stative is basically a conjugated verbal adjective (or noun) without temporal meaning as such.³² The form merely indicates that the subject is/was/will be what is referred to by the word in question. When formed from verbal roots, the

³¹ On Bauer's point of view (1910, 17 and 30), see 1.1.4.3. Bauer thought that *weqatal* preserves the form known from Akkadian *iparras* (i.e. the non-anterior form in Akkadian).

³² On the Akkadian stative, see the grammars and especially Huehnergard 1987, as well as Tropper 1995. Huehnergard uses the terms "verbal adjective" and "predicative form" rather than "stative," while he prefers the term "pseudo-verb" for the transitive type, which will be discussed further below (1987, 220, 231 and 232; in Huehnergard 2011, 393–395, he does not use the term "pseudo-verb," but rather "transitive *parsāku* construction"). Indeed, the usual term "stative" is problematic because of its use as one part of the semantic opposition between stative and fientive verbs (Huehnergard 1987, 229). Other scholars have used the term "permansive" (e.g. Rowton 1962). Note that Huehnergard sees the use of nouns in the stative/"predicative form" (as in, "I am a king") as secondary and analogically based on the use of verbal adjectives in the same construction (1987, 223).

meaning is usually resultative, indicating the "condition or state that is the result of the action of the verb" (Huehnergard 2011, 221). If the verb is active-transitive, the state referred to by the stative form is mostly passive ("stolen," not "having stolen") (ib., 27). In a restricted set of verbs, however, the stative has active meaning and may have what appears to be an object.³³ In WS, this usage seems to have become the dominant one, leading to the development of the form as a real relative temporal form marking anterior tense (or perfectivity, in the aspectual approach). All WS languages attest to the older nominal usage of the form (stative verbs). In addition, relics of the older anterior form (**yáqtul*) are found in all of them. Hence, the evolution of **qatala* into a real tense form and its dominating position in that area cannot have been *completed* at the Proto-WS or CS level (cf. Tropper 1995, 511–512). According to Tropper (ib., 509), this use is "keine proto-westsemitische, sondern eine proto-zentralsemitische Innovation [...], die erst nachträglich, via Sprachkontakt, Eingang in das Verbalsystem der geographisch eng benachbarten südsemitischen Sprachen gefunden hat." However, the development of a resultative construction such as the ancestor of **qatala* into an anterior temporal form is very straightforward and natural. If – as seems to be the case – the process had already started in PS, the further development might have taken place in the various branches without borrowing. The process, however, was no automatic drift, since it seems that the process was actually halted in Akkadian. The active-transitive stative eventually went into disuse and instead the *t*-perfect (*iptaras*) partially replaced anterior (preterite) *iprus* in later stages of the language (Rowton 1962, 236).

By way of explaining the development of the active-transitive usage, Huehnergard (1987, 228; based on Lambdin's unpublished ideas) suggests that transitive verbs acquired active meaning in this construction through the analogy of intransitive verbs, to which a passive meaning was not applicable. Thus, e.g., as *wašib* ("he is seated") relates to *ušib* ("he sat down"), the form *maḥir* is interpreted as "he is in receipt of," standing in a similar relationship to *imḥur*, "he received" (cf. also Tropper 1995, 502).³⁴ The active sense may

³³ See Huehnergard 2011, 393–395; 1987, 228–229; Rowton 1962. Most of these verbs have the general meaning "to hold" or "get a hold of." E.g., with *maḥārum* "receive," the stative functions as an "ordinary present perfect," with the meaning "he has received, accepted" (Rowton 1962, 243).

³⁴ Some other languages exhibit a similar connection between resultative/present perfect intransitives and passive/reflexive transitives. The Akkadian *t*-perfect (*iptaras*) looks like the passive/reflexive *Gt*-stem and in the Germanic and Romance languages, a passive of a transitive verb and present perfect of an intransitive verb can be expressed through the same form (*he is killed* vs. *he is gone* or *il est tué* vs. *il est arrivé*). Cf. Kuryłowicz 1972, 61. See also Van Peursen 2004, 207–208.

derive from a description of a state where a noun in the accusative was originally intended in an adverbial sense but reinterpreted as a direct object (e.g. "I am in a state of reception with regard to the silver" becomes "I have received the silver" (cf. Buccellati 1996, 409–410; Huehnergard 1987, 228, n. 45). From a formal point of view, the development of WS **qatala* poses several problems.³⁵ However, in the present context, this is of minor concern. The point is merely to show that WS **qatala* (and hence Hebrew *qatal*) and the Akkadian stative share the same background and that the latter never has the specifically non-anterior meaning of Hebrew *weqatal*.

In WS, **qatala* took over the anterior domain from **yáqtul* (which left only sporadic relics, cf. 5.1). The functions of the descendants of **qatala* in the various languages can be described in the same way as in Hebrew, i.e. simple past, present perfect, past perfect, future perfect, irrealis (and stative present with some verbs reflecting the nominal origin of the form).

Non-anterior uses similar to the ones proposed for Hebrew have been noted in other languages, but as was the case in Hebrew such usages are interpretable as varieties of anterior meaning.³⁶ This applies to performatives

³⁵ First, the final *-*a* in 3sm, which must be reconstructed for WS, is not part of the corresponding Akkadian form (cf. Kouwenberg 2010, 188f.). Second, WS lacks the long connecting *ā*-vowel of the Akkadian first and second person (1s *parsāku*, 2sm *parsāta*, etc.), which is probably derived from the long vowel of the 1s pronoun (*anāku*). Kouwenberg thinks this is an Akkadian innovation (ib., 183), while Bergsträsser (1929, 11, §3c, and 141, §27s) sees the -*ō*- in certain Hebrew roots (II-gem., II-*w*) as a relic of this formation. If Bergsträsser is right, maybe the "hybrid" forms of Amarna Canaanite (in -*āti*) attest to the same type. Third, the vowel in the second syllable is mostly *i* in Akkadian (also *u* and *a*), but typically *a* in the WS fientive type (and typically *i* and *u* in verbs with stative, adjectival meaning). Different explanations have been proposed for the use of the *a*-vowel (cf. Kouwenberg 2010, 185–6). Voigt (2004, 46f.) argues that the second *a* in **qatala* stems from the *t*-perfect (*iptaras*), which he assumes existed in PS. When the functions of this form were taken over by the newly evolving **qatala*, the disjunctive vowel was also taken over from the semantically related older form (in contrast, Tropper [1995, 505] relates the *a*-vowel to the vowel in *iparras*). However, the existence of the *t*-perfect at the PS stage is far from certain.

³⁶ For overviews of the use of cognates of *qatal* in various languages see, e.g., on early Aramaic, Segert 1983, 374–376, §6.6.3.2; on Syriac, Nöldeke 1898, 193–198, §255–263; on Arabic, Fischer 1972, 91–92, §181–183; on Phoenician, Friedrich and Röllig (Guzzo; Mayer) 1999, 188–190, §262; on Ugaritic, Tropper 2012, 702–718, §76.5; on Ethiopic, Tropper 2002, 182–186, §54.1; on Sabaic, Beeston 1984, 18–19, §7:1; Stein 2013, 131–135, §12.1–3.

and epistolary perfect,³⁷ alleged prophetic and gnomic perfects,³⁸ and the use of the reflexes of **qatala* in conditional clauses.³⁹ Smith (1991, 8) correctly notes that using "the past tense form standard to a given Semitic language" in conditional protases (and, in some languages, apodoses) might be a common Semitic feature of syntax. In Arabic, the use of *qatala* is standard in apodoses. Bravmann (1977, 565) derives the use of *qatala* in Arabic protases and apodoses from original descriptions of past occurrences ("when you [once] attempted to deceive God, he (i.e., God) deceived you [actually]"), which were subsequently generalized ("When (or: If) you attempt to deceive God, he (i.e., God) deceives you (or: will deceive you) [actually]"). From such cases, "the use of the perfect tense (in a 'non-temporal' meaning) in conditional sentences became routine" (ib., 566). For Hebrew cases of "logical" use of an anterior form in apodoses, see Num 32:23 (וְאִם-לֹא תַעֲשׂוּן כֵּן (וְהִנֵּה חֲטָאתֶם לַיהוָה אִם-יִהְיֶה לֹא-יִבְנֶה בַּיִת שְׂוֹא עִמָּלּוֹ (בּוֹנוּ בּוֹ אִם-יִהְיֶה לֹא-יִשְׁמְרֶרְעִיר שְׂוֹא שְׂקֵד שׁוֹמֵר). From such cases, the use of reflexes of **qatala* may have become standard in the fixed context of conditional structures. Hence, this usage is not evidence that the form had inherent non-anterior or future meaning. In contrast to the claim of Andersen (2000), who cannot see the semantic motivation for using a "past tense form in a conditional sentence, especially in the apodosis" (ib., 33), we do not have to regard the use of **qatala* in apodoses "as a remnant of an earlier future *qātal*" (ib., 55). However, the use of *qatal* in apodoses probably played a role in the development of explicit non-anterior meaning in Hebrew *weqatal* (see below).

A precative function has been ascribed to cognates of *qatal* in several languages. In some cases, the evidence is not convincing.⁴⁰ Arabic provides the clearest examples (e.g. Fischer 1972, 92, §182).⁴¹ However, even in Arabic,

³⁷ As argued in relation to Hebrew, these usages are simply anterior. Akkadian uses its own anterior form *iprus* or the *t*-perfect (*iptaras*) in such cases, cf. Pardee and Whiting 1987.

³⁸ As in Hebrew, such cases are stylistic uses of the ordinary anterior meaning. On prophetic perfect in Ethiopic, see Weninger 2001, 96. On Arabic, see Aartun 1963, 59 (gnomic) and 89 (prophetic).

³⁹ Again, Akkadian often uses its anterior form (or *iptaras*) in conditional protases. As Huehnergard (2011, 159) remarks, "the action is normally represented as having already taken place."

⁴⁰ Cf. 3.3.4. The Ugaritic evidence is ambiguous, too. Tropper (2012, 726–727, §77.34–35) sees a "volitivische Nuance" in the Ugaritic equivalent of *qatal*, while Pardee (2003/2004, 361) reaches the opposite conclusion. On precative *wqtls* and *qtls* in Phoenician, see below.

⁴¹ Marcus (1970, 10) ascribes the use of allegedly precative *qatal* in Mandaic to Arabic influence. Note that the Syriac use of the verb *hw'* in the *qatal* with a following PTC or

the usage seems to be restricted to more or less fixed expressions. Negated precatives use the particle *lā* (which also occurs with jussives, as opposed to indicative *mā*). In all Semitic languages, precative usage seems to be either clearly marked as precative through the use of such specific particles (which are the real carriers of precative meaning) or restricted to specific greetings, religious blessings, or fixed expressions. However, the latter cases still need to be explained, and it might be claimed that such a usage, though probably unattested in Hebrew (as argued in 3.3.4), was available at an earlier stage of the language, providing another possible starting point for the development of Hebrew *weqatal* (cf. Joosten 1992, 3).

Andrason (2013, 9) sees the precative as a "real factual optative." According to his reconstruction of the development, the usage must be the result of modal "contamination" at a time when the original form had present meaning, i.e. before **qatala* acquired past tense meaning in WS (see his Figure 1; ib., 22). In contrast to this view, other scholars see a connection between precative and irrealis (in hypothetical/counterfactual contexts; e.g. Joosten 1992, 3). In that case, the development would have taken place at a later stage when the form had already acquired its past (or rather, anterior) tense meaning. There may be some truth in both scenarios. In Akkadian, the combination of the particle *lū* with the stative (or any other nominal form) can express a wish etc. Possibly, remnants of such usage were preserved with stative/adjectival verbs, while the precative use of fientive verbs may have evolved at a later, temporalized stage from the irrealis use of anteriority. Still, as was the case with conditional **qatala*, we are very far from the Hebrew system in which *weqatal* has the same meaning as *yiqtol* and stands in clear contrast to simple *qatal*.

In the other Semitic languages, alleged non-anterior usages of reflexes of simple **qatala* are either problematic and disputed or clearly restricted to certain contexts (conditional clauses, specific particles, fixed expressions, etc.) – in glaring contrast to the ubiquitous use of *weqatal* in CH. Something decisive must have happened during the development of the HVS.

However, precursors of the characteristic CH use of *weqatal* may be attested in the languages most closely related to Hebrew. While the combination of the conjunction **wa-* and the local reflex of **qatala* in all WS languages generally indicates anteriority (like **qatala* by itself), several cases in the Canaanite language attested in the Amarna letters sent from Canaan seem to reflect a usage (at least partially) similar to CH non-anterior *we-*

adjective for the expression of a wish or command (Nöldeke 1898, 196, §260) might be derived from the subordinate use of the same construction after explicit expressions of command etc. (ib., 196–197, §261).

5 The origins of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*

qatal.⁴² E.g., EA 77:26–29, *šum-ma* MU.MEŠ *a[n]-^ˁni^ˁ-ta ú-ul / yu-ša-na* ERÍN.MEŠ [*pí-t*]á-ti / *ù in-né[-ep-ša-a]t ka-li / KUR.KUR.MEŠ a[-na* LÚ.MEŠ GA]Z, "If this year the regular army does not come forth, then all the lands will be[come aligned] w[ith the ^ˁ*apîru* [men]" (Rainey 1996, 359). The apodosis begins with *ù in-né[-ep-ša-a]t*, which must be a reflex of **wa+*qatala* (3sf), seemingly with future reference.⁴³ The apodosis in EA 88:29–39 begins with the same word (*ù in₄-né-ep-ša-<at>*), followed by a subject. After this, a new part of the apodosis (or an independent sentence) begins with "and"+subject+prefix form (*ti-né-ep-šu*), i.e. seemingly the same kind of interchange that can be observed in CH between *weqatal* and *yiqtol*.⁴⁴

Most cases of this kind of usage are in conditional contexts and this seems to be the most likely background for the use of **wa+*qatala* in independent contexts, as in Hebrew. According to Moran (2003b, 216), in the letters from Byblos we have "an early stage of the far more developed Hebrew usage." He notes that except for two cases, "all of these perfects occur in sentences which are implicitly or explicitly conditional. And the exceptions are more apparent than real, since they occur with a temporal clause, the general structure of which is identical with that of conditional sentences." E.g., EA 118:36–38, though not strictly conditional, contains an absolute infinitive seemingly functioning as a temporal/conditional clause: *al-lu / pa-tá-ri-ma* LÚ.MEŠ *ḥu-ub-ši ù / ša-ab-tu* LÚ.MEŠ GAZ.MEŠ / URU, "Behold, if the yeomen farmers depart, then the ^ˁ*apîru* men will seize the city" (Rainey 1996, 361). Note that here the verb is clearly fientive/transitive.

Smith (1991, 6–15) also sees the background of Hebrew *weqatal* in conditional apodoses, with precursors in Amarna and Ugaritic (and Phoenician;

⁴² See especially Moran 2003a, 24–49; 2003b, 215–216; Rainey 1996, 347–366; Smith 1991, 6–8 (note that Smith mixes up Moran's numbers and the terms apodosis and protasis). For the texts, see also the recent edition by Rainey (2015).

⁴³ A few apodoses with **qatala* are not introduced by **wa* (see Rainey 1996, 358). Two of the three cases mentioned by Rainey, however, do not have real future reference (EA 286:51–53 and 288:57–60). They are statives or present perfects to be translated as "are lost" (both are of the type "if there are no troops, the lands are lost!"). The atemporal character of the stative in the Akkadian language with which the Canaanite linguistic elements are mixed should also be kept in mind.

⁴⁴ *ù šu[m-ma la yi-iš-mu] / [L]UGAL BE-ia a-na a-wa-te Ì[R-šu] / ù in₄-né-ep-ša-<at>* URU *Gub[-la] / a-na ša-šu ù gáb-bi* KUR.ḤÁ L[UGAL] / *a-di* KUR *Mi-iš-ri ti-né-ep-šu / a-na* LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.MEŠ, "But i[f] the king, my lord, [does not heed] the words of [his] ser[vant], then Byblos will become aligned with him (^ˁAbdi-Ashirta) and all the lands of the k[ing] as far as Egypt will become aligned with the ^ˁ*apîru* men" (Rainey 1996, 360). Cf. EA 103:56–57 where the verb in the apodosis is a prefix form with a preposed object, *ka-li* KUR.MEŠ / *ni-il-qú^ˁ a^ˁ-na^ˁ šār-ri*, "we will take all the lands for the king" (Rainey 2015, 562–563).

ib., 14 and 21). With one possible Ugaritic exception,⁴⁵ "neither the Amarna letters nor the Ugaritic texts attest a clear instance of a 'converted' verbal form in independent clauses" (ib., 13). However, some of the cases from Amarna do seem to attest an "independent" usage. Cf. EA 123:33–35: 3 LÚ.<MEŠ> *ša-a šu-ri-ib / ¹Pí-ḥu-ra uš-^rši^r-ra / ù bal-ṭá-ti*, "Send the three m<en> whom Piḥura brought in and I will survive" (Rainey 2015, 646–647). EA 74:25–27: *du-ku-mi / ^reṭ^r-la-ku-nu ù i-ba-ša-tu-nu ki-ma ia-ti-nu / ^rù^r pa-aš-ḥa-tu-nu*, "Kill your 'lad' and become like us, and you will be at rest" (ib., 454–455). Such instances may suggest that the Canaanite dialect spoken by the scribes (not necessarily Proto-Hebrew but closely related) had already undergone the development that led to the system as known from CH. However, the nature of the evidence (a small corpus of texts; difficulties in discerning the actual Canaanite language in the Canaanite-Akkadian hybrid; the existence of competing interpretations and translations of the documents) probably prevents us from gaining real clarity on this question. We cannot know how pervasive this usage was in the language behind the Canaanite influence in the letters, and the interpretation of the forms as part of the general linguistic system remains uncertain.⁴⁶ The same applies to other Canaanite languages like Moabite, Ammonite, and Edomite. A form corresponding to Hebrew *wayyiqtol* (as far as the unvocalized writing permits us to see) occurs numerous times in Moabite but none of the preserved texts in any of these languages allows us to draw conclusions about the development of *weqatal*.

Phoenician and Punic provide several examples that may elucidate the process leading to Hebrew *weqatal*. There are cases of *wqtl* in conditional contexts.⁴⁷ In addition, as was the case in Amarna, several cases of possibly

⁴⁵ KTU 3.4.19. However, see below on the problematic nature of this case.

⁴⁶ Similarly, we can say nothing about a possible stress distinction as in Hebrew *weqatalí* vs. *weqatálti*. Note that many cases of **wa* plus **qatala* in the Amarna letters simply indicate "and" plus anteriority (Moran 2003a, 31–32). Note also that Moran's alleged cases of **qatala* with future meaning (without **wa*) are unconvincing (ib., 31). The eight instances are in protases of conditional clauses and do not have real future meaning.

⁴⁷ On verb forms in conditional contexts, see Friedrich and Röllig (Guzzo; Mayer) 1999, 228–230, §324. In protases, both *qtl* and *yqtl* are attested. In apodoses, *yqtl* is found in all periods while *wqtl* is restricted to Old Phoenician and Punic. Since most of the cases seem to be curses, the interpretation of apodoses with *wqtl* is not always clear. They might indicate simple future or a wish (precative *qtl*). Thus, Friedrich and Röllig render the apodosis in KAI 26 III:18 (𐤍𐤏) as "so mögen/werden der Baal des Himmels und El, der die Erde geschaffen hat, . . . dieses Königtum auslöschen" (ib., 229). Do such cases preserve a precative use of *qtl* (in which case the *w* possibly plays no role at all), are they "converted" to a non-anterior meaning simply by being in a conditional context, or – if we were to take the superficial similarity with Hebrew at face value – do they represent

non-anterior *wqtl* occur in contexts that are not (strictly speaking) conditional, but nonetheless may be interpreted as some sort of condition.⁴⁸ Unfortunately, much of the evidence is problematic, especially the possible cases of non-anterior or modal *wqtl* outside of conditional contexts. First, in the consonantal writing system, many forms are ambiguous. Garr (1985, 183) interpreted the *wqtls* in question as *w*+absolute infinitive.⁴⁹ Alternatively, some forms might be PTCs. Some occurrences, however, have a personal ending *-t*, that clearly indicates that the form in question is a first or second person finite form.⁵⁰ Second, the alleged non-anterior cases allow other interpretations. Thus, the form mentioned by Segert (*wktbt*, RES 1543), which he translates as "and you shall write" (1976, 195, §64.443), may be "and I have written." Similarly, *wšlḥt* (KAI 50:6), which Krahmalkov (2001, 177) translates as "you shall send," is rendered as "und du hast [...] geschickt" by Donner and Röllig (1968, 67).

Two possible examples are attested in the second part of the bilingual Phoenician-Luwian Karatepe inscription (KAI 26 III:2b–11). Most scholars interpret the two *wqtls* (III:2, וברך, III:7, וכן) as marking some sort of non-anterior or modal meaning. This reading hinges on the identification of the semantics of the Phoenician verb forms with the forms in the Luwian version of the text (which uses third person imperative forms in this part of the text). In fact, the text does read quite smoothly if one renders the forms as "and may Ba'al bless" and "may this city be." There are simple *yqtls* in III:8 and

real "converted" forms like Hebrew *weqatal* (i.e., do they have inherent non-anterior meaning)? The low number of examples and the small size of the available corpus in general probably preclude a definite answer. Note also the different verb forms in the protases in the conditional passage in KAI 26 (III:12–IV:3): *yqtls*, *wqtls*, and *wyqtls*. It is difficult to discern any difference between the forms, unless we should assume that the *wqtls* retain the anterior meaning of a simple *qtl* (cf. the occasional use of *qatal* in passages with *yiqtol*s and *weqatal*s in BH, 3.1). Also, see below for the possibility that the *wqtls* are in fact absolute infinitives.

⁴⁸ E.g. KAI 69:20 following a generalizing relative clause: כל כהן אש יקח משאת בדץ לאש ש] ונענ] ש, "was jeden Priester angeht, der eine Abgabe nimmt entgegen dem, was in diesem Texte festgesetzt ist, so wird er bestraft [werden]" (Friedrich and Röllig [Guzzo; Mayer] 1999, 230, §324). KAI 69:18 has a similar structure. Krahmalkov (1986, 5) refers to this kind of sentence structure as "anticipatory clause followed by resumptive main clause."

⁴⁹ In past contexts, Phoenician often uses the absolute infinitive followed by a personal pronoun (a usage sporadically attested in BH, see appendix 3). Perhaps this form was used as a "consecutive" form in any time frame.

⁵⁰ A *t*-ending can, of course, be a marker of the feminine PTC. Finite 3sf *qtl* did not have a *t*-ending, except when followed by a suffixed object (as in Hebrew). Thus, some cases are interpretable as either finite 3sf+object or as a feminine PTC. Cf. the discussion in Krahmalkov 1986.

10, which might support such a reading. However, Baranowski (2015) argues that the two versions are different texts, each to be analyzed in its own right, the Phoenician passage in question being a description rather than a blessing. He sees the *wqtls* as ordinary markers of past tense while the *yqtls* in the passage indicate past habitual events (2015, 329). His main arguments are 1), a blessing is unlikely in a royal inscription, and 2), the expected form in a blessing is *yqtl* (as in other Phoenician blessings), not *wqtl* (ib., 327–328).⁵¹ On the one hand, the habitual *yqtl* forms in II:4–5 in the first part of the inscription, which has clear past reference, might support Baranowski's thesis (ib., 329).⁵² On the other hand, it might be countered that one of the supposedly habitual *yqtls* is יכן (III:8), i.e. from the root "to be." With this root, a simple past form would be expected, as in III:7 (i.e. simple past according to Baranowski's interpretation of the form וכן). Why is a *wqtl* used in l. 7 but a habitual *yqtl* in l. 8, in very similar clauses (וכן הקרת ז בעלת שבע, "and this city was the owner of abundance," vs. ועם ז יכן בעל אלפם, "and these people ... were (used to be, were being?) owners of oxen")? However, the corpus of Phoenician texts hardly allows us to decide this question. Another potential explanation for the shift from *wqtl* to *yqtl* in the passage would be to interpret the *wqtl* וכן as present perfect, with a shift to future or modal יכן ("and this city has become the owner of abundance..., and these people ... will be owners of oxen etc.").

In any case, Baranowski's argument remains a necessary corrective to an approach that takes the existence of non-anterior/modal *wqtls* in non-conditional contexts in Phoenician for granted. Even if the majority reading of the passage as a blessing is accepted, the identity of the *wqtls* remains unclear. First, as proposed by Garr (1985, 183), they might be absolute infinitives. Second, if they are reflexes of **wa+*qatala*, do they represent a general precative usage of the reflex of **qatala* or Phoenician equivalents of Hebrew non-anterior *weqatal*? The possible attestation of *qtl* without *w-* with precative meaning might support the former option.⁵³ However, the passage III:7–

⁵¹ For the point of view that the passage is a blessing, see, e.g., Barré 1982.

⁵² Most verb forms in the first part of the inscription (I:1–III:2a), which clearly refers to the past, are absolute infinitives with 1s pronoun (e.g. I:6, ומלא אנך). There is only one 1s *wqtl* (I:8, וישברת, "and I shattered"). The form וכן (I:5; II:1, 7) may be a *wqtl* (3sm or 3pm) or an absolute infinitive.

⁵³ See Krahmalkov 1986, 10. Krahmalkov argues that clause initial position is the decisive factor, cf. also his broader treatment of the use of *qtl* (2001, 170–179). The attestation of *wqtl* with simple anterior meaning, however, would seem to pose a problem for this approach. He gets around this problem by insisting (ib., 178) that *qtl* in itself is unmarked for mood, aspect and tense and functions as a "consecutive subform," taking over the mood, aspect, and tense of the main verb. However, the claim that a verb form has no

5 The origins of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*

8 with one *wqtl* and one *yqtl* of the root "to be" seems to attest the same kind of interchange that we observe between Hebrew *weqatal* and (w+)X+*yiqtol* (in this case, the subject intervenes between ו and יכן). The same type of interchange was attested in the Amarna letters (see EA 88:29–39 above). A similar shift from *yqtl* to *wqtl* occurs in the Phoenician (Punic) text KAI 69 (lines 4, 8, and 10; X+יכן is followed by יכן+X). In these clauses, the meaning can hardly be precative (as might be the case in KAI 26 III:7). However, while not conditional in the strict sense, these clauses may be examples of the conditional-like structures referred to above. Does this kind of interchange between *yqtl* and *wqtl* indicate the existence of at least the rudiments of a system similar to the Hebrew one?⁵⁴ The lack of a large corpus of texts comparable to the corpus of CH means that any attempt at interpreting the Phoenician verbal system is bound to be inconclusive.

In Ugaritic, the evidence for something similar to Hebrew non-anterior *weqatal* is even less convincing. Smith (1991, 8) offers two main examples of conditional sentences "which bear on the BH converted perfect," KTU 2.30.16–20 and 1.119.34–36. According to Smith, the *yqtl* form in the apodosis of the second conditional clause in the former passage shows that the *wqtl* in the apodosis of the first conditional clause must have future meaning (ib., 8–9: *whm ht 'l wl'kt 'mk whm l' l wl'akm 'il'ak*, "and if the Hittite comes up, then I will send to you. But if he does not come up, then surely I will send"; on this passage, cf. Fenton 1969, 36–37). This is not a decisive argument. In fact, if the *wqtl* apodosis has the same temporal reference as the one with *yqtl*, it is difficult to see why the author felt a need for two separate conditional constructions. A different approach is taken by Segert (1984, 90, §64.26). He interprets the *wqtl* as irrealis, "and if the Hittite were to come up, (then) I would send (a letter) to you."⁵⁵ Alternatively, the first apodosis may be an ordinary anterior *qtl* with past or present perfect reference, "if the Hittites attack, I have (already, in another letter?) sent/written to you (so you already know what to do), and if they do not attack, I will surely send/write."

inherent meaning seems to be just as problematic in Phoenician as it is in Hebrew (see 1.1.3.4–5 and 3.2).

⁵⁴ Buth 1992, 101: "Phoenician may have examples of a sequential suffix form, so this development may be quite early." Cf. Fenton 1969, 38. Bauer and Leander (1965, 35, §2h) state that the only "Überrest" of non-anterior *weqatal* in Phoenician is the form יכן in texts such as KAI 69. They consider this usage "eine archaische, erstarrte Formel."

⁵⁵ Elsewhere, Segert renders the same passage as "and if the Hittite had come, I would have sent (a message) to you" (ib., 121, §77.6).

Since this seems to be the only example of *wqtl* in a clear conditional apodosis,⁵⁶ we cannot draw any conclusions. Note, however, that the shift from *wqtl* to *yqtl* follows the mechanism known from Hebrew, Amarna, and Phoenician (*wqtl*+X vs. *w*+X+*yqtl*).

In the passage 1.119.34–36, the case for non-anterior *wqtl* seems stronger (Smith 1991, 10: *wšm*^c *b*^c *l šlt*[*km*] *ydy* ^c *z ltgrkm* [*qrd*] *lhmytkm*, "And [Baa] will hear [your] prayer. He will drive the strong from your gates, [The warrior] from your walls"; The reading in KTU³ is *w šm*^c [*b*]^c *l . l . šltk*[*m*]). According to Smith, this is an apodosis to a protasis in l. 26, introduced by *k*-. However, the apodosis to this *k*- must be the *yqtl* in l. 27 (*tšun*). If *wšm*^c is to be interpreted as a reflex of **wa*+**qatala* with future meaning, we seem to have an independent use of a form similar to *weqatal*. However, since such usage would be unparalleled, it might be advisable to consider other possible interpretations. Could the form be an imperative (which would require the suffix on the following noun to be read as 1p)? Or could the clause be a kind of unmarked temporal/conditional protasis for the following verb *ydy*, i.e. "and (if/when) Ba^cal has heard your prayer, he will drive..."?⁵⁷ Smith (1991, 10–11) mentions several other cases of potential interest (KTU 1.5 I:25, 2.10:18, 3.4:17–19, and 3.9:5) but all appear in difficult or disputed passages and "are susceptible to more persuasive explanations." The most likely one seems to be KTU 3.4:17–19 but the exact interpretation of the clause and its status relative to the preceding clauses are not clear (ib., 11: [*w 'un*]_t *'inn lhm* ^c *d tttbn ksp 'iwrkl wtb l'un*_t*hm*, "[And] they have no [*'un*]_t-tax. Until they have repaid Iwrkl, They will return to their '*un*_t-tax"; on the ambiguity of the connection with the preceding clause, see Tropper 2012, 797–798, §83.214a). Smith finds Kienast's anterior reading (present perfect, "Bis sie das Silber des Iwarikalli zurückgeben, sind sie zu ihrer Lehnspflicht zurückgekehrt") "somewhat tortured." However, in light of Kienast's explanation, it does seem to make sense. The point is that the persons in question have been freed from their obligation – but only in principle. Until they repay the money used to free them, they have returned to their former obligation (Kienast 1979, 448). Tropper (2012, 716, §76.541a) notes two other instances of *wqtl* with alleged future meaning, KTU 1.124:9 and 2.7:10, both of which are dubious.⁵⁸ The former case (*w pr*^c[*t*]; in KTU³, there is no [],

⁵⁶ It is the only case listed by Tropper (2012, 717, §76.542). He mentions (ib., 687–688, §76.332) several examples of *yqtl* in apodoses, including one *wyqtl* (KTU 2.82:18–21).

⁵⁷ Cf. Tropper (2012, 910, §97.94) on "durch *w* eingeleitete Sätze mit konditionaler Implikation."

⁵⁸ Tropper (ib., 717) lists two other "future" *qtls*, one after the conjunction/particle *k* (*yld*; as Tropper notes, the form might be *yqtl*) and one (*yrt*) following the precative particle *l*.

but the *t* is marked as partially preserved) has been interpreted as an infinitive (without the final *t*) or a feminine PTC.⁵⁹ 2.7:10, which is not a real *wqtl* since *w* and *qtl* are separated by another element, has been read as an adverb or an ordinary anterior *qtl* (*w ikm kn*; Tropper [2012, 716, §76.541a] marks this case with "?" and translates "und irgendwie wird/möge es geschehen").⁶⁰

Ugaritic does not shed much light on the development of Hebrew *weqatal*. The analysis of the Ugaritic verbal system faces difficulties similar to the ones that prevent us from getting a clear picture of the verbal system of Amarna Canaanite and Phoenician. Due to the small size of the textual corpora and the widely varying interpretations of individual texts a complete view of the system *as a system* seems to be out of reach. We might find single instances that appear to function like the Hebrew consecutive forms, but the way such cases fit into the broader system is another question. Answering this question would require access to a much larger corpus of texts with similar contexts. The most we can say is that in Ugaritic, Phoenician, and – probably to a larger degree – Amarna Canaanite, there are sporadic attestations of what appear to be forms derived from **wa+*qatala*, which seem to behave like Hebrew non-anterior *weqatal*. However, the material does not allow us to determine the precise degree of similarity with the HVS. There is no decisive evidence that these languages used *wqtl* in the systematic manner attested in Hebrew but neither can we exclude the possibility entirely.

In sum, Smith's general conclusions on the subject seem valid, with a few additions. The most likely starting point for the development of CH *weqatal* does indeed seem to be the use of the ancestor of *qatal* in conditional clauses (Smith 1991, 14). Possibly, the use of the same verb form with precativ function attested sporadically in some WS languages provides another point of departure. In any case, the Hebrew system as such is "an inner Hebrew development" (ib., 14–15), in which the use of the verb form was extended from conditional clauses (and possibly precativ contexts) to "independent clauses in the form of the 'converted perfect', perhaps following the development of, and on analogy with, the 'converted imperfect'" (ib., 8). As noted above, it might be necessary to add that Amarna Canaanite, and possibly

⁵⁹ Pardee 1988, 188. Pardee remarks on the possible "converted" character of the form and the possible similarity to the Hebrew system (cf. Pardee 1983, 137, "If the reconstruction and analysis are correct, the form looks for all the world like a *waw*-consecutive perfect!").

⁶⁰ Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín (2015, 443) suggest that *kn* is the adverb "thus" or from the verbal root *k-n*. Pardee 1984, 243, "And how has he been?"

Phoenician, exhibit early reflections of the same process, but the material does not allow us to state this with any conviction.

5.3.1 The analogical explanation and the origin of final stress in *weqatal*⁶¹

Smith does not go into details with regard to the "inner development" that led to the system as known from CH, except for references to the widespread analogical explanation. He explicitly states that he will not address "many questions regarding the *waw*-consecutive's morphology," including the position of the stress (1991, xi). In this section I attempt to integrate the view presented above on the distinction between anterior **yáqtul* and jussive **yaqtúl* into the description of the development of Hebrew non-anterior *weqatal*. I argue that the analogical explanation of *weqatal* is more convincing if we take the position of stress into account (i.e. the movement of stress to the final syllable attested in the Masoretic notation in 1s and 2sm non-anterior *weqatal* under certain circumstances).

As noted in 1.1.4.3, several scholars have argued for some kind of analogical explanation, according to which *weqatal* was created as the counterpart of *yiqtol* after the model of the interchange between *qatal* and *wayyiqtol*.⁶¹ In Bobzin's version of the analogical approach (1973, 153), the process is presented schematically as follows: "(way)yiqtol – x : x – qāṭal = X : x – yiqtol. X = (w^e)qāṭal – x." The analogy is clear enough, despite claims to the contrary. Cook (2012, 209) states that "the relationship between these pairs is not analogous – either semantically or developmentally"; "Most importantly, Ewald (1879: 23) rightly observed that, in contrast to *wayyiqtol* [...], there is no evidence in the Semitic languages for a *wēqatal* conjugation. Despite attempts to make a case based on comparative-historical grounds (e.g., Bauer 1910), no convincing evidence is forthcoming." However, that is precisely the point of an analogical explanation – there is not supposed to be any non-anterior *weqatal* in the other languages since it is a new creation internal to Hebrew (and possibly other Canaanite dialects) based on the analogy of other parts of the system already at hand. The reference to Bauer is odd since his was clearly not an analogical approach (rather, he thought that non-anterior *weqatal* was a relic of the original meaning of *qatal*, cf. 1.1.4.3 and 5.3).⁶²

⁶¹ Smith (1991, 6) and Andersen (2000, 33) provide further references to scholars with this approach.

⁶² Edward M. Cook (2017, 16, n. 19) also argues against the analogical view. If *weqatal* was formed analogically after *wayyiqtol*, all dialects with *weqatal* must have had *wayyiqtol* as well – and since, according to Cook, Phoenician has *weqatal* and not *wayyiqtol*, the analogical explanation cannot be correct. However, as illustrated above, it is not evident that Phoenician had a *weqatal* as such (at least not in the systematic Hebrew sense).

5 The origins of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*

However, what seems to be lacking in the simple version of the analogical approach is some kind of motivation or mechanism that might explain the process. Ewald's claim (1870, 599) that *wayyiqtol* of itself calls forth *weqatal* ("ruft ... vonselbst ... hervor") is hardly convincing. Blake (1944, 271–272) notes that the change of meaning in *weqatal* as compared with *qatal* is unlikely to be simply the result of "inverse analogy" or "polarity."⁶³ Hence, he tries to integrate the form of the conjunction into the explanation, arguing that the *a*-vowel in *wayyiqtol* (the original vowel of the conjunction) was the marker of past meaning in the *yiqtol* part of the form, while *we-* in *weyiqtol* was a marker of present-future-modal meaning (ib., 278).⁶⁴ According to Blake, the "present-future-modal meaning thus developed in *uē* infects the perfect preceded by *uē* with its present-future-modal meaning" (ib., 295). Only the fact that the sequence *yiqtol+weqatal* became the preferred sequence (rather than *yiqtol+weyiqtol*) can ("perhaps") be explained as a "polar analogy," i.e., "as the sequence of perfect was an imperfect form, so the proper sequence of imperfect would tend to be the opposite form, viz., the perfect with *waw*." He adds that the analogy is probably more direct; since "the additive sequence of two past tense ideas is expressed by two different verb forms," two different verb forms should be used for a "similar sequence of two imperfect (present-future-modal) tense ideas" (ib., 293). This account fails to satisfy, primarily because no explanation is given for the preservation of *wa-* and its association with past time reference specifically. As argued above, the doubling of the prefix consonant (which Blake [ib., 279] perceives as a secondary, orthographic device) must be seen as integral to the combined marker *waCC-*, which is best explained as the product of the stress on the prefix in the ancestor form, anterior **yáqtul*. Blake (ib., 282) unconvincingly presents the "recessive accent" in *wayyiqtol* as a generalization (unexplained) of ordinary stress retraction before another stressed syllable (*nesiga*

Furthermore, "must have had" is crucial – an earlier stage of Phoenician may have used a *wayyiqtol*-like construction, which was lost prior to the writing of the extant written material. Hence, Cook's argument is not decisive.

⁶³ By "inverse analogy" he understands the following process: "if a form *x* has a meaning *x'* and a form *y* a meaning *y'*, a change in *x* producing the meaning of *y*, viz., *y'*, will produce when applied to *y* the meaning of *x*, viz. *x'*" (Blake 1944, 272). In the case at hand, this means that when the addition of *waw* to *yiqtol* produces the meaning normally associated with *qatal*, then the addition of *waw* to *qatal* will produce the meaning normally associated with *yiqtol*.

⁶⁴ Blake does not distinguish different predecessors of Hebrew *yiqtol* (no **yaqtul* vs. **yaqtulu*) but ascribes a general omnitemporal meaning to a single ancestor form (ib., 294). He gives no convincing explanation as to why *wa-* would be specifically associated with past tense.

or *nasog 'aḥor*). He does not explain why this happened specifically in *wayyiqtol*. However, though Blake's own account is hardly convincing, his call for something more than mere "inverse analogy" is valid. Importantly, he remarks that the reason for the development of final stress in *weqatal* might be the final stress in "the synonymous imperfect with ׀" – "as a result of the influence of these imperfect forms the oxytone accent came to be regarded as a characteristic of verb forms with ׀ which have imperfect (present-future-modal) meaning, and so is extended to perfect forms with ׀ that are not already oxytone" (ib., 284–285). An explanation that takes this as the central point (the position of stress and its connection to specific temporal/modal meanings) seems to have a better chance at accounting for the analogical process.

In fact, several earlier scholars have underlined the importance of the position of the stress.⁶⁵ E.g., Ewald (1870, 600) saw a close connection between final stress and the meaning of *weqatal*, as opposed to the retracted stress often observed in *wayyiqtol*, "Es ist als wenn man im Deutschen sagen wollte: *dá-spricht* oder *dá-sprach*, und im gegentheile *da-spricht*; oder als wollte jenes nach vorn hin an die vergangenheit, dieses nach hinten hin an die zukunft anknüpfen." Similarly, Driver (1874, 126) noted that "a *real difference* of some kind or other exists between the use of the perfect with simple *waw*, and the use of the perfect with *waw conversive*, and the external indication of this difference is to be found in the *alteration of the tone* which constantly attends and accompanies it."⁶⁶ To Driver, "the changed pronunciation [...] seems to cry *There!* to attract the hearer's attention, and warn him against construing what is said in an absolute and unqualified sense" (ib., 129).⁶⁷ Joüon (1911, 403) claims that the analogical stress shift occurred in the simple form, at the PS stage. He argues that **yaqtul*, "selon la place de l'accent, exprimait soit le future soit le passé" (note that no distinction is made between **yaqtulu* and **yaqtul*). Further, "[a] l'instar de la double accentuation du *yaqtul*, la langue différençia également le sens temporel des trois parfaits [i.e., the three types *qatila*, *qatula*, *qatala*] par une double accentuation, dont un reste se trouve également en hébreu (parfait et parfait converti)" (ib., 404).⁶⁸ Like Bauer, Joüon identifies the supposedly non-anterior **qatala*

⁶⁵ The distinctive stress pattern was recognized already by the earliest Jewish grammarians (1.1.4).

⁶⁶ The word "constantly" is, of course, an exaggeration, as will be discussed below.

⁶⁷ Isaksson (2015, 86, n. 15) argues that the stress shift might be "the residue of an intonation signal of a consequence clause (beginning of apodosis)."

⁶⁸ Cf. Joüon 1923, 320, §117c; Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 359, §117c.

5 The origins of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*

with Akkadian *iparras*. This identification is baseless and there is no evidence for simple *qatal*/**qatala* with final stress and non-anterior meaning.⁶⁹

Birkeland (1940, 72) presents a very clear version of the analogical approach, taking into account the position of the stress. He notes that 1), "im Impf. ein Gegensatz ausgebildet war, der nur durch den Akzent zustande kam: *yíqtul*:*yíqtúl*," and 2), *qatal* with penultimate stress typically continues a "*yíqtul*" (in the form of *wayyiqtol*), which also had penultimate stress. Accordingly, "In der gleichen Weise wird die ultimabetonte Form *yíqtúl* gerade durch die auch ultimabetonte Form des Perf. cons. fortgesetzt. Dass wir bei diesen Tatsachen vor der Erklärung der Betonung des Perf. cons. stehen, scheint sehr wahrscheinlich."⁷⁰ He states that the stress movement was the precondition for the development of *weqatal* into a separate form, "eine merkmalfahnde Form, die für ganz bestimmte Funktionen reserviert war und auch ohne irgendeine fortzusetzende Form vorkommen konnte" (ib., 73–74). Note that Birkeland's *yíqtúl* does not include the jussive, which he thought was stressed on the prefix. However, he adds that the later "analogische Akzentverschiebung auf die Ultima" happened earlier in the jussive than in *wayyiqtol* (ib., 73; cf. 5.2). The latter point ties in with the arguments presented above for the distinction between jussive **yaqtúl* and anterior **yáqtul* at some point prior to the development of the CH system. With this background, we can tentatively propose the following outline of the development of the Hebrew system of consecutive forms.

⁶⁹ Simple *qatal* has final stress in a few cases (in II-gem. roots). See Deut 32:41; Isa 44:16; Ps 17:3; 92:11; 116:6 (cf. Bauer and Leander 1965, 430, §58m). However, these cases do not seem to have non-anterior meaning. At least one is interpretable as an infinitive with 1s possessive suffix (Ps 92:11). Zevit (1998, 61), in contrast, assumes that what he refers to as "present-future *qatal* verbs were distinguished originally [by stress] when not preceded by a *waw*." There is no evidence for this, and the examples cited are mostly performatives and statives (i.e. ordinary anterior *qatals*).

⁷⁰ Artom, without citing any references, presents an analysis of the development of *weqatal* similar to Birkeland's. The difference is that Artom explicitly refers to the difference between *wayyiqtol* (past reference and penultimate stress) and *weyiqtol* (future reference and final stress) as the driving force behind the analogical creation of a distinction between past *weqatálti* and future *weqatalítí* (Artom 1965, 9). Note Blau's explanation of final stress in *weqatal* as a reflection of the general process that led to final stress in most words in Hebrew. He claims that simple *qatal* ought to have undergone the same development, but that it did not, "perhaps because of rhythmic reasons" (Blau 1971, 21–22). Secondly, he adds that the analogy as presented by Birkeland may have played a role. The first part of Blau's explanation seems unlikely. Penultimate stress in simple *qatálti* and *qatálta* was probably preserved quite regularly, because of the structure of the words. Hence, in order to explain the final stress in *weqatal* analogical pressure is required.

In all WS languages, the younger anterior form **qatala* had been replacing the older form **yáqtul*, which – to varying degrees in various languages – left only sporadic relics.⁷¹ However, before the new form had replaced the old one entirely, something happened in Hebrew, which preserved **yáqtul* and gave it a new lease of life. The development of *waC-* to *waCC-* before a stressed syllable enabled anterior **yáqtul* to survive in Hebrew, emerging as a separate verb form with a special marker, in the form *wayyiqtol*. The fact that the possibility provided by this phonetic development was actually realized (i.e., that the form with the archaic verbal element was retained rather than replaced by *w+qatal*) must be attributed to a certain conservatism in the language.⁷² Outside of this specific context, the younger form eventually prevailed completely as the expression of anterior tense (on possible other relics of **yáqtul*, see above). In this way, an interchange between *wayyiqtol* and *(w+)X+qatal* developed. This became the model for a similar interchange between *(w+)X+yiqtol* and a new analogical formation, *weqatal*.⁷³

When simple *yiqtol* without *waCC-* was no longer (or only sporadically) used with anterior meaning, the relation between *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* could be perceived, from a synchronic point of view, as expressing a fundamental

⁷¹ Smith (1991, 5) seems to ascribe **qatala*'s rise to dominance as a past tense form to the loss of final vowels in Hebrew, whereby original **yaqtulu* and **yaqtul* became indistinguishable (he does not take the stress into account). However, the same development of **qatala* and the decline of anterior **yáqtul* took place in Arabic (where the final vowel was not lost from **yaqtulu*) and in Ethiopic (which had no form descended from **yaqtulu*). In addition, the position of the stress would have helped distinguish the forms descended from **yáqtul* and **yaqtulu* (with stress on the new final syllable). Only later, when final stress was generalized (except in specific phonetic contexts), the total identity of all types of *yiqtol* in most roots would lead to the situation outlined by Smith. However, at that point, *qatal* had probably been functioning as a regular anterior form for a long period, as seen from the use of the form in the related languages (but see 5.3 above).

⁷² Cf. above on anterior **wa+*qatala* in Amarna Canaanite.

⁷³ Isaksson (2015, 80) suggests a different reason for the development of *weqatal*. He takes the difference in position between *yiqtol* (< **yaqtulu*) and the jussive as the starting point. When the former became restricted to non-initial position, "there was a need for an alternative encoding of a corresponding syndetic clause without a topicalized clause element." I.e., *weqatal* was used because initial *yiqtol* would imply volitive meaning. This may have played a role but it is hardly the main reason for the development of *weqatal*. As argued in 3.7, the typical initial position of volitives is not the cause of the volitive meaning. In fact, it seems preferable to see the positional rule as (partly) a result of the development of *weqatal* rather than the other way around. Because *weqatal* was used instead of (non-volitive) *weyiqtol*, the tendency for non-volitive *yiqtol* to occur in non-initial position was strengthened, leading to the classical positional distinction between volitives and non-volitive *yiqtol*.

5 The origins of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*

semantic shift from non-anterior to anterior (cf. Kawashima 2010, 16). Apparently, non-anteriority turns into anteriority when *waw* is prefixed, as the classic "converted" theory claims although, from a diachronic point of view, there is no "conversion." Further, the apparent "conversion" is often accompanied by a difference in stress between *wayyiqtol* and *yiqtol* < **yaqtulu*. It seems plausible that language users may have made a connection between final stress and non-anterior/modal/jussive meaning.⁷⁴ Even when stress became final in most *wayyiqtol*s, the distinction was preserved in some roots (5.2.1). Furthermore, the original penultimate stress was preserved in *qatal* in forms with a certain phonetic structure (1s, 2sm and 1p), even when stress in general shifted to the final syllable. On this basis, the non-anterior form *weqatal* (*weqataltî*) was analogically created – with a combination of final stress and non-anteriority as opposed to the simple *qatal* form with the opposite traits. Or, from a different angle, just like *qatal* (with penultimate stress) expresses the same anterior meaning as *wayyiqtol* (also with penultimate stress), non-anterior *yiqtol* (with final stress) enters into a similar interchange with the new form *weqatal* (also with final stress).⁷⁵

Hetzron (1969, 9) claims that the development of *weqataltî* happened after **yaqtulu* and jussive **yaqtûl* had become homonymous in most cases, since the new form "represents both the imperfect and the jussive." However, *weqataltî* is never a specific jussive. It has general non-anterior meaning and contextually derived modal shades of meaning. For the combination of "and" and jussive, CH would use *weyiqtol*. However, the meanings were close enough for the jussive to contribute to the perceived correlation between stress and meaning. The arguments presented above for an early Hebrew or pre-Hebrew distinction between anterior **yáqtul* and jussive **yaqtûl* are clearly important for the development of *weqatal*. If the position of the stress were the same in both forms, the perceived connection between stress and meaning would be more problematic and the analogical approach would have correspondingly less explanatory power.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ The imperative had final stress too. Further, in II-*w* roots, the loss of case vowels and feminine *-t* led to a distinction marked by stress between the feminine PTC (הִצִּיֵּן < **qāmātu*) and 3sf *qatal* (הִצִּיֵּן < **qāmat*). In 3sf, the original stress was preserved because of the long vowel in the stressed syllable.

⁷⁵ Janssens (1982, 52) derives the final stress in 2sm *weqataltá* solely from the cases where the function is one of command. In simple future use, as well as in 1s *weqataltî*, the final stress, according to Janssens, is analogically derived from the use of 2sm in commands.

⁷⁶ This, of course, is not an independent argument for the existence of a distinction marked by stress. However, the two theories (the analogical approach to *weqatal* and the theory

If the stress did play this decisive role in the development, the result of the process was not merely an old form with a change of meaning. Rather, the analogical creation was a new form with a corresponding new meaning (*weqatalí*). Hence, it would have been possible to maintain the "natural" construction – i.e. *w+qatal* without stress movement and with anterior meaning (*weqatálti*).⁷⁷ However, the extent to which this form was used in CH is a matter that is very difficult to settle (see 6.2.1 and ch. 8).

5.3.2 Final stress in *weqatal*?

The classical claim that stress is of relevance in connection with *weqatal* has often been contested. It is clear that the final stress is only regularly attested in 1s and 2sm and only in certain root types. Some roots (such as III-*h/'*) tend to prevent stress shift, with details differing according to stem type, syllable structure, etc. The shift is also prevented under certain phonetic and/or syntactic conditions in the clause (in pause or before a stressed syllable in the next word). The bewildering set of rules needed to account for all the apparently irregular occurrences has led some scholars to question the entire notion. Bergström (2014, 119) claims that the morphological difference between *weqatálti* and *weqatalí* is "not sufficiently distinctive." However, he gives no definition of what a sufficient distinction would be. Likewise, Cook argues that "there is no evidence that *qatal* and *wěqatal* represent distinct and independent developments in Hebrew," stating that there is no connection between stress and meaning (2012, 210). The example adduced to prove this point is Amos 1:4 (וְשִׁלְחָתִי) vs. Amos 1:5 (וְשִׁבְרָתִי). Both are non-anterior, yet only v. 5 has final stress. However, this is clearly an example of the well-known phenomenon that final stress tends to be avoided before a following word with initial stress when the two words are closely joined (*nesiga*).⁷⁸ In 1:4, the following word is שָׁא, in v. 5 we have בְּרִיחַ דְּמִשְׁקָא. Cook refers to Revell for the argument that the position of the stress is subject to prosodic forces, and this is clearly true. However, Cook seems to overlook the fact

of **yáqtul* vs. **yaqtúl*) fit nicely together and enable us to present an account of the development of the system, which is coherent and more convincing than the alternatives.

⁷⁷ Birkeland (1940, 74) states that the development of *weqatalí* presupposes a *weqatálti*, "sonst wäre das 'und' ein zureichendes Merkmal und eine Akzentverschiebung unverständlich." However, it seems that the model of *yiqtol* < **yaqtulu* (and **yaqtúl*) in contrast to *wayyiqtol* and simple *qatal* may have been enough to inspire final stress in *weqatalí*, whether or not *weqatálti* was part of the system.

⁷⁸ According to Revell (1985, 286), the influence of a following stressed syllable on *weqatal* 1s and 2sm is not, strictly speaking, *nesiga*, but a related phenomenon. The stress was not retracted as in ordinary *nesiga*, but remained in its original (pre-analogy) position. However, the underlying phonetic mechanism must be the same.

that Revell recognizes a distinction between two separate categories. The various phenomena that decide whether or not a given form occurs with final stress only apply to "converted" *weqatal* and not to simple *w+qatal* (Revell 1985, 279). Cook's other argument – that the distinction is very late, representing "at most a retrospective grammatical analysis and not an organic development within BH grammar" (2012, 210) – does indeed reflect Revell's view, but as will be argued below, the evidence for this view is not convincing.

A comprehensive attack on the semantic significance of stress in *weqatal* was launched by McFall (1982, 189–210). He concludes that "the tone was syntactically conditioned and was not linked with any phonemic change" (ib., 210). Revell's argument noted above that the rules regulating the occurrence or non-occurrence of final stress only apply in the category of non-anterior *weqatal* was specifically directed at McFall. McFall's point of view is clearly untenable. His main arguments are the occurrence of *weqatalti* with simple past meaning (ib., 194, point 4, and 203) and the opposite phenomenon, viz. *weqatalti* with non-anterior meaning (ib., 194, point 3). All his examples of the former type, however, are in fact non-anterior: future, modal, or expressions of habituality etc. in a past context (cf. Revell 1985, 278–279; also Zevit 1998, 52ff., especially 53, n. 13). For details, see appendix 39. The latter type (penultimate stress, non-anterior meaning) includes a few cases that are probably anterior (1 Chr 17:10 and 29:17).⁷⁹ The remaining cases are in pausal position, followed by a stressed syllable, or from root or stem types that tend to prevent stress shift (III-*h hif.* and *pi.*, III-'*nif.*, or II-*w* and II-gem. *hif.* with connective *-o-*).

Final stress in clearly non-anterior *weqatals* in words whose root type or phonetic or syntactic context normally prevent such stress are unproblematic. In most *weqatals* 1s and 2sm, the stress shift did take place and an analogical irregular overextension of the phenomenon is hardly surprising.⁸⁰ Hence, irregular הִיִּשָּׁר in Lev 24:5 (McFall 1982, 193–194) is not an argument against the classical conception.

McFall argues that the connection of the verb to the larger sense-unit is decisive. Final stress shows that "the speaker's mind is on what follows the verb," while non-final stress indicates the end of a sense-unit (ib., 201). To be sure, syntactic and phonetic conditions do influence the actual occurrence

⁷⁹ McFall writes 29:14, which has no *weqatal*. He must mean v. 17. Note also McFall's list (1982, 215–216), which purports to show that simple *qatal* has past and future meaning regardless of stress position. As argued in 3.3, there are no convincing examples of real non-anterior simple *qatal*.

⁸⁰ Cf. the sporadic stress shift in 3sf II-*w*, II-gem., *hif.* See Birkeland 1940, 73.

of final stress in a given word but this in no way eliminates the need to posit two distinct categories. McFall (ib., 194) claims that a semantic category that only finds expression under certain circumstances is absurd. The evidence, however, indicates otherwise. E.g., the category of gender is neutralized in pause in some words (אֵל, אֵלָה) and 1s and 2sf *qatal* are not kept apart when an object suffix is added. Similar neutralizations are found in many languages.

The details concerning the conditions that counteract final stress are not the point here.⁸¹ In any case, they are not necessarily consistent throughout all the texts. Revell (1987, 37) notes that the exact same sentence occurs with and without *nesiga* (2 Kgs 25:3 and Jer 52:6). The point here is merely to underline the fact that there is no reason to disregard the stress as part of the form non-anterior *weqatal*. Appendix 40 provides a list of *weqatáltis* in the OT whose penultimate stress cannot be explained by recourse to interfering factors such as problematic root/stem types, *nesiga*, pause, etc., but must be attributed to anterior meaning.⁸² For most of these, it is possible to find *weqataltís* from the same verb with clearly non-anterior meaning. There are, of course, many more occurrences of anterior *weqatal* (see 6.2.1) – but in most cases, the link between stress and meaning is not clear (due to the factors mentioned or because the verbs are not 1s or 2sm).

Many scholars see the distinction between *weqatálti* and *weqataltí* as late and possibly artificial. According to Brockelmann (1913, 150), it may be a product of "der künstlichen Synagogaussprache," since the expected natural outcome of **waqataltí* is the unattested *uqtaltí*. Yet, this argument is not decisive. In an analogical process, the new form may take over the general shape from the form on which it is based (cf. Blake 1944, 285). Similarly, the restriction of the stress shift to 1s and 2sm in certain root types in certain positions has been used as an argument for the lateness of the phenomenon.⁸³ Bauer and Leander (1965, 313–314, §42z) answered this point, arguing

⁸¹ See Revell 1985; Blake 1944, 289–292, n. 35. According to Birkeland (1940, 73) stress shift is irregular because "der Gegensatz *yíqtul:yíqtúl* im Schwinden war" at the time when *weqatal* developed and because 2sm *weqatal* "gelegentlich auch *yíqtul* [i.e., the jussive, according to Birkeland's approach] ersetzte." The latter part, at least, is hardly convincing, cf. the argument above that the jussive must have had final stress.

⁸² I.e., anterior meaning according to the interpretation of the Masoretes. In some cases, the intention behind the consonant text may have been regular non-anterior *weqatal* (see below).

⁸³ See Andersen 2000, 44. He asks why there is no final stress in "the more basic formation *qātal*, but only in the derived formation *wəqātal*." The answer is obvious. Simple *qatal* is always an anterior tense with stress according to the regular phonetic development while the new analogically created non-anterior *weqataltí* has analogical final stress derived from non-anterior/modal/jussive forms.

5 The origins of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*

against Brockelmann that if the distinction is really a late, artificial way of highlighting a difference of meaning, there is no reason why it is not found in the entire paradigm. On the contrary, the sporadic and somewhat irregular attestation may indicate that the shift is a relic of an originally more widespread phenomenon, cf. Ewald's claim that the stress shift is "nicht mehr überall deutlich ausgeprägt" (1870, 600).⁸⁴

Revell argues for the lateness of final stress by pointing out that the stress shift was blocked by the same mechanism that produced *nesiga* (before a stressed syllable in the following, closely joined word). Hence, Revell claims, the form *weqatalí* could not have been created before *nesiga* occurred, and since, according to Revell, *nesiga* likely had not occurred at the time of the Qumran writings, the final stress must be later than those texts and "probably arose within the biblical reading tradition" (Revell 1984, 439, n. 13, and 440). The idea that there was no *nesiga* in QH is based on the usual plene writing of the vowel in the penultimate syllable in *yiqtol* 3p which is reduced to *shewa* in Masoretic notation. Since *nesiga*, so to speak, skips reduced vowels (e.g. in *qatal* 3p as in Gen 49:6, קָרַגְוּ אֵישׁ), the reduction must have happened before *nesiga*. However, this argument is not very convincing. First, the mechanism behind *nesiga* seems to be a general tendency to avoid two consecutive stressed syllables rather than a single event that occurred just once. Second, the Qumran material does not show whether there was *nesiga* and reduction of vowels. The Masoretic notation is extremely detailed and shows all kinds of phenomena that occur in all languages all the time (reduction or lengthening of vowels, change of vowel quality, stress shift, spirantization of consonants, etc. depending on clausal position and phonetic environment). Most orthographies do not mark such phenomena explicitly because it would be mostly unnecessary for a competent speaker, who knows automatically how to pronounce a given word in a given context even though it is written in a standard way (i.e. a more phonemic notation as opposed to the more detailed phonetic information provided by the MT; cf. Brønno 1956, 255). Hence, we do not know whether the QH spelling יקטולו signifies a pronunciation or stress pattern different from the MT (e.g. MT Ps 129:2, לֹא-יִכְלֹוּ לִי, vs. 11QPs^a אֵל יִכּוּלוּ לִי; Ulrich 2010, 703). The fact that QH orthography does not show the same details as the MT does not constitute an argument for the lateness of *weqatalí*.

⁸⁴ Bauer and Leander explain the lack of final stress in 1p by analogical influence from the personal pronoun 1p without final stress, as opposed to the pronouns in 1s and second person. Cf. Revell (1985, 277, with n. 2). In addition, Revell follows Blau (1971, 22) in suggesting that stress in general may have been less likely to shift to *u*.

Clearly, our only source of knowledge about stress in *weqatal*⁸⁵ is the Masoretic notation.⁸⁵ The obvious fact that the attestation of this notation is very late does not mean that the distinctions expressed by the system are inventions without a basis in the real development of the language. As Gibson (1995, 97) correctly notes, "[t]hat these distinguishing marks [in *weqatal* and *wayyiqtol*] are not always present is not so important as the fact that they are there at all." The Masoretes probably misvocalized specific verbs (*wayyiqtol* instead of *weyiqtol* or *weqatal*^{tí} instead of *weqatá*^{tí}, or vice versa), but this does not signify that the categories in question are artificial inventions. We need convincing evidence for the claim that the Masoretes invented the category of *weqatal*^{tí}. In the absence of such evidence, we should try to make sense of the attested phenomenon as a real part of the language (cf. Birkeland 1940, 72; Driver 1874, 126–127: "a practice current in their [the Masoretes'] day, and doubtless handed down from a period when Hebrew was a living and growing language"). On a more general level, as Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 2, §1.6.3i) note, "[a] complex body of evidence indicates that the MT could not, in any serious or systematic way, represent a reconstruction or faking of the data." Still, it is important not to make too far-reaching claims. It is not possible to prove that final stress in *weqatal*^{tí} was part of spoken Hebrew when the category of non-anterior *weqatal* developed. However, as long as the evidence for the lateness and artificiality of the phenomenon remains unconvincing, an approach that integrates all the available information into the explanation ought to be preferred. The integration of the stress position in the evolution of *weqatal* enables us to describe the mechanism behind the analogical creation of the form in a more convincing manner (giving it more substance) than is the case if we ignore the stress.

⁸⁵ There is no convincing evidence that the variations in spelling in the ancient inscriptions indicate a stress distinction (as argued, e.g., by Zevit 1998, 58–59). To be sure, most *weqatals* are written with *-t* and most simple *qatals* with *-th*, but this distribution is not entirely consistent (cf. Gogel 1983, 87). Further, the fact that the full spelling occurs mostly on simple forms *without* final stress would be very odd if spelling and stress were connected.

6 The decline of the consecutive forms: Unclassical usage in various corpora

As argued, the central category in the HVS is relative tense throughout all stages of the language. The difference between CH and RH cannot be properly described as a transition from aspect-prominence to tense-prominence.¹ Rather, we are dealing with reconfigurations of the same relative temporal system. These reconfigurations, however, are of a quite fundamental character. Kutscher's designation of the changes as "revolutionary" may not be exaggerated (1982, 131).

Three main phenomena define the two major stages of the language in relation to each other. 1) The separate volitive system was abandoned. 2) The predicative PTC acquired an increasingly dominant position in the system, which brought about several changes in the usage of the finite forms. The PTC took over several functions from *yiqtol*, a process which was already underway in CH. Accordingly, *yiqtol* became restricted to the marking of relative posterior events and modal shades of meaning, including frequent use in subordinate contexts introduced by various conjunctions or particles. Some of the functions of *qatal* were taken over by the PTC as well ("performatives" and stative usage with some verbs). 3) The use of *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal* was abandoned. In RH, the characteristic system of consecutive forms known from CH is found only in biblical quotations.² Point 3), in particular, clearly separates RH from the classical language.³ Instead of the ever-present interchange of *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* or *yiqtol* and *weqatal*, RH simply coordinates the basic forms with *w-*, e.g. m. 'Abot 1:1 מִשָּׁה קָבַל תּוֹרָה מִסִּינַי וּמִסֵּרָה לִיהוֹשֻׁעַ (*qatal* and *weqatal*), or 1:11, ... וְיִמְאָר תְּחִבּוּבֵי ... וְיִשְׁתּוּ ... וְיִתְגַּלוּ (*yiqtol* and *weyiqtol*s). In order to set the stage for the further discussion of the development of the consecutive forms, the following section will briefly present the use of the relevant forms in the ancient inscriptions in contrast to the usage in the later documentary texts.

¹ In fact, RH is more aspect-prominent than CH (3.8.1 and 4.4).

² A passage in b. Qidd. 66a contains several *wayyiqtol*s (some cases of וַיִּבְדְּלוּ, וַיְבִיחוּ, וַיִּבְדְּלוּ, וַיְבִיחוּ; cf. Segal 1927, 72). According to Rabin (1958, 155), this may be a quotation from a lost "ancient" work comparable to Judith, Jubilees, etc. Sharvit (1980, 125) notes a few cases in the Mishnah of what appears to be non-anterior *weqatal* (m. 'Abot 1:11 and m. B. Meši'a 5:9). The verb is מִצָּא and he refers to a similar example without *w-* in m. Roš Haš. 1:6. Hence, it seems better to regard these cases as having ordinary anterior meaning. Pérez Fernández (1997, 101) mentions the use of מִצָּא as a special type of meta-language.

³ The Rabbis seem to be very well aware of the fundamental distinction between CH and RH, e.g. b. 'Abod. Zar. 58b, לְשׁוֹן תּוֹרָה לְעִצְמָה לְשׁוֹן חֻמִּים לְעִצְמָה; b. Hul. 137b; b. Qidd. 2b (cf. Meyer 1957, 148). In contrast, note Elwolde's view (1997, 51).

6.1 Consecutive forms in the inscriptions and documentary texts

The problematic nature of the epigraphic material was already mentioned in 4.1. The fragmentary state of many inscriptions, alternative readings, and competing interpretations reduce the number of forms that can be used in analyzing the verbal system. It is necessary to focus on forms that are clearly legible and occur in passages whose interpretation is more or less certain. In documents without vowel points context is needed in order to decide, e.g., whether a *wyqtl* is a *weyiqtol* or a *wayyiqtol*. Such decisions have consequences for one's view of the consecutive forms and in some cases it is not possible to decide. Similarly, some cases of *weqatal* seem to be equally interpretable as anterior or non-anterior.

In Arad 111:3, e.g., we find the form ואתן. Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 106) translate this as "and I will give," i.e. as a *weyiqtol*, apparently with no volitive meaning (Renz 1995, 402: "und ich werde geben"). This would be an unclassical use of *weyiqtol* for expected *weqatal*. However, this ostrakon is very fragmentary, and the form may be a *wayyiqtol* ("and I have given/gave"). Likewise, Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 248) render ותעצר in KBar 2:2–3 as "and seal," to which they add the mysterious claim that "[t]he form of the verb itself represents the correct biblical form for expressing consecutive imperatives, i.e., an imperative followed by a second-person imperfect 'converted' with *waw*, which fits with the consecutive nature of filling and sealing." This makes no sense. If it is a "converted imperfect," it is a *wayyiqtol* ("and she/you sealed"). In fact, there is no reason not to read the form as a *wayyiqtol*. Renz (1995, 339) refers to both possibilities in his notes, but prefers the *weyiqtol* interpretation in his translation ("und du sollst verschliessen"), indicating that the preceding imperative makes a jussive reading likely. However, the preceding verb form (מלא) might be a *qatal*. In any case, this short inscription may in fact be a school exercise (both words seem to be repeated), which makes it doubtful whether there is any connection between the verbs. Similar ambiguity applies to the *wyqtls* in KAjr 14:1; 15:2, 3; Uza 2:7. The form in Lach 4 Rev.:2 (וידע) could be a *weyiqtol* (Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 315 and 318: jussive, "and let him know") or a *weqatal* (Gogel 1983, 262–263 and 417: probably *weqatal*, "he will know").

Despite these problems, the more clearly attested cases conclusively demonstrate that the system of consecutive forms was in regular use. In general, scholars have noted the classical character of the inscriptions (Gogel 1983, 292; with particular reference to the verbal system, Joosten 2012a, 379). This does not mean that epigraphic Hebrew is identical with BH (or

6 The decline of the consecutive forms: Unclassical usage in various corpora

specifically with presumed EBH).⁴ Yet, if we focus on the use of the consecutive forms, the inscriptions seem to function in the way described in 3.6. We have attestations of *qatal*, *yiqtol*, non-anterior *weqatal*, *wayyiqtol*, (volitive) *weyiqtol*, imperative, absolute and construct infinitive, active and passive PTC. The functions are similar to the ones attested in the OT. However, due to the small size of the corpus and the genres of texts represented some usages of some verb forms are rare or completely unattested (cf. 4.1). Some scholars claim that the rather low number of *wayyiqtol*s (approx. seven) indicates that the consecutive forms were already more or less obsolete at the time of the inscriptions (e.g. Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 317). However, genre and the general style and character of the inscriptions seem to be the decisive element. In inscriptions with narrative passages more *wayyiqtol*s might have been expected (Arad 40, Lach 4, and Silm). Yet, there are reasons for the dominant use of *qatal* (preposed object or subject, relative particles, negations, etc.; cf. Isserlin 1972, 201–202; Young 2003b, 295). Most significantly, simple *qatal* is used in these cases, not anterior *weqatal*, as would have been the case if the system of consecutive forms had become obsolete.

There are approx. 12 *weqatals* in the inscriptions. Most are clearly of the classical, non-anterior type (see appendix 21). Two cases, however, (Arad 3:2–3 and Arad 16:4) are ambiguous (for the texts, see appendix 41). They seem to be interpretable as anteriors (*weqatálti*), especially 3:2–3 (וְצוּר הַנְּגִיהוּ (עַל בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע). על באר שבע וצור may be performative/epistolary (a function of basic anteriority), in which case the subject (הַנְּגִיהוּ) is the writer/sender of the letter. This may find support in Arad 16:1–2, where the same (?) הַנְּגִיהוּ sends greetings to the same (?) אֱלִישָׁבַח, using a 3sm verb followed by a 1s, which makes it clear that the 3sm form refers to the writer/sender. In Arad 3, however, we cannot be sure that הַנְּגִיהוּ is the writer/sender of the letter. If he is not, וְצוּר may be an ordinary non-anterior (future) *weqatal*. In this case, the order in lines 1–2 is to be carried out first, i.e. the addressee should give wine, possibly to הַנְּגִיהוּ, who will then proceed to send the addressee to Beersheba. In Arad 16:4, a non-anterior reading (future) of the form וּשְׁלַחְתִּי is possible as well – the preceding infinitival construction (כִּצְאֹתִי מִבֵּיתְךָ) can refer to any time frame.⁵ The two possible cases of *weqatal* in MHsh 1:5 and 6–7 were discussed in 4.1. Their unclassical nature is not clear.

⁴ See Young 2003b; Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 1:143–172; further, the monograph under preparation by Rezetko (*Comparing Ancient Corpora: Epigraphic and Biblical Hebrew in Historical Sociolinguistic Perspective*).

⁵ See Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 32–33. They prefer a past tense reading and refer to Pardee, who changed his interpretation from past to future. Gogel (1983, 263 and 390) renders the verb as "I will send." Renz (1995, 379), though using past tense in his translation, calls the form a "Prf. consec."

All the clear cases of *weyiqtol* in the inscriptions are volitive: KHin 2:6–7, 10–11; KAJr 19:8, 9. The forms in KHin are only partially preserved (וְ[י]שְׁמַרְךָ and וְ[י]שֶׁם; the first of these is preserved in an even worse state in KHin 1:15–16, וְ[י]שְׁמַרְךָ). Yet, it seems clear that they are *w+yiqtols*. The passage contains initial simple *yiqtols* and since the content is clearly a version of the text preserved in Num 6:24–26 (the Priestly Blessing), the interpretation of the forms as explicitly jussive *weyiqtols* seems evident. The reading of the two cases in KAJr 19 as *weyiqtols* seems to be certain as well (l. 8 וְיִשְׁמַרְךָ, l. 9 וְיִהְיֶה). The preceding verb is an initial *yiqtol*, i.e. probably a jussive (יִבְרַךְ). Since the content seems to be a blessing (introducing a letter; note the performative *qatal* in l. 5 בְּרַכְתָּךְ), the jussive reading is an obvious choice. The form in KAJr 19:9 is short (וְיִהְיֶה); in the other verbs, no formal distinction is possible. Thus, the four clearly attested cases conform to classical usage.

In spite of limited evidence, we must conclude that the epigraphic corpus is CH, as far as the use of *waw*-prefixed forms is concerned. No completely convincing case of unclassical usage is attested.

In contrast, the general character of the verbal system in the later documentary texts is clearly unclassical. Though a few forms are potentially interpretable as *wayyiqtols* due to lack of context, there are no clear cases of *wayyiqtol* or non-anterior *weqatal* in this corpus.

There are only three clear *weqatals*: Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 44:2 (וְחָלְקוּ), Mur 42:6 (וְהִפְצַתִּיךָ), and Mur 44:8 (וּפְקֹדְתִי). In her English translation, Yardeni (2000, 2:64) renders the *weqatal* in Mur 44:8 as a CH non-anterior *weqatal* ("And I shall order"). However, in her ModH translation (2000, 1:159), as well as in Milik's translation (1961, 162), the more likely unclassical, anterior interpretation is found. The other two cases are also unclassical anterior forms (the one in Mur 42:6 seems to be a counterfactual irrealis). In addition, Broshi and Qimron (1994, 292) apparently understand XḤev/Ṣe 49:10 (וְהִתְשַׁלַּם) as a *weqatal* 3sm, in the classical non-anterior sense: "And (the debt) might be collected." They note that the second letter can be read as a *yod* (i.e. as a *weyiqtol*), "but linguistically our reconstruction is preferable to וְיִתְשַׁלַּם." They do not explain why this is the case. In fact, since there are no other instances in this corpus that can be securely interpreted as non-anterior *weqatals*, one would expect the use of *weyiqtol* rather than *weqatal* if the meaning is future/modal. Further, the form may be a noun (Yardeni 2000, 2:19: "then the payment (will be).")

No convincing case of *wayyiqtol* occurs in this corpus. The context of some *wyqtls* is so damaged that any interpretation is possible: Naḥal Ḥever

6 The decline of the consecutive forms: Unclassical usage in various corpora

(P. Yadin) 49:12; 51:5, 8; Jericho 11:3; XHev/Se 6 fr. 2 6; fr. 3 1, 7.⁶ Strictly speaking, we cannot rule out a *wayyiqtol* reading, but since the other cases of *wyqtl* in the documents belong in contexts of either future time reference or command, it seems preferable to interpret all the forms (approx. 10) as *weyiqtols*. The occurrences (in addition to the ones mentioned before) are: XHev/Se 49:9;⁷ Naḥal Hever (P. Yadin) 45:25; 46:6 (twice), 9; Mur 44:4. In none of these cases does an explicitly volitive interpretation of *weyiqtol* seem necessary.

Though the lack of real narrative sequences makes it impossible to draw any firm conclusions regarding *wayyiqtol* and anterior *weqatal*, the evidence as it is seems to indicate that the classical consecutive forms have been lost in the language reflected in these texts.

In sum, the overall development seems to be tolerably clear. As far as the consecutive forms are concerned, the inscriptions present a classical type of Hebrew whereas the verbal system of the later documents aligns with RH.⁸ There are no unambiguous examples of anterior *weqatal* or non-jussive *weyiqtols* in the inscriptions, while classical *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* are clearly attested. The active PTC plays a very restricted role and there is no certain case of the periphrastic construction. In contrast, the later documents display no convincing and unambiguous examples of *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal*, while *weyiqtols* with seemingly non-volitive meaning and anterior *weqatals* are attested in several instances. The PTC, including the periphrastic construction, occurs much more frequently than in the inscriptions (on the PTC in both corpora, see 3.8).

⁶ On XHev/Se 6, see Mor 2016, 280. The text is a biblically based prayer and may contain classical *wayyiqtols*. However, the forms are interpretable as non-anterior *weyiqtols*. Morgenstern (2000, 199–200) translates the form in fr. 3 7 (וילמד[ג]ן) as "and he taught [u]s" but remarks that it may refer to an eschatological Torah to be restored at the end of days.

⁷ In 49:13, the form וואחתי occurs (Yardeni 2000, 2:19, "and I shall sign"). In principle, it could be claimed to be a *wayyiqtol*. However, Broshi and Qimron (1994, 287–288) read this word with a *mem* instead of an *alef*, interpreting the form as a passive PTC ("... and signed").

⁸ This is the general picture concerning the verbal system. When examining other aspects of the language, it becomes clear that the idiom preserved in the documentary texts cannot be the direct ancestor of RH (or rather, of the spoken language on which RH was based). Koller (2017, 164) argues that the language of the late documentary texts should be called Judean Hebrew and regarded as "the spoken language of the people in Jerusalem and Judea in Hellenistic times" – "through at least the early part of the second century CE," while "a somewhat different dialect we might call Proto-Mishnaic Hebrew was being spoken to the west, on the coastal plain and in the Shephelah."

6.2 Unclassical interference

As shown in 6.1, the development of the HVS is quite clear when one compares the two corpora of non-literary ancient Hebrew documents. The dates of these texts are less controversial than those of biblical books and their dependence on literary language is not as obvious as is the case with the Qumran material.⁹ A substantial period of time separates the two corpora (tenth to sixth century BC vs. ca. 130 AD), which allows an overall view of the development of the system. Moreover, the system in the late documentary texts resembles the system attested in RH while the system in the early inscriptions resembles the system attested in the OT. However, this statement requires serious modification. The classical system (as described in 3.6) is the dominant – but not the only – way that the verb forms function in the OT. In numerous places, seemingly unclassical usage shows up. When discussing the development of the consecutive forms, the cases of interest are the sporadic occurrences of anterior *weqatal* (*weqatálti*) and *weyiqtol*s without specific volitive meaning, i.e. unclassical substitutes for *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal*, respectively. If this kind of usage were limited to clearly late texts, we might be dealing with a simple reflection of the real world development of the language leading to a progressively more RH-like system. However, things are not that simple, especially not when the Qumran corpus is taken into account. Some demonstrably late texts show few or no signs of unclassical usage while some texts that are generally seen as early do.

In recent years, the presumed connection between linguistic traits and chronology has faced heavy criticism, in particular by Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd (2008; cf. several articles in Young 2003a; Rezetko and Young 2014). While some of the claims made by these scholars in their 2008 book have been lambasted for seemingly implying an almost total denial of chronological evolution of the language,¹⁰ the basic point of their criticism is certainly valid. The nature of the texts at our disposal, the way they were produced and transmitted, and the fact that the classical version of Hebrew must

⁹ Rezetko and Young (2014, 21–26 and 44) highlight the problems in using literary (specifically religious) texts in the description of the development of languages. Note that the non-literary nature of the inscriptions is not universally agreed upon. There might have been literary models for the language used as argued, e.g., by Rendsburg (1990, 32–33). On this question, see 7.2.

¹⁰ Cf. several contributions in Miller-Naudé and Zevit 2012. As argued by Rezetko and Young (2014, 594–595), they never intended to deny the role played by chronological development though they admit to having "sometimes used unpropitious language, misjudged or underplayed the potential relevance of different proportions of linguistic variants (in the variationist sense) in biblical writings, and in some instances even over argued a synchronic or stylistic interpretation of particular linguistic data."

have been used as a learned language in religious literature for a long period (while the spoken language probably evolved farther and farther away from the classical standard) would seem to preclude any direct and necessary relation between supposedly diagnostic traits in the linguistic makeup of a text and the date of writing of the original text. In fact, it does not seem to be possible to trace the development of the HVS in a straight line through the various books of the OT, via the Qumran documents, to RH. There is no guarantee that late texts such as the ones from Qumran must exhibit a clearly unclassical use of every part of the system. Since it seems necessary to assume a continued use of CH as a literary standard language, a skilled late writer or copyist may have been able to use a polished classical style without betraying his lateness.

In the next sections, the main types of unclassical usage in the OT and at Qumran will be discussed (anterior *weqatal* and non-volitive *weyiqtol*, with a critical discussion of Joosten's approach to the latter question). In ch. 7, the character of CH and the best way to characterize QH will be discussed.

6.2.1 Anterior *weqatal* in the OT

In section 6.1, I argued that no unequivocal anterior *weqatal* is attested in the ancient inscriptions (alternative interpretations are possible for the potential cases). The difficulties in deciding whether a *weqatal* is anterior apply to the other corpora of texts as well. Indeed, various scholars have offered quite diverging counts of the relevant forms in the OT. E.g., Rezetko (2003, 234, with n. 62) finds 610 "past-*weqatal* forms" in the OT, with Joshua exhibiting the greatest number (91). In contrast, Joosten (without giving a number for the entire OT) states that there are around 60 cases in "EBH" (which includes Joshua) and around 115 in "LBH" (2012a, 404).¹¹ He notes only one case from Joshua (9:12, וְעֵצָה הַגֵּיהַּ יְבֵשׁ וְהָיָה גִבְעוֹתֵיהֶם יִבְרֹשׁוּ) – and this may in fact be an ordinary non-anterior ("It is dry, and it will become crumblings/is about to crumble!").¹² The problem is that many cases are interpretable as non-anteriors. Sometimes the past reference is debatable (as in Josh 9:12), but in the majority of instances noted by scholars the context is clearly past. However, this does not rule out the use of a non-anterior form, as evidenced by the frequent use of *yiqtol* and *weqatal* to indicate iterative or habitual meaning in the past. Hence, the *weqatals* in question might be ordinary, classical non-anteriors,

¹¹ See the lists of occurrences in discourse (Joosten 2012a, 225–226) and narrative (ib., 227–228).

¹² The simple *qatal* in the similar expression in 9:5 might be an argument for an anterior reading, yet hardly a decisive one.

rather than unclassical anteriors.¹³ In Joshua, Joosten (2012a, 307) sees cases such as 19:11–14 as iteratives, while such forms must be included in Rezetko's "past-*weqatal* forms" (cf. Hornkohl 2014, 35, n. 99; 258, n. 276).

In the absence of native speaker intuition, it will probably never be possible to give a reliable number for the cases belonging to the category of anterior *weqatal*. In the lists presented in grammars and other treatments of the question, we often find cases of ordinary non-anterior forms referring to the future or, more often, indicating iterativity or habituality in the past. E.g., in Spieckermann's list of "Pf. cop. in sensu stricto" (1982, 126–128), we have 2 Sam 12:31 (וְהָעֵבֶיר) and 2 Kgs 12:10 (וְנִתְּנוּ; the same in v. 12), which seem to be habitual/iterative. Isa 28:26 (וְיִסְרוּ) and Jer 6:17 (וְהִקְמִתִּי) seem to have future reference and the same might be the case with 2 Kgs 14:10 (וְנִשְׁאַף) and 22:17 (וְנִצְתָה).¹⁴ Likewise, in the list of "single action past" *weqatals* in Samuel (Rezetko and Young 2014, 189, n. 47), 1 Sam 15:28 (וְנִתְּנָה) probably has future reference (cf. Joosten 2012a, 50). The number of anterior *weqatals* can be reduced substantially – depending on one's analysis of the type of event that can be subsumed under the heading non-anteriority (or imperfectivity or modality, according to other approaches). Clearly, all attempts at counting the cases must be subjective (cf. Van Peursen 2004, 157).

Concomitance and durativity are notions typically marked by the PTC and not by the finite non-anterior forms (3.8). Yet, this view may have to be modified. If these notions are included in the domain of non-anterior *weqatal*, many proposed anterior *weqatals* might be reinterpreted as non-anteriors. The idea that *weqatals* can indicate a type of concomitant action has been expressed by several scholars – with otherwise widely diverging views on the analysis of *weqatal* and its status in the system (see Siegismund 2017, 202–206). Driver (1874, 171) used the term "accretion" as opposed to "development" to describe the meaning of (some cases of) *weqatal*, often in "the conjunction of two synonymous or similar ideas." GKC (339, §112ss) refers

¹³ Note the well-known example of a (possibly) unclassical *weqatal*, Gen 15:6 (וְהִנֵּחַ לְךָ) (בִּיהֵנָה וַיִּהְיֶה לְךָ לְזֶכֶד). The form can be read as a simple past tense (Greek καὶ ἐπίστευσεν; cf. the probable *wayyiqtol* in 4Q225, [ויא]מין). Other interpretations have been proposed, however, including habitual/iterative past, durative past, simple future (with וְיִנְצֵחַ from v. 5 as the subject; see Willi-Plein 2000). Cf. Joosten 2012a, 227. Rogland (2008, 243) observes that the habitual/iterative interpretation is most natural and "accords with the overwhelming number of instances of *weqatal* in pre-exilic biblical narrative." However, we cannot be sure that the passage, or this particular verb, is pre-exilic. As will be argued below, it is possible that unexpected *weqatals* are late additions or other types of interference from a later type of language.

¹⁴ Spieckermann (1982, 127, n. 212) notes the possible future interpretation of the latter case, but finds it unconvincing in light of 22:13.

to a "longer or constant continuance in a past state," while Nyberg (1952, 276, §86kk) explains some (but far from all) cases of *weqatal* as indicating a "biomständighet vid sidan av huvudhandlingen" (concomitance in relation to the main event). Likewise, Spieckermann (1982, 124) states that "[n]icht selten dient die Koordination zweier oder mehrerer Perfecta auch dem Ausdruck der *Gleichzeitigkeit*." Revell (1989, 8) translates Judg 3:23 (וַיִּסְגֹּר וַיִּנְעַל בְּעָדָיו וַיִּנְעַל דְּלָתוֹת הָעֶלְיָהּ בְּעָדָיו וַיִּנְעַל; cf. 2 Sam 13:18) as "He closed the doors of the penthouse behind him, locking (them)." He attributes this usage not to the type of *weqatal* that is equivalent to *yiqtol* (YQTL in Revell's terminology), but to *weqatal* belonging to the category QTL (i.e., anterior *weqatal*). He states that, in this usage, a QTL verb represents "an action contemporary with a preceding one" (ib., 8). However, if this is in fact the function of the *weqatal* in Judg 3:23 it must belong to the non-anterior category (Revell's YQTL).

Other scholars ascribe other functions to unexpected *weqatals*.¹⁵ Longacre (1994, 72) argues that "an isolated *weqatal* in the narrative framework marks a climactic or at least a pivotal event." He refers to Judg 3:23 as a "great moment of a story" where "we can expect the narrator to indulge in a few tricks." The same form in 2 Sam 13:18 is said to be used in order to "mark the climactic event in a scenario of violence." Bergen (1994, 330) argues that authors use "incorrect" forms to express unusual thoughts. Robar (2014, 159) holds a similar point of view, arguing that unexpected *weqatals* "may suggest a thematic role for the clause in question that would not have been immediately obvious." She admits that, in most cases, the alleged theme is not "clearly expressed but only hinted at" (ib.).

The notion of pivotal events, climax, unusual thoughts etc. is too vague and subjective to be of real use. Clearly, many turning points or unusual ideas are not marked with this verb form. Yet, Longacre (1994, 85) does note one point of potential importance. He argues that a *weqatal* (וְהָיָה) sometimes points forward as a "marker of significant following material." However, the special significance of such following material is not evident (Siegismund 2017, 203–204). Rather, the *weqatals* mentioned by Longacre seem to introduce temporal expressions of concomitance.¹⁶ Though the event introduced

¹⁵ For further references, see Joosten 2012a, 223–228; Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 2:150–155.

¹⁶ וְהָיָה is followed by a preposition with infinitive (2 Kgs 3:15; 1 Sam 10:9) or by PTCs or a וְי- sentence (1 Sam 1:12–13; 17:48–9; 25:20), describing a prolonged period during which the event takes place. Cf. Spieckermann 1982, 125; Hornkohl 2014, 264.

by וְהָיָה in these cases is a simple, punctual event (in the *wayyiqtol*), the introductory *weqatal* seems to take over the meaning from the following temporal expression.

If we let non-anteriority include the notion of concomitant action, many cases of unexpected *weqatal* can be contained within the classical system.¹⁷ E.g., in Josh 6:8 (וַיִּשְׁבְּעוּ הַפְּהָנִים ... עָבְרוּ וְתָקְעוּ בַּשּׁוֹפְרוֹת), the *weqatal* seems to indicate action concomitant with the preceding *qatal* (NIV "went forward, blowing their trumpets"; cf. the following PTC, וַאֲרוֹן בְּרִית יְהוָה הִלֵּךְ אַחֲרֵיהֶם). The *weqatal* in 2 Sam 16:13 (וַעֲפָר) might indicate concomitance, like the PTC and absolute infinitive in the same verse. *Wayyiqtol*s are used in this verse as well, indicating that the expression of durativity etc. in a past context need not be marked explicitly on every verb (cf. 3.1). Another example is 1 Kgs 20:27 (וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הִתְפַּקְדוּ וְכָלְכָלוּ וַיִּלְכוּ לִקְרֹאתָם). The *weqatal* could be interpreted as a marker of an event concomitant with the preceding verb, while the following *wayyiqtol* indicates a separate event. Similarly in 2 Chr 34:4 (וְהָאֲשֵׁרִים וְהַפְּסָלִים וְהַמַּסְכּוֹת שִׁבַּר וְהַדָּק וַיִּזְרַק עַל־פָּנָיו הַקְּבָרִים), וְהָאֲשֵׁרִים seems to form a unit with שִׁבַּר while וַיִּזְרַק marks a separate event.

Following this line of thought, the list of anterior *weqatals* can be reduced to a very low number. In fact, according to some scholars, the number of irregular/unclassical cases may be zero. E.g., from an aspectual point of view, Moomo (2005) attempts to argue that all cases of *weqatal* are "imperfective."¹⁸ However, a more balanced approach seems to be needed (cf. Hornkohl 2014, 254–266; 287–293). Since we know that *weqatal* eventually replaced *wayyiqtol* as the expression of simple anteriority in continuous narrative and that the same usage is attested in Aramaic and other related languages, it seems unnecessary to claim that there are no cases of unclassical, anterior *weqatal* in the OT. The same argument casts doubt on the claim that the problematic *weqatals* are in fact absolute infinitives (Huesman 1956). To be sure, most of the problematic *weqatals* are 3sm, which means that the consonants may have signified absolute infinitives, with erroneous vocalization. Some cases, however, are first or second person. This fact (in addition

¹⁷ The distinction between habituality/iterativity and durative/concomitant action is often difficult to make (3.1). Stipp (1991, 532) notes that in Num 11:8 (וַיִּהְיֶה טַעְמוֹ כְּטַעַם לֶשֶׁת הַשֶּׁמֶן) and 2 Kgs 18:7 (וַיִּהְיֶה יְהוָה עִמּוֹ), the iterative meaning of the surrounding clauses with fientive verbs in *yiqtol* or *weqatal* seems to have led to the unexpected use of וְהָיָה rather than וַיְהִי. Rather than being durative or indicating simple past, the *weqatals* in these two cases would indicate that this was the taste every time it was tasted (Num 11:8) and that Yahweh was with him on every single, repeated occasion (2 Kgs 18:7).

¹⁸ In contrast, Cook (2012, 253) suggests that some *weqatals* (e.g. Gen 18:26) may be interpretable as "past-in-the-future"/future perfect. This would potentially lead to a very large number of unclassical *weqatals*.

to the presence of anterior *weqatal* as a regular feature in the later language) seems to indicate that we should maintain the category of anterior *weqatal*. Accordingly, we should be wary of using the "concomitant action" approach too liberally. Since we seem to have to accept at least some cases of anterior *weqatal*, it might be argued that many (or all) of the rest are of that type, too. As noted by Joosten (2012a, 227), none of the proposed approaches to problematic *weqatals* seems capable of explaining all the instances. The rarity of the form poses a problem in itself. If Longacre is correct in ascribing a "pivotal" or "climactic" meaning to the forms in question, why are they so rare? Likewise, if the concomitant approach is correct, we might expect many more such *weqatals*. Even when a simple *qatal* is immediately followed by another verb with prefixed *waw*, both of which share the same or similar meaning, there is no guarantee that the second form will be a *weqatal*. Some such sequences use *wayyiqtol* (e.g. 2 Kgs 19:26; Jer 50:23; cf. Joosten 2012, 225–226). With regard to the use of *weqatal* leading up to various expressions of concomitance, Stipp (1991, 538) remarks that if וְהָיָה with a following PTC is due to the durative meaning of the latter, it seems strange that there are so few cases. Mostly, the PTC is used alone or in the sequence וְהָיָה with PTC.¹⁹

This leads to the conclusion that although some (or even many) *weqatals* may express concomitant non-anteriority, it seems impossible to avoid the assumption in other cases of some sort of interference from another type or later stage of language.

Some supposedly unclassical *weqatals* occur in passages or single clauses regarded as late additions on other grounds, e.g. 2 Kgs 17:21 (וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע הַמֶּלֶךְ הַנְּבוֹנִים) and other parts of 2 Kings (especially ch. 23; cf. Joosten 2012a, 227). Likewise, Job 1:5 (וַיְבָרֶכְנוּ אֱלֹהִים בְּלִבְבָם) may be a dogmatic change of an original verb with the meaning "curse." When a late scribe changed the verbal root, he apparently used a late verb form.²⁰ Similarly, Bartelmus (1985, 368–375) integrates the supposedly unclassical *weqatals* in Ezek 37:7–10 in his argument for the lateness of the passage. However, it is clear that there is no automatic and necessary correspondence between late passages and the use of unclassical *weqatal*.

¹⁹ Not all participial clauses introduced by וְהָיָה or וְהָיָה are to be interpreted as periphrastic constructions. Thus, e.g., we should not read וְהָיָה רֶכֶבֶת as a unit in 1 Sam 25:20 (וְהָיָה הַיּוֹם) but rather (literally) as "and it happened – she was riding on the donkey" (cf. Joosten 2012a, 129). Support for this view is the lack of congruence between verb and subject. In other cases, however, the periphrastic construction seems to be attested (e.g. 2 Sam 8:15, מִשְׁפָּט וַיִּצְדָּקָה, וְהָיָה דָוִד עוֹשֶׂה מִשְׁפָּט וַיִּצְדָּקָה).

²⁰ In contrast, see Oblath 1999, 197–198 ("they blessed God in their *hearts*," i.e., "not outwardly, but only inwardly").

Interference of late forms need not be the result of later redaction/insertion or scribal slips. Instead, if the usage of the spoken language was different from the written standard, the original author may have permitted his daily language to influence his literary product, in sporadic contrast to the polished (probably more archaic) style otherwise used. As argued by Longacre, Bergen, and Robar, in some cases, this might even be an intentional method used by the author to attract attention to a particular point in the text. In practice, however, it seems futile to seek to prove that the alleged usage is intentional. Given the facts that anterior *weqatal* is a regular feature of RH and that the usage does not really fit into the system of CH, it is hard to escape the conclusion that interference of some sort is responsible for at least a large part of the problematic *weqatals* noted by scholars. Gropp's designation of anterior *weqatal* in CH as "extrasystemic" (1991, 48) is a fitting description. I.e., at least some cases of *weqatal* must be seen as interference from another grammatical system. Agreeing on which cases are to be included in this category is another matter. We would need native speaker intuition in order to decide precisely which cases are anterior and which (if any) can be understood as expressions of concomitant non-anteriority. We cannot decide from the context whether a *wayyiqtol* and a *weqatal* in a past context have the same meaning or whether some subtle difference of simple past tense vs. durative or concomitant action is implied. The context would be identical in both cases, the verb form itself marking the semantic difference.

6.2.2 Anterior *weqatal* in QH

In the documents from Qumran, the question of anterior *weqatal* is even more problematic than in the OT. Due to fragmentary contexts and varying interpretations, many *weqatals* may equally be claimed to be non-anterior and anterior (see Siegismund 2017, on which 6.2.2 is based).

The classical character of the HVS in most documents is readily observable, at least as regards the use of the consecutive forms. In general, we see the classical shift from clearly anterior *w+yiqtol* to *qatal* when some element precedes the verb, and a similar shift from clearly non-anterior *w+qatal* to *yiqtol*. According to several scholars, the system in general is much closer to BH than it is to RH.²¹ On the other hand, some scholars maintain the view

²¹ Smith 1991, 60: "The usage of converted tenses in QL more closely resembles that in a late BH book such as Esther rather than Mishnaic Hebrew" (on the problematic comparison with LBH, see 7.1); Van Peursen 2004, 4: typologically, the Hebrew of Ben Sira and the DSS "can be considered as late representatives of CH"; Holst 2008, 144: "no noticeable differences" between the HVS in 1QM and Ex 25–30; Penner 2015, 199: "The verbal syntax of most Qumran documents does not agree with Mishnaic Hebrew against Biblical Hebrew"; Geiger 2012, 492–493: "Das *tempus*-System des BH scheint im QH

(common in the earlier phases of research on QH) that the system is in a process of breakdown.²² Schniedewind (1999, 247) states that the use of *wayyiqtol* in QH is in general unclassical – the "highly nuanced narrative syntax" of BH "breaks down in QH." However, this view is clearly a product of his understanding of *wayyiqtol* in BH. He does not elaborate on this, but as it stands it makes little sense. The fact that ׃׃׃ is not used in QH is a question of style and genre, not of the basic grammatical system. The same applies to the numbers presented by Abegg (1998, 338). He argues that "the *waw* consecutive seems to have lost ground to the simple perfect as a means of expressing completed action." This statement is based on figures for the forms expressing what he calls "completed aspect," i.e. *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* (BH 48% *qatal* and 52% *wayyiqtol*; QH 75% *qatal* and 25% *wayyiqtol*). However, this does not reflect a fundamental change in the grammatical system. Rather, it seems to be a consequence of genre – as Abegg (ib., 337) acknowledges for the higher frequency of simple *yiqtol*s as opposed to *wayyiqtol*s in QH. There are few long, continuous narratives and therefore less need for *wayyiqtol*. Most significantly, there is no corresponding increase in the use of anterior *weqatal* (cf. Eskhult 2000, 84). Since *wayyiqtol* routinely occurs in cases where anterior *weqatal* might have been used we must conclude that the basic system of consecutive forms is intact, though the frequencies of the various forms may differ from the frequencies in BH due to genre and style. Many phenomena in QH point in the direction of later language, yet, as far as the basics of the HVS are concerned, Joosten's claim (2010a, 357) that QH "stands halfway between Classical and Mishnaic Hebrew in regard to verbal syntax" is clearly exaggerated. Similarly, his statement (2012a, 17, n. 22) that the system with "copulative QATAL" instead of *wayyiqtol* "is not fully attained" in QH seems to imply that anterior *weqatal* is very widespread though not completely dominant. The actual evidence does not support this claim.²³

In fact, in the major documents most extensively studied by scholars only a handful of anterior *weqatals* have been noted. The cases are listed in appendix 42 (cf. Siegismund 2017, 207–209). Smith (1991, 59) concludes that

weitgehend erhalten. [...] Dagegen unterscheidet sich das *tempus*-System des QH erheblich von dem des MH." On the formal side, of course, QH frequently deviates from the classical standard with the ubiquitous use of pseudo-cohortative *wayyiqtol* (׃׃).

²² For overviews of research on QH, see Penner 2015, 19–37; Holst 2008, 24–33.

²³ Cf. the equally unsubstantiated claim (Joosten 2016b, 91, n. 3) that *wayyiqtol* may have alternated freely with *weqatal*, though he admits that the scarcity of narrative texts makes this conclusion somewhat uncertain.

the texts examined by him "lack unconverted perfects, but they use the converted imperfect." Likewise, Penner (2015, 197) notes that – at least in this respect – QH is much closer to BH than to RH.

The numerous smaller documents, often in a very fragmentary state, have not received the same kind of attention that scholars have given the major "sectarian" scrolls. This is quite understandable since we cannot see the functioning of the system as a system in damaged and fragmented texts. Yet, in many cases, translators and commentators of such texts understand *weqatals* as anteriors, using simple past tense in their translations. In light of what we know from the better-preserved documents this is a questionable approach. In fact, only few *weqatals* treated as anteriors in various translations demand such an interpretation. Most cases are interpretable as ordinary non-anterior *weqatals* or may be read or reconstructed as something that is not a *weqatal* at all (Siegismund 2017, 209–213). E.g., García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:630–631) read [א] וקר in 4Q274 fr. 3 i 1, which they translate as "and he cal[led (?)]." The context is so fragmented that nothing necessitates the past translation and the reading itself is uncertain. Baumgarten (1999, 106) reads יקרָא. Likewise, ובלע in 4Q163 fr. 1 3 is translated as "and he has confused" (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:319) but nothing prevents a non-anterior (future) interpretation. In 4Q525 fr. 14 ii 16, García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*ib.*, 2:1057) and Puech (1998, 148) render the form והייתה as a past tense. Again, a non-anterior (future) reading is to be preferred. Many similar instances are noted in Siegismund 2017, 10–13, and further examples of potential (but mostly unlikely) anterior *weqatals* can be found in appendix 43. In most cases, the anterior reading cannot be disproved, but the rarity of this usage in the longer texts that provide coherent contexts should make us very cautious about accepting such translations when other interpretations are available.

Nine cases seem to be strong candidates for anterior use of *weqatal* in the minor documents, listed in appendix 44 (cf. Siegismund 2017, 215–217). Six are from narrative past contexts, three from the Book of Tobit (4Q200), two from Jubilees (4Q216 and 223–224), and one from the Commentary on Genesis (4Q252). In Tobit and Jubilees, the versions in other languages give us a strong argument in favour of the anterior interpretation. The three remaining forms are not from narrative contexts. They are cases of close coordination with a preceding simple *qatal*. In 4Q372, the *weqatal* comes immediately after a simple *qatal* with more or less the same meaning. In the two cases in 4Q418, the *weqatals* are also closely coordinated with preceding, more or less synonymous expressions. In addition, seven cases may have non-anterior meaning of the habitual or concomitant type (appendix 45; cf.

Siegismund 2017, 213–215). If this usage is not accepted (not all cases are equally convincing), these would seem to be anterior *weqatals* too.²⁴ In any case, anterior *weqatal* is clearly not standard usage in QH. The consequences of this will be the subject of further discussion in 7.1.1.

6.2.3 *Weyiqtol* in the OT

Weyiqtol in CH mostly expresses explicit volition (3.7). Yet, exceptions do occur. Joosten (2012a, 308–311 and 404–407) argues that most such cases in what he considers the core books of (presumably early) CBH (= Genesis–2 Kings) are suspect in different ways while a substantial number of assured occurrences occur in so-called LBH (= 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra–Nehemiah, Esther, Daniel, and Ecclesiastes). According to Joosten, *weyiqtol* often occurs in LBH in contexts where classical usage would require *weqatal* – "the different [volitive] forms are still extant, but they no longer imply a different meaning" (ib., 314; cf. Revell 1989, 30–31). Non-volitive *weyiqtol*s "represent normal syntax" in LBH, mixing with *weqatal* "without obvious semantic or pragmatic implications" (Joosten 2012a, 399). However, such a clear distinction between CBH and LBH is problematic. The reflection in the biblical books of the apparent real world development of the language is not straightforward. First, problematic, possibly non-volitive, *weyiqtol*s occur in supposedly early books. Second, some of the books in Joosten's LBH corpus do not exhibit any deviations from classical usage – as acknowledged by Joosten (ib., 408) as far as Esther is concerned. A major problem in dealing with the two supposedly chronologically distinct corpora is the circular nature of the assumptions underlying the interpretation of the forms (*weyiqtol*s in CBH are classical and deviations are explained away; in LBH they are normal). In fact, as was the case with anterior *weqatal*, interpreting *weyiqtol*s is highly subjective.²⁵

As stated in 3.7 (cf. appendix 18), most cases in Genesis and Exodus follow the classical rule (*weyiqtol* = explicit volition). The same applies to the other books described as CBH. Yet, a substantial number of instances are problematic. According to Joosten (2012a, 309), non-volitive *weyiqtol*s in

²⁴ Joosten (2006, 145–146) finds the "disappearance of iterative WEQATAL" confirmed by QH and RH but provides no evidence (see Rezetko and Young 2014, 191–192). Joosten's approach to verbal usage in supposedly early and late texts is quite problematic (cf. 6.2.3 on *weyiqtol*).

²⁵ The same applies to other aspects of the supposed breakdown of the volitive system in LBH. Joosten (2012a, 401) argues that long *yiqtol* in non-initial position can express volition in LBH (Neh 2:3, הַמֶּלֶךְ לְעוֹלָם יְהִי, vs. 1 Kgs 1:31, הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד לְעֹלָם, הִי אֲדָנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד לְעֹלָם). However, can we be certain that Neh 2:3 is not a simple indicative? Similarly, it is often very difficult to decide whether QH texts follow the classical rules or not.

Genesis and Exodus are Gen 22:17 (וַיִּרְשָׁ); Exod 19:3 (וַתִּגִּיד); 23:8 (וַיִּסְלַף); 23:12 (וַיִּנְפֹּשׁ); 24:7 (וַיִּשְׁמַע).²⁶ However, Joosten eliminates most of such cases in CBH by pointing to textual or other problems in the passages. Gen 22:17 is a I-y root and the writer of the consonant text may have intended the form as a *weqatal*. The problematic *weyiqtol*s in Exod 19:3, 23:8, and 23:12 are explained as "poetic syntax," following the "peculiar rules of ellipsis obtaining in poetry" (ib., 311 and 429). Exod 19:3 (וַתִּגִּיד) is a 2sm form, which is unclassical – though occurring in the classical corpus. According to Joosten (ib., 406), the *e*-vocalization reflects the late tendency to use the marked volitive forms with *waw*. In 23:12, the preceding verb is an ordinary *yiqtol* introduced by the particle לְמַעַן; we clearly expect *weqatal* instead of *weyiqtol*. Yet, a jussive interpretation may not be impossible ("and let the son of your servant woman be refreshed").²⁷ None of the three cases is poetry in any real sense of the word and the claim that influence from poetic usage explains the *weyiqtol*s does not, of course, remove the problematic occurrences. According to Joosten, the only real case of non-volitive *weyiqtol* in the two books is Exod 24:7. He argues that this verse is surprising, both because of the *weyiqtol* (instead of a *weqatal*) and because of the order of the two verbs in the clause, כָּל אֲשֶׁר-דִּבֶּר יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה וְנִשְׁמָע (ib., 308).²⁸ Apart from this case from Exodus, Joosten finds only one other undoubted instance of non-volitive *weyiqtol* in the corpus of classical prose, 2 Kgs 7:12 (וַיִּתְפָּשֶׂם).²⁹ Joosten eliminates all the other problematic cases in the corpus using the same or similar methods as those used in Genesis and Exodus (see appendix 46).

Two cases are apparently eliminated by Joosten without explanation (Josh 7:9, וַיִּשְׁמָעוּ; 1 Kgs 14:16, וַיִּתֵּן). They seem to be rather clearly non-volitive.

²⁶ Joosten (ib., n. 111) refers to difficult cases in Exod 26:24 and 28:28. He seems to think that they express "light subordination," which, according to Joosten, is a special function of the volitive forms (on such allegedly "indirect volitives," see 3.7).

²⁷ The Samaritan version has no second verb in the לְמַעַן-clause: כְּמוֹךָ וְאַמְתָּךְ כְּמוֹךָ. וְכָל בְּהֵמָתְךָ וְהַגֵּר.

²⁸ The Samaritans and one Greek ms. have the verbs in the opposite order, and 4QPaleo-Exod^m – though fragmentary – seems to exhibit the same order (וְנִשְׁמָע וְנַעֲשֶׂה); Ulrich 2010, 85). According to Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 653, §39.2.4c), the *waw* is epexegetical, "All that YHWH has said, we will do, *that is*, we will obey." It might be remarked that a volitive (cohortative) reading makes excellent sense in the context, but the non-initial position of the first verb and the lack of final *heh* on the *weyiqtol* would seem to argue against. However, a focused object may overrule the initial position of volitives, and there are other examples of non-use of cohortative *heh* (e.g. וַיִּלֵּן in Judg 19:11; cf. Joosten 2012a, 319, n. 22). On the other hand, Deut 5:27 uses *weqatals* (and the opposite order of words), וְנִשְׁמָעוּ וְנַעֲשֶׂינוּ.

²⁹ However, as in Exod 24:7, I would argue that nothing in the context seems to rule out a cohortative interpretation.

In addition to the cases noted and eliminated by Joosten, a few other cases in his CBH corpus might be candidates for a non-volitive reading (though given a volitive interpretation by Joosten): Exod 26:24 (וַיִּהְיֶה); and 28:28 (וַיִּרְכָּסוּ);³⁰ 1 Sam 12:3a (וַאֲעֵלִים); cf. the remarks on 1 Kgs 14:5 in appendix 46); 1 Kgs 13:33 (וַיִּהְיֶה). The latter case is especially interesting. It is clearly non-volitive, possibly marking iterative/habitual action in the past, i.e. a decidedly unclassical usage, which Joosten ascribes solely to certain LBH cases (cf. the notes on Nehemiah and 2 Chronicles in appendix 48, with n. 85).

Thus, Joosten's count of only two non-volitive *weyiqtol*s in CBH is probably too low. In addition, the use of textual corruption or scribal misunderstandings as explanations calls into question the entire enterprise of correlating specific linguistic traits and the date of the original writing of a text.³¹ The reference to "poetic syntax" as an explanation for some cases seems to presuppose a different grammatical system in prose and poetry, a claim for which there is little evidence (3.4). The difference between prose and poetry is a question of stylistic uses of the same system. Poetry is typically more abrupt with different segments referring to different temporal frames. Sudden shifts from non-volitive description to volitive outbursts may occur. However, the examples of "poetic syntax" referred to above are not of this type, but rather examples of *weyiqtol* seemingly having the same meaning as *weqatal*. This indicates that, though atypical, this usage was generally available to writers/scribes.

A major problem for the interpretation of *weyiqtol*s is the fact that it is not mandatory for a writer (or, presumably, a speaker) to use *weyiqtol* in a certain context. According to classical usage, the choice between *weyiqtol* and *weqatal* in an otherwise identical passage would indicate a difference in meaning, with *weyiqtol* explicitly stressing the volition of the speaker. The use of *weqatal* (or simple *yiqtol*) does not necessarily mean that there is no volition involved – it is simply not expressed explicitly (3.7). Since we do

³⁰ The cases are similar with no volitive context, though Joosten refers to the verbs as volitive "light subordination" (ib., 309, n. 111). However, in similar passages in the context, *weqatal* is used – and in fact, in the Samaritan version of 26:24, the verb is a *weqatal*. The preceding verbs are ordinary *yiqtol* (26:24) or *weqatals* (28:28).

³¹ There is a certain tension in Joosten's approach to the use of linguistic traits for dating biblical texts. On the one hand, he acknowledges that presumably early texts may contain late additions/corruptions and in a recent article (2016a, 19) he clearly states that the "diachronic approach to ancient Hebrew was not developed in order to date biblical texts." On the other hand, he hastens to add that the analysis of the linguistic phenomena may contribute to the debate, and, in fact, most of his work operates within a paradigm that correlates linguistic traits with date of origin. Cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 91–96.

not have native speaker intuition, much depends on our analysis of the context and our understanding of the development of the system. In the same context, the choice of *weyiqtol* or *weqatal* might be the only variable. How do we decide whether the forms are used indiscriminately or with separate meanings (explicit volition vs. lack of explicit – but still possibly implicit – volition)? In many passages in the CBH corpus a volitive interpretation of a *weyiqtol* makes sense, yet a non-volitive interpretation seems just as meaningful. If we did not entertain the idea that such forms ought to be volitive in CBH, some could easily be interpreted as non-volitives.³²

Several CBH *weyiqtol*s occur in passages that are not clearly volitive and where it is difficult to see why *weyiqtol* is used rather than *weqatal*. Conversely, the reason for choosing *weqatal* over *weyiqtol* is sometimes unclear. In such cases, then, do we claim that the distinction is still there (*weyiqtol* = explicit volitive meaning) or do we consider them manifestations of the eventual breakdown of the system? E.g., Gen 1:14–15 has two *weqatals* (both וַיְהִי), following an initial jussive (יִהְיֶה). Similar clauses in the immediate context have *weyiqtol*s (יִהְיֶה in 1:6 and וַתִּרְצֶה in 1:9). In 4QGen^s fr. 2, the line corresponding to MT v. 14 has a *weyiqtol* (וַיְהִי; Ulrich 2010, 4).³³ How are we to interpret such a state of affairs? Does the MT attest to an unclassical, possibly indiscriminate use of *weqatal* and *weyiqtol*, while 4QGen^s has the proper classical usage? Or, on the contrary, did the scribe of 4QGen^s misunderstand some subtle point in the MT's non-use of an explicit volitive form?

According to Joosten (2012a, 296), "the transition [in Gen 37:20] from a volitive form to WEQATAL obviously does imply a semantic nuance" (imperative, two *weyiqtol*s, *weqatal*, *weyiqtol*). Indeed, interpreting the *weyiqtol*s as volitive and the *weqatal* as simple future makes sense ("come and let us kill him"; "and let us throw him"; "and (then) we'll say"; "and let us see"). However, apart from the form itself, our interpretation of the system as a whole, and our decision to see the passage in question as belonging to the classical period, nothing in the context seems to prevent reading this as an example of the breakdown of the system and an indiscriminate use of the

³² Revell (1989, 31) notes (and rejects) the position that various "anomalies" in the classical corpus might indicate that the late system was already more or less evolved at an earlier time and that, maybe, "the different connotations ascribed to modal and indicative forms in many other cases are illusory." While it seems unwarranted to abandon the notion of different meanings for *weyiqtol* and *weqatal* altogether, the theoretical position referred to by Revell does point to an important problem. The decision to understand a given case of *weyiqtol* as volitive or not is often far less straightforward than Joosten seems to think.

³³ The verb at the beginning of MT v. 15 has not been preserved in the scroll.

6 The decline of the consecutive forms: Unclassical usage in various corpora

two forms.³⁴ Appendix 47 lists many examples from CBH that may reflect a blurring of the classical distinction between *weyiqtol* and *weqatal*.

Turning to Joosten's list of non-volitive *weyiqtols* in so-called LBH, it is clear that the occurrences are far from uniform.³⁵ Some may be volitives while others could be eliminated using the same methods applied to the supposedly early corpus. Some (especially in Daniel and Ecclesiastes) do seem to attest to an indiscriminate use of *weyiqtol* and *weqatal*. However, Daniel is clearly not ordinary prose but prophetic/visionary discourse with passages that are often somewhat obscure.³⁶ Neither is Ecclesiastes ordinary prose. Accordingly, if "poetic syntax" and archaic or poetic passages are eliminated in CBH, we should also refrain from basing our conclusions on works like Daniel and Ecclesiastes. Appendix 48 lists the details about supposedly non-volitive *weyiqtol* in Joosten's LBH corpus.

The difference between supposedly CBH and LBH usage is not as clearly marked as expected. The number of problematic, possibly non-volitive cases in CBH is higher, and the corresponding number of clear non-volitive cases in LBH is lower than assumed by Joosten. The general usage in the LBH corpus is quite classical. 1 Chronicles has 16 *weyiqtols* and only one of these is (probably) non-volitive.³⁷ 2 Chronicles has 36 *weyiqtols*, of which only 16 figure on Joosten's list. As shown in appendix 48, most are interpretable as volitives, as are the remaining 20. Ezra has only two *weyiqtols*, both of which are volitive. Nehemiah has 18 *weyiqtols*. Seven of these are found in Joosten's list, and as shown in the appendix, most are less than clearly non-volitive (and the remaining 11 are volitives). In Esther, there are 11 *weyiqtols*, all of which are volitive. Most of the clearly non-volitive occurrences are in Daniel and Ecclesiastes, which are not representative of ordinary prose

³⁴ Cf. the similar cases in Gen 28:3 and 41:35. In both instances, the *weqatal* probably but not unambiguously indicates simple future consequence in contrast to the volition of the *weyiqtols*. Thus, in 28:3, "And may El Shadday bless you and may he make you fruitful and may he multiply you and (then) you will be an assembly of peoples." Note the possible alternative rendering as a result clause ("so that you will be"). This would be a purely translational "trick," of course, though one that often seems to be more applicable to *weqatals* than to the supposed "light subordination" expressed by *weyiqtol*.

³⁵ For the list, see Joosten 2012a, 309, n. 115, and 399. Eccl 7:7 is included in the list on p. 309, but not on p. 399.

³⁶ Cohen 2013, 250: Dan 11 "differs from the rest of the Second Temple period texts" and "should be treated as an independent entity." Jones (2015, 409) concludes that Dan 8–12 was not written by a native speaker of Hebrew; the language of these chapters "should not be considered in any diachronic analysis of ancient Hebrew."

³⁷ 1 Chr 14:15 (וַיִּיָּצֵא). We would expect *weqatal*. This case is not included in Joosten's list of non-volitive LBH *weyiqtols*, but the same form in 2 Sam 5:24 is eliminated due to textual corruption.

and should be eliminated. In sum, the picture is less clear than Joosten's list would suggest. Joosten's claim that non-volitive *weyiqtol*s in CBH are "spurious examples that are hard to integrate into the verbal system" while the occurrences in LBH "represent normal syntax" (2012a, 399) is an exaggeration. In fact, the nice distinction between the two corpora seems to be, at least partly, a result of a decision to interpret the forms according to different rules in the two preconceived corpora.³⁸

While the general evolution of the language discernible in the non-literary material and the comparison of CH with RH indicate that the general development from volitive to non-volitive use of *weyiqtol* did happen, there is no direct reflection of this in the literary texts.

6.2.4 *Weyiqtol* in QH

The distribution of *weyiqtol* in the documents from Qumran illustrates the same phenomenon. There is no necessary connection between the date of writing and specific linguistic traits. Some documents have many *weyiqtol*s, many of which are probably non-volitive and employed in seemingly indiscriminate interchange with *weqatal*. Other documents follow classical usage. It is impossible to state a precise number of *weyiqtol*s in the Qumran material. Neither can the proportion of non-volitive cases be established with certainty. Due to the fragmentary state of many documents, *w+yiqtol* is often equally interpretable as *wayyiqtol*, volitive *weyiqtol*, and non-volitive *weyiqtol*. Even in larger, less fragmentary documents, the interpretation is often highly subjective – volitives occasionally show up in unexpected places. Due to the unvocalized nature of QH, it is often difficult or impossible to decide with certainty whether a *w+yiqtol* is *weyiqtol* or *wayyiqtol* (even in texts that are not full of holes). This applies especially to poetic texts like Hodayot.³⁹

³⁸ Note Young's general criticism (2016, 992) of the method used by the proponents of what he calls the "MT-Only paradigm" (i.e. the idea that the MT reflects the language of the original author and hence that linguistic traits can be used for the purpose of dating the text): "When a few PCH [Peripheral Classical Hebrew; otherwise referred to as LBH] features turn up in Samuel or Kings, clearly this is not a sign for them that these books are late (the MT-Only scholars know that these books are early). However, when a few PCH features turn up in Peshar Habbakuk or the Community Rule, this is taken by MT-Only scholars as clear evidence that they are late (because they know they must be, and that late books are characterised by these PCH features)."

³⁹ De Vries (1965a, 389) notes "the conflation of past, present, and future" in some passages in Hodayot, suggesting "a significant parallelism between the inconcinnities of the poet's theological ideology and the ambiguities of the verbal system." Cf. Zuber 1986, 141 (the use of ambiguous verb forms is "ein bewusst angewandtes Stilmittel"). However, the ambiguity is there in writing only. Though this is a matter of some controversy, with some scholars claiming that the Masoretic distinction between *weyiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* is

In any case, if we want to investigate whether documents from Qumran behave like CBH or LBH in their use of *weyiqtol*, we should use the same standards of elimination of problematic forms as in the OT – this means disregarding poetry, textually problematic and highly ambiguous and fragmented texts, etc. Of course, the mere absence of non-volitive *weyiqtol* in a document might not be significant unless *weqatals* are attested. The lack of *weyiqtol*s might merely indicate a lack of appropriate context for such forms rather than a preference for the classical usage.

I will highlight a few texts in order to illustrate the different degrees of adherence to the classical standard in the corpus.

In 1QM, most verbs are non-anterior forms referring to the future or indicating directions for action (cf. Holst 2008, 80). Large numbers of ordinary *yiqtol*s and *weqatals* occur in classical interchange, according to the presence or absence of other clause elements in fronted position (ib., 143). In contrast, only few *weyiqtol*s are attested. There are nine cases of *w+yiqtol*, of which three are quite clearly *wayyiqtol*s.⁴⁰ The six remaining cases are 6:11 (ויהיו); 11:9 (ותעש); 13:13 x2 (ונגילה and ונשישה); 17:6 (וישלה); 18:14 (ותבצור). In addition, there is וירד in 11:7, in a quotation from Num 24:19 (וַיִּרְדָּ). However, in the consonant text of 1QM, the form may be interpreted as a *weqatal* (root ירד). 18:14 (ותבצור) occurs in a badly preserved context that precludes secure analysis. 11:9 (ותעש) and 13:13 (ונגילה and ונשישה) are interpretable as a jussive and two cohortatives, as is evident from the forms. However, the form in 11:9 is an unclassical 2sm. The following verb in 1QM 11:10 is a non-initial (and unshortened) *yiqtol* (תבעיר). Nonetheless, it may be jussive with a preposed focused object contrasting with the wicked ones denoted by the "them" in l. 9. Such use of a non-negated 2sm jussive is, of course, unclassical as well.⁴¹ Holst (2008, 109) interprets וישלה in 17:6 as "indicative future"

late and possibly artificial, I find no evidence for this claim. Rather, since the Masoretic system fits so well into what we know from historical and comparative Semitic studies, it seems likely that the vocalization reflects an actual difference in pronunciation (cf. ch. 5). Of course, it is likely, too, that at least part of our feeling of bewilderment in the face of verbal usage in some poetic passages is the result of our lack of native speaker intuition and an inadequate understanding of conventions of poetic style(s).

⁴⁰ 10:2 (וילמדנו); 13:7 (ותקימה); 14:5 (ויקרא).

⁴¹ In QH, to an even higher degree than is the case in BH, there is a clear tendency for short forms (or, in 1s/p, for the lengthened forms in *heh*) to be used after *waw*, regardless of the meaning of the form (see Qimron 1986/1987). This tendency, of course, is a natural product of the fundamental fact that, originally, all occurrences of *w+yiqtol* would be short forms (< anterior **yáqtul* or jussive **yaqtúl*) or, in 1s/p *weyiqtol*, the cohortative forms, while the place of *w+yiqtol* < **yaqtulu* was filled by *weqatal* in the classical system. The use of pseudo-cohortative forms in 1s/p *wayyiqtol*, which is such a characteristic

rather than jussive. However, a jussive reading seems probable, considering the initial simple *yiqtol* in 1. 8, which seems to be jussive as well. Alternatively, *וישלה* may be a *wayyiqtol*. The only remaining case is 6:11 (ויהיו). This form can hardly be a *wayyiqtol* and a volitive reading seems odd in the context – we clearly expect *weqatal*. Yet, in CBH, Joosten eliminates *weyiqtol*s from היה due to textual corruption. Of course, those cases are of the introductory "and it will happen"-type, which is not the case here. However, ויהיו in 6:11 is very similar to Exod 26:24, which Joosten explains as the "subordinate" type of volitive (n. 30 above). A similar reading might make sense here. Still, I find it more convincing to read 1QM 6:11 and Exod 26:24 as simple non-volitive, unclassical *weyiqtol*s. In sum, 1QM seems to have one non-volitive *weyiqtol*, as well as one 2sm volitive form (11:9), a type attested very sporadically in CBH. In light of the widespread use of classical *weqatal* in the document, the few cases of deviant usage do not seem to warrant a general "unclassical" label for 1QM (since similar unclassical usage is found inside the "classical" corpus itself).

1QS has more than 50 *weqatals* of the ordinary, non-anterior type (though many are the same word, ונענש). The number of non-volitive *weyiqtol*s, in contrast, is very low. Smith (1991, 41–42) notes jussive *weyiqtol*s in 1QS 2:3, 4, 6, 16; 3:9. In addition, 6:22 (ויהי); 10:13 (וארצה); 10:14 (ואברכנו) are probably volitive *weyiqtol*s. Two or three of the four "unconverted imperfect forms" noted by Smith (1QS 5:8, ויקם; 6:2, וישמעו; 10:2, וישתהו; 11:13, ויכן) may be volitives as well. Only 1QS 10:2 seems to be clearly non-volitive.⁴² Further, ויבדילהו in 6:25, curiously referred to by Smith (ib., 43) as a "converted perfect" yet correctly given as *wybdylhw*, seems to be non-volitive (beginning of apodosis in a legal rule, followed by *weqatal*; note that BibleWorks reads ובהדילהו, which is not what can be seen in the pictures available). Yet, an explicit expression of volition may have been needed to avoid reading the verb as a straight continuation of the preceding participial clause (והואה יודע). Also note the possible connection with the clearly volitive use

trait of QH, is clearly an analogical extension of the perceived connection between *wayyiqtol* and the jussive in the third person producing a similar connection between *wayyiqtol* and the cohortative in 1s/p. Qimron's argument that the prevalent use of short forms in *weyiqtol* is conditioned by the *waw* and not the volitive meaning of the form is, to a large extent, based on his reading of many forms as non-volitive. However, in many cases, a volitive reading is more likely. E.g. in Zeph 2:13, Qimron states that the following *weqatal* and *yiqtol* indicate that "the prophecy is in the indicative mood" (1986/1987, 157). However, this is no decisive argument.

⁴² On 5:8, see Kesterson 1987. 11:13 may not be volitive but rather a *wayyiqtol* introducing a new segment continued by the following *qatal*, both translatable as present perfects ("And he has made firm").

of the same word in 2:16. In addition, there is ויז in 4:21, not mentioned by Smith, which might be non-volitive but not necessarily. The preceding verb form has been read as a *weqatal* (וּזְקַל) or as a *yiqtol* (יִזְקַל; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:78), which would be in initial position. A volitive interpretation cannot be ruled out, like a wishful outburst (cf. Lev 15:24 in appendix 47). Kesterson (1984, 169) suggests that the particle וַ (as found in 4:19, 20) has been left out between the *waw* and the verb. This would be akin to the type of usage referred to as "poetic ellipsis" by Joosten. One additional case should not be interpreted as a non-volitive *weyiqtol*, viz. 1QS 10:16 (וַאֲדַעָה). This is probably a *wayyiqtol* (stative present/present perfect, "and I have come to know"; cf. 4.2.2).

In 1QSa, most verbs are *yiqtols*, in occasional interchange with *weqatal*. There are no *weyiqtols* (though two of the four *weqatals* are I-y [2:13 and 2:14] and might be claimed to be *weyiqtols*).

In the Damascus Document (CD), most *weyiqtols* seem to be volitives. CD 14:19 may be a *wayyiqtol* (עַד מַעְמוּד מִשִּׁי הָאֵהָרָן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּכְפֹּר עוֹנֵם), "until the rise of the anointed of Aaron and Israel, and (until) their sin has been atoned"; cf. 4.2.2). Likewise, 20:2 (וַיִּקְוֶן) and 20:28 (וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ and וַיִּתְחַדּוּ) may be *wayyiqtols*. Thorion-Vardi (1985, 74–75) lists several cases of "future" *w+yiqtol* (2:2; 2:9; 2:14; 11:1; 13:8–9, x4; 20:2; 20:33, x3). Some of these might be *wayyiqtols* (2:9, וַיִּדַע, and 20:2, וַיִּקְוֶן, though Thorion-Vardi notes that the form in the ms. has "babylonian vocalization of copulative W" [ib., 74]). 11:1 (וַיִּרְד) is probably a *weqatal* (or *wayyiqtol*?). The remaining cases from Thorion-Vardi's list seem to be volitive. Kesterson (1984, 144) argues that the *weyiqtols* in 20:33 (followed by two *weqatals*) "seem to function as the *wēqatalī* does in BH." However, it is reasonable to interpret the *weyiqtols* as volitives while the *weqatals* indicate simple future. In general, Kesterson's evidence for a "breakdown" in the distinction between *weqatal* and *weyiqtol* in QH (ib., 172) is less clear than suggested. In fact, Kesterson notes that CD and the Serakim are quite classical in most cases.

The most likely non-volitive is the partially preserved form in CD 15:14 (וַיִּלְמַד). The context is fragmentary, which makes it difficult to decide if the passage is volitive. The preceding *weqatal* may suggest that the two forms are used indiscriminately. וַיִּתְחַלְכוּ in 19:4 follows two *weqatals*, but the *weyiqtol* marks the beginning of a conditional apodosis. Since the meaning is clearly a command ("if... then they must..."), a volitive reading makes sense. Yet, *weqatals* are usually found in such passages (which often makes it difficult to decide where the protasis ends and the apodosis begins). Hence, an

indiscriminate use of the form as a substitute for *weqatal* seems plausible.⁴³ The two CD mss. are not from Qumran but medieval mss. found in the Cairo Genizah. It is interesting to note that the much older fragments of this text found at Qumran provide a few additional *weyiqtol*s in parallel passages. In 4Q266 fr. 8 i 5, there are two *weyiqtol*s (ויצוהו and וילמד) corresponding to the *weqatal* and *weyiqtol* in CD 15:14. Does this mean that the entire passage is in fact volitive (in which case CD possibly exhibits an unclassical, indiscriminate use of the two forms), or is the passage non-volitive (in which case both texts are unclassical, but the older text even more so)? Similarly, 4Q266 fr. 10 i 6 has a *weyiqtol* in contrast to the *weqatal* in CD 14:13 (וינתן vs. ונתנו). Again, it is not quite clear if the intention is volitive, and accordingly, whether the older or the younger text is more classical. In addition, 4Q266 fr. 11 i 8 might be non-volitive too (וידבר; there is a *yiqtol* right before this form, and the following verbs are *weqatals*). The same applies to 4Q270 fr. 7 i 16 (וידיעהו, with a simple *yiqtol* preceding); possibly 4Q270 fr. 7 i 10 but the context is unclear (ויכתו]בוהו [).

1QpHab contains several (potential) non-volitive *weyiqtol*s but interestingly, they all occur in the parts that quote the biblical text. Some are found in the MT as well while others are variants (MT simple *yiqtol* or *weqatal*). In some cases, however, it is difficult to decide whether the intention behind the written form is *weyiqtol* or *wayyiqtol*.⁴⁴ In contrast, no *weyiqtol*s appear in the actual *peshar*-sections, while several cases of ordinary *weqatal* are attested (4:2, 3, 8; also 1:9, which is very badly preserved).⁴⁵

These texts hardly give reason for claiming that the classical use of *weqatal* and *weyiqtol* had been abandoned. The few cases of probable non-volitive *weyiqtol* and the examples of second person *weyiqtol*s do not indicate that the forms were used indiscriminately but rather (as was the case in most of the OT material, whether "CBH" or "LBH") that the classical usage was occasionally and sporadically disturbed by what could be interpreted as interference from the spoken language of the period, in which the system

⁴³ וידיעהו in CD 9:17 looks like a defectively written *hif. weyiqtol* (also in an apodosis). However, it might be a mistake for a *hif. simple yiqtol* יודיעהו. There are also cases of *weqatal* introducing an apodosis in the text (CD 9:12, 21).

⁴⁴ 1QpHab 4:9 (וישמ = MT 1:11, וְאָשַׁם; the form in the scroll is probably a *wayyiqtol*, cf. the preceding MT ויַעֲבֹר); 5:8 (ותהריש = MT 1:13, *yiqtol*); 5:13 (ויגרהו = MT 1:15, *yiqtol*; the preceding MT *qatal* is a *yiqtol* in the scroll); 8:13 (ויקומו = MT 2:7, *yiqtol*); 8:15 and 9:3 (וישלוכה = MT 2:8, *yiqtol*); 10:6 (ויכונו = MT 2:12, *weqatal*; the form in the scroll may be a *wayyiqtol*).

⁴⁵ 1QpHab 6:1 might be non-volitive *weyiqtol*, but nothing prevents reading the form as *wayyiqtol* (cf. Smith 1991, 39).

known from RH might have already developed. In contrast, other texts seem to exhibit a much higher degree of such interference.

The clearest example is the Temple Scroll (11QT). Smith (1991, 60) notes that this document differs markedly from the other documents ("the converted and unconverted forms were mixed"). In many passages, a semantic difference between *weqatal* and *weyiqtol* is hard to detect. Though the *weyiqtol* ויכפר (11QT^a 26:9) might indicate a type of volition (command) while the *weqatal* ונסלה (l. 10) indicates mere future consequence ("and then they will be forgiven"), such a correspondence between form and meaning does not hold for the next verb, which is a *weqatal* (ורחץ), yet seems to indicate a command.⁴⁶ Similar seemingly random shifts between *weqatal* and *weyiqtol* occur frequently, e.g. 45:15–16 (ויספר...ויכבס...ורחץ); cf. three *weqatals* in Lev 15:13) or 49:17–20 with several *weyiqtol*s in contrast to a similar passage in 50:8 with *weqatals*. 50:14–15 and 51:3 exhibit the same kind of seemingly indiscriminate use of *weqatal* and *weyiqtol*. The same verb (כבס) occurs as a *weyiqtol* in 51:3 and as a *weqatal* in l. 4. Does this mean that the forms are equivalent? Did the writer(s) see no semantic difference between *weqatal* and *weyiqtol*? Maybe the writer(s), though clearly aware of classical *weqatal* (which is far more frequent than *weyiqtol*), simply did not understand the finer shades of meaning obtaining in CH between this form and *weyiqtol*. However, it may be possible to argue that the usage is not completely arbitrary. Due to the genre of the document, practically all the *weyiqtol*s are in inherently volitive contexts. Maybe the beginning of the document described God telling someone to command the people to do all the things that are commanded (as in, e.g., Lev 24:2 or Num 5:2), in which case *weyiqtol*s would not seem out of place, indicating an explicit degree of added volition. Of course, since *weqatals* are employed in the majority of cases, this added volition would be only occasionally expressed in an explicit way – *weqatal* does not specifically indicate non-volition, but merely the lack of explicit volition (3.7). García Martínez and Tigchelaar occasionally try to distinguish between the forms in translation, e.g. the passage in 61:15 (ונגש הכוהן וידבר (אל העם ואמר אליהמה), "the priest shall come forward and he will speak to the people and shall say to them" (2000, 2:1285). Curiously, "will" is used for *weyiqtol*, and "shall" for *weqatal*. Cf. 64:5–6 (ורגמוהו כול אנשי עירו באבנים) (וימות), "shall stone him"; "and he will die" (ib., 1287). Muraoka (2000b, 209) refers to the latter case as an example of the preference for unconverted verb forms in the scrolls in contrast to the MT (the passage is a version of Deut 21:21 with two *weqatals*). Yet, in this case, the shift from *weqatal* to *weyiqtol* (and back to *weqatal* in the following verb) may be intentional – the *weyiqtol*

⁴⁶ Cf. Lev 4:20 with two *weqatals*: ויכפר עליהם הפהן ונסלה להם.

might be volitive (possibly of the type that some scholars refer to as indirect). Also note that the MT (vocalization) has a *weyiqtol* at the end of v. 21 (וַיִּרְאוּ).

Only few *weyiqtols* in 11QT occur in passages that are not some kind of command. At least some of these potentially non-volitive *weyiqtols* might be parsed as *wayyiqtols*. The following *w+yiqtols* occur in contexts that can hardly be considered volitive: 48:17 (וַיִּטְמְאוּ; probably *wayyiqtol*);⁴⁷ 50:10 (וַיָּמוּת; possibly *wayyiqtol*: "And a woman, when she becomes pregnant, and her child has died in her womb, all the days that it is dead inside her, she will be unclean like a grave"; the context is clearly non-volitive); 51:17 (אֲשֶׁר יִקַּח; clearly non-volitive; however, this case is similar to Joosten's "poetic syntax" as found in Exod 23:8 etc.); 56:8 (וַיַּעַשׂ; probably non-volitive, but maybe *wayyiqtol* as in 50:10?); 57:7 (וַיִּתְפַּשׂ; here, Joosten's "light subordination" makes sense, i.e. a type of volition, cf. Yadin 1983, 2:256, "lest he be taken"); 59:16 (וַיַּעַשׂ; clearly non-volitive; maybe "poetic parallelism"?); 64:9–10 (כִּי יִהְיֶה בְּאִישׁ חֲטָא מִשְׁפַּט מוֹת וַיְבַרַח אֶל תּוֹךְ הַגּוֹאִים וַיִּקְלַל; clearly non-volitive; possibly *wayyiqtol* as in 50:10, cf. Yadin 1983, 2:290, "and has defected"; "and has cursed"). In addition, 49:20 (וַיִּטְהַר), though in a context of command, may indicate a simple future consequence. Note also that there is only one unclassical second person *weyiqtol* (25:11, וַתַּעֲנוּ) against numerous second person *weqatals* and simple *yiqtols*. Another possible indication that the writer(s) of 11QT did not use *weyiqtol* and *weqatal* in a haphazard way is 11QT^a 55:17, reflecting Deut 17:3. The MT has three rather unexpected *wayyiqtols* (וַיִּגְלֹךְ וַיַּעֲבֹד אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם). They must indicate future perfect since the reference is clearly future as indicated by the preceding clauses (...כִּי יִמְצָא... אִישׁ אוֹ-אִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה...). In v. 4 there is a shift to *weqatal* with ordinary future reference. In 11QT^a 55:17, the first part of the passage is the same as in the MT, but the *wayyiqtols* are *weqatals* in the scroll (וַהֲלַךְ וַעֲבַד אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַהֲשַׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם). There seems to be no reason to claim that these forms are unclassical, anterior ("unconverted") *weqatals*. An ordinary non-anterior reading fits the context perfectly and it raises the question whether the *wayyiqtols* in the MT might be a product of late vocalization while the consonant text had *weyiqtols* – in a non-volitive context. In any case, it seems significant that the scroll does not use *weyiqtol* in a context that is clearly not volitive. In sum, while the large number of *weyiqtols* in 11QT remains strange from a classical point of view, it seems possible to maintain that the classical distinction is still there, albeit

⁴⁷ Cf. Yadin 1983, 2:210: "And as for the leper who is afflicted with old leprosy or scab, and the priest has declared him unclean." In contrast, Smith (1991, 49) states that the form is "an unconverted imperfect, as the syntactically parallel clause in line 15 indicates." However, these lines are not parallel, and the *wayyiqtol* reading is clearly preferable.

employed in an unexpected way. The grammar and inherent semantics of the forms might be classical, but the style is certainly not.⁴⁸

Other documents exhibit a similar seemingly indiscriminate use of *weqatal* and *weyiqtol*, although, in shorter texts, it is impossible to see how typical such more or less isolated cases are in the context of the entire original writing (e.g. 4Q274 fr. 1 i 3, וּרְחַץ בְּמִים וַיִּכְבֵּס בְּגָדָיו; fr. 2 i 1, וּרְחַץ וַיִּכְבֵּס). The fragments of Jubilees in 4Q216–228 seem to include several unclassical *weyiqtols* as well.⁴⁹ Similarly, non-volitive *weyiqtols* (seemingly indicating future prediction) probably occur in the writing represented in 4Q371 and 4Q372.⁵⁰ This text seems similar to Dan 11 (n. 36 above), i.e. it is atypical in the classical corpus as well as in so-called LBH.

To conclude, the supposedly clear-cut distinction between the use of *weyiqtol* in early and late texts is not reflected in the material from Qumran. Some of these clearly late texts show a very low degree of unclassical interference, while others seem to attest to a more or less indiscriminate use of *weyiqtol* and *weqatal*.⁵¹ The most likely candidate for the latter category (11QT) is presumably older than the major "sectarian" works, which generally exhibit a much more classical use of the forms (Smith 1991, 62). Furthermore, interpreting forms as volitive or non-volitive is a subjective undertaking, which makes it hard to draw firm conclusions. Joosten (2012a, 339–340) reads CBH Lev 15:24 as a volitive outburst (see appendix 47). Hence,

⁴⁸ 11QT is generally regarded as a composite work with separate parts with different backgrounds. Wilson and Wills (1982) divide the scroll into sections based on content and note that these sections differ stylistically and linguistically. Some sections have far more *weyiqtols* (in comparison to *weqatals*) than other sections and הִיָּה (*yiqtol*)+PTC is concentrated in specific sections (ib., 285–286). They do not indicate the relative date of the presumed sources but note that "[a]lthough *wēyiqṭōl* and *yihyeh qōṭēl* are both late forms, the authors of the documents had different styles and used these forms with different frequencies" (ib., 286). See also Callaway 1986 for a more cautious approach on the question of sources.

⁴⁹ E.g., 4Q216 II 5 (וַיִּלְכְּדוּ) and 6 (וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ), which seem to be predictions concerning the future (unwanted) behavior of the Israelites. The Jubilees fragments exhibit other types of unclassical verbal use, most conspicuously anterior *weqatal* in 4Q216 VII 11 and 4Q223–224 Unit 2 IV 18 (6.2.2).

⁵⁰ There is some overlap between the two mss. In a few cases, *w+yiqtol* in one is paralleled by simple *yiqtol* in the other (4Q371 fr. 1 2 vs. 4Q372 fr. 1 6; 4Q371 fr. 1 12 vs. 4Q372 fr. 1 13). However, the analysis of this text is difficult. Schuller and Bernstein (2001) advocate a past tense reading, interpreting the *w+yiqtols* as *wayyiqtols*, the *weqatals* as unclassical anteriors, and the simple *yiqtols* as archaic past tense forms. This would seem to be a rather amazing mixture. In contrast, Mitchell (2009, 193) argues that reading the text with future reference makes more sense.

⁵¹ In contrast, note Joosten's claim that *weqatal* "freely alternates with *w* plus imperfect," seemingly referring to QH in general (Joosten 2016b, 91; cf. 2015, 32).

numerous supposedly odd *weyiqtols* might be analysed in the same way in non-CBH documents. In fact, it might be possible to ascribe a large part of the deviant behavior of *weyiqtols* in texts such as 11QT to the style of the writer(s) rather than to a fundamental change in the grammatical system and the semantics of the verb forms. For this reason it would hardly make sense to use statistical means to measure the "classicality" of different texts according to their use of *weyiqtol*. What would be measured would not be objective, observable facts but rather the scholar's subjective interpretation of the material (cf. 2.1; see also Rezetko and Young 2014, 229).

The same applies to anterior *weqatal*. As noted in 6.2.1, we cannot define the limits of the category in a clear way and many cases permit alternative interpretations. Hence, it is difficult to establish a clear connection between such forms and the date of the texts in which they occur. If, as seems to be the case, some instances are the result of later additions or scribal influence, the connection is even weaker. Joosten (2012a, 224) argues that the best approach to the distribution of the form is "a diachronic view" – "the older books show few cases of w^e +QATAL, while in later books, starting with 2 Kings and Jeremiah, the usage increases. In Ecclesiastes, w^e +QATAL is used about 25 times, while WAYYIQTOL occurs only thrice." However, he also remarks that in the "other late books the syntagm is not particularly frequent" (ib., n. 58). "There is simply a sprinkling of single cases occurring in the midst of good, classical narrative" in various parts of the OT (ib., 227; cf. ib., 386). As will be discussed further in ch. 7, the fact that the probable real-world diachronic development is clear does not mean that this development must be reflected directly in the actual texts.

6.2.5 Remarks on the biblical Qumran scrolls

The distinction between a biblical scroll and a non-biblical one containing much biblical material is difficult to make. 11QT, discussed above, reuses many passages from the Pentateuch, and several cases of variation were noted with potential significance for the description of the development of the HVS. Likewise, biblical passages in Peshar documents may include variants (a few *weyiqtols* for MT *yiqtol* or *weqatal* were noted in 1QpHab). In the mss. usually designated "biblical" (apparent versions of the "same" texts that we have in the MT rather than pesharim or more extensive reworkings), similar variation is attested but not in any systematic way.⁵² In fact, in most mss., the significant variants are very few. Appendix 49 presents a list of variants pertaining to verbs and their potential relevance for the evolution of

⁵² The decision to call a ms. "biblical" is still somewhat subjective, of course. I have restricted myself to mss. included in Ulrich 2010.

the HVS (1QIsa^a is discussed separately in appendix 50). This does not include variants that are merely orthographical (plene or defective spelling, addition of final *-h* on 2sm *qatal* etc.) or in other ways irrelevant for the questions of interest in the present context (sg. vs. pl., use of a different root, a different stem, passive/active, etc.). The distinction between an orthographic variant and a variant with implications for the analysis is sometimes difficult to make (cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 206). Nonetheless, the interesting cases (for the present purpose) are readily apparent – the use of *qatal* instead of *yiqtol* or vice versa, the use of *weqatal* instead of *wayyiqtol*, or of what appears to be *weyiqtol* instead of *weqatal*, etc.

The overall impression is clear. In general, the mss. present a verbal system that does not deviate significantly from the one attested in the MT. Only few mss. exhibit large numbers of significant variants that may indicate a breakdown of the classical system, such as *weqatal* instead of MT *wayyiqtol* or *weyiqtol* instead of MT *weqatal*.⁵³ The clearest such case is the great Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a). However, as was already suggested by Goshen-Gottstein (1958b, 105), 1QIsa^a is atypical. Furthermore, even in this scroll, the description is not always as straightforward as one would presume based on Kutscher (1974, 17). To be sure, it is possible to interpret many variants as reflections of a late type of verbal system, but in many cases, an interpretation within a more classical system is also possible. There is no general "updating" of the language to a direct reflection of the late verbal system. Only some variants seem to derive from a post-classical perception of the system (see appendix 50 for an excursus on verbal usage in 1QIsa^a). After 1QIsa^a, the Samuel and Psalms mss. seem to present the greatest degree of variation. On Samuel, cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 453–591. Again, while some cases may be unclassical as compared to the MT, other cases are more ambiguous. In most other mss., significant variation is very restricted.⁵⁴

Outside of 1QIsa^a, the only cases where a scroll has a non-volitive *weyiqtol* not attested in the MT are the following (most are ambiguous, marked with ?): Gen 41:30; Exod 15:14 (?; probably *wayyiqtol*); Deut 32:43; Isa 22:17 (?); 46:6 (?); Jer 31:8 (?); Joel 4:16 (?); Mal 3:17 (?); Ps 104:22 (?); 104:28 (?); 104:29 (?); 104:30 (?). No completely clear case of non-MT anterior *weqatal* seems to be found in these scrolls, but see 2 Sam 6:13; 8:2; 15:2, 6 (all of which are probably iterative/habitual); Ps 33:9 (?), Ps 38:6 (?). In contrast, the scrolls occasionally seem to reflect a more classical usage than the MT. Note the following cases pertaining to the semantics of *weqatal*

⁵³ Cf. the general conclusions in Muraoka 2000b, Fassberg 2000, Abegg 2011.

⁵⁴ On the low number of variants (compared to the MT) in biblical mss. from elsewhere (e.g. Masada), see Young 2005.

6 The decline of the consecutive forms: Unclassical usage in various corpora

and *weyiqtol*: Gen 1:14; Exod 2:7 (?); Deut 2:4; 1 Sam 10:5; 2 Sam 5:8 (?); 6:16; 12:16 (?; MT probably iterative/habitual *weqatal*); Isa 43:4 (?), 12; 49:7 (?); 57:13 (?), 17 (?), 18 (?); 63:5–6 (?); Ps 35:15 (?); Ps 71:2; Ps 109:31 (?); Ps 136:15 (?); Ps 144:5; Job 37:1 (?); Dan 11:15. For details, see appendix 49.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Unclassical influence is often discernable in the Greek translation of OT texts. The translators, of course, generally had a good grasp of BH but occasionally, and to varying degrees in various books, they seem to have been influenced by the way Hebrew (and/or Aramaic) was spoken in their own time. In most cases, the translations reflect the classical system well. If one were to read the OT as RH (*w+yiqtol* as non-anterior, *w+qatal* as anterior), most of the texts would cease to make any sense. However, in some cases, *weqatals* do seem to be interpreted as anteriors (where the original meaning was probably habitual past) or past habitual *yiqtols* as future tense (cf. 2 Kgs 12:12–15?). Yet, it is extremely difficult to draw clear conclusions. A translation may not be intended as a direct translation of the text that we have in the MT. Furthermore, the obvious differences in grammatical system between Hebrew and Greek must be taken into consideration, as well as the specific type of Greek used. In the confines of this dissertation, I cannot venture into this wide field of research. On several important aspects of the question, see especially Joosten's works, conveniently collected in Joosten 2012c. Specifically on the verbal system, cf. also Good 2010.

7 QH, spoken Hebrew, and the character of CH

The observations presented in ch. 6 seem to indicate that the essential elements of the classical HVS remained in use throughout the pre-mishnaic period for literary production.¹ In the OT, apart from Ecclesiastes, which as a whole is particularly unclassical, the deviations from the classical system are quite sporadic (and it is sometimes debatable whether they are in fact unclassical). Some deviations are isolated cases in otherwise classical passages, but sometimes a longer passage exhibits several examples of unclassical verbal usage (e.g. 2 Kgs 23). We can explain this state of affairs by claiming that CH functioned as a more or less standardized literary language for a long time while the spoken language evolved towards a complete abandonment of the system of consecutive forms. On this background, deviations from classical usage could be seen as interference from the linguistic system of the spoken register of the writer (or scribe) into what was intended to be literary CH.

7.1 What is QH and (how) does it reflect spoken language?

The characterization of the Hebrew of the Qumran documents and the reasons for the use of Hebrew in these writings are important questions for understanding the history of the language and the role it played in society in different periods. What does the general classical character of QH tell us about the real world development of spoken Hebrew? Specifically, is it possible to claim that some speakers of Hebrew were speaking a type of Hebrew like the one found in the scrolls? Did (some varieties of) spoken Hebrew maintain the classical consecutive forms in this period?

Against the prevailing view that QH is "basically the latest stage of biblical (literary) language" (Blau 2000, 20), some scholars have argued that QH was a spoken language. One of the most prominent proponents of this idea is Qimron. The central point of his argument is that "the grammar of DSS Hebrew is basically independent and distinct from other phases of Hebrew," reflecting "the Hebrew of the period spoken in Jerusalem or in its vicinity" (Qimron 2000, 232).² Elsewhere he states that certain "unique features show that DSS Hebrew is not merely a mixture of BH, MH and Aramaic, but also draws on a distinct spoken dialect" (1986, 117–118). However, terminology such as "reflects" and "draws on" is highly ambiguous. These and similar

¹ The general classical character of the Hebrew of Ben Sira is evident (see Van Peursen 2004). Very few clear anterior *weqatals* are attested (and some are dubious or occur in variant readings/secondary passages; *ib.*, 409). Non-volitive *weyiqtol*s are more frequent, yet classical non-anterior *weqatal* and volitive *weyiqtol*s are in quite general use.

² On the problematic use of "DSS Hebrew" rather than QH, see Reymond 2014, 5; cf. Schniedewind 2000, 245.

terms can be used to indicate several degrees of reflection – from sporadic reflection of a spoken language in a literary language to a more or less direct expression of the way people were actually speaking.

Qimron's stand is not always clear. On the one hand, at times he expresses himself in a way that sounds like the ideas that he otherwise criticizes. Thus he states, "Admittedly, most of the DSS are literary works, but their grammar should be considered as reflecting the spoken language of their scribes" (Qimron 2000, 244). Similarly, "One may therefore describe the history of written Hebrew as reflecting the influence of these dialects (and of Aramaic) upon the literary language" (1992, 361). He argues that the language of 4QMMT "presumably [sic] best reflects the spoken Hebrew of Qumran" (1986, 117).³ If there are different degrees of reflection, the written language *in general* cannot be a direct representation of the spoken language. On the other hand, elsewhere he is adamant that QH is *not* "an unknown phase of BH or a mixture of the spoken and written language of the Jews" (Qimron 2000, 232). This claim implies a very direct sense of "reflection." A similar direct relationship between spoken language and writing seems to be presupposed in Qimron's rather naïve statement that, "Naturally, one should assume that the Hebrew of the book attributed to Nehemiah (and written in the first person) would reflect the language of Nehemiah" (*ib.*, 236).

The basis for Qimron's view is twofold. First, he rightly shows that there are no traces of RH (MH in his terminology) in QH as would be expected if the scribes were speakers of RH (*ib.*, 233). However, he also notes (*ib.*, 235–236) that RH is a literary language from a later period, probably based on the spoken language of another part of the country. Accordingly, it is clear that RH in the strict sense (the language of the Mishnah and other Rabbinic writings) is not to be found in QH. In fact, most of the scholars that Qimron is arguing against likely have a less restricted sense of RH in mind when they argue that QH is attempted CH/BH written by speakers of RH. The idea is not that QH reflects the specific idiom found in the Mishnah, which is a highly condensed and technical literary language that was probably never spoken as such.⁴ Rather, the Mishnah and other RH writings are based on a later developmental stage of spoken Hebrew and what is reflected in QH is not RH as such, but an earlier phase of the dialect that later became the basis for RH or, more likely, an earlier phase of a dialect related to the dialect on

³ Cf. Qimron and Strugnell 1994, 65–108, especially 102–108. In this work, we do not find the strong claim that spoken Hebrew is directly reflected in QH in general.

⁴ The same applies to BH (cf. Ullendorff 1971; Knauf 1990). Native speakers of BH as abstracted from the totality of biblical texts never existed.

which RH was based.⁵ Hence, while Qimron's observations about the lack of direct links between QH and RH are important in their own right, they hardly constitute an argument for the view that QH reflects a spoken dialect in any *direct* way.

Second, according to Qimron, the grammar of QH is independent and distinctive from other phases of the language and he finds several specific traits that he can only explain on the basis of a living language (2000, 237; 1992, 354–355).

A similar view was put forward by Morag (1988). Qimron cites Morag approvingly though he notes that some of Morag's evidence for influence from a spoken language might be explained otherwise. Nonetheless, Qimron uses the evidence in a much more far-reaching way than Morag, who does not claim that the written language reflects the spoken language directly. According to Morag (1988, 149), there are three main categories of QH: CSH ("Copper Scroll Hebrew"), QM ("Qumran Mishnaic"), and GQH ("General Qumran Hebrew"). CSH contains one document (the Copper Scroll/3Q15). As for QM, Morag only mentions 4QMMT (unpublished at the time) and further refers to Milik (1962, 222), who – in addition to 4QMMT – notes some "Mishnaic" elements in 4QMishmarot and 4QPseudo-Jubilees. GQH includes most of the texts and is defined by "the occurrence of several distinctly salient features" such as the long forms of the personal pronouns and the *yiqtol* type יקוטלהו. According to Morag (1988, 163), several of these features in GQH "can in no way be regarded as having been originated in a literary, archaizing, language, which had BH as its model of writing, or as indicating a linear development of LBH. They are part and parcel of the morphological structure of certain Hebrew dialects of the Qumran period."⁶ They must be the result of processes that, according to Morag, can only occur in a living, spoken language. Yet, unlike Qimron and some other scholars, Morag does not claim that the expression of this supposed spoken language in the texts is direct. They "do not precisely represent the language spoken by the scribes who were bound, in their orthography, grammar and lexicon, to a certain literary tradition. They could not, however, in spite of the attempts to adhere to the standards of the literary tradition, avoid the imprints of their spoken language" (ib., 150). Morag's use of the ten features (see n. 6) to

⁵ For a recent treatment of the background of RH, see Koller 2017.

⁶ Morag treats ten GQH features, 1) the use of אשר rather than אש , 2) contraction of *-aw* in final position, i.e. $\text{יִי} > \text{י}$, 3) dissimilation of *CC* into *nC*, 4) *w+yiqtol* with the "cohortative" suffix ה , i.e. ואקטלה , 5) pausal forms in non-pausal position, 6) *yiqtol*+object יקוטלהו and יקטולהו , 7) long forms of the personal pronouns in 3sm/f, 8) 3sm possessive suffix הו on words ending in -i , 9) 2p and 3p endings with ה , 10) syntactic structures: a) היה+PTC and b) specific uses of certain prepositions (Morag 1988, 151–152).

prove that GQH is an independent entity is questionable. He explicitly states that there are more GQH features and that the ten have merely been selected by him. Still, he uses the number of similarities or lack thereof between GQH, BH, and RH with regard to the ten features as an argument. Since Morag has selected the list of features in order to show that GQH is an independent entity, it is difficult to see what such statistics can prove. If he had included other features, the result would have been different. There are many grammatical traits that are the same in BH and GQH – as opposed to the single such trait (feature 1) noted by Morag (*ib.*, 150). Hence, the numbers hardly prove Morag's point. In addition, some of Morag's features may be explained by analogical influence from forms also attested in BH, thus making the claim of a basis in spoken language unnecessary. Morag admits this in the case of feature 4 (pseudo-cohortative וְאִקְטִלָּהּ; *ib.*, 154) but the same seems to apply to other features. E.g., the type יְקוּטְלֶהוּ before object suffixes (feature 6) may be an analogical creation based on the imperative with object, as noted by Qimron (1986, 52–53). Further, feature 3 (dissimilation of *CC* into *nC*) is very rare and its relevance for the characterization of QH seems negligible.

Returning to Qimron, the phenomena that he mentions in support of his thesis are, first, the more or less consistent use of what looks like jussive and cohortative forms in all *w+yiqtol* forms (1992, 354). Second, the double sets of short and long pronouns and suffixes, regulated by phonetic constraints, which prevent long forms from occurring when the preceding sound is *-ū-* or *-ī-* (*ib.*, 355). Third, and this is what Qimron calls "[p]erhaps the most convincing example" (*ib.*, 355), there is the use in 4QMMT of ׀ֿש like in RH instead of classical אִשׁ. This particle is used in a way that is not entirely consistent with the way it is used in RH, which means that the spoken language was not RH, and since the very existence of the particle is "contrary to the literary standard" its use must reflect a spoken dialect different from RH. As was noted above, it is evident that the spoken language at the time was not RH in the strict sense. However, the fundamental lesson from this example in fact goes against the view of QH in general as a direct reflection of spoken language. If it is true that the spoken language used ׀ֿש like 4QMMT, the other Qumran texts that do not use this particle but rather the classical counterpart seem to be attempts at standard literary Hebrew with a notable degree of archaizing in contrast to contemporary spoken usage. On a more general level, Qimron's claim that the grammar of QH is independent and distinctive is hard to follow. To be sure, there are special traits that characterize QH, but the basic grammatical system – particularly the verbal system – clearly aligns with the system known from BH (as argued in ch. 6).

Other scholars have expressed views similar to Qimron's. Talshir (2003, 265) finds that "QH must have been a living language rather than an artificial creation of a number of dedicated scribes. This is proven by the recurring and consistent use of linguistic patterns." Furthermore, Talshir considers it likely that QH is "the natural continuation of LBH" (ib., 265).⁷ According to his interpretation, classical BH developed into LBH and QH in the mountain areas, while it developed into RH in the lowlands (ib., 262).⁸ Talshir's view is quite radical in ascribing the status of living language to various attestations of Hebrew. He seems to see all these types of language as real, living, spoken languages, including LBH (ib., 269, "LBH does not have to be viewed as an artificial language or a language in disguise"). However, the idea that any part of the OT provides direct evidence for the spoken language is problematic (cf. 7.3).

Naudé also appears to think that QH reflects the spoken language in a very direct way. He even mentions the transmission of grammar from mother to child in this connection, implying that QH was a natural language that children would learn as their mother tongue (Naudé 2000, 116). He points to the Bar Kokhba letters as proof that Hebrew was spoken and not merely a Rabbinic invention. However, this is an argument that RH was based on living, spoken Hebrew. It has nothing to do with the degree of direct reflection of the spoken language in QH.⁹

Most other scholars are more cautious. While Muraoka (2000a, 344) agrees with the view that some features can only be explained by phonological processes occurring in spoken language, he notes that "the notion of writing as one talks is a fairly modern one," and therefore "none of the documents is likely to reveal the writer's spoken Hebrew in full, which equally holds for Mishnaic Hebrew." Similarly, Joosten (2010a, 356) remarks that writing always differs from speech and certain traits of the language can be

⁷ The continuity between LBH and QH is a widespread view (e.g. Joosten 2012a, 380) but some scholars doubt that there is a direct link, cf. Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 1:253–255 and 276. Already Polzin (1976, 6–8) noted that QH is in many ways closer to EBH.

⁸ Other scholars note that RH cannot be the direct descendant of BH, typically arguing that RH sometimes exhibit more archaic forms than BH. For an overview of the main evidence, see Koller 2017, 152–155. Note that some of the evidence may be debatable (such as the claim that the feminine demonstrative וְ is older than תַּז or the view that 3sf III-*h* הַנְּתָה is necessarily more original than הַנְּתָה rather than a later development).

⁹ Note also Naudé's curious statement about "the disappearance" of the consecutive forms: "In fact, the *waw*-consecutive phenomenon is nearly absent in QH" (2000, 126). Likewise, it "is not altogether certain whether QH has the consecutive *waw* construction" (2003, 210). These claims find no support in the documents.

seen as artificial, but still "one should always give the Qumran authors the benefit of the doubt: unless there is reason to think that a form, a word, or a turn of phrase reflects reuse of biblical expressions, or influence from Aramaic, one should admit that it represents proper Hebrew of the dialect used by the sectarians." However, he also stresses the decidedly biblicizing style of the Qumran authors. In addition to direct quotations and allusions, even when "the authors express their own ideas, they often clothe them in language that is partly taken over from earlier writings" (ib., 359).

As indicated by Joosten's words, the biblical flavour of QH is very pronounced. Yet, at the same time, there are clear indications of something that is not BH. The claim (Joosten 2010a, 361) that the scrolls show that Hebrew was a living language in the first century BCE is clearly correct, but that does not mean that this living Hebrew was identical to QH. The problem is how to define the "reflections" from the spoken language in the texts. What does it mean that QH reflects a living language? Does it mean that the authors wrote more or less like they spoke, or does it mean that their spoken language sometimes caused interference in the more or less standardized literary language. "Reflections" might be understood in either way. Calling QH a "distinct dialect" does not in itself indicate whether that dialect was spoken in real life and the idea of a "living substratum" would hardly be denied by anybody. Obviously, the authors spoke some kind of living language when they were not writing and there is good reason to suppose that this was a type of Hebrew (while they were probably also proficient in Aramaic). However, the question is the degree to which this living substratum is *directly* reflected in the writings.

Blau has argued that all the traits that Qimron and others claim could only have evolved in a spoken language are explainable as purely literary phenomena. He notes that "*even dead languages, only used in literature, change*" (Blau 2000, 20). In his opinion, QH simply reflects "the latest stage of artificial (literary) biblical language, exposed, to some extent, to the influence of the spoken vernaculars, viz. Aramaic and some sort of Middle Hebrew, which later crystallized as Mishnaic Hebrew, but also representing various traditions, genres, fashions, scribal schools, and personal inclinations" (ib., 22). He refers to medieval Middle Arabic texts with special developments of classical Arabic forms, which cannot have been caused by contemporary spoken Arabic since they involve the case system or the internal passive, which the spoken language had lost (ib., 21 and 24). Similar examples can be found in other languages, e.g., Sanskrit, as noted by Coulson (1992, xxi). Furthermore, Coulson makes two important distinctions that

may be helpful when discussing the different types of Hebrew, between living and dead languages and between natural and learned languages.¹⁰ According to this view, a language is living "when people choose to converse and formulate ideas in it in preference to any other" (ib., xix). To a modern scholar, Classical Sanskrit is dead and learned, but to the writers in the classical period it was learned, yet living. Likewise, QH was not a dead language (as Blau thinks), but a living, learned language. The spoken Hebrew dialects, of course, would be living and natural in this terminology.

Even if specific traits in a written text could be shown to derive from spoken language, such "reflections" need not indicate that the spoken language was the same as the written language (cf. Hurvitz 2000, 113). Rather, it might be a case of interference, i.e. influence from one linguistic system on another. In the case of QH, this would mean that QH should be described as CH with interference, either from an entirely different language (Aramaic) or from a later phase or different register of the same language (some kind of spoken pre-RH), cf. Rabin's term "involuntary Mishnaisms" (1958, 146).¹¹ Hence, we cannot say that Qimron and others with similar ideas have convincingly undermined the prevailing view of QH (the "conservative view," to use Blau's term).

However, another intriguing question must be addressed – the question of "why." If the writers of QH spoke another kind of Hebrew, why did they write the way they did? Specifically, to which degree was this a conscious decision?

7.1.1 "Antilanguage"?

Schniedewind has argued strongly for a "conscious" approach (1999; 2000; 2013, 173–190; Rendsburg 2010 embraces Schniedewind's position, cf. 2015). The basic idea was already presented by Rabin. In various Qumran texts, he noted several examples of what seems to be the sectarians' negative perception of their opponents' language and he thought that language was used as a marker of identity between the Qumran sect and their opponents, Pharisees or Rabbinic Jews (Rabin 1958, 146 and 158–159).¹² He argued that

¹⁰ Learned in the sense that the language is not a mother tongue, but has to be acquired later through study and mastered in a conscious way. In addition, Coulson (1992, xx) notes that the "literary medium of any language contains elements of learned speech."

¹¹ In light of the remarks on RH above, "Mishnaisms" is not a very precise term (cf. Goshen-Gottstein 1958a, 105, n. 14: "nur als Klischee aufzufassen").

¹² Rabin takes expressions such as "a halting tongue," "an uncircumcised language," and "a tongue of blasphemies" to be derogatory terms for RH (ib., 146). Other interpretations may be possible, however – Greek, Aramaic, or a reference to the general content rather than the form of language?

the writers of the DSS "employed a Hebrew which is much more like that of the Bible, and has only few traits of the spoken language. This effort at purism was probably not a function of superior linguistic training, but part of the self-identification of that group with the generation of the Exodus from Egypt and the will to imitate not only the latter's religious customs, but also their way of speaking" (1974, 37).

Following the same line of thought, Weitzman (1999, 45) describes the use of Hebrew as one of the methods used by the sect to affirm "its identity as a transcendent community, a symbolic gesture of its eternally valid status in a world of competing ideologies and languages," as a means to "transcend the multilingualism of the wayward world around it."

According to Schniedewind (1999, 235), QH is an "antilanguage" – "created by conscious linguistic choices intended to set the speakers and their language apart from others."¹³ Specifically, the language was modelled after what was perceived to be "the very language of God used in the creation of the world," including forms and usage from poetry (perceived to be archaic) as well as what was intended to be pre-classical forms, i.e. pseudo-classicisms and hyper-classicisms (Schniedewind 2000, 245; cf. Kutscher's "vogue for archaisms" [1974, 21] in certain aspects of 1QIsa^a spelling). Since it is clear that not all the documents are the products of the supposed sect, Schniedewind (1999, 237) states that it is necessary to limit "our analysis to the corpus of sectarian texts that reflect the language specifically of the group living at Khirbet Qumran."

¹³ Schniedewind also uses the idea of conscious linguistic choice in other contexts. Describing the early development of Hebrew writing, he suggests that the spelling of the word for "land" in Hebrew and Aramaic with *šade* and *ʿayin* (earlier *qof*), respectively, was not "simply the result of different phonological mergers or shifts," but rather of ideological considerations – "we can hardly rule out such issues in a highly loaded word like *land*" (2013, 55). However, neither can we rule out the simpler explanation that the writing simply reflects different natural developments of the underlying PS sound leading to different pronunciations in the two languages. Given the fact that the same correspondence between graphemes (and presumably sounds) is attested in other words and is, in fact, quite regular, there seems to be no reason to see an ideological, conscious motive here. The basic point of Schniedewind's idea was already expressed by Rabin (1974, 29), "a desire to stress features that differentiate 'our' language from those of the neighbours." In a general form, the idea has merit, of course. If the natural development of a language leads to the existence of several variants, some of which are different from the ones in neighbouring languages, while others are the same, speakers or writers might choose the former if they want a "national" language that is maximally differentiated from their linguistic relatives. Yet, it seems that more evidence is needed if specific cases of such conscious language planning are to be accepted.

Schniedewind's theory is surely intriguing and makes for a fascinating narrative that connects the place, the persons and the language of the texts. At least for some aspects of QH, this approach may point in the right direction but as a general description, the speculative and circular nature of the reasoning cannot be denied. Schniedewind (2000, 245) states that language is a complex social fact and "[c]onsequently, the sectarian religious beliefs of the Qumran community would have influenced Qumran Hebrew." However, there is no automatic connection – sectarian beliefs may lead to a markedly different use of language, but since we need to show that this is actually what happened in the case at hand, it cannot simply be used as the starting point. Similarly, when Schniedewind limits his analysis to the texts that he thinks are sectarian he also seems to presuppose what he is supposed to prove. The designation "sectarian" is not unproblematic and scholars have noted that the communities described in, e.g., CD and 1QS are not identical (Collins 2010, 157). All documents with the "sectarian" label need not derive from the same "sect" or from the same place or time in the development of such a group. This makes any clear connection between a specific type of language attested in the texts and the supposed language policy of a particular group highly problematic.¹⁴

Antilanguages tend to avoid and violate standard usage (Schniedewind 2000, 245; Irvine 1989). In Schniedewind's view (2000, 246), the standard was "the vernacular spoken in Jerusalem by the opponents of the Qumran community."¹⁵ However, he also notes that there is a written or literary background. This means that the use of an archaizing CH may not have been a specifically sectarian trait. In fact, it seems more likely that the standard, for written usage, was precisely CH with the OT as a model. The problem is that we do not have any writings from the supposed opponents of the sectarians from the same period. This point was also criticized by Weitzman (1999, 37; cf. Segert 1963, 315).¹⁶ In fact, Schniedewind recognizes the problem (2000,

¹⁴ On the different ways of applying the term "sectarian" to texts, see Newsom (1990, 173). She notes that though it seems probable that writings originating in a sectarian group would often exhibit distinctive traits of style, vocabulary etc., they do not have to have such traits; in certain genres, it is possible that all authors, whether sectarian or not, would have to abide by certain stereotypical conventions (*ib.*, 175–176).

¹⁵ Schniedewind (*ib.*, 252) points out that scribal corrections, when made, are towards the "Qumran practice."

¹⁶ Schniedewind claims to be doing sociolinguistics, but Rezetko and Young (2014, 238–239, n. 95) point out that this is not really the case. He does not achieve the desired correlation between measurable linguistic and social phenomena. Similar criticism applies to Kim's "sociolinguistic evaluation" of the linguistic dating of OT texts (Kim 2013).

251) yet does not seem to see how speculative his approach is because of this factor.

To demonstrate the validity of his hypothesis Schniedewind (2000, 251) mentions the 3sm suffix on words with -\eta (אֲבִיָּהוּ), which he refers to as a hyper-classicism, one of the "most telling attempts to reconstruct primordial language." Such forms go "against the natural linguistic tendencies." Since the η mostly elided in CH, its "reappearance" is the result of "the ideological creation of an idiolect for the community" (Schniedewind 1999, 238).¹⁷ However, the proof is not conclusive. The η -forms may reflect usage in the spoken dialect of the writers, which (in this particular trait) may have happened to be more conservative than the MT, preserving a more original form. Alternatively, the type with η may be a late analogical (literary or spoken, and not necessarily conscious and sectarian, but quite natural) creation based on other cases with preserved η (with 3sf or 3p suffix) or Aramaic influence. In general, Schniedewind sees the addition of η (personal pronouns, verbal endings, the adverb שָׁמָּה, etc.) as hyper-archaizing indicating the sectarians' attempt to reconstruct primordial forms. Since, in some cases, the longer forms are clearly older and the shorter forms later reductions, a general feeling may have arisen that long forms are old and therefore appropriate for archaic religious language, regardless of the real history of the forms (Schniedewind 2000, 253–254). To be sure, most of such longer forms are arguably late analogical creations, yet we still lack a convincing argument that they are *conscious* creations. Some are attested in Samaritan Hebrew too, which would seem to indicate that other factors may have been at work beside the ideology of the presumed Qumran sect.¹⁸

Further, Schniedewind (2000, 254) argues that the type יִקְטוּלוֹ, which in the MT is a pausal form (mostly in poetry), is another instance of conscious use of a perceived archaic form. Again, nothing indicates that this was a conscious choice.¹⁹

Further, note that one of the "independent" variables used by Kim is the date of the texts – the question he is trying to evaluate (cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 240).

¹⁷ For a seemingly opposite development, see Reymond 2014, 88 and 99 (γ seems to be most susceptible to loss or substitution by other signs in the most "sectarian" texts).

¹⁸ Cf. Ben-Hayyim 1958, 207. Rendsburg (2010, 235) suggests a separate but similar sectarian motivation behind the Samaritan forms.

¹⁹ According to Morag (1988, 155), "pausal" forms in non-pausal position are a GQH trait, indicating penultimate stress. However, the orthography of QH only indicates part of what is expressed in the detailed MT vocalization. The spelling יִקְטוּלוֹ need not indicate a pronunciation or stress pattern different from the MT (cf. 5.3.2).

In general, the positive evidence for a conscious linguistic ideology at Qumran is ambiguous at best.²⁰ However, a more promising line of thought is the negative evidence – what Schniedewind (1999, 243) calls "studied avoidance." In some texts, features of unclassical language, specifically "Mishnaic" elements, are prominent (he mentions the Copper Scroll and 4QMMT, as well as sporadic cases in other scrolls). This shows that this type of language existed and could be written but was mostly avoided. Schniedewind does not mention any traits from the verbal system in this connection, but verbal usage seems to support the general point. The sporadic cases of unclassical usage scattered across the documents show that an unclassical type of verbal system did exist at the time but was not – in general – used in writing. However, this does not tell us whether this was a conscious choice of a particular sect or simply the way to write good, classical literary Hebrew.

Unfortunately, the document most clearly connected to RH (cf. Høgenhaven 2015), viz. the Copper Scroll, contains very few verbs (only imperatives). We cannot know if consecutive forms would have been used. The other documents dubbed "Mishnaic" provide no clear evidence for unclassical verbal usage (4QMMT, 4QMishmarot and 4QPseudo-Jubilees). The designation of the Mishmarot texts as "Mishnaic" seems to be based on the use of relative ׀ש. There are no verbs of relevance to our question. 4QPseudo-Jubilees clearly uses the classical system – and possibly in a more classical way than the MT.²¹ The "Mishnaic" character of 4QMMT stems mostly from the vocabulary, while the grammar is "primarily Qumranic" (Qimron and Strugnell 1994, 102–103). No *wayyiqtol*, *weyiqtol*, or anterior *weqatal* is attested. However, there are several cases of non-anterior *weqatal*, some of which are in direct or indirect OT quotes, while two are not (4Q398 fr. 14–17 ii 5, והרהיק, 7, ונחשבה). The use of PTCs in MMT is very dominant, including periphrastic constructions with היה (*yiqtol*). This seems to point in the direction of RH but since the text is direct discourse, genre plays a role. PTCs used as a real present tense in direct discourse are not unclassical.

While no Qumran text attests to a verbal system of a clearly RH type, numerous cases of unclassical usage show up in the documents (6.2.2 and 6.2.4). On the one hand, the presence of such usage seems to indicate that a verbal system of the RH type was in use at the time of writing or copying of the texts. On the other hand, the texts do not regularly use this system but rather the classical one. This seems to support the view that the written and

²⁰ On conscious linguistic development in other languages, see Dixon (1997, 12 and 106, n. 2).

²¹ The possibly non-anterior *weqatal* in Gen 15:6 seems to be a *wayyiqtol* in 4Q225 fr. 2 i 7 ([ויא]מין), cf. n. 13 in ch. 6.

spoken registers of Hebrew were in fact quite different in this period. In other words, the idea that QH reflects spoken language directly is difficult to uphold. Rather, in QH (as well as in BH) we seem to witness varying degrees of interference from a system of the RH type in the classical system. Apparently, a situation of diglossia existed. Two markedly different grammatical systems were in use at the same time, a high variety (without native speakers) that had to be learned for literary, formal use, and a low variety used for ordinary conversation and day-to-day usage.²² Occasionally, slips may have occurred between the two varieties, leading to the use of colloquial elements in the formal variety (and, in some cases, such usage may have been a deliberate stylistic choice; cf. Van Peursen 2004, 55–57).

Was strict adherence to the classical standard language with archaizing tendencies a conscious decision of a particular group (the "antilanguage" of the presumed sect at Qumran)? The clearest cases of anterior *weqatal* in QH (6.2.2) occur in texts that are generally considered "non-sectarian," while the near total absence of such forms in the major "sectarian" documents might be seen as an attempt to be "more biblical than the Bible itself." Apparently, texts such as Tobit and Jubilees were not subject to the same archaizing tendencies (Siegismund 2017, 218). Perhaps the almost consistent non-use of anterior *weqatal* in the major sectarian documents shows that they deliberately avoided this form in their own works as opposed to other writers and the scribes of mss. such as 1QIsa^a, who allowed a higher degree of interference from the system of the spoken language.²³ However, this does not prove the "antilanguage" claim (conscious decisions). Maybe the "sectarian" writers were simply better at avoiding interference in a language type that was not necessarily their own conscious creation but rather "standard" Hebrew, the way one was supposed to write regardless of one's sectarian affiliation.

²² On diglossia, see especially Rendsburg 1990. Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd (2008, 1:172–179) discuss several responses to Rendsburg's approach. E.g., our lack of information on real spoken usage prevents us from determining the degree of divergence between the supposed high and low varieties and whether we are in fact dealing with diglossia or merely with a standard language based on one dialect as opposed to other, more or less diverging dialects. On dialects in ancient Hebrew, see, e.g., *ib.*, 1:180–200. In addition, several foreign languages played a role in the periods under consideration (Aramaic, Greek, later also Latin), in different varieties and registers. Hence, the linguistic situation must have been more complex than "simple" diglossia.

²³ Smith (1991, 59) states that the "absence of unconverted perfects is in part a matter of genre and in part a matter of style. The extant QL texts are mostly prescriptive in character and therefore do not call for past **wqtl* which was might [sic] be expected in historical texts." However, the texts that do include narrative past sequences typically use *wayyiqtol* and simple *qatal* – not anterior *weqatal*. Nothing indicates that, e.g., 1QM would have used large numbers of anterior *weqatal*, had it included lengthy narrative passages.

In fact, with the available material, it seems impossible to prove the "anti-language" theory. At the same time, the evidence does not allow us to disprove it either. Too many factors remain unknown. Specifically on the use of anterior *weqatal*, the numbers are very low, and it would be unwise to draw too firm conclusions.

The same applies to the question of the degree of direct reflection of spoken language. The observations above seem to indicate that QH was a literary language that differed markedly from the spoken dialect(s). Below, I will discuss the view that this was probably the case for BH as well and that CH in general is to be considered a literary standard language. However, given the obvious lack of actual samples of spoken Hebrew from ancient times, Qimron's thesis cannot be disproved that easily – some people may have been speaking an archaic dialect that preserved the classical verbal system. Of course, the literary language (whether a more general standard or a consciously created "antilanguage") may even have been secondarily used as a spoken language by the presumed sectarians (cf. the distinction between living/dead and learned/natural languages).²⁴ Further, it could be claimed that the supposed interference from spoken Hebrew was in fact Aramaic, while contemporary spoken Hebrew used the classical verbal system. However, the evidence suggests that Hebrew was spoken even at a later date and the late documentary texts do not use the classical system at all. Hence, it seems likely that the interference, at least in part, came from a type of Hebrew.²⁵ Finally, perhaps the variation that has been noted and interpreted as signs of interference from the spoken language in the written language may in fact have existed in the spoken language, i.e., the spoken language used anterior *weqatal* and *wayyiqtol* with the same meaning, the choice between the forms possibly reflecting social stratification, style, etc. Indeed, during the development of the spoken language, such a situation likely existed (8.2). However, such a situation must have been very unstable since the existence of anterior *weqatal* would tend to produce a high degree of ambiguity as long as classical non-anterior *weqatal* remained in use, as it clearly was in QH. Since the reflections of an RH type of verbal system seem to be attested in texts from a longer period they are more likely to be interference in a written standard language from a spoken language, which had already undergone the fundamental shift in the verbal system at an earlier date.

²⁴ See Reymond 2014, 14, n. 3. In other diglossic situations (Modern Arabic) the primarily literary high variant is used in spoken form under certain circumstances.

²⁵ Kutscher (1974, 29) notes that many features of 1QIsa^a are shared by RH and Aramaic. He remarks that if the changes made in the scroll were supposed to produce a more popular edition we must assume that Hebrew was still in use (ib., 73).

In sum, the evidence leaves many possibilities open and allows for very few clear conclusions. Since we only have access to written texts and do not have any sources that unambiguously tell us about the spoken language it is difficult to see how a definitive answer to the questions can be given. As long as this is the case, I see no reason to abandon the widely accepted view that QH in general is to be considered classical literary Hebrew with different degrees of archaizing as well as interference, possibly from the spoken languages (a pre-RH type of Hebrew and Aramaic) and possibly from purely literary developments attributable to scribal style etc.²⁶

7.2 The ancient inscriptions and spoken Hebrew

It seems likely that a diglossia-like situation obtained when the Qumran texts were written. An archaic literary language and a spoken language, presumably in several dialects, coexisted for different communicative purposes. To account for the deviations from classical usage we must assume that at least some of the spoken dialects had undergone a considerable development in comparison with the classical language, in the verbal system as well as other parts of grammar, phonology, and lexicon. If that was the case for QH, when did such a situation originate?²⁷

Rendsburg (1990, 175) sets the beginning of diglossia at a very early date ("c. 1200 B.C.E."). At that time, the written and spoken dialects were very similar for "a brief instant," but "[w]ith the standardization of classical Hebrew, especially from c. 1000 B.C.E. onward in Jerusalem, and the continued development of the spoken idiom, the difference between the two dialects became more pronounced." To be sure, a period of relative similarity between written and spoken language (specifically concerning the consecutive forms) must have existed at some point unless we embrace the unconvincing claim that the system is an artificial creation (7.2.1). Yet, it may be necessary to date that period much later than Rendsburg does. According to Rendsburg (*ib.*, 32–33), the inscriptions imitate the OT, which he dates early ("by and large their language is identical to BH, and few colloquialisms appear to have penetrated them"). However, since the arguments for early dating of OT texts in general have been challenged (to say the least), the idea that BH (as we know it) influenced the inscriptions is problematic. Of course, it is possible (and indeed likely) that ancient literary works may have existed that have been completely lost to us or that may have been partly incorporated into works that later became part of the OT. An additional complication is the

²⁶ See the balanced approach presented by Reymond (2014, 18 and 20).

²⁷ Cf. Hornkohl 2014, 24.

possibility that an oral literature may have existed, leaving no direct evidence. The presence on the Ketef Hinnom silver amulets (KHin) of a version of the Priestly Blessing (Num 6:24–26) and a passage similar to Deut 7:9 is noteworthy in this respect. Yet it clearly does not prove that the writer of these inscriptions knew Numbers and Deuteronomy as finished books in the form transmitted to us (in contrast, cf. Schniedewind 2013, 114–115). Significantly, most other ancient inscriptions deal with matters much more mundane. In some cases, there is a certain degree of formality (e.g. seemingly fixed expressions such as *ישמע יהוה את אדני שמעת שלם* in Lach 2:1–3, or *מי עבדך כלב* in 2:3–4; cf. also Lach 3; 4; 5; 6; 8; 9; see Young 1993, 110). In all languages, the mere act of writing tends to lead to the use of linguistic traits that differ from the ones used in spoken discourse, as noted by Young (ib., 25). He suggests that the inscriptions were written in what he refers to as "Official Prose," which stands in contrast not only to the "Literary Prose" of the biblical texts but also to the spoken language (ib., 20). This "official" language was needed "by the large centralized administration set up by David and Solomon to rule their empire" (ib., 97). However, the historicity of these characters and their empire is not a given fact and the argument ought to be more general and cautious (to the degree that some kind of centralized administration/state existed, an "official" or standard language would tend to be needed).²⁸

²⁸ Young's view is based on Rabin (1974, 29). Young (1993, 4; cf. Rabin 1974, 21–22) argues that "the origin of Hebrew is to be sought in the continuation of a pre-existing 'Canaanite' literary prestige language" (see also Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 1:178 and 316). This prestige language is reflected in the Amarna letters from Canaan, which are seen as expressions of a consciously evolved hybrid language with a high degree of uniformity (Young 1993, 7–10). However, this theory is not convincing. It is unnecessary as an explanation for the attested similarities between Canaanite languages, which can simply be seen as the result of ordinary historical development of diverse dialects from a common source. In Young's early work, classical historical-comparative linguistics and the question of genetic relationship between languages do not seem to play any role. In the period when separate Canaanite languages are attested, the languages are very similar (it might be debated whether Hebrew and Moabite, e.g., are separate languages). At an earlier date (closer to their common source), at the time of Amarna, the similarities must have been even greater. Hence, the perceived uniformity in the Canaanite traits attested in the letters need not be the product of a conscious, literary creation but might be perfectly natural reflections of a still mostly undifferentiated Canaanite language. In addition, the claim that the Amarna letters with Canaanite influence represent a uniform means of communication deliberately developed by scribes (cf. Schniedewind 2013, 47) seems unwarranted. They may be more or less failed attempts at writing Akkadian by native speakers of Canaanite. Alternatively, see von Dassow's argument (2004) that the intention was, in fact, to write Canaanite rather than Akkadian. In any case, the evidence for a consciously created literary prestige language is hard to see.

Clearly, we have no real specimens of spoken Hebrew. As noted above, "the notion of writing as one talks is a fairly modern one" (Muraoka 2000a, 344).²⁹ However, since we do not know how people were actually speaking, this does not necessarily mean that we have to posit diglossia at the time of the inscriptions (in the strict sense of two coexisting varieties of markedly different type). We have no evidence that there were significant grammatical differences between spoken and written Hebrew at this stage. If we restrict the discussion to the HVS, the kind of unclassical interference known from BH and QH does not seem to occur in the inscriptions. This might be mere chance, of course, but we must at least recognize the possibility that the reason may be that the classical consecutive forms were in fact a living part of spoken Hebrew at this time.

Schniedewind (2013, 99) argues that a "democratization of Hebrew" took place in ancient Judah from the eighth century BC. Writing spread through different classes of society and was no longer restricted to a highly trained scribal elite (ib., 104). He assumes a relatively widespread rudimentary literacy, which he calls "craft literacy" (ib., 105).³⁰ The contents of several inscriptions may support this view. Lach 3 ("Letter of a Literate Soldier") is thought to indicate that illiteracy was a social stigma since the soldier in the letter vehemently defends himself against accusations that he is unable to read (ib., 106). Schniedewind argues against the view that the letter is "Official Hebrew" and/or that it was penned by a professional scribe since the point of the letter is that the soldier is able to do it himself (ib., 107). In addition, the "rudimentary linguistic skills" of the writer and the "linguistic problems" of the letter, according to Schniedewind, indicate that the soldier was the actual writer (ib., 107).³¹ Similarly, he states that we cannot take for granted that the complaint from an agricultural worker in MHsh 1 (Yavneh Yam) was penned by a professional scribe (ib., 112). In fact, he argues that the language is "rather redundant [...] perhaps reflecting aspects of oral speech" (ib., 111). Similarly, Parker (1997, 16) notes that the "clumsiness" of the letter "must reflect the manner of speech" of the worker. Parker, however, thinks that the worker was an illiterate who poured out his story to a

²⁹ We cannot use spoken discourse as represented in the OT as evidence for real spoken usage. "When Biblical authors composed their works they couched everything, including direct speech, in the classical language" (Rendsburg 1990, 19).

³⁰ Cf. Wise (1992, 158) on "craftsman's literacy" ("a society in which most craftsmen can at least read, while women, unskilled laborers, and peasants generally cannot").

³¹ The word "linguistic" in this context is not well chosen. There is no reason to assume that the soldier did not have full command of what we assume was his own language. "Scribal" or "stylistic" would have been better terms.

scribe, thereby possibly adding to the alleged "clumsiness" due to "his agitation and anxiety under the circumstances." One should be very cautious when making such value judgements – the perceived "clumsiness" may be due to our lack of native speaker intuition. The text, however, does appear repetitious and in some ways atypical. Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 360) note that the "style may be characteristic of colloquial Hebrew."

The Siloam inscription (Silm), describing the building of the famous tunnel, may be another relevant case. The contents and location of the inscription (inside the tunnel) are atypical compared to building inscriptions in other languages. Perhaps it was put up by and for the actual workers, possibly reflecting their spoken language.³² However, we cannot know whether they used a professional scribe.³³ In fact, none of the texts mentioned here yields conclusive evidence about the real extent of literacy in the period or about the relation between spoken Hebrew and the language of the inscriptions (cf. Smith 1991, 26).³⁴ However, taken together, they do seem to suggest that the strictly official or even literary character of the inscriptions may be an unwarranted assumption. We cannot exclude the possibility that the language of the inscriptions was close to spoken varieties.

7.2.1 Artificial consecutive forms?

While some scholars have argued explicitly that the consecutive forms must have been part of the spoken language, more seem to hold a more skeptical view.³⁵ Several scholars have claimed that the consecutive forms are purely

³² Rendsburg and Schniedewind 2010 argue (rather speculatively) that certain Northern dialectal traits in the text indicate that the author of the inscription was a recent refugee to Jerusalem from the North, used as forced labour.

³³ See Young 1993, 104. Based on 2 Chr 32:2–4, he argues that "the miners [...] may well have had expert royal scribes laid at their disposal by a grateful king." The use of the biblical narrative as historical witness reduces the usefulness of this argument considerably.

³⁴ A recent analysis of the handwriting in 16 Arad letters concludes that at least six authors are represented, hence literacy must have been quite widespread in the military hierarchy around 600 BC (Faigenbaum-Golovin et al. 2016). However, Rollston provides some cautionary remarks on the study and its conclusion. He thinks there is no evidence for widespread literacy (online, cited 27 November 2017: <http://www.rollstonepigraphy.com/?m=201604>). Cf., e.g., Rollston 2006 (on the formal and standardized character of the inscriptions and formal scribal training).

³⁵ Isserlin (1972, 200) notes that several *wayyiqtol*s are attested in what he refers to as "popular" or "low class" Hebrew, viz. in MHsh 1. He argues that this type of Hebrew was more conservative than the more official inscriptions. Blau, too, seems to see the forms as part of the spoken language although he argues that the system was less fixed than in the written language (1971, 26; 1977, 23; 2010, 194, §4.3.2.2.8).

literary phenomena and that their occurrence in the inscriptions should be seen as elements of written language foreign to spoken Hebrew. Segal (1927, 73, §157) suggested that it might "be doubted whether the consecutive construction ever attained in popular speech that dominating position which it occupies in the literary dialect." Young (1993, 104) argued that the use of the forms in "Official Hebrew" is influence from "Literary Hebrew," the *wayyiqtol* in Silm being "most likely a case of the influence or intrusion of High Literary idiom into the lower form of standard prose." On the same form in MHsh, he states (*ib.*, 121) that "the poorly educated author tried to give his text a certain literary polish." Likewise, the use of *weqatal* in the Arad letters is seen as intrusion into "Official Hebrew" from the literary language (*ib.*, 111).³⁶ According to Rendsburg (1980, 103), "the consecutive tenses were used only in the written dialect and not in the spoken dialect" (*cf.* 1990, 20, n. 61: "characteristic only of written Hebrew"). In Schniedewind's view, "Forms such as the *waw* consecutive are purely scribal forms, hence the description of it sometimes as a 'narrative tense'" (2013, 46–47).³⁷ Sasson (1997, 123, n. 29) "cannot accept the idea that the *waw* consecutive imperfect was a day-to-day spoken verbal form," but sees it as "a purely literary construction and a pretentious one at that. It is a special literary 'dress', put on for oral declamation or in written compositions." According to Sasson, *wayyiqtol* was originally developed "for recounting heroic, war-related, mythic, or national epic drama" (*ib.*, 122), possibly in Aramaic from where Hebrew borrowed the construction (*ib.*, 124).³⁸ Smith, too, concludes that the most likely scenario is that "the *waw* consecutive was primarily a literary usage," though he notes the impossibility of showing "the extent of converted forms in the spoken language" (1991, 26–27). Joüon and Muraoka (2009, 325, §111a, n. 3) state that "the typical BH tense system must be considered primarily a feature of a well-established literary idiom. The day-to-day prose form, let alone the spoken idiom, was most likely somewhat different." The

³⁶ The view expressed here seems to be somewhat modified in later work. Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd (2008, 1:155) correctly observe that the relative rarity of consecutive forms in the inscriptions may be the result of genre and content.

³⁷ The "hence" in the quote makes little sense. The term "narrative tense" is used by some scholars because *wayyiqtol* is used in narration of past, sequential events, not because it is a purely scribal form. On MHsh 1, Schniedewind (2013, 112) states that "[e]ven though the complaint is rather crude in its style, it still uses classical literary forms of SBH, like the *waw* consecutive."

³⁸ In contrast, Gianto (1996, 495) claims that *wayyiqtol* originated in Hebrew and spread from there to adjacent Aramaic and Canaanite regions. It seems much more likely that Hebrew *wayyiqtol* and similar usage of prefix forms in other languages are relics of PS **yáqtul* rather than an innovation borrowed from one language (see 5.1).

basis for the latter claim is the alleged use of anterior *weqatal* in the Arad inscriptions. However, as noted in 6.1, these cases are ambiguous.

Most of these scholars provide no clear arguments for the largely literary character that they ascribe to *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*. The idea that the forms were in some way difficult or strange and hence unsuited for ordinary, everyday spoken usage seems to play a role in the discussion. Young, e.g., refers to the use of a "more straightforward style" in contrast to the consecutive forms of literary prose (1993, 27), claiming that the latter forms are rare in "Official prose" because its "overriding concern is with clear, efficient expression" (ib., 97). The consecutive forms are seen as imprecise (ib., 108). Segal (1927, 73) describes the use of the unconverted tenses as "more convenient" than "the more difficult construction by means of the consecutive tenses." Likewise, Sasson (1997, 123) states that *wayyiqtol* "simply was not a practical, day-to-day linguistic tool; not even in written form."

I find no basis for these claims. The fact that the system of consecutive forms may seem impractical and strange to a modern reader is not a decisive argument. Many languages boast features that strike a non-native learner as strange and impossible to learn and use in actual speech but this does not prevent native speakers from doing so! In fact, the historical explanation of *wayyiqtol* as a reflex of the ordinary PS anterior form **yáqtul* (5.1) shows that there is nothing mysterious or artificial about the form. Further, the classical system with *qatal/wayyiqtol* vs. *yiqtol/weqatal* is actually very clear and precise. The feeling of imprecision and impracticality only arises in texts with unclassical interference where *weqatal* and *w+yiqtol* become ambiguous. In addition, the ambiguity was mainly a problem in the written language, since at least some forms were differentiated through stress position and the distinct vowel in *wayyiqtol* when spoken aloud.

There is no reason to assume that the consecutive forms are artificial in the sense that they were made up specifically for literary use. Yet, at some point, they do seem to have been restricted to the literary language, much like French *Passé Simple*, which is not used in ordinary speech. This does not mean that the *Passé Simple* is artificial – it is a continuation of the Latin Perfect form. Earlier it must have been used in spoken discourse as well, as is still the case with the corresponding form in other Romance languages. Similarly, at some point, *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* must have been real, living phenomena of the spoken language. The idea of deliberately creating a phenomenon like the Hebrew system of consecutive forms is simply too unbelievable (cf. Pardee 2012, 286).

This, of course, does not tell us when the forms ceased to be used in natural spoken discourse. Since no actual spoken Hebrew is available, it might be

true that the use of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* in the inscriptions is literary influence. Clearly, there is always a more or less marked difference between speech and writing. However, Holmstedt (2006, 13) correctly observes that this does not mean that there must be a fundamental difference in the grammatical system – such an assertion must be backed up by evidence.

In QH, many texts contain unclassical usage. This leads to the reasonable assumption that the spoken language at the time of writing of these texts had evolved away from the classical system. As far as the consecutive forms are concerned, no unambiguous cases of such unclassical interference are attested in the epigraphic corpus. Hence, we cannot preclude the possibility that the classical system was used naturally in speech as well as in writing at the time of the inscriptions. If the contrary claim is made, evidence should be adduced. Two of the three inscriptions noted above, whose contents seem to be particularly non-literary, possibly reflecting the speech of workers and a soldier, contain consecutive forms (*wayyiqtol*s in Silm 4 and MHsh 1:4, 5, 7, 8). While not conclusive in itself, this fact might lend support to the view that such forms were part of spoken usage when the inscriptions were written. In any case, even if the use of consecutive forms were an archaic literary device at the time of the inscriptions, this merely moves the vernacular character of the forms further backwards in time. It is not proof that the forms as such were artificial or invented literary forms.

7.3 CH as a standard literary language and the question of dating

The best way to make sense of the material seems to be to accept that CH, though originally based on what must have been a spoken variety of Hebrew, developed into a standardized literary language used throughout a period of several hundred years. The spoken language appears as sporadic interference in this written register, until eventually a new written language emerges with much more direct ties to the spoken register of the time. This is the standard view of RH.³⁹ As Rabin (1958, 161) has argued, there seem to have been

³⁹ For the argument that RH was based on living, spoken Hebrew and not a mere invention of the Rabbis, see especially Segal 1927, 5ff. Cf. Pérez Fernández 1997, 1ff; also Emerton 1973. It is customary to distinguish the first (Tannaitic) phase of RH (RH1) from later phases, which reflect a situation in which Hebrew had ceased to be used as a spoken language. Koller (2017, 150–152) gives an overview of the evidence, concluding that RH cannot be a "purely scholastic invention" (ib., 152). He notes that the internal evidence, on which Segal based his argument (specific RH traits that cannot be explained from BH or Aramaic), only shows that RH was a spoken dialect "*at some time and in some place,*" not the precise time and location (ib., 152). The external evidence (that a dialect of Hebrew was used in documents from the Bar Kokhba period) might be the result of political/ideological motives – "In the absence of 'neutral' texts, whose language choices are

ideological and social reasons for the shift from one literary language (CH) to another (RH), viz. "the break between Pharisaism and the Qumran sect" (cf. 1976, 1015; cf. also Pérez Fernández 1997, 9). Schniedewind, too, emphasizes the connection between the content (oral law) and the "intentional use of vernacular Hebrew in the Mishnah" (2000, 247). However, as also noted by Schniedewind (2013, 197), RH is not a direct reflection of the vernacular but "comes to us as a textualized and standardized vernacular."⁴⁰

This seems to have been the case for CH as well. Centuries before the emergence of written RH, CH must have had its origin in a similar textualization and standardization of what had previously been an ordinary day-to-day vernacular. Rendsburg (1990, 28; cf. 29–30 and 176) notes that the spoken language of an earlier period typically lives on as a conservative written standard idiom for quite some time until something happens that leads to the adoption of a new written standard. From a presumed more or less close relation between spoken and written language, the two varieties become progressively less alike as the spoken variety develops while the literary standard remains conservative and increasingly archaic. When a new social/political situation leads to the adoption of a new written language, the connection between spoken and written language becomes close again for a period of time until the spoken language again diverges from what is now a new conservative standard. Accordingly, there is no direct and natural development from BH to RH, both of which are literary languages (similarly, modern written French is not a direct descendant of classical Latin). However, the spoken languages, on which they were based, must have been part of a natural diachronic relationship (the exact nature of which is complicated by dialectal considerations).

The view of CH as a standard literary language (in itself hardly a controversial point of view, cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 96) does not necessarily invalidate the attempts to use linguistic traits for the purpose of dating biblical texts since it might be the case that there was a steadily increasing degree of interference of the spoken language in the written register correlating with the time of writing. However, the evidence from ch. 6 (anterior *weqatal* and non-volitive *weyiqtol*) supports the central claim of Rezetko, Young, Ehrensverd, and others who have challenged the entire notion of linguistic dating. While the evolving spoken language and the conservative written language must have moved increasingly apart, it seems clear that there is no

not driven by political motivations, it is impossible to be sure that Hebrew was in fact a naturally spoken language" in this period (ib., 151). Fassberg (2012) suggests that spoken Hebrew may have lived on in some places for far longer than often assumed.

⁴⁰ Cf. 7.1. In contrast, Rabin claims that "the Sages wrote as they talked" (1974, 39).

direct link between the date of writing of a text and the degree of interference from the vernacular. In addition, as has been strongly emphasized by Rezetko and Young, we do not have access to the actual originals of any texts but only to copies in which the linguistic details used as arguments for the dating of the texts may have undergone all kinds of change (linguistic modernization or archaizing, scribal additions, corrections, corruptions, etc.; see, e.g., Rezetko and Young 2014, 114; Young 2017). Without engaging further in this debate, I find it necessary to accept their basic position.⁴¹ The nature of CH (and BH specifically; cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 167), the character of the sources, the scribal transmission, the relative fluidity of the language in different versions of texts, etc. preclude any automatic correlation between the chronological position of the original writer or even of later editors or scribes and the presence of specific linguistic phenomena in the mss. at our disposal. An inherent problem in much work by scholars using language for dating purposes is readily apparent – once a few "late" traits have been found in certain texts, it is all too often assumed that texts that do not contain such traits must be early.⁴² However, this is clearly not the case.

The findings on *weyiqtol* (6.2.3) indicate that so-called LBH is not a unified phenomenon directly reflecting late usage. There is no necessary connection between the time of writing of a text and the use of non-volitive *weyiqtol* (or anterior *weqatal*). However, I would emphasize that the general evolution of the real world language seems clear enough (full use of the system of consecutive form and clearly volitive *weyiqtol*s in the ancient inscriptions vs. the abandonment of the consecutive forms and explicitly volitive *weyiqtol* in RH and the late documentary texts). In literary corpora prior to the Mishnah, however, the classical system seems to function, with sporadic interference from what we assume was the spoken language, in which the development of the system was already underway. In some texts, this interfering influence is very restricted or non-existent, in others it is clearly felt.

⁴¹ However, I tend to agree with those scholars who have perceived a sometimes too sweeping anti-diachronic line in Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008 (but see n. 10 in ch. 6). Similarly, the notion of "style" as an alternative explanation instead of chronology was simply too vague (in effect, style seems to be just another word for variation; cf. Siegismund 2013, 274). In their recent work (Rezetko and Young 2014), these shortcomings have been rectified.

⁴² E.g. Shin 2016. He argues that the postexilic prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi contain "clear elements of LBH" (ib., 267). However, he does not show that other prophetic texts cannot be late as well; in fact, he does not even consider the question. On clearly late (postexilic) texts without LBH traits, see Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 1:55–56.

There is no direct link between the date of a text and the degree of "classicality" in the use of the verbal system. For the long period in which Hebrew in its classical form was in use as a learned, religious language, the date of composition of a text is clearly not the only determining factor in the observable linguistic variation. Accordingly, the renaming of LBH as PCH ("Peripheral Classical Hebrew") and the description of the linguistic traits characteristic of the texts usually called LBH as "non-standard" rather than "late" (as opposed to contrasting "early" traits), as suggested by Rezetko and Young (2014, 10–11, 88, and 399), are steps in the right direction.

Note, in conclusion (and in contrast), the rather extreme claim made by Joosten in a recent article (2016a, 28): "CBH and LBH are not the same language, nor even contiguous chronolects: they are separated by a period of time long enough to allow for the forgetting of many expressions, their reinterpretation in an unrelated way, and their revivification with the new meaning." This is the conclusion to his latest treatment of the phenomenon called "pseudo-classicisms."

On this subject, see appendix 51.

The examples adduced by Joosten provide absolutely no basis for the claim that CBH and LBH are separate languages. Of course, as argued above, the language behind the texts developed and it makes sense to see RH and the spoken language on which it was based as, in many ways, a grammatical system distinct from CH (especially in the domain of the verbal system). Yet, it would seem odd to call RH and CH separate languages rather than separate stages of the same language.

The literary language CH functions according to the same fundamental grammatical system throughout its long period of use as standard literary medium, with varying degrees of interference from the later system.

We might argue that a text with excessive unclassical influence and a text with no such influence are close to being separate grammatical systems, and in fact, when focusing on the verbal system, it makes sense to exclude a text like Ecclesiastes from being part of CH. It would still, of course, be BH (since it is part of the Bible) and would still belong to the merely chronological category "Early Hebrew" (cf. n. 2 in the preface). Similarly, the documentary texts from the Bar Kokhba period are "Early Hebrew," but not CH – and, of course, not BH. However, most texts are not as clearly unclassical as Ecclesiastes.

The basic traits of the language are, in fact, quite stable throughout most of BH and CH in general, as emphasized by Rezetko and Young (2014, 110–111).⁴³

⁴³ Holmstedt (2006, 18) calls for a "new bottom-up approach," in which "separate descriptions are constructed for each 'bibliolect', that is, the grammar of each text" (cf. Holmstedt and Screnock 2016, 68 and 106). While this would indeed be an interesting enterprise, it is clear from the treatment of the noun phrase in 1QM (Holmstedt and Screnock 2016) that much of the information in such separate grammars would be virtually identical, since the basic grammar and structures are the same.

8 The decline of the consecutive forms: Steps towards an explanation

As argued above, it seems clear that the literary language preserved the consecutive forms long after they were lost from spoken usage. Discussing the later abandonment of the forms in written usage, Smith (1991, 32) makes the following observation: "Given that direct discourse attested in classical Hebrew utilizes freestanding forms, it might be suggested that the speech of direct discourse eventually affected the narrative system of converted tenses. In other words, the spoken language may have influenced the literary idiom." He states that "two usages of tenses co-existed from the period of the monarchy down to Qumran: one was more formal and literary, and the other approximated more closely the spoken language. The use of tenses in speech eventually may have superseded the formal usage of converted forms" (ib., 63). It is not certain how far back in time this dual usage can be traced (7.2) but the general picture is clear enough for the later period. However, the question remains how the system without consecutive forms evolved from a system with such forms. Unless we assume that *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal* were never part of spoken Hebrew (an assumption that was described as baseless in 7.2.1), the reference to spoken usage superseding the formal, literary use of consecutive forms merely pushes the problem backwards in time. It does not free us from the task of explaining how and why the use of these forms was abandoned in the spoken language.

At first glance, the use of *weqatal* instead of *wayyiqtol* seems very natural. In fact, as illustrated in 5.3, in all WS languages the old anterior form **yáqtul* was displaced by the younger **qatala*. In Hebrew, the special development of the marked form *wayyiqtol* ensured the survival of the descendant of **yáqtul* in this particular context, but only for a limited period. In the end, *qatal* replaced this incarnation of **yáqtul* as well, as it had done in all other contexts. In this sense, the loss of *wayyiqtol* is hardly mysterious. If *qatal* means "he killed," it seems very natural and obvious that "and"+*qatal* should mean "and he killed." However, what complicates the matter is the existence in Hebrew of non-anterior *weqatal*. Because the language had developed this form, we have a situation where the form *weqatal*, which eventually replaced *wayyiqtol*, was already in use in the classical system with a meaning quite unlike that of *wayyiqtol*. The question is how to account for the development in light of this situation.

A few general remarks on language change and its causes may be in order. Variation is inherent in all languages, even in the speech of an individual. This must be the fundamental reason why all languages change all the time (Anttila 1972, 189: "Change is the struggle of variants"). However, the causes of specific changes and the reasons why some changes catch on while

others do not are often obscure. At various levels of language, several factors may lead to change, such as ease of pronunciation and "natural" tendencies in speech production or perception, analogy, reanalysis, metaphor, semantic "bleaching" of the meaning of a form through exaggerated use and subsequent coinage of new constructions to express the earlier meaning more explicitly, influence from other languages, etc. The diffusion of certain changes as opposed to others in a specific community relates to social pressure, fashion, the need to differentiate various groups, etc.¹ Recall what was said about grammaticalization and "path theory" in 2.3 concerning tendencies in the direction of change and the fact that there is (in general) a cognitive, conceptual logic in the way that languages change.² However, as noted there, the "naturalness" of a certain change does not make it necessary and hence does not explain why and how it happened in a particular language at a particular time (see Hickey 2012, 394; Lass 1980). The view often expressed (mostly by non-linguists) that language change is deterioration has no basis in facts.³ On the other hand, neither is linguistic evolution functional in the sense that it leads to a steadily more efficient or better system. Simplification in one area of a language may make other areas more complex (loss of morphological case makes a language "easier" from one point of view but the price may be more complex rules of word order etc.).⁴

Trask (2010, 20) refers to several cases of rather absurd explanations of language change, such as the claim that the damp climate around Paris leads

¹ For a basic introduction to the general question, see, e.g., Trask 2010; also Anderson 1973; Anttila 1972, 57–204; Hickey 2012; Lightfoot 2006.

² Cf. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994, 282–302.

³ On Hebrew, see, e.g. De Vries 1965a, 377: "severe deterioration in key points of verbal syntax" (cf. *ib.*, 414); 1965b, 76: "the degree of decay in the syntax of the Qumran scrolls" (cf. *ib.*, 82). Holst (2008, 28, with n. 24) rightly observes that the conclusions of De Vries are partly attributable to his faulty understanding of the functioning of the classical consecutive forms. Schniedewind's statement (2013, 187) on the use of *wayyiqtol* in QH seems to reflect a view close to De Vries's.

⁴ Traditionally, linguists claim that all languages are equally complex. This notion has been challenged, e.g. by Trudgill (2011, 16), who states that the traditional claim was mostly a "propaganda ploy that was vital for combating the 'some languages/dialects are primitive/inadequate' view that has been widespread in our society." According to Trudgill, it does make sense to speak about simplification. Hence, "a language must be more complex before simplification than after it; and if some languages are more or less complex at different stages of their history, then different languages can be more or less complex than others" (*ib.*, 15–16). However, while Trudgill claims that it cannot be maintained that simplification in morphology necessarily leads to, e.g., more complex syntax (*ib.*, 16), it remains difficult to see how one could ever measure complexity in absolute terms for a language as a whole.

to frequent head colds, which is supposedly the cause of nasal vowels in French. A similarly far-fetched idea in the field of Hebrew is the claim of Murtonen (1963–1964, 92) that a direct connection existed between heavy or sharp word stress and the "psychic tension or pressure" caused by instability and crisis in the Bar Kokhba period. To be sure, language is part of society, but we should not expect to be able to posit such direct links between specific events in society and specific linguistic changes. Naudé (2000, 113) emphasizes the distinction between change (in an individual's idiolect, fundamentally caused by the impossibility of perfect grammar transmission), on the one hand, and diffusion, on the other hand – the spread of such change "throughout a specific population group over a certain length of time" (ib., 115).⁵ Naudé notes that "there is a different object (grammar) with the advent of each generation. The grammar of the mother [or other providers of linguistic input, we may add] does not change into the grammar of the child. The child is engaged in a process of grammar construction" (ib., 112).⁶ A language, or the grammar of a language, is clearly not a physical thing that actually changes. Yet, in an abstract sense, it seems necessary and meaningful to continue to speak about the differences between two stages of a language as change (and the term language in itself is, of course, an abstraction based on actually existing, perpetually varying, idiolects; cf., e.g., Lightfoot 2006, 17 and 40). The purpose of this final part of the dissertation is to describe the factors that may have led to the basic observable fact that CH uses consecutive forms while RH does not.

8.1 Aramaic influence

Aramaic influence is evident in many aspects of the development of Hebrew. In the domain of the verbal system, many scholars cite such influence as a main factor since the similarities between the verbal systems of Hebrew and Aramaic are obviously greater in RH than in BH. However, scholars are generally well aware that Aramaic influence cannot be the only explanation. As

⁵ Other scholars use the terms innovation and change rather than change and diffusion, see, e.g., Hickey 2012, 393; Roberge 2012, 374.

⁶ Cf. Naudé 2003; 2012; Holmstedt 2012. On change and diffusion, see also Rezetko and Young 2014, 211ff. Naudé (2003), Holmstedt (2012) and Rezetko and Young (2014; in contrast to their 2008 book) all refer to the well-known S-curve for diffusion of linguistic change. The process starts slowly among few speakers, picks up momentum after reaching a certain point, then slows down again before its eventual spread throughout the entire speech community affected by the change. Rezetko and Young use this as one argument against a mechanical correlation between linguistic traits and the date of a text since "*there can be considerable differences in the participation of (contemporaneous) individual speakers/writers in ongoing changes*" (2014, 396).

Goldfajn (1998, 27) notes (in a discussion of Hebrew as a "Mischsprache"), "[f]oreign elements do not introduce syntactic changes that are completely alien to the structure of a language." It does seem unlikely that Hebrew speakers decided that *weqatal* ought to mean "and he killed" rather than "and he will kill" simply because that was the meaning in Aramaic. Some kind of inner development in Hebrew must have made such external influence possible (cf. Meyer 1972, 55, §101.7a).

Segal (1927, 73) was reluctant to claim Aramaic influence on the earliest books in the OT, in which there is already evidence that sometimes "the simple tenses are used in place of the usual consecutive tenses."⁷ He draws the following conclusion: "Probably this irregularity in the use of the simple for the consecutive tense arose at an early time within the Hebrew language itself, and independently of outside influence. [...] The contact with Aram. naturally strengthened the simpler construction, until eventually the consecutive construction disappeared from the living speech, and survived only in literature, largely by the force of the literary tradition, as in the later books of the Bible, in Sirach, and other literary productions of the MH period" (ib., 73). Similarly, Kutscher (1982, 75) takes a cautious stand noting that rather than ascribing everything to Aramaic influence, "a parallel development might have occurred in both languages." Though "parallel development" is probably not the right term (since Aramaic never had a system of consecutive forms in the Hebrew manner), it seems reasonable to attempt to look for a language internal explanation before turning to outside influence, as part of the description of the general development (cf. also Joosten 2012a, 382). Internal and external pressure may have worked together to push the development forward (Hickey 2012, 388: internal vs. external "should not be understood as forming a mutually exclusive dichotomy, but rather as referring to two possible sources which can be identified in language change").

It seems reasonable to assume that many (or even most) speakers of Hebrew in much of the period in which the development of the HVS occurred must have been bilingual or at least exposed to Aramaic on a regular basis (and probably other languages such as Greek). In such situations of multilingualism, code-switching is a frequent phenomenon. A speaker (writer)

⁷ As argued in ch. 6, it is not clear to which extent the "simple" forms (anterior *weqatal* and non-jussive *weyiqtol*) were used in the originals of presumably early books. We cannot rule out interference from the language of later redactors or scribes. On the question of simplicity, see below.

8 The decline of the consecutive forms: Steps towards an explanation

switches between two or more languages in the context of a single conversation (text), occasionally in the course of a single sentence.⁸ If such switching occurred frequently, it would clearly tend to strengthen an internal development already underway in one language if the direction of this development was towards greater similarity with the other language. Hudson (2001, 44) notes that "[f]eatures presumably spread across language boundaries as the result of bilingualism, and the prevalence of syntactic features among areal features may be due to the tendency among bilingual individuals to mix languages in mid-sentence. [...] language-mixing may encourage the suppression of syntactic differences" (cf. Dixon 1997, 20 and 25).

Edward Cook argues that the decisive influence of Aramaic on Hebrew was not the result of native speakers of Hebrew being exposed to Aramaic and communicating in Aramaic. Rather, basing himself on insights from general linguistic research on contact situations, he suggests that the changes that led to RH are the results of widespread imperfect second language acquisition of Hebrew by adult Aramaic speakers (Cook 2017, 7). The prerequisite for such a scenario is a historical situation in which a large number of Aramaic speakers acquired Hebrew – a number large enough to affect the way native speakers spoke Hebrew (ib., 18). According to Cook, the Hasmonean period (with territorial expansion and Judaization) is the most likely candidate (ib., 22). He does not propose pidginization or creolization as the origin of RH. Rather, RH may be of the type that Trudgill calls "creoloids" and John Holm has termed "partially restructured languages" (ib., 10–11).⁹ Cook prefers McWhorter's term "Non-hybrid Conventionalized Second Languages" ("Non-hybrid, because they are neither pidgins nor creoles; conventionalized second languages, because they originated in non-native acquisition but have been adopted by the native speaker community," ib., 11).¹⁰ Since acquisition of the second language in this scenario remains imperfect, structural characteristics of the native language of the learners may be incorporated into the acquired language or traits that were part of the native variety of the acquired language may be lost because they have no

⁸ Cf. Schendl 2012, 523. He notes that multilingualism is much more common than generally assumed based on the situation in most modern, Western societies. In fact, on a world-scale and in historical perspective, monolingualism may be the exception rather than the norm (ib., 521).

⁹ Cf. Trudgill 2011, 68, who cites Afrikaans as a good example of a "creoloid" language. On pidgins and creoles, see, e.g., Anttila 1972, 173–177.

¹⁰ Aramaic itself (in the period that is relevant here) seems to be a product of a similar process. Many people had to acquire Aramaic as a second language in the period of the empires (Cook 2017, 19). He sees Imperial Aramaic as a simplified *koine* developed as a compromise or combination of the features of several dialects.

analogue in the learners' own language (ib., 9–10). According to Cook, this background explains the loss in RH of several features of the older language, viz. the absolute infinitive, the volitive system, and the consecutive forms (ib., 11–18).¹¹

Cook describes this process as simplification, though he observes that "[s]implification, ironically, is a complex notion" (ib., 8). We might ask – is RH simpler than CH (or BH in particular)? On the level of the language as a whole, it seems impossible to answer this question. Regarding the system of consecutive forms specifically, we observed in 7.2.1 that the classical use of *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal* is really quite simple. Much of the perceived complexity and ambiguity may be a product of different grammatical systems having been mixed in the texts as they have been transmitted. Cook's argument (ib., 17) that the classical system was overspecified and redundant because it obligatorily marks sequence is based on a faulty interpretation of the semantic content of the forms (3.6). Yet, since the abandonment of the system includes the loss of separate forms (with specific rules of vocalization and stress, etc.) it does make sense to talk about simplification. As long as we restrict ourselves to the formal side of things, Cook is clearly right. The loss of separate forms, such as the absolute infinitive, the volitives, and *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal* does represent a simplification, at least on the surface level. This would be important especially for Aramaic speaking adult learners who did not have such forms in their native language, since, obviously, the loss of *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal*, and of the entire system of consecutive forms as such, increases the similarity between Hebrew and Aramaic. However, while high-contact languages in general tend to become more simple (at least in morphology), whereas languages with little or no outside contact tend to be more complex, as argued by Trudgill (2011, 72 and 101), we clearly cannot conclude that formal simplification in a specific subsystem of a language cannot occur without external interference.

Specifically, the decline of the consecutive forms may have set in earlier than envisaged in Cook's scenario, independently of Aramaic influence, as acknowledged by several scholars referred to above. In fact, in relation to the volitive forms, Cook (2017, 15) mentions the possibility that the cohortative may not have survived in Hebrew even prior to the presumed scenario of

¹¹ Cook (ib., 6) explicitly states that "BH is the parent language of MH," though it "has to share parental rights with another language" (viz. Aramaic). As argued in 7.3, BH was a literary language and it did not evolve into RH as such. Rather, the spoken varieties on which BH was originally based evolved and then a new literary language was based on one or more of these varieties.

contact-driven simplification. Similarly, it is "possible that the Hebrew jussives had already undergone morphological leveling without the stimulus of Aramaic contact" (ib., 15).¹² Likewise, on the loss of the consecutive forms, he states that "[a]t some point, but not here, there will have to be a more detailed discussion of what preconditions in Hebrew allowed this process to happen" (ib., 17, n. 20). Indeed, it is difficult to see why native speakers of Hebrew would follow Aramaic speakers with faulty Hebrew skills in thinking that *weqatal* means "and he killed" rather than "and he will kill" unless the internal development of Hebrew had already led in that direction.¹³

Hence, Cook's approach does not bring us much closer to a description of the actual process that led to the loss of the consecutive forms. Still, the realization that the "Aramaic connection" may have involved Aramaic speakers acquiring Hebrew in addition to Hebrew speakers being influenced by Aramaic is clearly important. The scenario proposed seems to be a plausible background for at least some aspects of the development of post-classical Hebrew, although this does not necessarily apply to all the changes that define RH in relation to CH. Rather than explaining the origins of changes, this scenario seems to be relevant in relation to the wider diffusion of innovations already under way in Hebrew.

8.2 Internal developments

Superficially, the form *weqatal* appears to have changed its meaning from "and he will kill" in CH to "and he killed" in RH. However, this is not necessarily the case. If (as argued in 5.3.1–2) non-anterior *weqatal* (marked with final stress where possible) was a category separate from anterior *qatal* and from anterior *weqatal* (to the extent that the latter form was in fact in use in CH), we are not dealing with a single form whose meaning shifted from non-anterior to anterior. Rather, non-anterior *weqatal* was entirely lost, just as *wayyiqtol* was lost. However, there may be other ways to understand the development, and the fact that *weqatalti* and *weqatalti* were formally indistinguishable in some root types and under several specific circumstances complicates the matter further. In the present section, I will discuss various factors that may have played a role. Given the nature of the question, it seems unavoidable that the discussion will be somewhat speculative. The purpose

¹² As mentioned before, Aramaic preserved a formal distinction of the jussive even at the QA stage (Muraoka 2011, 101, §24k).

¹³ An open question is the number of people involved. The historical scenario proposed by Cook appears plausible enough but it remains a hypothesis – we have no hard evidence that great numbers of Aramaic speakers acquired Hebrew. Cook admits that we have "no evidence on the language policy of the Hasmoneans" (ib., 24).

is merely to make a series of observations and present a possible scenario that might help shed some light on the development and possibly lead to further work on the subject.¹⁴

An important element is the existence of anterior *weqatal* (*weqatálti*) in CH. Some scholars have argued that this form was available all along. Meyer (1972, 55, §101.7a) notes "den althergebrachten präteritalen Gebrauch des Perf. in Satzgefügen [...], wo man nach der klassischen Regel das Imperf. cons. erwarten sollte." Anterior ("präterital") use of *weqatal* is attested "bereits im ältesten Epos Israels," viz. Judg 5:26, וְהִלְמָה סִיסְרָא מִחֶקֶה רֹאשׁוֹ וְהִלְפָה רִקְתּוֹ, and in MHsh 1:5, 6–7, וְאָסַם (ib., 46–47, §100.3e).¹⁵ However, as argued in 4.1 and 6.1, the epigraphic evidence is not clear. וְאָסַם may not be an anterior *weqatal* after all and other supposed cases in the inscriptions are ambiguous as well. The view that Judg 5 is very old is, of course, widespread but not universal (cf. Levin 2003). There seems to be no reason to rule out interference from a later type of Hebrew, either on the original writer (who may have written the poem at a rather late date) or secondarily during the process of transmission. The same applies to many other cases of presumed anterior *weqatal* in the OT.

Some *weqatáltis*, however, seem to have been in use at an early stage. Birkeland (1940, 74) observed that the development of *weqatalítí* presupposes the original existence of *weqatálti* but later the latter form gradually disappeared, being replaced by *wayyiqtol*. According to Birkeland, then, there was a period where *weqatálti* existed, followed by a period without *weqatálti*, followed, in turn, by the late period when *weqatálti* was replacing *wayyiqtol*. In Birkeland's analysis, the development of *weqatalítí* occurred during the earliest of these periods. Pardee (2012, 294–295, with n. 47) seems to operate with the same basic periods, but – like Revell and others – he dates the development of final stress to the late period as a secondary attempt at distinguishing the two types of *weqatal*. The problems associated

¹⁴ I must admit that I am not able to make much sense of what seems to be Naudé's explanation of the loss of the consecutive forms (2003, 212). It appears to be partly based on the erroneous claim that the *waw* in the consecutive forms is a subordinating conjunction (ib., 209 and 212). He states that "[c]hanges in the lexical features of the *waw* (from strong to weak) will not cause the raising of the verb to the complementizer position and will imply the disappearance of the *waw*-consecutive phenomena" (ib., 212) – but no explanation of the change from strong to weak *waw* seems to be offered. Cf. n. 9 in ch. 7 on Naudé's views on the consecutive forms in QH.

¹⁵ Cf. Meyer 1959. Notarius (2013, 290) argues for anterior *weqatal* in "archaic" poems and a virtual lack of classical non-anterior *weqatal* (ib., 288). However, I remain unconvinced that the poems in question really represent an archaic verbal system (see appendix 9).

with the late date of the development of *weqatal* were discussed in 5.3.2, and as mentioned in 5.3.1 (n. 77), Birkeland's focus on *weqatalti* as a necessary prerequisite for *weqatal* may be unwarranted since ample analogical pressure existed even without *weqatalti*. However, the evidence from Amarna Canaanite (and Phoenician and Ugaritic) seems to indicate that anterior *w+qatal* was in use at an early stage, including – presumably – in some kind of Proto-Hebrew.¹⁶ Still, it may be claimed that Hebrew was always very conservative and never developed the temporal use of *w+qatal* because the older anterior form **yáqtul* was preserved in the specific context of an immediately preceding *waw*, even while simple *qatal* took over the expression of anterior tense from **yáqtul* in other contexts. However, the nominal background of *qatal* must be taken into consideration. Adjectival and stative *qatals* must have been available for use with a preposed *waw* all the time. Though the same verbs with the same meaning occasionally occur in *wayyiqtol* (as a result of the general interrelatedness of the forms as part of the overall system; cf. 3.6; 3.6.1), this is one type of *weqatalti* that must be assumed to have been a part of CH. In addition, Pardee (2012, 295) notes that anterior *weqatal* might have been retained in "morpho-syntactic slots where confusion with imperfective *w²qātal* [i.e., non-anterior *weqatal* in my terminology] was not a significant problem, particularly as the last of a series of *qātal* forms." However, as suggested in 6.2.1, some such cases may potentially be interpreted as non-anteriors (concomitance etc.).

In any case, Pardee seems to be right (and in agreement with Birkeland) when he observes that "it appears necessary to surmise that the perfective **waqatal* [i.e., anterior *weqatal*] fell largely out of usage at some stage of proto-Hebrew [...]. Perfective *w²qātal* was, therefore, to a great extent abandoned by the time that Judaeen Hebrew reached the state that we know from the pre-exilic inscriptions and from Standard Biblical Hebrew" (ib., 295). The spoken language, of course, might be a different story. The main argument in 7.2.1 was that *wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal* must have been part of spoken usage at some point. Yet, we have no way of knowing whether anterior *weqatal* was a regular feature of the spoken language as well (though leaving no clear trace in the inscriptions). Perhaps anterior *weqatal* was in

¹⁶ Meyer (1959, 122) uses Ugaritic as an argument that anterior *weqatal* "auch im klassischen Hebräisch eine lange und legitime Geschichte hat, die bis in vorisraelitische Zeit zurückreicht." However, keep in mind that Ugaritic is not Hebrew, nor a direct ancestor of Hebrew. The same applies to Phoenician while the status of the Canaanite language in the Amarna letters is less clear. Hebrew may represent a very conservative/archaic dialect, which preserved older traits even at a comparatively late date.

regular use already at the pre-Hebrew stage but was lost in the written language where *wayyiqtol* became dominant while both forms continued in use in the spoken language. If this is the case, the occurrence of anterior *weqatal* has no chronological significance at all – it was always available in the spoken language and could have intruded in the written language at all stages of composition and transmission. However, there are problems with this approach. First, there is no unambiguous evidence for anterior *weqatal* in indisputably early Hebrew, i.e. in the epigraphic corpus. Second, having two forms (*wayyiqtol* and *weqatálti*) with what seems to be the same meaning and function appears redundant. In addition, a high degree of ambiguity would seem to result from the lack of distinction between many instances of the two types of *weqatal*. Hence, it may be argued that anterior *weqatal* cannot have been very widespread in the spoken language that must have been the basis for CH. Since the most fundamental distinction in the HVS is the one between anteriority and non-anteriority, it is difficult to imagine that the system could include a form that – apart from a restricted set of cases – was systematically ambiguous between these two basic categories.¹⁷ For the same reason, a very long period of diffusion seems difficult to envisage, as it would tend to lead to frequent misunderstandings.¹⁸

If there is some truth in this line of thought, a further impetus for the development of the system seems to be required. Keeping the speculative nature of the discussion in mind, we may suggest that several phenomena worked together against the consecutive forms. First, in QH, the use of non-volitive *weyiqtol* seems to have been more widespread than the use of anterior *weqatal* (6.2.2 and 6.2.4). We should not draw too firm conclusions from such evidence regarding the development of the language in the non-literary world, yet we might take this as an indication that the entry of *weyiqtol* into the domain of classical non-anterior *weqatal* was the earlier of the two main

¹⁷ One might counter that OT narrative texts in which anterior *weqatal* occurs alongside ordinary *wayyiqtol*s are usually quite easy to understand. The problem referred to above, however, is the existence of *weqatal* with two fundamentally different temporal meanings, which would seem to make it more difficult to interpret non-narrative, spoken discourse efficiently. To be sure, verbs in many languages are ambiguous in this way, but typically such languages have no verbal morphology and obligatory expression of tense, quite unlike Hebrew (where the anterior vs. non-anterior distinction is an essential and obligatory part of the system).

¹⁸ In contrast, Naudé (2012, 77–78) argues for a long process of diffusion. However, though the written evidence may seem to evince a slow and long-drawn process, the actual evolution in the spoken language is another story. As argued in ch. 6 and ch. 7, literary CH attests to various degrees of interference from a spoken language in which the process had probably already run its course.

developments that separate the later system from CH (viz. anterior *weqatal* and non-volitive *weyiqtol*). The development of *weyiqtol* seems to have been part of a general semantic bleaching of the volitive forms, aided by the loss of formal distinction between simple *yiqtol* and the jussive. A gradual encroachment of *weyiqtol* on the domain of *weqatal* may have opened the way for wider use of anterior *weqatal*.

Further, *weqatal* in a past context was always part of the classical system, in the sense of habitual, iterative, concomitant non-anteriority. Perhaps a kind of bleaching occurred, leading to the reanalysis of such *weqatals* as simply expressing some kind of pastness rather than marked habituality etc. This process seems to presuppose that *weqatal* was already under pressure from *weyiqtol*. A further significant factor contributing to this reanalysis might be the rise of the PTC and its encroachment on the domain of the finite non-anterior forms, including habituality etc. in a past context. If a new verb form became available for the explicit marking of concomitant or habitual events, the older form that used to have this function might be reinterpreted without this specific semantic component – this process might have been strengthened by the fact that the expression of habituality etc. was never obligatory in Hebrew (3.1). *Yiqtol*, of course, was also used in past contexts for the expression of habituality etc. but this form was clearly not reinterpreted as anterior, since *yiqtol* was in widespread use as a non-anterior. The reanalysis of *weqatal* (if it occurred) must be seen in connection with the rise of non-volitive *weyiqtol* and with influence from the meaning of simple *qatal*.¹⁹

Smith (1991, 32) correctly notes the possible role of the PTC in the development, arguing that "the use of the participle as a verbal form governing independent clauses" may have played a role in the "slow breakdown of converted tenses in narrative prose." He states that "the use of the participle as a main verb in narrative probably contributed to the reconfiguration of the post-exilic system of narrative tense" (ib., 33). While the precise role played by the PTC is not entirely clear from Smith's presentation, it remains a highly plausible suggestion that the PTC and its increasing role in the verbal system, gradually taking over the domain of *yiqtol* and *weqatal*, was of some importance for the decline of the system of consecutive forms.²⁰

¹⁹ Some scholars argue that the PTC itself underwent a process of bleaching later on, in Hebrew as well as in Aramaic (cf. 3.8). E.g., Rosenthal (1974, 55) states that the Aramaic PTC sometimes loses its meaning of simultaneousness and functions as a simple narrative tense. On the general notion of new, more expressive formations replacing older ones to carry some "desired stylistic effect" after the old forms have lost their original "marked force," see Lightfoot 1979, 385.

²⁰ According to Smith (1991, 32), the use of the PTC in independent clauses is found in narrative in post-exilic writings while pre-exilic narrative only uses the PTC in dependent

8 The decline of the consecutive forms: Steps towards an explanation

(viz. the loss of all distinguishing markers). However, there is no real evidence that such a general retraction of stress (and particularly in *weqatal*) took place (cf. 5.3.2).

Finally, recall that the Masoretic notation of penultimate or final stress in specific *weqatal* forms does not necessarily reflect the intention behind the consonant text (5.3.2; the same applies to the Masoretic notation of *wayyiqtol* vs. *weyiqtol*). While the system of stress distinction as such must be seen as a real part of the language rather than a secondary and artificial addition, actual instances of *weqatal* may have been (and probably were) misanalyzed when the accents were added. Hence, a process of reanalysis similar to the one hypothesized to have taken place in the spoken language may be attested in the texts as well. I.e., some *weqatals* (1s or 2sm) originally intended to mark past habituality etc. may have been interpreted as simple anteriors with penultimate stress (e.g. 1 Sam 17:35, וְהִצֵּלְתִּי and וְהִחַזְקֵתִּי; cf. Driver 1913, 145).²²

²² Driver (1874, 134) regards the penultimate stress in these verbs as a misconception brought about by the preceding *weqatals* which belong to types that do not allow distinction of stress.

9 Conclusions

In this dissertation, I have focused on two main questions. 1) The basic character of the system and the most adequate description of the semantic content of the non-volitive, finite verb forms. 2) The functioning, origins, and development of the system of consecutive forms.

On the first question, the dissertation presents a sustained argument that the Hebrew language at all stages of its development is a system of relative tense. *Qatal* – and *wayyiqtol* in CH – indicate events that occur before something else, i.e. anteriority. *Yiqtol* – and *weqatal* in CH – indicate events that do not occur before something else, i.e. non-anteriority. The argument includes a general discussion of tense, aspect, and mood (1.2), a critical evaluation of the methods used by Penner, Cook, and others (ch. 2), and an illustration of the inadequate foundations of aspectual and modal theories (3.5). Statistical and typological approaches are rejected as unreliable in the role of allegedly objective arbiters between the opposing views on the semantics of the verb forms. If tense relates to temporal location and aspect to internal temporal structure (as the simple, uncontroversial definitions state), it is clear that aspect cannot be the dominant category of the system. Similarly, the obvious modal connotations of *qiqtol* and *weqatal* that may be perceived in many instances should be seen as context-derived. The quite restricted repertoire of forms in the relevant part of the Hebrew system (a single opposition between *qatal/wayyiqtol* and *qiqtol/weqatal*) is of fundamental importance. Since it is clear that the forms are not restricted to indicating simple past or future tense, the absolute temporal approach is inadequate. Ch. 4 provides illustration of the fact that Hebrew never developed separate relative tense form in the sense of Comrie's absolute-relative tenses. Hence, the widespread belief that later phases of Hebrew developed into a system of absolute tense is rejected. In addition, the discussion of the early grammarians and their views of the HVS indicates that the absolute tense interpretation often attributed to these scholars seems to be a misunderstanding. In contrast to the claim of Cook and others who see CH as aspect-prominent and RH as (absolute) tense-prominent, I argue that RH is *more* aspect-prominent than CH. The increasingly dominant position of the predicative PTC and in particular the use of the periphrastic construction (היה+PTC) allows the system to express aspect in a way that was not possible at an earlier stage. The fact that the PTC gradually takes over the expression of various notions that were previously the domain of the finite non-anterior forms (progressive, concomitant action, later also habituality etc.) must also be taken into consideration in the description of the finite forms. Specifically, the non-anterior forms become increasingly restricted to posterior meaning, while concomitance be-

comes the domain of the PTC. However, it is argued that enough counterexamples remain to warrant the continued use of the term non-anteriority for the semantic content of *yiqtol/weqatal*.

On the second question (the consecutive forms), the dissertation defends the view that the non-volitive, finite verbal system in CH is characterized by a fundamental opposition between two groups of forms, *yiqtol/weqatal* vs. *qatal/wayyiqtol*. The members of each group have different origins and histories but their regular interchange in the classical system means that we cannot claim that *yiqtol* and *weqatal* or *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* have different inherent semantics. The use of the simple or *waw*-prefixed forms depends on the presence of other material in the focal position of the clause – and on the presence of the conjunction *waw* (3.6). Ch. 5 presents a detailed discussion of the background of *wayyiqtol* as a relic of PS anterior **yáqtul* and of *weqatal* as an analogical creation with possible early precursors in Amarna Canaanite and other related languages. In particular, it is argued that the special vocalization and doubling of the initial prefix-consonant in *wayyiqtol* are the results of a simple phonetic process caused by the stress on the prefix in (some forms of) the underlying verb form. In this connection, arguments are presented for positing a stress-based distinction between the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol* and the jussive at some stage of pre-Hebrew. Similarly, it is argued that the stress shift attested in non-anterior *weqatal* under specific circumstances must be integrated into the description of the process that led to the CH system of consecutive forms. These forms must be seen as real parts of the spoken language rather than artificial formations or constructions that were always restricted to literary usage (7.2). In RH, however, the consecutive forms are no longer used, and ch. 8 presents a discussion of various factors that may have influenced this development. A combination of several types of internal pressure in addition to the external pressure from Aramaic should be seen as components of a description that is more plausible than the unconvincing point of view that the written language merely took over the system of the spoken language or that the development was merely the product of Aramaic influence.

The decline and eventual loss of the consecutive forms are clearly important parts of the real evolution of the Hebrew language. However, the discussions in chs. 6 and 7 show that there is no direct relation between this development and its reflection in the documents. The view is defended that CH was a literary language that was used for a long period after the spoken language had evolved away from the use of the classical consecutive forms. The investigation of the use of anterior *weqatal* and non-volitive *weyiqtol* in the OT and in QH illustrates that there is no necessary link between the date

of a text and the presence of such unclassical traits. In 7.1, the status of QH is treated and the claim that the language directly reflects spoken language is found to be problematic. The same conclusion is reached concerning the alleged conscious character of the typical QH traits and the designation of QH as an antilanguage. Yet, certain phenomena may indicate that at least some writers consciously strove to keep unclassical interference out of their writings.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Alleged absolute future *qatal* in Hodayot (1QH^a)¹

4:36	לה]תהלך בכול אשר אהבתה ולמאוס בְּכוֹל אשר שנאתה] ולעשות] הַטּוֹב בעיניך
	There are two <i>qatals</i> in this line (שנאתה and אהבתה), though the second one is partially reconstructed in the reading used by Penner (שנא]ת). According to Penner's database, both E and R are after S, and E is marked with an "s?" in relation to R (i.e. possibly simultaneous). The forms do not express absolute future. They are stative verbs. In such verbs, the anteriority of <i>qatal</i> can be interpreted/translated as simple present tense (cf. 3.3). Other instances of the same type occur in 6:21 and 7:32, yet Penner does not interpret these as future tense but rather as simple present (tagged with an "S," simultaneous, for all the relations, E/S, E/R, and R/S). This illustrates the limited value of statistics based on interpretative exegesis.
9:25	מה אדבר בלא נודע ואשמיעה בלא סופר
	One form is clearly a <i>qatal</i> (סופר; <i>pu.</i>). The form נודע may be a PTC. The absolute future interpretation is clearly unnecessary. It would lead to a translation like "what will/can I declare that will not be told," which makes little sense. Rather, the point of the passage is that the person speaking cannot say anything that is not already known and has been told, since all his understanding comes from God. Hence, an anterior interpretation is preferable (cf. Newsom: "that is not already known, [...] that has not already been told." In fact, Penner tags both forms according to this view, albeit tentatively (with a "b?," before, for the relation between E and R). I.e., there is no reason to include these forms among the supposed cases of absolute future <i>qatal</i> .
11:11 (8–13)	<p>8 ... וְאֵהִיָּהּ בְּצוּקָה כְּמוֹ אִשֶּׁת לְדָה מִבְּכָרִיָּה כִּי־אֵהִיָּהּ צִירִים</p> <p>9 וְחָבַל נִמְרָץ עַל מִשְׁבְּרִיָּה לְהַחִיל בְּכוֹר הָרִיָּה כִּי־אֵהִיָּהּ בָּאוּ בָנִים עַד מִשְׁבְּרֵי מוֹת</p> <p>10 וְהָרִית גֹּבֵר הַצָּרָה בְּחִבְלֵיהָ כִּי־אֵהִיָּהּ בְּמִשְׁבְּרֵי מוֹת תְּמַלִּיט זָכָר וּבְחִבְלֵי שְׂאוֹל יִגִּיחַ</p> <p>11 מִכוֹר הָרִיָּה פְּלֵא יוֹעֵץ עִם גְּבוּרָתוֹ וַיִּפְלֹט גֹּבֵר מִמִּשְׁבְּרִים בְּהָרִיתוֹ הַחִישׁוּ כוֹל</p> <p>12 מִשְׁבְּרִים וְחִבְלֵי מִרְץ בְּמוֹלְדֵיהֶם וּפְלִצוֹת לְהוֹרוֹתָם וּבְמוֹלְדֵי יֵהֲפֹכוּ כוֹל צִירִים</p> <p>13 בְּכוֹר הָרִיָּה וְהָרִית אִפְעָה לְחַבֵּל נִמְרָץ וּמִשְׁבְּרֵי שַׁחַת לְכוֹל מַעֲשֵׂי פְּלִצוֹת ...</p>
	The form החישו in l. 11 is tagged with "A," after, for all the relations (though with a "?" added for the relation between R and S). Newsom renders the form with a general present tense ("hasten"). However, the passage is a description of the distress in which the speaker found himself at some point and his suffering is compared to the labor pains of a woman giving birth. Accordingly, it would seem that there is no need for a specific absolute future reading of the verb. Rather, we see a poetic shifting back and forth

¹ For the text, see Stegemann 2009, with translations by Newsom (cf. Schuller and Newsom 2012). The numbering of columns and lines differ from Sukenik's earlier edition of the text.

Appendices

	between <i>yiqtol</i> s expressing general present tense and <i>qatal</i> s expressing present perfect, cf. Newsom's translation of the <i>qatal</i> נהפכו in l. 8 ("when pangs and painful labor have come upon her womb opening"). The other <i>qatal</i> s should be treated in the same way.
11:29	וחבלי מות אפפו לאין פלט
	Penner's tagging: E after S, R after S, E simultaneous ("s?") with R. Newsom uses present tense ("and the cords of death encompass, leaving no escape"). The temporal reference of this passage is probably future as part of a long protasis consisting mostly of <i>b</i> +infinitives. Yet, this does not mean that we have to interpret the <i>qatal</i> אפפו as an absolute future. It is an ordinary anterior <i>qatal</i> functioning as a future perfect in a future context, most naturally rendered with a present perfect in English. ²
12:20	למען יתפשו במחשבותם אשר נזורו מבריתכה
	Penner's database has "A," after, for all the relationships, including (with "?") the relationship between E and R. An absolute future interpretation is clearly unnecessary since the <i>qatal</i> נזורו occurs in a relative clause, which makes a future perfect reading likely, i.e. anteriority in the future context (to be translated as present perfect), cf. Newsom ("those who have deserted your covenant").
14:18	פרה כצִיִן]
	Penner has E after S, R after S, and E simultaneous ("?") with R. The <i>qatal</i> פרה comes immediately after a lacuna, which makes the passage difficult to assess. Of course, the text is a psalm, which makes it even more difficult to interpret the specific temporal frame of each verb. The context seems to point to a future frame for the passage as a description of the glorious effects of God's actions for his chosen ones. However, these actions are expressed with <i>qatal</i> s in l. 13 (עשִׂי[תה]) and l. 15 (הביאותה), which are translated as present perfects by Newsom ("[you] have acted"; "you have brought"). Thus, the text shifts between events that have occurred and future events. The same could be the case with פרה, indicating that "their root" (or whatever is reconstructed in the lacuna) has already sprouted but the final effects of this are still to be seen. Alternatively, the word may not be a verb form but rather the noun "a bud, sprout" (Maier 1995, 1:82, "eine Blüte"; cf. Num 17:23). Either way, the absolute future reading is not very certain.
18:7, 8 (x2), 9 (x2)	7 ... מה אזום בלוא חפצתה ומה אֲתַחֲשַׁב 8 באין רצונכה מה אתחזק בלא העמדתני ואיכה אֲשַׁכֵּל בלא יצרתה 9 לי ומה אדבר בלא פתחתה פי ואיכה אשיב בלוא השכלתני

² The verb occurs in several OT Psalms (Ps 18:5/2 Sam 22:5, Ps 40:13; 116:3; also Jon 2:6), always as a *qatal* indicating either simple past or the resultative state after the enclosing, i.e. anterior meaning, to be rendered into English as a present perfect. As argued in 3.1, simple past and present perfect, as well as all other types of anteriority, belong to the same anterior tense category in Hebrew.

Appendices

	These are similar to the case in 9:25 above. The speaker asks how he can plan anything, say anything, be strong, etc. without God having done different things, e.g. "and what will/can I say when you have not opened my mouth" (l. 9). Hence, there is no absolute future but mere anteriority. In fact, this is also indicated by Penner's tagging (E is before the future R).
20:26 (25–26)	כיֹּאֲ כשכלם הגשתם
	The <i>qatal</i> הגשתם seems to occur in a future context, which is, however, rather fragmentary. If the reconstruction of the preceding line in Stegemann 2009 is correct (a כִּיֹּאֲ-clause), the verb is part of an explanatory subordinate clause, in which case a present perfect/future perfect makes sense as the prerequisite for the further events in the future (i.e., future events are determined by what God has already done or decided). As in the preceding cases, this is also Penner's reading (E before the future R). Hence, there is no compelling reason to take the <i>qatal</i> as an absolute future (Newsom uses the present tense).
21:12	למי נחשבתי עד זות
	In this case, Penner's tagging makes no sense: E after S, but R simultaneous with S (with "?") and E before R (with "?"). Newsom uses future tense for the <i>qatal</i> נחשבתי ("with whom shall I be reckoned until this?"). However, the "this" in "until this" must be God's action to bring the speaker into the covenant, and this has already occurred (l. 10, "you have brought into covenant with you, and you have uncovered the heart of dust," according to Newsom). Hence, an anterior interpretation of the <i>qatal</i> seems possible.

Appendix 2

Zuber and translations

Zuber's approach (1986) is another attempt at finding external validation for a specific way of analyzing the HVS. Zuber's analysis of the translation of the Hebrew verb forms into Greek and Latin is claimed to provide the basis for an interpretation of the HVS centered on modality.

According to Zuber (1986, 27), the Hebrew verb forms belong to two categories, *recto* (*qatal*, "unconverted" *w+qatal*, and "converted" *w+yiqtol*) and *obliquo* (*yiqtol*, "unconverted" *w+yiqtol*, and "converted" *w+qatal*). He describes the semantic content of the categories as indicative (*recto*) vs. modal (*obliquo*).³

Zuber's statistics show that "G [the Greek translation] und L [the Latin translation] verstehen die hebr. *recto*-Formen grundsätzlich indikativisch, die *obliquo*-Formen hingegen grundsätzlich modal oder futurisch" (ib., 77).

There is a 10.8% deviation from this general picture, but since "mit verschwindend wenigen Ausnahmen die eigentlichen Abweichungen sich

³ For a general critique of mood-prominence, see 3.5.2.

auch durchaus gemäss der Theorie interpretieren lassen, *darf die hier vertretene Theorie vom hebr. Tempussystem grundsätzlich als bewiesen gelten*" (ib., 137). The alleged proof is not convincing. At most, the statistics may show that the ancient translators understood the system in the same way that Zuber does. However, this does not guarantee that this is the correct interpretation of the HVS.

There are two main problems with the approach. The first problem is the question of the kind of Hebrew in which the ancient translators were competent (cf. Joosten 2001, 165, n. 2; see also n. 55 in ch. 6). To be sure, the translators might be as close as we can come to having access to native speakers, yet we cannot be sure that they really were native speakers of Hebrew – and if they were, the grammatical system of the spoken Hebrew of their period may have differed from the system found in the OT.⁴ The latter point, however, does not seem to be problematic for the interpretation of the basic semantic categories in the HVS and the characterization of the system as modal, temporal, etc. (the difference between BH and later stages of the language does not seem to be a difference in the basic meaning of the verb forms; cf., on BH and QH, Zuber 1986, 34, n. 1).

The second problem is more serious and has to do with the fundamental difference between the languages involved. Hebrew, Greek, and Latin have very different repertoires of forms, and the verb forms have different basic semantics. Greek has aspectual and temporal markers, including relative tense forms, as well as modal forms. In Hebrew, on the other hand, the part of the system under investigation comprises only two basic categories (cf. Good 2010, 69). The attempt to fit the Greek and Latin forms into the two categories of indicative and modal (usually not considered the basic semantic categories in those languages) is misguided (cf. Gross 1987a, 426). See also Cook's critical remarks (2012, 140). In addition, the main reason why modality can be interpreted as the dominant category is the theoretical and terminological decision to describe future tense as a type of modality, in Hebrew as well as in the other languages used in the analysis. Clearly, the material and the statistics do not provide independent proof of anything without our interpretation.

⁴ Good 2010, 13: "[T]he translator was informed by contemporary spoken Hebrew, by a traditional understanding of the archaic use of certain verb forms in written Hebrew (derived from the study of text and reading traditions), and by the realization that the context may bring additional meaning to the verb forms." He also notes that scholars have questioned "the ability of the translators to produce proper idiomatic Greek," and even "whether they had a good grasp of the Hebrew original" (ib., 37).

Appendix 3

A few remarks on the use of infinitives

Though the absolute infinitive sometimes occurs in contexts where an imperative would usually be employed (e.g. Exod 20:8, וְזָכַר אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת, or Nah 2:2, נִצְוֹר מְצָרָה; cf. Arad 1:1–3, ועת נתן לכתים יין), the nominal character of the form remains (cf. German "Achtung!"; "Vorsicht!"). The absolute infinitive may function as a "stand-in" for other verb forms as well (e.g. Exod 8:11, וַיִּרְא פֶרְעֹה כִּי הָיְתָה הַרְוּחָה וְהַכֹּכַב אֶת-לְבוֹ). The use of an ordinary noun in a similar function in 1 Sam 7:17 (וַיִּתְשַׁבְּתוּ הָרִמָּתָה כִּי-יָשָׁם בֵּיתוֹ) illustrates the nominal character of the usage. In addition, there is the well-known use of absolute infinitive in emphatic constructions (e.g. Gen 2:16, מְפַל עַיִן-הֶגֶן אָכַל תֹּאכֵל, and in expressions of continuous, durative, or iterative action (e.g. Gen 8:3, וַיֵּשְׁבוּ הַמַּיִם מֵעַל הָאָרֶץ הַלּוֹד וְיָשׁוּב). These functions reflect an adverbial use of the nominal form.

The construct infinitive, in most cases, is clearly a nominal form – the object or subject of a verb or often part of a prepositional phrase with *l-*, *k-*, or *b-*. Some scholars have argued that *l-* plus infinitive functions as a finite verb (mostly in so-called LBH and QH). Eskhult (2000, 91) refers to passages in Chronicles that substitute *l*-+infinitive for finite verbs in Samuel and Kings, allegedly with the same meaning. The problem is, however, that such passages are seldom identical. There is no reason to assume that the sentences are supposed to carry the same meaning and that the different verb forms should be considered equivalent. E.g., Eskhult uses the example 2 Sam 7:12 (כִּי יִמְלֹאוּ יָמֶיךָ וְשָׁכַבְתָּ אֶת-אֲבוֹתֶיךָ) vs. 1 Chr 17:11 (וְהָיָה כִּי-יִמְלֹאוּ יָמֶיךָ לְלֶכֶת עִם-). These two passages are clearly not just two ways of expressing the exact same thing. While the finite verbs יִמְלֹאוּ and וְשָׁכַבְתָּ are coordinated in 2 Sam ("when your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers"), לְלֶכֶת in 1 Chr is subordinate to יָמֶיךָ ("and it will happen, when your days for walking with your fathers have been fulfilled").

Similarly, Cohen claims that all verb forms in the passage 2 Chr 7:14ff. have the same meaning, including the construct infinitive לַעֲשׂוֹת in v. 17 (וְאַתָּה אִם-תֵּלֵךְ לִפְנֵי פָאֶשֶׁר הָלַךְ דָּוִד אָבִיךָ וְלַעֲשׂוֹת כְּכָל אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ וְחָקִי וּמִשְׁפָּטֵי תִשְׁמֹר). According to Cohen (2013, 172–173), they have all "undergone a certain degree of neutralization." However, nothing prevents us from making a distinction between the *wegatal* וְהָיָה in v. 16 and the *weyigtols* in v. 14 (degree of volition) and there is no reason to understand the infinitive in v. 17 as a finite verb as Cohen does. He translates the passage as "As for you, if you will walk before me as your father walked before me, and will do [...]." Instead, we should understand the infinitive in an adverbial sense as dependent

on the main verb (תָּלַךְ) and as coordinated with the preceding phrase (...כַּאֲשֶׁר). Much more could be said on these questions (and some cases of a kind of predicative use of *l*-+infinitive do occur), but it is clear enough that there is no need to treat the infinitives further in the main discussion.

Appendix 4

Further examples of relative tense usage of *qatal* in the OT

Gen 26:18	וַיָּשָׁב יִצְחָק וַיִּתְחַפֵּר אֶת־בְּאֵרֶת הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר חָפְרוּ בְיַמֵּי אַבְרָהָם אָבִיו וַיִּסְתְּמוּם פְּלִשְׁתִּים אַחֲרַי מוֹת אַבְרָהָם וַיִּקְרָא לָהֶן שְׁמוֹת כַּשְׁמֹת אֲשֶׁר־קָרָא לָהֶן אָבִיו
	The <i>qatal</i> and the <i>wayyiqtol</i> in the relative clause (וַיִּסְתְּמוּם and חָפְרוּ) are interpretable as past perfect while the following <i>wayyiqtol</i> (וַיִּקְרָא) is not. This is another example of the fact that Hebrew has to use the same verb forms for different kinds of anteriority.
Exod 5:23	וּמֵאִזּוּ בָאתִי אֶל־פְּרֹעֹה לְדַבֵּר בְּשִׁמְךָ הֲרַע לְעַם הַזֶּה וְהֵצִל לֹא־הֵצִילְתָּ אֶת־עַמְּךָ
	The first <i>qatal</i> (בָּאתִי) could be rendered with a simple past tense in English while an inclusive present perfect could be used for the second and third (i.e., X has happened since a certain time until now). E.g. ESV, "For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in your name, he has done evil to this people, and you have not delivered your people at all." Hebrew does not distinguish the two types of anteriority and uses the same verb form throughout. ⁵
Num 17:11	וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־אַהֲרֹן קַח אֶת־הַמַּחֲתָה וְתוֹעֲלֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְשִׁים קִטְרֹת וְהוֹלֵךְ מִהֲרָה אֶל־הָעֵדָה וְכַפֵּר עֲלֵיהֶם כִּי־יֵצֵא הַקֶּצֶף מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה הַחֵל הַנֶּגֶף
	The <i>qatals</i> וְשִׁים and הַחֵל must be interpreted as having present relevance (present perfect). In contrast, הַחֵל in v. 12 must be past perfect (וְהִגֵּה הַחֵל הַנֶּגֶף בְּעַם).
2 Sam 5:24	וַיְהִי בְשִׁמְעֶךָ אֶת־קוֹל צְעָדָהּ בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַבְּכָאִים אֲזַ תַּחֲרֹץ כִּי אֲזַ יֵצֵא יְהוָה לִפְנֵיךָ לְהַכּוֹת בְּמַחֲנֶה פְּלִשְׁתִּים
	The <i>qatal</i> in the <i>כי</i> -clause (כִּי אֲזַ יֵצֵא יְהוָה לִפְנֵיךָ) refers to a point of time anterior to the future R implied in תַּחֲרֹץ אֲזַ תַּחֲרֹץ אֲזַ בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַבְּכָאִים אֲזַ תַּחֲרֹץ.
Jonah 3:10	וַיְרֹא הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם כִּי־שָׁבוּ מִדֶּרֶכָם הָרָעָה וַיִּנְחַם הָאֱלֹהִים עַל־הָרָעָה אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר לַעֲשׂוֹת־לָהֶם וְלֹא עָשָׂה
	The final part contains two <i>qatals</i> (אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר לַעֲשׂוֹת־לָהֶם וְלֹא עָשָׂה). The first one, however, indicates past anteriority (past perfect), while the second one must be interpreted as a simple past when translating into English. I.e., "and God repented of the evil that he had said he would do to them, and he did not do it," rather than "that he had said he would do to them and had not done."

⁵ Other languages may treat such cases differently, according to the rules of their own verbal system, cf. the German Einheitsübersetzung: "Seit ich zum Pharaoh gegangen bin, [...] behandelt er dieses Volk noch schlechter, aber du hast dein Volk nicht gerettet."

Appendices

Appendix 5

"Legitimate prophetic perfects" (Klein 1990)

Gen 17:20	הִנֵּה בְּרַכְתִּי אֹתוֹ וְהִפְרִיתִי אֹתוֹ וְהִרְבִּיתִי אֹתוֹ בְּמֵאֵד מְאֹד שְׁנַיִם־עָשָׂר נְשִׂאִים יֹולִיד וְנִתְּמִיו לְגֹוי גְדוֹל
	<i>תִּי</i> is a performative or present perfect (cf. Rogland 2003, 123). As explained in the main text, in Hebrew, performativity is a function of general anteriority.
Num 24:17	אָרְאֶנּוּ וְלֹא עָמָה אֲשׁוּרֵנוּ וְלֹא קָרוֹב דְּרָךְ כּוֹכַב מִיַּעֲקֹב וְקָם שָׁבֹט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וּמָחִץ פְּאֵתֵי מוֹאָב וְקָרַקַר כָּל־בְּנֵי־נֶשֶׁת
	<i>דָּרַךְ</i> is present perfect or report of vision. Rogland (2003, 92) argues that all the forms in v. 17–19 (from <i>דָּרַךְ</i>) refer to the past, i.e., the <i>weqatals</i> are <i>weqatáltis</i> and the <i>weyiqtol</i> in v. 19 is a <i>wayyiqtol</i> . However, this interpretation is unnecessary since a shift from a (present perfect) anterior form to non-anterior forms (<i>weqataltís</i>) is quite unproblematic in prophetic/poetic style. The <i>weyiqtol</i> in v. 19 might be revocalised as a <i>weqatal</i> from the root ירד.
Isa 5:13	לְכֹן גָּלָה עַמִּי מִבְּלִי־דַעַת וּכְבוֹדוֹ מִתִּי רָעַב וְהִמּוֹנוֹ צָחָה צָמָא
	Simple past or present perfect.
Isa 9:1–5	¹ הָעַם הַהִלְכִים בַּחֲשֵׁךְ רָאוּ אֹר גְּדוֹל יִשְׁבִּי בְּאֶרֶץ צִלְמוֹת אֹר נִגְהָ עֲלֵיהֶם ² הִרְבִּיתָ הַגּוֹי לֹא הִגְדַּלְתָּ הַשְּׂמֻחָה שְׂמֻחוֹ לְפָנָיִךְ פְּשֻׁמַּחַת בְּקִצִּיר פְּאֲשֹׁר יִגְלוּ בְּחֻלְקֵם שְׁלָל ³ כִּי אֶת־עַל סִבְלוֹ וְאֵת מִטָּה שְׂכָמוֹ שָׁבֹט הַנִּגְשׁ בּוֹ הִחַתָּת כְּיוֹם מִדְּיָן ⁴ כִּי כָל־סֹאזֶן סֹאן בְּרַעַשׁ וְשִׁמְלָה מְגוֹלְלָה בְּדָמִים וְהִיָּתָה לְשִׁרְפָה מְאֹכֶלֶת אֵשׁ ⁵ כִּי־יִלְד יִלְד־לָנוּ בֶן נִתְּנ־לָנוּ וְנִתְּהִי הַמְּשֻׁרָה עַל־שְׂכָמוֹ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ פְּלֹא יוֹעֵץ אֵל גְּבוּר אֲבִיעַד שֶׁר־שְׁלוֹם
	All the <i>qatals</i> (and <i>wayyiqtols</i>) are interpretable as ordinary past tense or present perfect. Note the shift to non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> in v. 4 (which might support the present perfect reading of the other forms). Rogland (2003,74) sees the passage as a narration of a vision and the <i>weqatal</i> in v. 4 as a iterative past or <i>weqatálti</i> .
Isa 10:28	בָּא עַל־עֵינַי עֶבֶר בְּמִגְרוֹן לְמִכְמֶשׁ יִפְקִיד כְּלָיו
	Present (or future) perfect, cf. the shift to present/future <i>yiqtol</i> . Rogland (2003, 91) takes the <i>qatals</i> as simple past and the <i>yiqtol</i> as future in the past. The point is that in the HVS, these alternatives are functions of the same two categories, anteriority vs. non-anteriority.
Isa 11:9	לֹא־יִרְעוּ וְלֹא־יִשְׁחִיתוּ בְּכֹל־הָר קִדְשֵׁי כִּי־מְלֹאָה הָאָרֶץ דַּעַה אֶת־יְהוָה כַּמִּים לַיָּם מִכֹּסִים

Appendices

	A stative verb, "be full," hence left out by Rogland (2003, 57, n. 32). Even if we read the verb as a fientive, the introductory כִּי clearly makes a present or future perfect reading possible ("for/when the earth has become full"). ⁶
Isa 19:7	עָרוֹת עַל-יְאֹר עַל-פִּי יְאֹר וְכָל מִזְרַע יְאֹר יִבֹּשׁ נִדָּף וְאֵינָנוּ
	Klein only refers to נִדָּף, though there are other <i>qatals</i> in the surrounding passage. The style is clearly characterized by poetic abruptness, and a present perfect translation makes sense, "and every sown field by the Nile will wither; it has been blown away; it is no more". ⁷
Isa 43:14	כֹּה-אָמַר יְהוָה גֹּאֲלְכֶם קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַעַנְכֶם שְׁלַחְתִּי בְבִלְהָ וְהוֹרְדְתִּי בְרִיחִים כְּלֵם וְכַשְׂדִּים בְּאֲנִיּוֹת רִנָּתָם
	שְׁלַחְתִּי is present perfect, possibly performative (cf. Rogland 2003, 101). Shift to ordinary non-anterior (future) <i>weqatal</i> . The text may present the event as initiated or decided though it has not happened yet.
Jer 48:41	נִלְכְּדָה הַקְרִיּוֹת וְהַמְצָדוֹת נִתְפָּשָׁה וְהָיָה לֵב גְבוּרֵי מוֹאָב בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא כְּלֵב אִשָּׁה מִצָּרָה
	Present perfect in a lively, dramatic passage introduced by הִנֵּה and a comparison to an eagle in flight. Rogland (2003, 90) suggests reading the forms as 1p cohortative rather than 3sf <i>qatal nif</i> .
Jer 51:30	חָדְלוּ גְבוּרֵי בָבֶל לְהִלָּחֵם יֵשְׁבוּ בַּמְצָדוֹת נִשְׁתָּה גְבוּרָתָם הֵיוּ לְנִשְׁיִם הַצִּיּוֹת מִשְׁכַּנְתֶּיהָ נִשְׁפְּרוּ בְרִיחֶיהָ
	Klein (1990, 56) includes the cases in this verse with much hesitation. The entire passage 51:29–32 is interpretable as a dramatic report of the envisaged destruction of Babylon, to be rendered with the present perfect. This interpretation is supported by the <i>yiqtol</i> in v. 31 and the general content of that verse.
Dan 7:27	וּמְלֻכוֹתָהּ וְשִׁלְטָנָא וּרְבוּתָא דִּי מְלָכוֹת תְּחִיבָהּ לְעַם קְדִישִׁי עָלְיוֹנִין מְלֻכוֹתָהּ מְלָכוֹת עָלְמָא וְכָל שִׁלְטָנָא לָהּ יִפְלְחוּן וַיִּשְׁתַּמְעוּן
	This case is irrelevant since it is in Aramaic, not Hebrew. In any case, the "prophetic" reading of יְהִיבָהּ is unnecessary – a present perfect or future perfect interpretation is preferable. ⁸

⁶ Note that IQIsa^a has a *yiqtol* instead of the *qatal* (תמלאה; Ulrich 2010, 353).

⁷ Cf. Joosten 2012a, 208. Rogland (2003, 113) offers no explanation but notes that the passage is textually problematic. In IQIsa^a the *qatals* are *weqatals* (Ulrich 2010, 365).

⁸ Rosenthal (1974, 56) suggests that the passive form of the verb and its relation to the passive PTC might have something to do with the use of *qatal* in this case. Cf. Rogland 2003, 56, n. 27.

Appendix 6

Further examples of "precative perfect" (from Andrason 2013)

In addition to the instances discussed in the main text (Ps 10:16; 31:6), the following ten passages are the most convincing ones, according to Andrason (presented in his order and with his emphasis and translation, followed by my comments).

Ps 22:22	<p>הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי מִפִּי אֲרִיִּה וּמִקֶּרְנֵי רְמִים עֲנִיתָנִי</p> <p>"Rescue me from the mouth of the lions; save/may you save me from the horns of the wild oxen."</p>
	<p>Instead of reading the two halves of the verse as parallel, עֲנִיתָנִי can be understood as a separate exclamation ("you have answered me!"). A similar approach is taken by several translators. This would mark a turning point in the poem from a description of the troubles faced by the psalmist to praise of God for his help. Of course, this would entail disregarding the Masoretic accents.</p>
Ps 4:2	<p>בְּקִרְאֵי עֲנֵנִי אֱלֹהֵי צְדָקָי בְּצַר הִרְחַמְתָּ לִּי חֲנֻנִי וְשָׁמַעַתְּ תַּפְלֹתַי</p> <p>"Answer me when I call, O God of my right! Give me relief from my distress. Be gracious to me, and hear my prayer."</p>
	<p>Praise of God for his previous acts is expressed side by side with the present supplications. Cf. v. 4 (וְדַעוּ כִּי־הִפְלָא יְהוָה חֲסִיד לֹו).</p>
Ps 71:3:	<p>הָיָה לִּי לְצוּר מְעוֹן לְבוֹא תִּמְדִּי צְוִיתָ לְהוֹשִׁיעֵנִי כִּי־סִלְעִי וּמְצוּדָתִי אָתָּה</p> <p>"Be my rock of refuge, to which I can always go; command to save me, for you are my rock and my fortress."</p>
	<p>צְוִיתָ can be read as part of what Driver (1969, 55) calls a "concealed" relative clause describing the צוּר מְעוֹן (Driver: "be thou to me a rock of help, (to which) ever thou hast bidden me come that thou mayst save me"). Alternatively, the verb introduces a short independent sentence, in which case it would be a statement of the fact that God has decreed the ultimate salvation of the psalmist a long time ago. A similar type of interweaving of past events and the present/future occurs elsewhere in this psalm (cf. vv. 5–6 "from my youth" and 17 "from the womb").</p>
Ps 3:8	<p>קוּמָה יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי אֱלֹהֵי כִּי־הִכִּיתָ אֶת־כָּל־אֲבִי לְחֵי שְׁנַי רְשָׁעִים שִׁבְרָתָ</p> <p>"Arise, O LORD! Deliver me, O my God! Strike [for you must strike] all my enemies on the jaw; break the teeth of the wicked."</p>
	<p>The כִּי makes a past or present perfect interpretation of the two <i>qatals</i> a rather obvious solution. The past event is the foundation for the present supplication. Possibly the event was merely "seen" in a dream sent from God during the sleep referred to in v. 6?</p>

Appendices

Ps 7:7:	<p>קוּמָה יְהוָה בְּאַפְּךָ הַנִּשְׂא בְּעִבְרוֹת צוֹרְרֵי וְעוֹרָה אֵלַי מִשְׁפָּט צוּיִתָּה</p> <p>"Arise, O LORD, in your anger; rise up against the rage of my enemies. Awake, my God; decree justice."</p>
	<p>תָּהּ may be an independent clause with present perfect or simple past interpretation, stating that God has decreed justice long ago. Alternatively, we may follow Driver (1969, 55), who sees this as a "concealed" relative clause.⁹</p>
1 Chr 17:27	<p>וְעַתָּה הוֹאֵלְתָּ לְבָרְךָ אֶת-בֵּית עֲבָדְךָ</p> <p>"So now may you agree (may you be willing) to bless the house of your servant."</p>
	<p>Andrason infers the precative meaning from the wider context. The parallel in 2 Sam 7:29 has two imperatives (וְבָרַךְ אֶת-בֵּית עֲבָדְךָ). However, Driver (1969, 58) notes that the parallel is a different sentence with a different meaning. In fact, nothing in 1 Chr 17:27 necessitates a precative reading.</p>
Ps 116:16	<p>אָנָּה יְהוָה כִּי-אֲנִי עֲבָדְךָ אֲנִי-עֲבָדְךָ בְּן-אֲמָתֶךָ פִּתְחֵת לְמוֹסְרֵי</p> <p>"O Lord, I am your servant; I am your servant, the child of your serving girl. May you lose my bonds!"</p>
	<p>A present perfect translation makes much better sense than a precative reading, cf. the following verses in which the psalmist describes how he will offer thanks to God for what he has done.</p>
Lam 1:21	<p>שָׁמְעוּ כִּי נִאֲנַחָה אֲנִי אִין מְנַחֵם לִי כָּל-אִיבֵי שָׁמְעוּ רַעְתִּי שָׁשׂוּ כִּי אָתָּה עָשִׂיתָ הַבֹּאֵת יוֹם-קִרְאָתָּ וַיְהִי כִמְנִי</p> <p>"They heard how I was groaning, with no one to comfort me. All my enemies heard of my trouble; they are glad that you have done it. Bring on/may you bring the day you have announced, and let them be as I am."</p>
	<p>Driver (1969, 58) suggests reading an imperative instead of the <i>qatal</i> (הָבֵא אֵת instead of הַבֹּאֵת; cf. the apparatus in BHS). According to Driver, "[c]learly a past tense is out of the question in the context." Yet, this is not necessarily true. הַבֹּאֵת may belong with the preceding statement – the enemies are happy "because <i>you</i> have done it; you have brought about the day you had proclaimed." This must refer to the punishment that was due because of the transgressions, a consequence clearly proclaimed in advance. Cf. 1:18: עֲשֵׂה יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר זָמַם בַּצַּע אֲמַרְתוּ אֲשֶׁר 2:17: צַדִּיק הוּא יְהוָה כִּי פִּיהוּ מְרִיתִי 1:18: צָוָה מִימֵי-קֶדֶם.</p>
Ps 67:7	<p>אֲרַץ נְתַנְנָה יְבוּלָהּ יְבָרְכֵנוּ אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵינוּ</p>

⁹ However, Driver's translation uses the general present tense, "Thou who dost command." The LXX renders this as a relative clause as well, but with an aorist verb; also, the antecedent of the relative clause is different from the one in Driver's proposal (ἐν προστάγματι ᾧ ἐνετείλω).

Appendices

	" May the earth yield her produce, and God, our God, will bless us."
	A past or present perfect reading makes sense as an expression of the event that is the reason for the calls for jubilation and thanksgiving expressed by the jussives in the preceding verses.
Isa 43:9 (8–9)	<p>הוֹצִיא עַם-עוֹר וְעֵינַיִם יֵשׁ וְחִרְשִׁים וְאָזְנִים לְמוֹ ⁸</p> <p>כָּל-הַגּוֹיִם וְקִבְּצוּ יְחִדּוּ וַיֵּאָסְפוּ לְאֲמִים ... ⁹</p> <p>"Lead out those who have eyes but are blind, who have ears but are deaf. All the nations gather together, and the peoples assemble."¹⁰</p>
	A past tense or present perfect interpretation is entirely possible. We might follow Driver (1969, 59) and emend the following <i>weyiqtol</i> (וַיֵּאָסְפוּ) to <i>wayyiqtol</i> but this is not necessary in a poetic context. We may go from "all the peoples have been gathered" to "and let the nations be assembled." Note that the vocalization of the verb in v. 8 (הוֹצִיא) indicates that it is a <i>qatal</i> rather than an imperative, which makes the anterior interpretation of וַיֵּאָסְפוּ even more likely.

Furthermore, Andrason notes the following less clear instances: Ps 10:16 (which was also treated as one of the convincing cases); Ps 57:7; Isa 26:15; Mic 1:10; Job 21:16, 18; Lam 3:57–61. All of these are either textually problematic, more or less obscure, or interpretable according to the ordinary anterior meaning of *qatal*.

Mic 1:10 is textually problematic (הַתְּפִלָּשְׁתִּי). On Isa 26:15 (וַיֵּאָסְפוּ x2, וְקִבְּצוּ, and וַיִּקְהַת), Driver (1969, 60) states that the whole context is "completely obscure, but the general opinion seems to be that the prophet is referring either to something which has recently happened or to something which is expected immediately to happen and of whose occurrence he is sure. [...] In any case, a dubious usage of a tense cannot be supported by a passage of doubtful import." Ps 57:7 (וַיִּפְלֹ) and Lam 3:57–61 (several verbs) are readily interpretable as ordinary past or present perfect. The same goes for Job 21:18 (וּכְמֵץ גִּבְבַּתוֹ סוּפָה), possibly as an unmarked relative or temporal clause ("like straw before the wind and like chaff (which) the storm has taken"). Job 21:16 (וַיִּקְהַת מִנִּי; repeated in 22:18) is a stative/present *qatal*.¹¹

¹⁰ It is not clear why Andrason does not render this case more clearly as a precative ("let the nations be gathered").

¹¹ Other scholars find even more cases, none of which seems to be more likely than the ones discussed here. For a passionate defence of the precative perfect, see Buttenwieser 1925.

Appendix 7

Qatal after אִו ("or")

Several cases of allegedly "converted" *qatal* with non-anterior meaning occur after אִו ("or"). In passages referring to the future, typically in a temporal or conditional protasis, a sequence of *yiqtol*s or *weqatal*s may be interrupted by *qatal* introduced by אִו. In fact, in such passages, אִו is never followed by *yiqtol*.¹² E.g., Exod 21:37 (כִּי יִגְנֹב־אִישׁ שׁוֹר אֶו־עֶשֶׂה וַיִּטְבְּחֵהוּ אִו מְכָרוֹ) or 22:9 (וַמָּת אֶו־) נִשְׁפָּר אֶו־נִשְׁפָּה (נִשְׁפָּר אֶו־נִשְׁפָּה). In a habitual/iterative context we find Num 11:8 (וַיִּלְקְטוּ וַיִּטְחְנוּ בְּרַחֲמִים אִו דָּכוּ בַמַּדְבָּה). Kawashima (2010, 31) sees such cases as "converted" in a manner similar to *weqatal*.¹³ However, as noted in 3.1, the explicit marking of habituality is not always consistent. Hence, there is no reason to see דָּכוּ in Num 11:8 as "converted" (cf. the simple *qatal* at the start of the sequence). In the cases with future reference, we cannot entirely reject the interpretation of Kawashima and Zuber, yet an alternative analysis seems to be available, once we make two important assumptions. First, that *qatal* is not an absolute past tense but a general anterior form. Second, that a degree of abruptness is allowed in certain styles of writing. Thus, Exod 21:37 may be rendered as "when/if a man steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters it, or (when/if) he has sold it, he shall repay, etc." Similarly in Exod 22:9, "when/if a man gives a donkey or an ox or a sheep or any beast to his neighbor to keep and it dies, or (when/if) it has been crippled or stolen, etc." All the cases can be read in a similar way: Exod 21:36, 37; 22:9, 13; Lev 5:1, 21, 22; 15:3; 25:49; Num 5:14; 11:8; 30:11; 35:20, 22.¹⁴ Kawashima follows this line of thought in some cases where he allows a relative past reading (2010, 31, n. 70).¹⁵ The same reading seems to be applicable to all the passages. In any case, as argued in the main text, even if we follow the analysis proposed by Zuber and Kawashima, the alleged non-anterior meaning is not a "natural" feature of simple *qatal*, but derivable from *weqatal*.¹⁶

¹² In contrast, QH sometimes uses אִו+yiqtol in such contexts: 1QS 7:5; 4Q270 fr. 2 i 10 (?); fr. 2 ii 12 (?), 13, 15; 11QT^a 53:14 (אִו יִשְׁבַּע instead of אִו+absolute infinitive in Num 30:3). However, there are also cases of אִו+qatal in QH in such contexts: CD 9:4; 4Q267 fr. 6 6 (?); 4Q270 fr. 6 iii 18. Note also that 11QT^a 53:16 has אִו אֶסְרָה instead of the *weqatal* in the similar passage in the MT (Num 30:4).

¹³ Cf. Zuber, 1986, 158: אִו is "*selbst imstande, das darauffolgende Tempus umzukehren!*".

¹⁴ Lev 4:23 and 4:28 are textually problematic. An "or" makes little sense in the context. Read "and" (cf. LXX) or "if" (cf. Peshitta). 2 Sam 18:13 is probably irrealis.

¹⁵ Kawashima mentions Exod 21:36; Lev 5:1; Num 35:18, 20, 21, 22 (note that in 35:18 and 35:21, the אִו does not appear right before the *qatal*).

¹⁶ Note also the use of the absolute infinitive after אִו in a few cases in similar contexts in BH: Lev 25:14; Num 30:3 (*yiqtol* in 11QT^a 53:14); Deut 14:21. Cf. Cohen 2013, 271.

Appendix 8

Examples of verbal usage in poetry

Ps 1

<p>¹ אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא הָלַךְ בְּעֵצַת רָשָׁעִים וּבְדֶרֶךְ חַטָּאִים לֹא עָמַד וּבְמוֹשָׁב לְצִים לֹא יָשָׁב</p>
<p>² כִּי אִם בְּתוֹרַת יְהוָה חִפְצוֹ וּבְתוֹרָתוֹ יִהְיֶה יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה</p>
<p>³ וְהָיָה כְּעֵץ שְׂתוּל עַל־פְּלִי מִים אֲשֶׁר פִּרְיוֹ יִתֵּן בְּעֵתוֹ וְעָלְהוּ לֹא־יִבּוֹל וְכָל אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה יִצְלִיחַ</p>
<p>⁴ לֹא־כֵן הִרְשָׁעִים כִּי אִם־כַּמֶּץ אֲשֶׁר־תִּדְפְּנוּ רוּחַ</p>
<p>⁵ עַל־כֵּן לֹא־יִקְמוּ רָשָׁעִים בְּמִשְׁפַּט וְחַטָּאִים בְּעֵדוּת צְדִיקִים</p>
<p>⁶ כִּי־יִדְעַע יְהוָה דֶּרֶךְ צְדִיקִים וְדֶרֶךְ רָשָׁעִים תֵּאבֵד</p>

Ps 1 begins with *qatals* in v. 1 (יָשָׁב, עָמַד, הָלַךְ), followed in v. 2 by a nominal clause and a clause with *yiqtol* (יִהְיֶה) marking general, habitual action (cf. יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה). V. 3 shifts to *weqatal* (וְהָיָה), and in the rest of the poem *yiqtols* are used, indicating future or general, habitual action. Numerous translations render the *qatals* in v. 1 as present tense, apparently in order to bring them

into line with the remaining verbs or to stress the general applicability of the statement. However, an anterior reading is clearly relevant here. The blessed man is the one who has not (or "never," cf. the remarks on Rogland's translations in 3.3.2; see Rogland 2003, 45) walked in the counsel of the wicked. The two following *qatals* are (potentially) stative verbs and may be interpreted as having present stative or past or present perfect stative or fientive meaning – all of which are "the same thing" in the Hebrew system, viz. anteriority.

Ps 2:1–2

<p>¹ לָמָּה רָגִשׁוּ גוֹיִם וְלְאֻמִּים יִהְגּוּ־רִיק</p>
<p>² יִתְיַצְּבוּ מִלְכֵי־אֲרָץ וְרוֹזְנִים נוֹסְדוּ־ יָחַד עַל־יְהוָה וְעַל־מְשִׁיחוֹ</p>

The first verses of Ps 2 shift from *qatal* to *yiqtol* and from *yiqtol* to *qatal* (יִהְגּוּ – רָגִשׁוּ and נוֹסְדוּ – יִתְיַצְּבוּ). Instead of rendering everything in the present tense, we can retain

the Hebrew distinction between anteriority and non-anteriority by choosing a translation that allows a shift from present perfect to the general present. E.g., "why have the nations crowded tumultuously together, and (why) are the peoples roaring in vain. The kings of the earth are taking their stand, and the rulers have conspired together against Yahweh and his anointed."¹⁷ According to Niccacci (2006, 259), the passage refers to the past, "why did the

¹⁷ Possibly לָמָּה covers v. 2 as well, i.e. "(why) are the kings of the earth taking their stand," etc. Cf. Niccacci 2006, 259; Joosten 2012a, 427. This makes no difference for the argument above.

nations conspire, while the peoples were plotting" etc. This is certainly possible since Hebrew does not distinguish the two alternatives. When translating into English we have to choose between the various types of anteriority and non-anteriority. The main point is the correctness of Niccacci's insistence on making a distinction between the main categories in poetry as well as in prose. Note also Cook's translation (2012, 216).

Other examples of similar shifts:

<p>Ps 109:2–5</p> <p>כִּי פִי רָשַׁע וּפִי־מִרְמָה עָלַי פָּתַח־וּ דְּבָרוּ אֵתִי לְשׁוֹן שִׁקָּר וְדַבְּרֵי שִׁנְאָה סָבְבוּנִי וַיִּלְחַמוּנִי חַנּוּם תַּחַת־אֲהַבְתִּי יִשְׁטְנוּנִי וְאֲנִי תַפְלָה וַיִּשְׁימוּ עָלַי רָעָה תַחַת טוֹבָה וְשִׁנְאָה תַּחַת אֲהַבְתִּי</p>	<p><i>Qatals</i> and <i>wayyiqtol</i> in v. 2–3, <i>yiqtol</i> in v. 4, <i>wayyiqtol</i> in v. 5. Instead of conflating everything into a general present translation, the anterior (here present perfect) vs. non-anterior (general present/future) distinction should be maintained.</p>
<p>Deut 33:2</p> <p>יְהִנֶּה מְסִינִי בָּא וְזָרַח מְשַׁעִיר לְמוֹ הוֹפִיעַ מִהַר פְּאָרְזָן וְאֶתְהָ מִרְבַּבַת קִדְשׁ</p>	<p>The shift between <i>qatal</i> and <i>weqatal</i> (אָּ might be a PTC) need not indicate that the <i>weqatals</i> are unclassical anteriors or that the simple <i>qatal</i> has future or another non-anterior meaning. It is possible to go from "he has shone forth" to "and he will come" (of course, וְאֶתְהָ may have been intended as "and with him").</p>
<p>Prov 4:17</p> <p>כִּי לְחַמוּ לְחָם רָשַׁע וַיִּינּוּ חֲמָסִים יִשְׁתּוּ Prov 6:8</p> <p>תִּכְנֶן בְּקִיץ לְחֶמֶה אֲגַרָה בְּקֶצֶר מֵאֲכָלָהּ</p> <p>Prov 11:7</p> <p>בְּמוֹת אָדָם רָשַׁע תֵּאבֵד תִּקְוָה וְתוֹחֶלֶת אוֹנִים אֲבָדָה</p>	<p>All these cases exhibit a similar shift between (present perfect) anteriority and (general present or future) non-anteriority.</p>
<p>Ps 7:13</p> <p>אִם־לֹא יָשׁוּב חֲרָבוֹ יִלְטוֹשׁ קִשְׁתּוֹ דָּרְךָ וַיִּכּוֹנְנֶנָּה</p>	<p>In spite of his correct general stance in the matter, Joosten (2012a, 422) seems to slide into the opposite position with regard to this passage, stating that <i>wayyiqtol</i> has an "omni-temporal" meaning in combination with <i>yiqtol</i> ("if one does not repent, he will whet his sword; he bends his bow and aims it"). However, the usual anterior interpretation of <i>qatal</i> and <i>wayyiqtol</i> is quite adequate, both being translatable as present perfect. Indeed, some of the dramatic content of the passage seems to be lost when the general present is used. See also Rogland 2003, 40.</p>

Appendix 9

Excursus on anterior *yiqtol* in selected "archaic" poetry

A comparison of the parallel texts Ps 18 and 2 Sam 22 shows multiple variants in the use of verbs (cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 156–159, 413–421). After the prose introduction, both versions begin in a present temporal frame, featuring nominal clauses and *yiqtols* (vv. 2–4), followed by two verses that seem to retain the present reference with *qatals* (vv. 5–6; present perfect) and a *yiqtol* (v. 5; present/future). Alternatively, the temporal reference is past with the *yiqtol* indicating concomitant action in the past. The Hebrew grammatical system does not distinguish between these alternatives.

<p>Ps 18:2–6</p> <p>2 ... אֲרַחֲמֶךָ יְהוָה חֲזָקִי</p> <p>3 יְהוָה סִלְעִי וּמְצֹדֹתַי וּמְפִלְטֵי אֱלֹהֵי צוּרֵי</p> <p>אֲחַסֶּה-בּוֹ מְגִנֵי וְקִרְוֵי-יְשַׁעִי מִשְׁגָּבַי</p> <p>4 מִהֲלֵל אֶקְרָא יְהוָה וּמִן-אִבֵי אֲנֹשֶׁעַ</p> <p>5 אֶפְפֹּנֵי חֲבִלֵי-מָוֶת וְנִחֲלֵי בְלִיעֵל יִבְעֹתוּנִי</p> <p>6 חֲבִלֵי שָׂאוֹל סָבִיבֵנִי קִדְמוּנֵי מוֹקְשֵׁי מָוֶת</p>	<p>2 ... יְהוָה סִלְעִי וּמְצֹדֹתַי וּמְפִלְטֵי-לִי</p> <p>3 אֱלֹהֵי צוּרֵי אֲחַסֶּה-בּוֹ מְגִנֵי וְקִרְוֵי יְשַׁעִי מִשְׁגָּבַי</p> <p>וּמְנוֹסֵי מִשְׁעֵי מַחְמָס תִּלְשַׁעֵנִי</p> <p>4 מִהֲלֵל אֶקְרָא יְהוָה וּמִן-אִבֵי אֲנֹשֶׁעַ</p> <p>5 כִּי אֶפְפֹּנֵי מִשְׁבְּרֵי-מָוֶת נִחֲלֵי בְלִיעֵל יִבְעֹתֵנִי</p> <p>6 חֲבִלֵי שָׂאוֹל סָבִיבֵנִי קִדְמוּנֵי מוֹקְשֵׁי-מָוֶת</p>
---	--

In v. 7, Ps 18 contains four *yiqtols* (אֶקְרָא, אֲשׁוּעַ, יִשְׁמַע, and תָּבוֹא), while 2 Sam 22 shifts to *wayyiqtol* in 7b (אֶקְרָא, אֶקְרָא, and וַיִּשְׁמַע; there is no equivalent of תָּבוֹא). Does this mean that we must interpret יִשְׁמַע as the semantic equivalent of וַיִּשְׁמַע, i.e. as anterior *yiqtol* (< **yaqtul*)? Not necessarily. We should not force the same meaning onto parallel texts. Rather, Ps 18 may refer to the general present, with יִשְׁמַע and תָּבוֹא probably indicating jussive meaning. In 2 Sam 22, we may interpret the two אֶקְרָא's with present reference as well, or as indicating past iterativity or ongoingness (cf. Notarius 2013, 165). If we claim that the Masoretes misvocalized וַיִּשְׁמַע, the intention might have been a *weyiqtol*, providing jussive meaning like (possibly) in Ps 18.

<p>Ps 18:7</p> <p>בְּצַר-לִי אֶקְרָא יְהוָה וְאֵל-אֱלֹהֵי אֲשׁוּעַ יִשְׁמַע</p> <p>מִהֵיכָלוֹ קוֹלִי וְשׁוֹעֲתֵי לִפְנֵי תָבוֹא בְּאָזְנוֹי</p>	<p>2 Sam 22:7</p> <p>בְּצַר-לִי אֶקְרָא יְהוָה וְאֵל-אֱלֹהֵי אֶקְרָא וַיִּשְׁמַע</p> <p>מִהֵיכָלוֹ קוֹלִי וְשׁוֹעֲתֵי בְּאָזְנוֹי</p>
---	---

From v. 8 to v. 16, both versions seem to be past narration, featuring mostly *wayyiqtols* and a few *qatals* – as well as *yiqtols*.

<p>Ps 18:8–16</p> <p>8 וַתִּגְעַשׂ וַתִּרְעַשׂ הָאָרֶץ וּמוֹסְדֵי הָרִים יִרְגְּזוּ וַיִּתְגַּעְשׂוּ כִּי־תִרְהָ לּוֹ 9 עָלָה עֵשׂוֹן בְּאָפוֹ וְאֵשׁ־מִפִּי תֹאכַל גְּחָלִים בְּעָרוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ 10 וַיֵּט שָׁמַיִם וַיִּרֶד וַעֲרָפֶל תַּחַת רַגְלָיו 11 וַיִּרְכַּב עַל־כְּרוּב וַיַּעֲף וַיֵּרָא עַל־כַּנְּפֵי־רוּחַ 12 וַיִּשֶׁת חֶשֶׁךְ סָבִיבוֹתָיו סִפְתּוֹ חֶשֶׁכֶת־ מַיִם עֲבֵי שְׁחָקִים 13 מִנְּגֵה נִגְדּוֹ עָבְרוּ עָבְרוּ בְּרֶד וְגִחְלֵי־אֵשׁ 14 וַיִּרְעַם בְּשָׁמַיִם יְהוָה וַעֲלִיּוֹן יִתֵּן קוֹלוֹ בְּרֶד וְגִחְלֵי־אֵשׁ 15 וַיִּשְׁלַח חֶצְיוֹ וַיְפִיצֵם וּבָרְקִים רַב וַיִּהְיֶם 16 וַיִּרְאוּ אֶפְקֵי מַיִם וַיִּגְלוּ מוֹסְדוֹת תְּבַל מִנְּעֲרָתָהּ יְהוָה מִנְּשִׁמַת רוּחַ אֶפְדָּה</p>	<p>2 Sam 22:8–16</p> <p>8 וַתִּגְעַשׂ וַתִּרְעַשׂ הָאָרֶץ מוֹסְדוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם יִרְגְּזוּ וַיִּתְגַּעְשׂוּ כִּי־תִרְהָ לּוֹ 9 עָלָה עֵשׂוֹן בְּאָפוֹ וְאֵשׁ מִפִּי תֹאכַל גְּחָלִים בְּעָרוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ 10 וַיֵּט שָׁמַיִם וַיִּרֶד וַעֲרָפֶל תַּחַת רַגְלָיו 11 וַיִּרְכַּב עַל־כְּרוּב וַיַּעֲף וַיֵּרָא עַל־כַּנְּפֵי־רוּחַ 12 וַיִּשֶׁת חֶשֶׁךְ סָבִיבוֹתָיו סִפְוֹת חֲשֻׁרֹת־מַיִם עֲבֵי שְׁחָקִים 13 מִנְּגֵה נִגְדּוֹ בְּעָרוֹ גִּחְלֵי־אֵשׁ 14 יִרְעַם מִן־שָׁמַיִם יְהוָה וַעֲלִיּוֹן יִתֵּן קוֹלוֹ 15 וַיִּשְׁלַח חֶצְיִים וַיְפִיצֵם בָּרֶק וַיִּהְיֶם 16 וַיִּרְאוּ אֶפְקֵי יָם וַיִּגְלוּ מוֹסְדוֹת תְּבַל בְּגַעְרַת יְהוָה מִנְּשִׁמַת רוּחַ אֶפּוֹ</p>
--	--

Some of these *yiqtol*s are readily interpretable as concomitant action in the past (i.e. the ordinary non-anterior meaning of *yiqtol*): יִרְגְּזוּ in v. 8, תֹאכַל in v. 9, יִתֵּן in v. 14, all of which are shared by both versions. However, in three cases, one version has a *wayyiqtol*, while the other has a simple *yiqtol* (as was the case with יִשְׁמַע/וַיִּשְׁמַע in v. 7). In v. 12, 2 Sam has וַיִּשֶׁת, Ps 18 וַיִּשֶׁת. Similarly in vv. 14 and 16 (2 Sam 22:14, יִרְעַם, vs. Ps 18:14, וַיִּרְעַם; 2 Sam 22:16, וַיִּגְלוּ, vs. Ps 18:16, וַיִּגְלוּ). Though we are dealing with two versions of the "same" text, we cannot take for granted that these forms have the same meaning. According to Furuli (2005, 420), "[i]f there are no textual problems with a particular clause, and we find one verb form in one place and another form in the doublet, then we can draw the conclusion that both these forms could be used to convey the same meaning." This claim is not convincing (and variation in verbal usage might be considered a textual problem in itself). The simple *yiqtol* in 2 Sam 22:16 (וַיִּגְלוּ) seems to function just like the ones in vv. 8, 9, and 14 (i.e. concomitant action in the past). The expression of durative or habitual meaning in a past context (by the use of non-anterior verb forms) is not mandatory. The person responsible for the present text in Ps 18:16 may have chosen not to express this special notion but used an anterior form unmarked for this meaning instead.

The forms in vv. 12 and 14 seem to be more problematic. They are in initial position and short, which, in other text types, would indicate volitive

meaning.¹⁸ In fact, such a reading might not be impossible in a poetic description of a theophany, even in the midst of a sequence of verb forms referring to the past (cf. Driver 1874, 62). Thus, it might be claimed that 2 Sam 22:14 is a sudden volitive outburst – in which case the second *yiqtol* in the verse (יִתֵּן) would be simple future or another jussive, whose customary initial position has been overruled due to the focused position of the subject ("may Yahweh thunder from the heavens, and the Most High will raise his voice/and may the Most High raise his voice"). The same could be the case in Ps 18:12.

From v. 17 (and for the rest of the poem), the temporal reference seems to be the present again (like in the beginning of the poem). There are several initial *yiqtol*s possibly indicating volition (v. 17, יִשְׁלַח, "may he send," יִקַּחנִי, "may he take me," etc.), and other *yiqtol*s indicating general present/future action. However, a number of *wayyiqtol*s and *qatals* occur as well, in both versions (*qatals* in vv. 18, 20, 22 [x2], 37, 41,¹⁹ 42, 44; *wayyiqtol*s in vv. 19, 20, 24 [x2], 25, 33, 36, 40). All of these anterior forms, however, are interpretable as having present reference, i.e. as the present perfect type of anteriority (and some *qatals* indicate stative present tense). E.g., the *qatals* in v. 22 (כִּי שָׁמַרְתִּי דַרְכֵי יְהוָה וְלֹא רָשַׁעְתִּי מֵאֱלֹהֵי) are part of a statement on the way the psalmist has acted ("I have (always, hitherto) kept the ways of Yahweh and I have not acted wickedly away from my God"). The *wayyiqtol*s are interpretable in the same way. E.g., v. 19 shifts from simple *yiqtol* to *wayyiqtol* (לְמַשְׁעַן לִי יִקְדָּמֵנִי בְיוֹם אִיְדֵי וַיְהִי יְהוָה מִשְׁעַן לִי), "they confront me on the day of my suffering, but Yahweh has become [= is] a support for me." V. 20 has the opposite shift (וַיֹּצִיאֵנִי וַיִּצֵּא לְפָרְחָב אֹתִי וְיִצֵּא לְפָרְחָב בֵּי יַמִּים בֵּי יַמִּים), "and he has brought me out in the open; he will [or may he?] save me," stressing the present relevance of an anterior event. Similarly in v. 40 (וַתְּזַרְנֵי חֵיַל וַתְּזַרְנֵי חֵיַל), "and you have girdled me with might for the war; you will [or may you?] humble my adversaries beneath me." In some verses, 2 Sam has *wayyiqtol*s in addition to the ones in Ps 18 (vv. 38–39, 41, and 44). The opposite phenomenon is attested in Ps 18:48 (with a PTC in 2 Sam). The latter case as well as the one in 2 Sam 22:44

¹⁸ On volitive forms, see 3.7. The segmental character of poetry and the omission of various syntactical markers usually present in prose mean that the rules governing the connection between position and volitive/non-volitive meaning cannot always be assumed to be operative in poetry. E.g., the *yiqtol* in v. 19 can hardly be jussive. Even in prose, however, the rules are tendencies and not mandatory laws.

¹⁹ 2 Sam 22:41 has the strange form תַּתָּה, which seems to be a reduction of נַתַּתָּה as found in Ps 18.

(which is a simple, initial *yiqtol* in Ps 18:44) are interpretable as present perfect-type anteriors indicating present relevance of an anterior event. However, the forms in 2 Sam 22:38, 39, 41 are problematic.

<p>Ps 18:38–41</p> <p>38 אָרְדֹף אֹיְבֵי וְאַשְׁיגֶם וְלֹא־אָשׁוּב עַד־ כְּלוֹתָם</p> <p>39 אֶמְחָצֵם וְלֹא־יִכְלוּ קוּם יִפְלוּ תַחַת רַגְלִי</p> <p>40 וַתֵּאָזְרֵנִי חֵיִל לְמַלְחָמָה תִּכְרִיעַ קַמִּי תַחַתִּי</p> <p>41 וְאֹיְבֵי נִתְתָה לִי עֶרְף וּמִשְׁנָאֵי אֶצְמִיתָם</p>	<p>2 Sam 22:38–41</p> <p>38 אָרְדָּפָה אֹיְבֵי וְאַשְׁמִידֶם וְלֹא אָשׁוּב עַד־ כְּלוֹתָם</p> <p>39 וְאַכְלֵם וְאֶמְחָצֵם וְלֹא יִקוּמוּן וַיִּפְלוּ תַחַת רַגְלִי</p> <p>40 וַתֵּזְרֵנִי חֵיִל לְמַלְחָמָה תִּכְרִיעַ קַמִּי תַחַתִּי</p> <p>41 וְאֹיְבֵי תַתָּה לִי עֶרְף מִשְׁנָאֵי וְאַצְמִיתָם</p>
--	---

The passage in Ps 18 has a simple, initial *yiqtol* followed by a *weyiqtol* and a negated simple *yiqtol* in v. 38, three *yiqtol*s in v. 39, and one *yiqtol* following a *qatal* in v. 41. The intervening v. 40 has a *wayyiqtol* and a *yiqtol*. The entire sequence fits nicely in the over-all passage from v. 17–51 as a description with predominant present tense/future/volitive reference, with occasional anterior forms indicating past events with present relevance. In 2 Sam 22, however, v. 40 and v. 41 are interpretable in the same manner, but v. 38 and v. 39 are difficult, especially considering the explicitly volitive form at the beginning of v. 38. It seems plausible that these forms have been misvocalized. *Weyiqtol*s appears to make much better sense – in fact, it is not easy to see how the vocalizer would have understood the sequence in its entirety.

This overview of the variant versions of the poem (and further variation can be found if we include non-MT material, LXX etc.)²⁰ suggests that we may read each version on its own terms without recourse to special meanings of forms or relics of archaic forms. Though it is indeed possible to read large parts of the poem as referring to the past and thus find numerous examples of archaic *yiqtol* (indicating simple past tense), this is not a necessary reading.²¹ Robertson (1972, 9) claimed to base his findings concerning archaic *yiqtol* only on "passages which beyond reasonable doubt refer to past time." However, the point is that such unambiguous passages are hard to come by in the sort of literature under consideration.

²⁰ Cf. 4QSam^a (Ulrich 2010, 319), in which the text of 2 Sam 22:39 and 41 has *yiqtol*s without *w*- in contrast to the MT of 2 Sam, but corresponding to the forms found in MT Ps 18. The unvocalized *w+yiqtol* in v. 38 can be interpreted as a *weyiqtol* in the scroll. In v. 40, the scroll has *w+yiqtol* (וּתְכַרְעַ), possibly a *wayyiqtol*, in contrast to simple *yiqtol* in the MT (2 Sam and Ps 18, תִּכְרִיעַ).

²¹ In contrast, Notarius (2013,181) concludes that "preterite **yaqtul*" is the main storytelling form in 2 Sam 22:5–20. In 33–46, the main form is claimed to be "imperfective **yaqtulu* used as a historical present."

Appendices

This also applies to Exod 15, which is often referred to as the clearest example of archaic poetry.²² In fact, all of the supposed occurrences of archaic past *yiqtol* are interpretable as non-anteriors or volitives.

Exod 15:4–5

4 מִרְכַּבַּת פְּרָעָה וַחֲתִילוּ יָרֵה בַיָּם וּמִבְּחַר
שְׁלֹשֵׁי טַבָּעוֹ בַיָּם-סוּף
5 תִּהְיֶה מֵת יִכְסִימוּ יָרְדוּ בַמַּצּוֹלֹת כְּמוֹ-אֶבֶן

E.g., יִכְסִימוּ in v. 5 may indicate concomitant action in relation to the absolute past indicated by the surrounding *qatals*. Alternatively, it may be simple present/future, in which case the *qatals*

are translated as present perfects. As has been noted several times, Hebrew does not distinguish between these two alternatives. In the fiction of the text, the song is sung right after the events transpired. Hence, it makes sense to say, "they have been drowned in the Reed Sea, the floods cover them/will cover them" (even outside of this setting, the same reading makes sense, cf. Isa 43:17, הַמּוֹצִיא רַקְב־נְסוּס חֵיל וְעִזּוֹז יַחֲדָו יִשְׁכְּבוּ בַל-יִקוּמוּ דַעְכוּ כַפְּשֵׁתָהּ כָבוּ).

Exod 15:6–7

6 יְמִינָהּ יְהוָה נֶאֱדָרִי בַכַּח יְמִינָהּ יְהוָה
תִּרְעֵץ אוֹיֵב
7 וּבָרַב גְּאוּנָהּ תִּהְיֶה קַמְיָהּ תִּשְׁלַח חֲרֹנָהּ
יֵאֱכָלְמוּ כִקֶּשׂ

The *yiqtol*s in vv. 6 and 7 are likely part of a passage of general praise with present/future reference.

The *yiqtol*s in v. 9 clearly do not refer to the past. Rather, they seem to be volitives (cohortative and jussive), forming part of the direct speech uttered by the enemies.

Exod 15:9

אָמַר אוֹיֵב אֶרְדֹּף אֲשִׁיג אֲחַלֵּק שְׁלָל
תִּמְלֹאמוּ נַפְשֵׁי אַרְיֵק חֲרִבֵי תוֹרִישְׁמוּ יָדֵי

Exod 15:12

נְטִיטָהּ יְמִינָהּ תִּבְלַעְמוּ אֶרֶץ

The *yiqtol* in v. 12, while often seen as a prime example of archaic preterite *yiqtol*, may indicate concomitant action in the past (cf. Notarius 2013, 119). Alternatively, and maybe more likely, it is a jussive in a short piece of direct speech/thought ("you stretched out your right hand [saying/thinking], 'let the earth swallow them!'").

Exod 15:14–15

14 שָׁמְעוּ עַמִּים יִרְגְּזוּן חֵיל אַחַז יִשְׁבִּי
פְּלִשְׁתִּים
15 אַז נִבְהָלוּ אֱלֹפֵי אֲדוֹם אֵילֵי מוֹאָב
יֵאֱחָזְמוּ רַעַד נִמְגּוּ כָל יִשְׁבֵי כְנָעַן

In vv. 14–15, the *yiqtol*s may indicate concomitant action in the past, or, alternatively, general present/future with the *qatals* interpreted as present perfects (again, in Hebrew, there is no difference).²³

²² According to Robertson (1972, 155), the early dating of Exod 15 is "the one unequivocal, firmly grounded conclusion" of his study. This conclusion is based on other traits besides the supposedly archaic use of *yiqtol*. See also, Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 1:329–335. Cf. Siegismund 2013.

²³ 4QExod^c (Ulrich 2010, 65) has יִרְגְּזוּן instead of יִרְגְּזוּן in v. 14 (see appendix 49).

Exod 15:16–18

16 תפל עליהם אימתה נפחד בגדל זרועה ידמו
 כאבן עדי-יעבר עמה יהנה עדי-יעבר עם-זו
 קנית
 17 תבאמו ותטעמו בהר נחלתה מכון לשבתה
 פעלת יהנה מקדש אלני כוננו ידיה
 18 יהנה ימלה לעלם ועד

The *yiqtol*s (and *weyiqtol*) in vv. 16–18 are interpretable as general present/simple future or volitives.

As was the case in 2 Sam 22/Ps 18, other interpretations are possible for Exod 15. Reading the *yiqtol*s as simple past tense makes sense in most cases. However, nothing com-

pels us to accept that such a rare usage is in fact attested in this poem (cf. Notarius 2013, 124).²⁴

Deut 32 provides more convincing evidence for the archaic, anterior use of *yiqtol*. Rainey, Notarius, and Joosten (as well as other scholars) argue for this usage in the supposedly narrative passage in the poem (32:8–20).²⁵ However, even in this poem, alternative interpretations may be possible.

Deut 32:8–20

8 בהנחל עליון גוים בהפרידו בני אדם יצב גבלת עמים למספר בני ישראל
 9 כי חלק יהנה עמו יעקב חבל נחלתו
 10 ימצאהו בארץ מדבר ובתהו ילל ישמן יסבבנהו יבוננהו יצרנהו כאישון עינו
 11 כנשר יעיר קנו על-גונליו ירחף יפרש כנפיו יקחהו ישאהו על-אבדתו
 12 יהנה בךד ינחנו ואין עמו אל נכר
 13 ירפכהו על-במותי ארץ ויאכל תנובת שדי וינקהו דבש מסלע וישמן מחלמיש צור
 14 תמאת בקר וחלב צאן עם-חלב כרים ואילים בני-כשן ועתודים עם-חלב פליות חטה
 ודם-ענב תשתה-חמר
 15 וישמן ישרון ויבעט שמנת עבית כשית וישא אלוה עשהו וינבל צור ישעתו
 16 יקנאהו בזרים בתועבת יכעסהו
 17 יזבחו לשדים לא אלה אלהים לא ידעום חדשים מקרב באו לא שערום אבותיכם
 18 צור ילדה תשי ותשכח אל מהללה
 19 וירא יהנה וינאץ מפעס בניו ובנתיו
 20 ויאמר אסתירה פני מהם אראה מה אחריתם כי דור תהפכת המה בנים לא-אמן בם

²⁴ Note Gianto's unconvincing claim (1996, 506–507) that the "primary grammatical meaning of the verbal form *yiqtol* as tense, aspect, or modality is determined by the semantic content of the subject." Thus, when God is the subject in Exod 15, *yiqtol* is allegedly a "preterite" while this is not the case when the subject is the people of Israel or a third party.

²⁵ See Rainey 1986, 15–16; Notarius 2013, 73–106; Joosten 2012a, 417–419. They all recognize some of the *yiqtol*s in the passage as non-anteriors (partially recognizable on the formal level because of energetic *nun* etc.) indicating past durative, circumstantial action etc. (this includes Joosten, whose usual refusal to ascribe this meaning to *yiqtol* does not apply to what he considers a clearly archaic text). The *yiqtol*s in the first part of v. 11 are considered general present tense referring to the eagle in the comparison.

Reading the passage as narration remains an obviously viable analysis, especially in light of the introductory remarks in v. 7 (זָכַר יְמוֹת עוֹלָם בֵּינֵנוּ וְשָׁנוֹת (דְּדוֹר-דְּדוֹר וְשָׁאֵל אֲבִיךָ וַיִּגְדֶּךָ וְזָקְנֶיךָ וַיֹּאמְרוּ לְךָ)). If this is the case, several of the *yiqtol*s do indeed seem to make most sense if interpreted as expressions of simple past tense. Niccacci (2006, 261, n. 24) argues that the *yiqtol*s are not narrative, but rather describe or represent the events "graphically" (i.e. the regular past durative/concomitant use of non-anterior *yiqtol*).²⁶ E.g., he translates יִצַּב in v. 8 as "he would fix" and יִמְצְאֵהוּ in v. 10 as "should he find him/when he would find him." This reading makes little sense, at least not for v. 8. In v. 10 we might choose to read another verbal root attested in the Samaritan version (יאמצהו; cf. LXX ἀυτάρακησεν), which makes more sense as a durative. In fact, the word "find" seems odd in a narrative about God and the Israelites in the desert (after all, it was God who brought them there). In Niccacci's analysis, the overall passage is still considered narrative, referring to the past. However, it might be possible to read the entire passage as referring to the present/future, probably in a volitive sense.

As far as v. 8 is concerned, this idea was briefly alluded to by Driver (1874, 62, n. 1), "Does not Deut. xxxii. 8 gain in force if יִצַּב be taken strictly, as expressing, namely, a wish that the manner in which the territories of the nations are allotted may be fixed by a continual reference to Israel – the *reason* of the wish following in v. 9?" Though it is customary to read the MT in light of 4QDeut^j (בני אלוהים; preceding and following words are missing) and the LXX (κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ), the verse as transmitted in the MT (with לְמִסְפַּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) might in fact make sense as a wish for the future – that the peoples will be given to the sons of Israel as an inheritance.²⁷ If the verse in the MT is indeed a dogmatic correction made by the Masoretes (to avoid the idea of the peoples being distributed to different gods), we really have no idea what form the verb had in the original (the verb has not been preserved in 4QDeut^j). In any case, if vv. 8 and 9 are not part of the narrative, and יאמצהו is read in v. 10 instead of יִמְצְאֵהוּ, the rest of the problematic *yiqtol*s seem to be more easily interpretable as non-anteriors in a past context. In v. 13, there are two *wayyiqtol*s (וַיִּנְקְהוּ and וַיֵּאָכְלוּ). However, the LXX as well as the Samaritans attest to verbs without *waw*. Maybe these forms were originally non-anterior *yiqtol*s as well, or, alternatively, we might revocalize the forms

²⁶ Cf. also Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd 2008, 325–326.

²⁷ A further alternative reading might be tentatively proposed. יִצַּב might be a *qatal*, either a *pi* from the root יצב (cf. Aramaic), or, following Joosten's suggestion for 2 Kgs 8:29 = 9:15 (2012a, 287, n. 67), the form might be a *yif* (*qatal*) rather than a *hif*., which could explain the *yod*. Of course, such explanations are quite *ad hoc* with no real support.

as *weyiqtol*s. If this is the case, the entire passage might be read as future/volitive, although this would render the apparent introduction in v. 7 meaningless. In v. 15, in any case, we seem to have a short narrative passage, followed in 16–19 by a passage with present reference describing the way the Israelites behave. וַתִּשְׁכַּח in v. 18 may be a present perfect-type anterior ("you are unmindful of the rock that bore you and you have forgotten the God that gave birth to you").

As can be seen from this short discussion, the potential for an alternative reading is there, but it is clearly not as straightforward as seems to be implied by Niccacci. I find it impossible to conclude that there are no archaic, anterior *yiqtol*s in the passage, but the ambiguous poetic content makes it equally impossible to decide in favour of the opposite point of view. In addition, the unstable character of the text should be taken into consideration. At least some of the *waws* are unstable between the different attestations of the poem, which makes it very difficult to say anything conclusive about the use of simple *yiqtol* with possibly anterior meaning.

Appendix 10

A few examples of alleged anterior *yiqtol* (<**yaqtul*) in prose, with comments

Joosten (2012a, 287) notes the following potential cases. He concludes, probably correctly, that they should be considered "local anomalies, to be explained on an *ad hoc* basis, whether as textual, linguistic, or literary."

Gen 37:7	וְהָיָה אֲנַחְנוּ מְאֻלָּמִים אֲלֵמִים בְּתוֹךְ הַשָּׂדֶה וְהָיָה קָמָה אֲלֵמָתִי וְגַם־נִצְבָה וְהָיָה תִסְבִּינָה אֲלֵמָתֵיכֶם וַתִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינּוּ לְאֵלֵמָתִי
	<i>וְהָיָה אֲנַחְנוּ</i> is readily interpretable as durative, concomitant action in the past (i.e. ordinary non-anteriority). As noted in the main text, Joosten is reluctant to ascribe this shade of meaning to <i>yiqtol</i> .
Deut 2:12	בְּשַׁעִיר יִשְׁבוּ הַחֲרִים לְפָנַי וּבְנֵי עֵשׂוֹ יִירָשׁוּם וַיִּשְׁמְדוּם מִפְּנֵיהֶם וַיִּשְׁבוּ תַחְתָּם כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאֶרֶץ יְרֵשָׁתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־נָתַן יְהוָה לָהֶם
	In light of vv. 21 and 22 with <i>wayyiqtol</i> from the same root and another order of verbs, יִירָשׁוּם seems to be a mere scribal mistake.
Judg 2:1	וַיַּעַל מִלְּאֲדָ־יְהוָה מִן־הַגִּלְגָּל אֶל־הַבְּכִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֶעֱלֶה אֶתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם וְאָבִיא אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הָאֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאֲבֹתֵיכֶם וְאָמַר לֹא־אֶפְרָ בְּרִיתִי אֶתְכֶם לְעוֹלָם
	The form אֶעֱלֶה is long, which is unexpected if the verb is an archaic relic of * <i>yaqtul</i> . A progressive/durative past reading might make sense. Alternatively, we might speculate that something is missing in front of the verb, which could make a simple future reading possible (something like "and I said in my heart/I told you, 'I will lead you up from Egypt'. And I brought

Appendices

	you..."; cf. Exod 3:17). While not supporting this specific reconstruction, the LXX does show that something might have fallen out of the text here. In contrast to 2:1, the similar passage in Judg 6:8 has a more expected verb form (אָנְכִי הָעֲלִיתִי אֶתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם וְאַצִּיא אֶתְכֶם מִבֵּית עַבְדִּים). In the latter case, however, we have a fronted/focused subject personal pronoun.
1 Kgs 7:8	וּבֵיתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־יִישֵׁב שָׁם חָצַר הָאֲחֻרַת מִבַּיִת לְאוֹלָם כַּמַּעֲשֵׂה הַזֶּה וְהָיָה וּבֵית יַעֲשֶׂה לְבַת־פְּרֻעָה אֲשֶׁר לָקַח שָׁלְמָה כְּאוֹלָם הַזֶּה
	Again, a long form (יַעֲשֶׂה). A non-anterior reading hardly makes sense, but why would an archaic * <i>yaqtul</i> form show up in this connection? It seems to be a mere scribal mistake, probably due to attraction to the preceding habitual non-anterior <i>yiqtol</i> s (vv. 7 and 8).
1 Kgs 20:33	הָאֲנָשִׁים יִנְחָשׁוּ וַיִּמְהָרוּ וַיַּחְלְטוּ הַמַּמְנֹנֵי וַיֹּאמְרוּ אַחִיקָה בְּוַדָּד וַיֹּאמֶר בָּאוּ קָחֵהוּ וַיֵּצֵא אֵלָיו בְּוַדָּד וַיַּעֲלֵהוּ עַל־הַמֶּרְכָבָה
	Though perhaps unexpected, a progressive/durative non-anterior reading of יִנְחָשׁוּ is possible.
1 Kgs 21:6	וַיְדַבֵּר אֵלָיָה כִּי־אָדַבֵּר אֶל־נְבוֹת הַיִּזְרְעֵאלִי וַאֲמַר לוֹ תִּנְהַלֵּנִי אֶת־כֶּרְמִי בְּכֶסֶף אוֹ אִם־חֶפֶץ אַתָּה אֶתְנֶה־לְךָ כָּרֶם תַּחֲתָיו וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא־אֶתֵּן לְךָ אֶת־כֶּרְמִי
	אָדַבֵּר has progressive/durative-type non-anterior meaning. As noted before, Joosten is reluctant to ascribe this function to <i>yiqtol</i> (it is usually the domain of the PTC).
2 Kgs 8:29 = 9:15	וַיֵּשֶׁב יוֹרָם הַמֶּלֶךְ לְהַתְרַפָּא בְּיִזְרְעֵאל מִן־הַמְּכִים אֲשֶׁר יָבִיאוּ אֲרָמִים בְּרָמָה בְּהַלְחָמוֹ אֶת־חֲזֵה־אֵל מֶלֶךְ אֲרָם ...
	Again, we might argue that יָבִיאוּ is progressive/durative but this interpretation seems unconvincing in the context. We clearly expect a <i>qatal</i> (indicating anteriority in the past = past perfect), cf. the parallel in 2 Chr 22:6 (הִכָּהוּ). Joosten (2012a, 287, n. 67) tentatively suggests that יָבִיאוּ might be a <i>yif.</i> , i.e. a <i>hif.</i> with weakening of <i>h</i> > <i>y</i> as attested in Phoenician. In this case, the form could be a <i>qatal</i> .

Appendix 11

Excursus on word order

Most scholars seem to hold the view that VS is the unmarked, basic word order in verbal clauses in CH (e.g. GKC 456, §142a, f; Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 545, §155k; Moshavi 2010, 10–11; Joosten 2012a, 356–362). However, some dissenters have argued for the opposite view, viz. that SV is the unmarked order (e.g. Joüon 1923, 474, §155k; Holmstedt 2005 and 2011; Cook 2012, 235–237). In Siegismund forthcoming a, I treat the question in some detail. In the present context, I briefly present the standard VS view and some critical remarks on the SV approach as advocated most prominently by Holmstedt.

It is clear that Hebrew does not have a fixed word order in the sense that some other languages do. Both VS and SV clauses occur and it is clearly possible for writers (and, presumably, speakers) to front all kinds of elements (i.e. place them in initial position) in order to focus attention or provide emphasis on relevant parts of a clause.²⁸ Hebrew has been described as a "free order" language, i.e. a language "exhibiting a great deal of word order variation," for which reason "[a]ttention to the pragmatic features of a clause is particularly significant" (Holmstedt 2011, 220). However, it is much easier to explain SV clauses as being marked for some kind of focus on the subject, derived from a more basic VS order, than the other way around (i.e. than claiming that SV is basic and having to explain VS clauses as in some way specially marked with focus on the verb; cf. Joosten 2012a, 362).

Buth (1999, 95) describes the basic mechanism of fronting "out of an underlying predication with a basic VSOX order plus a slot before the verb for pragmatic marking by means of word order. The pragmatic, communication effect may have one of two functions, either marking special saliency, a Focus, or marking a less salient constituent as orienting the clause to the context. This Contextualizing Constituent is the more common function in narrative."

Proponents of basic SV order recognize that objects or other elements may be fronted for pragmatic reasons (e.g. Screnock 2011, 40). Holmstedt (2011, 23, n. 53) even refers to SV clauses with fronted subject. However, if the basic order is SV, as claimed by Holmstedt, it makes little sense to say that the same order can be pragmatically marked. According to Holmstedt (ib., 24; 2005, 149–150), many SV clauses do not mark any special focus on the subject and should be regarded as a serious challenge to the VS approach. However, none of his examples are convincing. Rather, some kind of focus seems to be discernable in every case.

When discussing basic word order, Holmstedt argues that some clause types and verb forms should be left out of consideration (2011, 13ff.). To be sure, negative or interrogative clauses and marked volitive verb forms should be disregarded if the aim is to determine the unmarked word order. Similarly, clauses with preposed objects or adverbs cannot be considered basic (they quite consistently have VS order after the preposed element). However, Holmstedt reduces the field even further, arguing that we ought to disregard

²⁸ There are other means of focusing/emphasizing. Cf. 1 Sam 31:5 (וַיִּפֹּל גַם־הוּא עַל־חַרְבּוֹ) or Isa 7:14 (לָכֵן יִתֵּן אֲדֹנָי הוּא לָכֶם אוֹת). On the notion of emphasis see Holst 2008, 75, and especially Muraoka 1985.

wayyiqtol, *weqatal*, and initial *qatal* too. *Wayyiqtol* exhibits a "highly restricted pattern" (ib., 12),²⁹ while *weqatal* and initial *qatal* are regarded as modal (ib., 19–20; 2005, 150). Accordingly, it is not very difficult for Holmstedt to "prove" that SV is the basic order (since virtually all VS clauses have been eliminated from the discussion). However, as pointed out by Screnock (2011, 36), it makes no sense to claim that *weqatal* is modal while *w+X+yiqtol* is not. Either we also eliminate non-initial *yiqtol* from the discussion (which would leave us with only non-initial *qatals* to discuss), or we must admit that *weqatal* should not be eliminated. Similarly, there are no convincing arguments that initial *qatal* is modal (cf. Joosten 2012a, 354–355; Gross 1976, 32), except for Holmstedt's decision to translate the form as such. E.g., Holmstedt (2005, 150) translates Prov 22:13 (אָמַר עָצֵל) as "the lazy person says," claiming that the initial *qatal* is a modal form with habitual meaning. In contrast, I argue that such cases are to be interpreted like other *qatals* (i.e. expressing anteriority), probably functioning as minimal narrative units (Siegismund forthcoming a; cf. 3.3.2).³⁰ In addition, the claim that *wayyiqtol* should be disregarded due to its restricted pattern is unconvincing – *wayyiqtol* is part of a system of interchange with *X+qatal* and the restrictions apply to the system as such, not just to *wayyiqtol*.

The question of word order must be seen in connection with the Hebrew system of consecutive forms, as described in 3.6. When the text flows along continuously with clauses introduced by "and," the forms used are *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*. However, when some kind of deviation from the regular flow occurs (introduction of a new, contrasting subject or object, emphasis, focus, etc.), the simple forms *qatal* and *yiqtol* are used, following the fronted element that marks the focused part of the clause. Accordingly, VS seems to be unmarked, while the shift to SV seems to be the result of focusing on the subject. In clauses that are not part of a continuous flow, both word orders are possible. However, in such isolated or disconnected clauses, new subjects are often introduced, which leads to a tendency for SV to dominate. As suggested in 3.7, focus-based fronting seems to play a role in the distribution of volitive (initial) and non-volitive (non-initial) *yiqtol*. Non-volitive *yiqtol* is part of the interchange with *weqatal* and therefore only occurs in continuous discourse when other elements are fronted. In single/isolated clauses, on the

²⁹ Holmstedt (2006, 20) argues that *wayyiqtol* includes a "reduced function word," which is the cause of the VS order. Cf. 5.2.

³⁰ Hence, the tendency for a connection between modality and initial position cannot be extended beyond the volitive subsystem (3.7). Possibly the passive PTC could be included here as well (the type בָּרוּךְ אוֹ אָרוּר+subject, etc.). However, how are we to decide whether the meaning of such clauses is "blessed be Yahweh" or "blessed is Yahweh"? Cf. the use of בָּרוּךְ with an explicit volitive verb form in 1 Kgs 10:9 (יְהִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ בָּרוּךְ).

other hand, the subject would tend to be focused, while the focus in volitive clauses would tend to be on the modal meaning of the verb itself. Accordingly, VS position is maintained, albeit – as noted (3.7) – not consistently.

Appendix 12

Further examples of *weqatal* marking a shift to non-anteriority

Gen 17:6	וְהִפְרַתִּי אֶתְךָ בְּמֵאֵד מְאֹד וְנִתְתִּיךָ לְגוֹיִם וּמְלָכִים מִמֶּךָ יֵצְאוּ
	This is a transition from a performative <i>qatal</i> in v. 5 (which, according to the analysis presented here, is not to be regarded as being fundamentally different from ordinary anterior <i>qatal</i>) to non-anterior <i>weqatals</i> with future reference (one of which is even from the same root as the preceding simple <i>qatal</i>).
Gen 17:20	וּלְיִשְׁמָעֵאל שְׁמַעְתִּיךָ הִנֵּה בְּרַכְתִּי אֹתוֹ וְהִפְרִיתִי אֹתוֹ וְהִרְבִּיתִי אֹתוֹ בְּמֵאֵד מְאֹד נְשִׁים-עֶשְׂרֵת נְשִׂאִים יוֹלִיד וְנִתְתִּיו לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל
	The preceding <i>qatal</i> may be performative here as well.
Gen 26:22	... וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי-עָתָה הִרְחִיב יְהוָה לְנֹוֹ וּפְרִינוּ בְּאֶרֶץ
Exod 31:6	וְאֲנִי הִנֵּה נִתְתִּי אֹתוֹ אֶת אֶהֱלִיאָב בֶּן-אֲחִיסָמֵךְ לְמִטֵּה-דָן וּבִלְבַב כָּל-חֻכְמֵי-לֵב נִתְתִּי חֻכְמָה וְעָשׂוֹ אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ
1 Sam 15:28	וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו שְׁמוּאֵל קִרַע יְהוָה אֶת-מַמְלַכּוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַלְיָךְ הַיּוֹם וְנִתְּנָה לְרַעַף הַטּוֹב מִמֶּךָ
1 Sam 17:36	גַּם אֶת-הָאֲרִי גַם-הַדּוֹב הַכָּה עִבְדְּךָ וְהָיָה הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי הָעָרַל הִנֵּה כָּאֶחָד מֵהֶם ...
1 Sam 27:12	וַיֵּאמְרוּ אֲכִישׁ בְּדוֹד לֵאמֹר הַבָּאֵשׁ הַבָּאִישׁ בְּעֵמּוֹ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וְהָיָה לִי לְעַבְדַּ עוֹלָם
2 Kgs 9:26	אִם-לֹא אֶת-דְּמֵי נְבוֹת וְאֶת-דְּמֵי בְנָיֹו רְאִיתִי אֲמַשׁ נְאֻם-יְהוָה וְשַׁלְּמֹתִי לָךְ בַּחֲלָקָה הַזֹּאת נְאֻם-יְהוָה ...
Isa 2:2	וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים ...
	The first word in a new prophetic prediction, following the introduction in v. 1 with a simple <i>qatal</i> . Cf. Joosten 2012a, 294, n. 89.
Isa 9:7	דִּבֶּר שְׁלַח אֲדֹנָי בִּינְעֻקֵב וּנְפֹל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
Isa 31:2	וְגַם-הוּא חֻכְמָה וְנִבְאָ רַע וְאֶת-דְּבָרָיו לֹא הִסִּיר וְקָם עַל-בֵּית מְרַעִים וְעַל-עֲזֵרַת פְּעֻלֵי אֲנוֹן
	The preceding <i>qatal</i> and <i>wayyiqtol</i> in this verse are often treated as non-anteriors in translations. However, as argued in 3.4 on the use of verbs in poetry, such conflation of the meaning of the forms is unnecessary.
Isa 48:15	אֲנִי אֲנִי דִבַּרְתִּי אֶף-קִרְאֹתִיו הִבִּיאֹתִיו וְהִצְלִיחַ דְּרָכּוֹ
Jer 28:13	... כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה מוֹטֵת עַץ שִׁבְרֹתָ וְעֹשֵׂת תַּחְתֵּיהֶן מִטּוֹת בְּרִזָּל

Appendices

Jer 48:41	גִּלְפָּדָה הַקָּרִיּוֹת וְהַמְצָדוֹת נִתְפָּשָׂה וְהָיָה לֵב גְּבוּרֵי מוֹאָב בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא כְּלֵב אִשָּׁה מְצַרָּה
Ez 17:24	... אָנִי יְהוָה דִּבַּרְתִּי וְעָשִׂיתִי
	The same sequence occurs in Ez 22:14; 36:36; 37:14. While some translations treat the <i>weqatal</i> as anterior (KJV: "I the LORD have spoken and have done it"), a shift from anterior to non-anterior makes better sense (ESV: "I am the LORD; I have spoken, and I will do it"; cf. LXX, ἐγὼ κύριος λελάληκα καὶ ποιήσω; in 22:14 and 36:36, KJV has a similar rendering).
Ez 23:31	בְּדַרְךָ אַחֲזַתְךָ הַלֵּכֶת וְנִתְתִּי כוֹסָה בְּיַדְךָ
Mal 3:17	וְהָיוּ לִי אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר אָנִי עוֹשֶׂה סִגְלָה ...
Ruth 2:9	... הֲלוֹא צִוִּיתִי אֶת־הַנְּעָרִים לְבִלְתִּי נִגְעַף וְצָמַת וְהַלֵּכֶת אֶל־הַכְּלִים וְשָׂתִית מֵאֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאֲבוּן הַנְּעָרִים

Appendix 13

A selection of *weqatals* marking a shift to non-anteriority (the preceding anterior form occurs in some kind of subordinate clause)

Lev 13:5	וְהִסְגִּירוּ	Preceding הִנֵּה-clause with <i>qatals</i> .
Num 16:10	וּבִקְשָׁתֶם	Preceding כִּי-clause with <i>qatal</i> and <i>wayyiqtol</i> .
Deut 17:5	וְהוֹצֵאתָ	Preceding הִנֵּה-clause with passive PTC and <i>qatal</i> .
Isa 16:9–10	וְנֶאֱסַף	Preceding כִּי-clause with <i>qatal</i> .
Isa 60:11	וּפְתָחוּ	Preceding כִּי-clause with <i>qatals</i> .
Jer 7:14	וְעָשִׂיתִי	Preceding יַעַן-clause with infinitives, <i>wayyiqtol</i> s, and <i>qatals</i> .
Jer 9:10	וְנִתְּתִי	Preceding כִּי-clause with <i>qatals</i> .
Jer 26:6	וְנִתְּתִי	Preceding relative clauses with various forms, including a <i>qatal</i> right before the <i>weqatal</i> .

Appendix 14

***Wayyiqtol* indicating a shift to anterior reference (see Joosten 2012a, 182–183)**

Exod 6:2–3	... אָנִי יְהוָה ² ... וְנֶאֱרָא אֶל־אַבְרָהָם אֶל־יִצְחָק וְאֶל־יַעֲקֹב בְּאֵל שְׁדֵי ³
Lev 20:26	וְהֵייתֶם לִי קְדוֹשִׁים כִּי קְדוֹשׁ אָנִי יְהוָה וְאַבְדַּלְתֶּם אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָעַמִּים לְהִיּוֹת לִי
Deut 26:5	... אֲרָמִי אֲבָד אָבִי וַיֵּרַד מִצְרָיִם ...

Judg 19:18	... עֲבָרִים אֲנַחֲנוּ מִבֵּית־לֶחֶם יְהוּדָה עַד־יִרְכָתִי הַר־אֶפְרַיִם מִשָּׁם אָנֹכִי וְאֵלֶּךָ עַד־בֵּית לֶחֶם יְהוּדָה ...
1 Sam 2:29 ³¹	לְמָה תִבְעֲטוּ בְזֹבְחֵי וּבִמְנַחְתֵי אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי מֵעוֹן וּתִכְבְּדוּ אֶת־בְּנֵיךָ מִמֶּנִּי ...
1 Sam 15:17	... הֲלוֹא אִם־קִטְוֹן אָתָּה בְּעֵינֶיךָ רֹאשׁ שְׁבָטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אָתָּה וַיִּמְשַׁחֲךָ יְהוָה לְמֶלֶךְ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
2 Sam 14:5	... אָבָל אֲשֶׁה־אֶלְמָנָה אָנִי וַיָּמָת אִישִׁי
2 Sam 14:6	וּלְשִׁפְחָתְךָ שְׁנֵי בָנִים וַיִּנָּצוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם בַּשָּׂדֶה וְאִין מִצִּיל בֵּינֵיהֶם וַיִּכּוּ הָאֶחָד אֶת־הָאֶחָד וַיָּמָת אֹתוֹ
1 Kgs 3:17	... אָנִי וְהָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת יֹשְׁבַת בְּבַיִת אֶחָד וְאֵלֶּךָ עִמָּה בַּבַּיִת
2 Kgs 10:13	... וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִתִּי אֲחֻזָּיָהוּ אֲנַחֲנוּ וַנִּרְדּ לְשָׁלוֹם בְּגִי־הַמֶּלֶךְ וּבְגִי הַגְּבִירָה
Job 14:17	חַתָּם בַּצָּרוּר פִּשְׁעֵי וַתִּטְפַּל עַל־עֹנִי

Appendix 15

Potential present stative *wayyiqtol*s (alternatively, fientive simple past or present perfect)

Exod 33:17 (וְאֵדָעָה)	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה גַם אֶת־הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ אֶעֱשֶׂה כִּי־מִצָּאתָ חֹן בְּעֵינַי וְאֵדָעָה בְּשֵׁם
Deut 10:5 (וַיִּהְיֶה)	וְאִפְּן וְאֵרַד מִן־הַהָר וְאֲשֵׁם אֶת־הַלְחַת בְּאֵרוֹן אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי וַיְהִי שֵׁם כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּנִי יְהוָה
Deut 22:16	... אֶת־בְּתִי נָתַתִּי לְאִישׁ הַזֶּה לְאִשָּׁה וַיִּשְׁנֹאֶהָ
Isa 2:7–8	⁷ וַתִּמְלֵא אַרְצוֹ כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב ... וַתִּמְלֵא אַרְצוֹ סוּסִים ... ⁸ וַתִּמְלֵא אַרְצוֹ אֱלִילִים
Isa 31:1	הוּא הִירְדִים מִצְרַיִם לְעֹזְרָה עַל־סוּסִים יִשְׁעֵנוּ וַיִּבְטְחוּ עַל־רֶכֶב כִּי רַב ...
Isa 50:7	וְאֵדָנִי יְהוָה יַעֲזֹר־לִי עַל־כֵּן לֹא נִכְלַמְתִּי עַל־כֵּן שָׁמַתִּי כִּנִּי כַחַלְמִישׁ וְאֵדָע כִּי־לֹא אָבוֹשׁ
Jer 5:27	כַּכְּלוֹב מְלֵא עוֹף כֵּן בְּתִיָּהֶם מְלֵאִים מְרָמָה עַל־כֵּן גָּדְלוּ וַיַּעֲשִׂירוּ
Jer 11:18	וַיְהִי הוֹדִיעֵנִי וְאֵדָעָה אֲזִי הִרְאִיתִנִי מֵעַלְלֵיהֶם
Ez 9:9	עוֹן בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה גְּדוֹל בְּמָאֵד מָאֵד וַתִּמְלֵא הָאָרֶץ דָּמִים וְהָעִיר מְלֵאָה מָטָה
Ps 29:10	יְהוָה לַמַּבּוּל יָשָׁב וַיִּשָּׁב יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ לְעוֹלָם
Ps 45:8	אֶהְבֶּתְךָ צֶדֶק וַתִּשְׁנֵא רִשְׁעֵי ...

³¹ might be claimed to represent a misvocalization of an unclassical non-volitive *weyiqtol*.

Appendices

Ps 52:9	הנה הגבר לא ישים אלהים מעוזו ויבטח ברב עשרו יעז בהנתו
Ps 78:3	אשר שמענו ונדעם ואבותינו ספרו לנו
Ps 119:90	לדר ודר אמונתך כוננת ארץ ומעמד
Ps 139:1	למנצח לדוד מזמור יהוה חקרתני ותדע
Lam 4:6	ויגדל עון בת-עמי מחטאת סדם ההפוכה כמו-רגע
1 Chr 23:25	כי אמר דויד הננים יהוה אלהי-ישראל לעמו וישפן בירושלם עד-לעולם

Appendix 16

Potential present perfect *wayyiqtol*s (some of the most convincing examples)

Num 22:11	הנה העם היצא ממצרים ויכס את-עין הארץ עתה לכה קבה-לי אתו
Num 31:50	ונקרב את-קרבו יהוה
	According to Joüon and Muraoka (2009, 366, §118o), this is a "present of instantaneous action, like <i>qatal</i> ," i.e. performative (cf. Van Peursen 2004, 100, n. 106). However, an "ordinary" present perfect translation may be more appropriate, like the <i>qatal</i> in v. 49 (עבדיך נשאו את-ראש) (אנשי המלחמה). See Joosten 2012a, 187).
Josh 6:25	ותשב בקרב ישראל עד היום הנה
	On clauses with "to this day," see Joosten 2012a, 99. Cf. also Bergström 2014, 130. He notes that the expression also occurs with verbs that seem to refer to the absolute past, as in Josh 9:27 with a <i>wayyiqtol</i> referring to an event in the past (indicated by ביום ההוא) (ביום ההוא חטבי עצים ושאבי מים לעדה ולמנבח יהוה עד-היום הנה). This is merely a further indication of the essential point that Hebrew uses the same forms (<i>wayyiqtol</i> and <i>qatal</i>) to indicate all kinds of anteriority.
Josh 13:13	וישב גשור ומעכת בקרב ישראל עד היום הנה
Josh 15:63	וישב הבוסי את-בני יהודה בירושלם עד היום הנה
1 Sam 14:28 (ויער)	ויען איש מהעם ויאמר השבע השביע אביך את-העם לאמר ארור האיש אשר-יאכל לחם היום ויערף העם
	If the final clause is part of the direct speech, the verb must have some kind of present relevance ("the people have become weary" or stative "are weary"). However, the clause may mark the return to the narrative flow.
Ruth 2:7 (ותעמוד)	... ותבוא ותעמוד מאז הבקר ועד-עתה ...

Appendix 17

A selection of potential past perfect *wayyiqtol*s (for further examples, see Joosten 2012a, 171–172; cf. also Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 552–553, §33.2.3)

Josh 2:4	ותקח האשה את־שני האנשים ותצפנו ותאמר כן באו אלי האנשים ולא ידעתי מאין המה
	The preceding verse reports the arrival of a messenger to Rahab demanding that she bring out the men who had come to her. She must have hid the men prior to her conversation with the messenger. Hence, ותקח and ותצפנו are interpretable as past perfects.
1 Kgs 6:38	ובשנה האחת עשרה בניה בול הוא החדש השמיני כלה הבית לכל־דבריו ולכל־משפטו ויבנהו שבע שנים
	כלה clearly does not indicate an event that follows ויבנהו. It may be interpreted as past perfect, or simply as a summarizing simple past.
Isa 39:1	בעת ההוא שלח מרדך בלאדן בן־בלאדן מלך־בבל ספרים ומנחה אל־חזקיהו וישמע פי חלה ויחזק
	וישמע seems to be a good example of past perfect <i>wayyiqtol</i> . Note that the parallel in 2 Kgs 20:12 has כי שמע (cf. 4QIsa ^b ; Ulrich 2010, 509).
Neh 2:9	ואבוא אל־פתוות עבר הנהר ואתנה להם את אגרות המלך וישלח עמי המלך שרי חיל ופרשים
	The sending marked by וישלח must have occurred prior to the arrival of Nehemiah (i.e., past perfect).

Appendix 18

Wayyiqtol in Genesis and Exodus

There are 175 occurrences of *wayyiqtol* in Genesis and Exodus, in 139 verses: Gen 1:6, 9, 26; 9:26, 27 (two); 11:3, 4, 7; 12:2 (three), 3; 13:9 (two); 17:2 (two); 18:5, 21, 30, 32; 19:5, 20, 32 (two), 34; 20:7; 22:5 (two), 17; 23:4, 9, 13; 24:3, 14, 49, 51, 56, 57, 60; 26:3 (two), 28; 27:4, 7 (two), 9, 21, 25, 28, 29 (two), 31, 41; 28:3 (two), 4; 29:21, 27; 30:3 (two), 25, 26, 28; 31:3, 27, 37; 32:10; 33:12 (two); 34:12, 21 (two), 23; 35:3 (three); 37:13, 20 (three), 27; 38:24; 41:33, 34, 35 (two); 42:2, 16 (two), 20, 34; 43:4, 8 (three); 44:21; 45:18, 28; 46:31 (two); 47:16, 19 (two); 48:9, 16 (two); 49:1, 7, 25 (two); 50:5 (two); Exod 2:7, 20; 3:3, 10, 18; 4:18 (two), 23; 5:1, 3, 9, 21; 6:11; 7:16, 19, 26; 8:4 (three), 16; 9:1, 13, 22, 28; 10:3, 7, 12 (two), 17, 21 (two); 11:2; 12:3; 14:2 (two), 4, 12, 15, 16, 17 (two), 26; 15:2 (two), 17; 17:2; 18:19;

Appendices

19:3; 20:19; 23:8, 12; 24:7, 12; 25:2; 26:24; 27:20; 28:28; 32:10 (three); 33:5, 13; 35:10.³²

In most cases, the classical "rules" (the tendencies outlined in 3.7) clearly apply. Where distinct short forms exist, these are used in almost all cases (14): Gen 1:6; 9:26, 27b; 19:20; 24:51; 41:34; Exod 2:7 (consonant text; vocalisation as for ordinary *yiqtol*, וְתִינֶק); 8:4a; 9:22; 10:12a, 17, 21a; 18:19; 32:10a.

Only one occurrence has a clearly non-shortened form with a root where a short form exists, viz. Gen 1:9 (יָקוּוּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל-מְקוֹם אֶחָד וְתִרְאֶה (הַיַּבְשָׁה וְיַהֲיֶיךָ)).³³ The same applies to the consonant text in Exod 19:3, though not the vocalisation (וְתִגִּיד; see 6.2.3 on this and other problematic forms).

In the first person, all *weyiqtol*s from roots that are able to take the *heh*-suffix occur with this ending: Gen 11:3, 7; 12:2c, 3; 13:9a, 9b; 17:2a; 18:5, 30, 32; 19:5, 32a; 22:5b; 23:4, 13; 24:56, 57; 26:28; 27:4, 7a, 25, 41; 29:21, 27; 30:25, 26, 28; 32:10; 33:12a, 12b; 34:12; 35:3a; 42:34; 43:4, 8a, 8b; 44:21; 45:18; 46:31a, 31b; 47:16; 49:1; 50:5a, 5b; Exod 3:18; 4:18a; 5:3; 8:4b; 9:28; 14:4, 12, 17b; 20:19; 24:12; 33:5.³⁴

Most of the *weyiqtol*s are in clearly volitive passages, typically following other volitive verb forms (approx. 151 of the 175 occurrences):

After an imperative	Gen 12:2a; ³⁵ 12:3; ³⁶ 13:9a, 9b; 17:2a; 18:5; 19:5; 19:34; 20:7; 23:4, 9, 13; 24:3, 14, 49, 51, 56, 60; 26:3a; 27:4, 7a, 9, 21, 25, 28, ³⁷ 29b; 29:21, 27; 30:3a, 25, 26, 28; 31:3, 37; 32:10; 34:12; 35:3a; 37:13, 20a, 27; 38:24; 42:2, 16a, 16b, 34; 43:8a; 44:21; 45:18; 47:16, 19a, 19b; 48:9; 49:1; Exod 2:20; 3:10; 4:23; 5:1; 6:11; 7:16, 19, 26; 8:4a, 16; 9:1, 13, 22, 28; ³⁸ 10:3, 7, 12a, 17, 21a; 11:2; 12:3 (?); 14:2a, 12, 15, 16, 26; 17:2; 20:19; 24:12; 25:2; 32:10a; 33:5, 13.
---------------------	--

³² The list is from BibleWorks 9.

³³ In Gen 1:9, 4QGen^k has the sequence וְתִרְאֶה הַיַּבְשָׁה (Ulrich 2010, 3). Nothing else is preserved, but Ulrich assumes that the form is a *wayyiqtol* and that this ms. contained more text than the MT (cf. LXX). However, since the preceding part of the text has not been preserved, this might be the MT *weyiqtol* with the expected shortened form.

³⁴ Some of these first person forms have no final *heh* in the Samaritan Pentateuch (Gen 12:3; 18:5; 19:5; 22:5b; 24:57; 27:4, 25; 29:21; 32:10; 34:12; 45:18; 46:31b; 47:16; Exod 8:4b; 9:28; 24:12;). Gen 29:27 also lacks the final *heh* in the Samaritan text. However, the form is 1s, while the MT has a 1p – unless the MT וְתִגִּיד is a *nif. weqatal* 3sf (in which case, however, the following וְתִגִּיד is unexpected).

³⁵ The intervening simple *yiqtol* is in a relative clause.

³⁶ וְתִגִּיד. It might make more sense to read the *w*+imperative as a *weqatal*. The preceding forms are *weyiqtol*s.

³⁷ A relative clause intervenes between the imperative and the *weyiqtol*.

³⁸ A nominal clause intervenes between the imperative and the *weyiqtol*.

Appendices

After a jussive (formally marked or initial)	Gen 1:6, 9; 9:27a; 18:30, 32; 26:28; 27:29a, 31, 41; 41:33, 34; ³⁹ Exod 5:9, 21; 15:17 (?).
After a cohortative	Gen 1:26; 11:3, 4, 7; 18:21; 19:20, 32a; 22:5a; 24:57; 33:12a; 34:23; 43:4; 45:28; 46:31a; 49:7 (?); 50:5a; Exod 3:3, 18; 4:18a; 5:3; 18:19 (?); 24:7.
After another <i>weyiqtol</i>	Gen 9:27b; 12:2b, 2c; 17:2b; 19:32b; 22:5b; 27:7b; 28:3b; 30:3b; 33:12b; 34:21b; 35:3b, 3c; 37:20b; 41:35b; 43:8b, 8c; 46:31b; 48:16b; 50:5b; Exod 4:18b; 8:4b, 4c; 10:12b, 21b; 14:2b, 17b; 32:10b, 10c.

In some cases (approx. 13), the general context is clearly volitive, even though the preceding verb is not a volitive form:

Gen 9:26	Follows a הָרַחֵם -clause.
Gen 28:3a	The preceding <i>yiqtol</i> does not have a short form and the focused subject overrules the initial position. However, the content is clearly a prayer/blessing.
Gen 28:4	Belongs to the same sequence as the <i>weyiqtol</i> in v. 3 above though the preceding verb is a <i>weqatal</i> .
Gen 34:21	After a descriptive nominal sentence. The whole context suggests a volitive reading. Note that LXX and the Samaritans have no <i>waw</i> .
Gen 37:20c	Disregarding the intervening quotation, the preceding verb is a <i>weqatal</i> . The verbs preceding the <i>weqatal</i> , however, are <i>weyiqtol</i> s and an imperative, and the context is clearly volitive. On the <i>weqatal</i> , see 6.2.3.
Gen 41:35a	Though the preceding verb is a <i>weqatal</i> , there are other volitive forms in the vicinity and the context clearly allows a volitive reading.
Gen 48:16a	Similar to 28:3a.
Gen 49:25a and 25b	The syntax of this passage is difficult. The meaning of the verbs ("help" and "bless") indicates a context of prayer or blessing, which would suggest a volitive reading. The LXX has "and" plus aorists.
Exod 2:7	The preceding verb is a <i>weqatal</i> . The context seems to indicate that the volition of the addressee is asked for (Joosten 2012a, 275). Yet, a non-volitive reading makes sense as well (appendix 47).
Exod 15:2a and 2b	After nominal clauses. The context of praise seems to suggest a cohortative interpretation.
Exod 27:20	The preceding verb is a non-initial <i>yiqtol</i> . The lexical content of this word is "command" (הִצַּוָּה). Hence, a following volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> makes sense (cf. Joosten 2012a 141). ⁴⁰

In sum, in the overwhelming majority of cases, *weyiqtol* in Genesis and Exodus seems to be volitive (but see 6.2.3).

³⁹ Initial, but long (הִצַּוָּה). The Samaritans have שָׁעַר .

⁴⁰ According to Niccacci (1987, 10), the preceding *yiqtol* does have jussive value because the parallel text in Lev 24:2 has an imperative instead of *yiqtol*. However, such arguments from the semantic equivalence of different verb forms in parallel passages are not convincing.

Appendix 19

On the alleged aspectual distinction marked by word order in participial clauses

According to Joosten (1989; 2012a, 29–31, 56–59, and 230–257), word order in participial clauses marks an aspectual opposition. The order subject plus PTC ("Su-Ptcp") indicates an event in actual progress (imperfective aspect), while the opposite order ("Ptcp-Su") presents the situation as a complete whole (perfective aspect). He uses the terms "actual present" (for Su-Ptcp) vs. "factual present" (Ptcp-Su). Joosten (2012a, 231) admits that "the semantic distinction referred to is subtle." In addition, various factors such as the lexical meaning of the verb and subject fronting may "void" the nuance between "actual" and "factual" (ib., 236–239). The relatively rare "factual" order only marks the perfective aspectual meaning sometimes (ib., 248). Yet, he maintains that the distinction is clear to see in most cases (ib., 231).⁴¹

Some of Joosten's examples do seem to support his thesis – at first glance, at least. E.g., the PTC in 2 Sam 18:27 seems to indicate actual, ongoing present (אָנִי רֹאֶה אֶת־מְרוֹצֵת הָרֵאשׁוֹן), which cannot be the case with the opposite order in Gen 31:5 (רֹאֶה אֶנְכִי אֶת־פְּנֵי אַבְיָכֶן כִּי־אֵינְנוּ אֵלַי כְּתַמְלֵל שְׁלֹשָׁם). Jacob is speaking to Leah and Rachel without their father being present; hence, the seeing is not actually ongoing. However, in several cases, the alleged distinction is problematic. In other instances, the distinction seems possible, but ultimately unprovable.

Some Ptcp-Su clauses are clearly ongoing and indicate "actual present": Exod 36:5 (מְרַבִּים הָעֵם לְהִבְיֵא); 2 Sam 20:17 (שָׁמַע אֶנְכִי); Isa 33:9 (וְנִעַר בְּשֹׁן); 46:1 (קָרַס נָבוּ); Jer 4:19 (הִמָּה־לִּי לְבִי), 29 (קִשַׁת בְּרַחַת כָּל־); 38:26 (מִפִּיל־אֲנִי תַחֲנִיתִי);⁴² Job 6:4 (אֲשֶׁר חִמַּמְתֶּם שְׁתֵּה רוּחִי).

⁴¹ According to Joosten (1989, 131, n. 10), there are about 110 cases of Ptcp-Su and about four times as many Su-Ptcp (excluding "circumstantial clauses"). He presents a list of the 110 cases (ib., 158). Cf. 2012a, 231 (140 Ptcp-Su, about eight times as many Su-Ptcp; these numbers are extrapolated from the figures for Genesis). Note that if the alleged semantic distinction existed it must have been for a rather short period only. It was clearly a Hebrew innovation and, according to Joosten (2012a, 234, n. 18), "[i]n LBH, the facts are not clear-cut, but in Qumran Hebrew the two sequences manifestly function according to different rules from those in CBH."

⁴² According to Joosten (2012a, 255), the sequence Ptcp-Su in Jer 38:26 is an expression of the "immediate past" in which the "continuing relevance of the situation" is stressed. This seems like a way to explain away a passage that does not fit the theory. His translation is quite correct ("I was presenting my plea"), but this is simply durative, ongoing action relative to the past context. The same applies to the other cases that Joosten notes as belonging to the same type (Exod 36:5; Isa 33:9; 46:1; Job 6:4). They all seem to refer to ongoing action in spite of being Ptcp-Su.

Often, the alleged distinction between "fact" and ongoingness is very vague. A "fact" may be ongoing and an ongoing event may be a "fact" (e.g. 2 Sam 15:19, וַגַּם־גִּלְיָה אֶתָּה לְמִקְוָמָךְ). In contrast, some clauses with Su-Ptcp seem to indicate not "actual" ongoing present tense, but rather a "factual" present (as in Gen 31:5 above), e.g.: Gen 25:32 (הִנֵּה אֲנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ לְמוֹת); Josh 5:14 (מָה אֲדֹנָי מְדַבֵּר אֵלַי־עַבְדּוֹ); Jer 38:19 (אֲנִי לֹא אֶת־הַיְהוּדִים); Neh 2:17 (אֲתֶם רֹאִים הָרֶעָה) (אֲשֶׁר אֲנִיחֶנּוּ בָּהּ).

Joosten introduces an "extended present" use of Su-Ptcp (e.g. Judg 18:3, וַמָּה־אֶתָּה עֹשֶׂה), as opposed to the "actual present" (Judg 18:18, מָה אֲתֶם עֹשִׂים). This usage seems to be very close to the "factual" Ptcp-Su, as Joosten acknowledges, though he maintains that "[p]resumably, each syntagm implied a distinct nuance to speakers of biblical Hebrew, but for modern readers it is hard to capture this nuance in every case" (Joosten 2012a, 243). The attempt to impose the theory on the material leads to some far-fetched claims. On Ps 19:2 (הַשָּׁמַיִם מְסַפְּרִים כְּבוֹד־אֵל וּמַעֲשֵׂה יְדָיו מְגִיד הַרְקִיעַ), Joosten states that "the first clause would seem to insist more on the actual ongoing nature of the process, the second clause more on its eternal veracity" (ib., 256). There seems to be nothing to back up this claim, except for the thesis itself. Since we are not native speakers, we are in no position to evaluate such subtle distinctions.⁴³

Appendix 20

Volitive *yiqtol* in the ancient inscriptions

יִרָא in Lach 6:1–2 (יִרָא יְהוָה אֶת אֲדֹנָי אֶת הַעֵת הַזֶּה שְׁלֹם) seems to be the only *yiqtol* in the corpus that is formally marked as a jussive. The verb is in initial position and seems to indicate a wish ("may Yahweh cause my lord to see..."). The remaining *yiqtol*s cannot distinguish formally between jussive and "long" *yiqtol*. There are no internal *matres*. Thus, the form הִרְכַּב in Arad 1:6–7 is probably a *hif.* but the lack of internal *yod* does not necessarily indicate that it is a short form. Practically all *yiqtol*s follow the classical rule with regard to position.

The following forms arguably occur in initial position. Most are from greetings in letters or similar contexts where a blessing would seem to be appropriate and hence a jussive meaning expected:

⁴³ Some cases of Ptcp-Su in Joosten's list are from acrostic psalms. Here the constraints of the poetic format make it even more difficult to argue that the order of elements plays a semantic role. This includes the very first example of the allegedly "factual present" in his first article on the question, viz. Ps 34:8 (Joosten 1989, 130). The occurrences in acrostic psalms are Ps 34:8, 23; 37:18; 119:162; 145:20.

Appendices

KHin 1:14–15 (and KHin 2:5)	יברך יהוה
KHin 1:16–17 (and KHin 2:8)	[י]אר יהוה
KAjr 19:7–8	יברך
Lach 2:1 (also 3:2; 5:1; 9:1)	ישמע יהוה את אדני שמעת שלם
Lach 2:5	יבכר יהוה את א[]י דבר
Lach 4:1 (similarly 8:1)	ישמע יהוה [את] אדני עת כים שמעת טב
Lach 5:7	יראך יהוה הקצור בטב הים
Lach 6:1	ירא יהוה את אדני את העת הזה שלם
MHsh 1:1	ישמע אדני השר את דבר עבדה

The verb *ישאל* in Arad 18:2–3 might be an exception (יהוה ישאל לשלמך). The context seems to be comparable to other blessings at the beginning of letters (Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 38, "May YHWH seek your welfare") but the subject precedes the verb. Either this is a violation of the positional rule – which is not a grave offence, of course, since the initial position of the verb may be overruled by the need to focus on another element of the clause – or we might say that *ישאל* is not a jussive but rather a future tense prediction ("Yahweh will seek your welfare"). In either case, the passage stands out in comparison with the greetings in the other letters.

In addition to this case, some scholars treat *yiqtols* in a way that casts more doubt on the validity of the classical rule in the inscriptions. E.g., Renz (1995, 355) argues that the *yiqtols* in Arad 1 (lines 6–7, תרכב, and 10, תתן) and 18 (line 6, תתן) are jussives (Schüle 2000, 115–116, interprets them in the same way). Both passages express commands, and the preceding verb forms are imperatives in both cases (in Arad 1 the first verb, נתן, is an absolute infinitive used in place of an imperative and the following one, וכתב, might be interpreted as an imperative or another absolute infinitive). However, there seems to be no reason to assume that the *yiqtols* have explicit jussive meaning. All the forms are second person and if direct volition were intended, we would expect imperatives rather than jussives. In contexts of command, the inscriptions use imperatives (and absolute infinitive), *weqatals* and simple *yiqtols*. The difference between the imperative on the one hand and *weqatal* and *yiqtol* on the other hand seems to be one of degree of direct volition, while the choice between *weqatal* and *yiqtol* has to do with the presence of other material that needs to be focused. If a focused object or something similar is placed first, *weqatal* cannot be used, and we get the sequence *w+X+yiqtol*. Imperatives, too, are more or less consistently used

in initial position in the inscriptions (with the exception of Arad 4:3). For biblical examples of clearly long *yiqtol*s following an imperative and interchanging with *weqatal*, see, e.g., Gen 6:14 (עֲשֵׂה לָךְ תֵּבַת עֲצֵי-גֹפֶר קִנִּים תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָהּ) or Num 10:2 (עֲשֵׂה לָךְ שְׁתֵּי חֲצוּצֹת כֶּסֶף מִקְשָׁה (תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם וְהָיוּ לָךְ לְמִקְרָא הַעֲדָה וּלְמַסַּע אֶת-הַמַּחֲנֹת).

Thus, the material does seem to be interpretable in a way that is consistent with the classical rules – non-initial *yiqtol* is ordinary non-anterior *yiqtol*, while initial *yiqtol* is volitive/jussive.

Appendix 21

Non-anterior *weqatal* in the inscriptions (clear cases)

Arad 2:5–6	והסבת	The passage begins with an absolute infinitive used instead of an imperative (2:1, נתן). In 4–5, the sequence ומלא may be a <i>w</i> +imperative, a <i>w</i> +absolute infinitive, or a noun (see the discussion in Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 14). After the <i>weqatal</i> comes a negated jussive (ואל תאחר).
Arad 2:7–8	ונתת	This is the apodosis to a conditional nominal clause (ואם עוד חמץ ונתת להם), following the passage described above.
Arad 3:8	ולקחת	The preceding verb is <i>w</i> +imperative (3:6–7, וספר). In line 5, the verb may be read as a <i>weqatal</i> or a <i>w</i> +imperative (וצרר or וצורת), see Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 17).
Arad 7:5–6	[ו]כתבתה	The <i>waw</i> is reconstructed but a simple <i>qatal</i> makes no sense. The preceding lines contain an imperatival absolute infinitive (7:2, נתן) followed by adverbs and the object.
Arad 17:3–4	ולקחת	The preceding and following verbs are (<i>w</i> +imperatives (17:1–2, בא; 4–5, ושלה; 5–6, וחתם) or, alternatively, absolute infinitives.
Arad 24 Rev:2	ושלחתם	The preceding passage is very fragmentary. The verb probably indicates a command like the other cases of <i>weqatal</i> above, cf. the mention of דבר המלך in line 6, translated by Dobbs-Allsopp et al. (2005, 49) as "And the command of the king is with you as a matter of your life."
Arad 24 Rev:3–4	והפקידם	In contrast to the other cases, which are all 2sm or 2pm, this is a 3sm. The form may function as a simple future type of non-anteriority whereas the second person forms seem to have a higher degree of context-induced modal meaning.

Appendix 22**Wayyiqtol in the inscriptions (clear cases)**

Lach 4:6–7	וסמכיהו לקחה שמעיהו ויעלהו העירה
MHsh 1:4 and 1:5	עבדך קצֹר היה עבדך בחצֹל אסם ויקצר עבדך ויכל ...
MHsh 1:7 and 1:8	ויבא הושעיהו בן שבי ויקח את בגד עבדך
Silm 4	ובים הנקבה הכו החצבם אש לקרת רעו גרזן על [ג]רזן וילכו המים מן המוצא אל הברכה במאתים ואלף אמה

Appendix 23**"Epistolary" and/or "performative perfect" in the inscriptions**

Arad 16:1 and 16: 2–3	אחך חנניהו שלח לשלם אלישב ולשלם ביתך ברכתך ליהוה
Arad 21:1 and 21:2	בנך יהוכל שלח לשלם גדליהו [בן] אליאר ולשלם ביתך ברכתך ל[יהו]ה
Arad 24 Rev.:7	הנה שלחתי להעיד בכם ...
Arad 40:2, 40:3, and 40:4	בנכם גמר[יהו] ונחמיהו שלח[ו] לשלם [מלכיהו ברכתך ליהו]ה ועת הטֹה [ע]בדך [ל]בֹה ...
KAjr 18:1 (2x)	אמר א [] ... ברכת אתכם ליהוה שמרן ולאשרתה
KAjr 19:1 and 19:5	[א]מר אמריו ... ברכתך ל[י]הוה תמֹן ולאשרתה
Lach 3:1	עבדך הושעיהו שלח להג[ד] ל[אד]ני ...
Lach 3 Rev:5 (?)	שלחה עבדך אל אדני
Lach 5:6 (?)	השב עבדך הספרם אל אדני
Mur 1A:1 (2x)	אמר [] יהו לך [ש]לח שלחת את שלם ביתך

Appendix 24

Stative *qatal* in the inscriptions⁴⁴

In a clearly present context:	
Arad 40:9	והנה ידעתה []
MHsh 1:11	[כל] אחי יענו לי אמן נקתי מא[שם]

In a possibly present context:	
Lach 2:4	כי זכר אדני את [ע]בדה
	Or "ordinary" present perfect?
Lach 2:6	... דבר אשר לא ידעתה
	Or simple past?
Lach 3:8	לא ידעתה קרא ספר
	Either "you do not know how to read a letter," or (Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 309): "You did not understand it. Call a scribe!"
Silm 1	וזה היה דבר הנקבה
	Or simple past?

Appendix 25

Other non-simple past *qatals* in the inscriptions

Lach 3:12	וגם כל ספר אשר יבא אלי אם קראתי אתה וא[ה]ר אתננהו אל מאומ[ה]
	<i>קראתי</i> indicates future perfect or present perfect, in a conditional clause.
Lach 6:13 and 6:14	[מ]אז קרא עבדך א[ת] הספרם ל[א] היה לעב[דך] [] ...
	One or both of these <i>qatals</i> may indicate inclusive present perfect (English usage prefers present perfect for היה, German for קרא; cf. Dobbs-Allsopp et al. 2005, 323, vs. Renz 1995, 427).
MHsh 1:6 and 1:8	כאשר כל[ע]בדך את קצר ... כאשר כלת את קצרי ...
	Both cases seem to indicate past perfect.

⁴⁴ Note that depending on the interpretation of the passage in MHsh 1:2–4, היה might have present stative meaning, see 3.8.

Appendix 26

Stative present *qatal* in QH

These are some of the most probable cases:

1Q27 fr. 1 i 3 (ידעו and התבוננו), 4 (ידעו), 9 (שנאו), 10 (חפץ);⁴⁵ fr. 1 ii 11 (ידע); 1QS 2:26 (געלה); 3:26 (אהב); 4:1 (שנא and תעב); 5:19 (ידעו); 1QM 10:16 (ידעו); 18:10 (ידעתה); 1QH^a 4:36 (שנאתה and אהבתה); 5:35 (ידעתי); 4Q185 fr. 1–2 ii 15 (ידעתי); CD 2:3 (אהב), 15 (שנא and רצה); 5:12 (נכונו); 4Q266 fr. 11 7 (געלה); 4Q372 fr. 1 31 (ידעת[י]); 4Q381 fr. 31 5 (לבו and ידעתם); fr. 45 3 (בטחתי); 4Q385 fr. 2 2 (אהבו)?; 4Q394 fr. 8 iv 4 (י[לע]); 4Q398 fr. 14–17 ii 3 (חשבנו); 4Q416 fr. 2 iii 5 (ידעתה); 4Q443 fr. 2 8 (הבינותי); 4Q491 fr. 11 i 13 (ישבתי), 15 (נחשב); 4Q504 fr. 4 5 (ידענו); 5Q506 fr. 131–132 10 (ידענו); 4Q508 fr. 2 4 (ידעתה); 4Q511 fr. 18 ii 7 (שנתי); 11QPs^a 19:12 (אהבתי), 22:2 (אהבתיך).

Appendix 27

Qatal with (relatively) clear present relevance (present perfect) in QH

1Q27 fr. 1 i 11 and 12	מי גוי אשר לוא עשק רעה[ו] איפה עם אשר לוא גזל הו[ו]
	The meaning seems to be "who has never" done like this.
1QS 1:24–25	נעוינו פִּשְׁעֵנוּ[חט] אֲנוּ הרשענו
	The present relevance of the confession seems clear.
1QS 2:1	ורחמי חסדו גִּמַּל עלינו מעולם ועד עולם
	Inclusive present perfect (with מעולם ועד עולם)?
1QS 5:11 (?)	החשבו ... בקשו ... דרשהו
1QS 5:18 (?)	... נחשבו ...
1QS 9:9 (?)	... אשר לוא הזכו דרכם ...
1Q28b V 27	כיא אל הקימכה לשבט למושלים לפ[ניכה]
1QM 1:12	ובכול צרותמה לוא נהיתה כמוה
1QM 18:7	הגדלתה עם עמל[ה] להפליא וברייתה שמרתה לנו מאז ושערי ישועות פתחתה לנו פעמים רבות למע[ן] בְּרִיתכה
	Note the use of מאז and פעמים רבות to indicate what God has done repeatedly up until the present time.
1QM 18:10	ומאז לוא נהיתה כמוהה ... והיום הופיע לנו כוח[כה]
	The first case with מאז indicates that "something like this" has never happened before. The second case with היום clearly signifies present reference.
1QH ^a 12:9 (?)	נמאסתי
4Q200 fr. 4 6	כבר ספרתי לך א[י] כִּלְהָ עֲזָבְתִּים
	Note the adverb כבר.

⁴⁵ Note the *yiqtol* from the same root in the following line.

Appendices

CD 2:3	חכמה ותושייה הציב לפניו
CD 2:17	כי רבים תעו במ וגבורי חיל נכשלו במ מלפנים ועד הנה
	Inclusive present perfect, marked by הנה. מלפנים ועד הנה.
CD 3:19	... בית נאמן בישראל אשר לא עמד כמהו למלפנים ועד הנה
	Inclusive present perfect with הנה. למלפנים ועד הנה.
CD 19:3	כסרך הארץ אשר היה מקדם
	Inclusive present perfect, marked by מקדם.
4Q377 fr. 2 ii:12	אשר לוא נבִּלְאוּ {ל} מעולם ולעֹד
4Q385 fr. 2 2 (?)	ראיתי רבים מישראל אשר ...
4Q386 fr. 1 ii 2	ראיתי יהוה והנה חרבה
4Q389 fr. 8 ii 4	על כן הסתרתי פני מ[הם עד] אשר ישלימו עונם
	The following אשר ישלימו [עד] seems to suggest a present perfect interpretation of הסתרתי, "I have hidden." Alternatively, the <i>qatal</i> may have simple past reference, in which case the <i>yiqtol</i> could be a future in the past. In either case, the point is that the verb forms occur in any temporal frame, i.e., they are not absolute tenses.
4Q394 fr. 8 iv 2–3	על החרשים שלוא שמעו חוק ... ולוא [ש]מעו משפטי ישראל ... שלוא רֵאָה ולוא שמע ...
	The focus is on the present result of not having heard/seen (the same passage occurs in 4Q396 II 3–5).
4Q418 fr. 81+81a 6	ובאמונתִי הלך תמיד]
	הלך is probably an imperative <i>pi</i> . However, if we read the possessive suffixes in the vicinity as <i>waws</i> (=3sm), the form might be a <i>qatal</i> 3sm. With the following תמיד it would indicate an inclusive present perfect, "he has always walked in his faithfulness." However, the editors of the text find this unlikely (Strugnell and Harrington 1999, 306).
4Q434 fr. 1 i 1ff.	כי הציל נפש אביון ...
	הציל and several other <i>qatals</i> and <i>wayyiqtols</i> in the following lines seem to refer to the present result of past events.
4Q491 fr. 8–10 i 8	ועתה הקימות[ה] נופלים בעוז[כה] ורמי קומה תגדע ל[השפילם]
	The preceding ועתה and the following <i>yiqtol</i> seem to indicate present reference (note that the corresponding passage in 1QM 14:10 has ואתה instead of ועתה).
4Q504 fr. 1-2r vi 5	ועתה כיום הזה אשר נכנע לבנו ...
	נכנע seems to indicate present reference. However, נכנע might be a PTC.
4Q509 fr. 7 3	כִּי מעולם שנאתה
	Inclusive present perfect, preceded by כִּי מעולם.
4Q511 fr. 63–64 iii 1	אני תרנן לשוני צדקכה כיא פתחתה ובשפתי שמתה מקור תהלה
	The <i>qatals</i> in the כיא-clause explain the present state of affairs.

Appendices

4Q514 fr. 1 i 4 (also line 7)	אשר לא החל לטהור ממק[ר]י
	A relative clause indicating anteriority in relation to a preceding clause with a negated jussive, i.e. present (or future) perfect.
4Q521 fr. 2 ii+4 11	ונכבדות שלוא היו יעשה אדני
4Q525 fr. 2 ii+3 3	אשרי אדם השיג חוכמה
11QPs ^a 19:12, 13, 16	... חסיתי ... נסמכתי ... קויתי
	כול היום might be a stative present, especially if the following belongs with this clause. As argued in the main text, stative present and present perfect belong to the same general anterior category in Hebrew.
11QPs ^a 21:13	דרכה רגלי במישור כי מנעורי ידעתיה
	Inclusive present perfect with מנעורי.
11QPs ^a 24:3	יהוה קראתי אליכה הקשיבה אלי פרשתי כפי למעון קודשכה הט אוזנכה ותן לי את שאלתי
	The shifts to imperatives indicate that the <i>qatal</i> s have present relevance.

Appendix 28

Future perfect *qatal* in QH⁴⁶

The following list contains references to some of the most convincing occurrences of *qatal* in a future context. For the ones with "?" the future reference is less clear. Several refer to general/conditional situations outside of conditional clauses. Often, an occurrence might as well have been included in the list in appendix 27. Recall that the point is merely to show that QH *qatal* is not an absolute tense form but designates anteriority in any time frame.

1QpHab 5:5 (שמרו); 1QS 10:20 (הכין); 4Q159 fr. 2–4 6 (עשה); CD 4:12 (נבנתה and רחק); 9:7 (הקים and ענה); in the apodosis of a conditional clause), 11 (גנבו and גנב); 12:11 (באו); 15:14 (שגה)?; CD 20:34 (חסו)?; 4Q266 fr. 5 ii 2 (פצל)?; fr. 6 i 4 (נוסף), 6 (באה); 4Q267 fr. 5 iii 4 (פצל); 4Q270 fr. 6 iii 15 (הקים); fr. 6 iv 14 (מלאו)?; fr. 7 i 12 (לקחו); 4Q271 fr. 3 9 (הוכן); 4Q271 fr. 3 12 (נשכבה and התארמלה); 4Q272 fr. 1 i 7 (צמח), 12 (נוסף); fr. 1 ii 1 (נמלא); 4Q273 fr. 4 ii 4 (נרפא and צמח), 11 (באה); 4Q274 fr. 2 i 6 (השיגה), 7 (נגעה); 4Q276 fr. 1 1 (שרת)?; 4Q299 fr. 8 5 (ידע and שמע; introduced by בלוא);⁴⁷ 4Q284 fr. 2 i 2

⁴⁶ See also the discussion of the supposedly absolute future use of *qatal* in the Hodayot in 2.1 (and appendix 1).

⁴⁷ The first verb could be a stative present. The use of a potentially stative present *qatal* in conjunction with a non-stative verb illustrates the fact that there is no fundamental

(נגע)?; 4Q284a fr. 1 6 (הוב[א]?)?; 4Q376 fr. 1 ii 2 (נעלה; with ואחר, "and after X has been lifted");⁴⁸ 4Q390 fr. 2 i 7 (קצפת[י]?)?; 4Q416 fr. 1 11 (התגללו)?; fr. 2 iv 6 (הסיג); 4Q417 fr. 1 ii 14 (צוה; with בלוא)?; fr. 2 ii+23 2 (פתח)?; 4Q492 f 1 9 (נפלו; same in line 10); 4Q511 fr. 1 7 (הופיע)?; 11Q14 fr. 1 ii 13 (שבתה); 11QT^a 15:15 (מלא)?;⁴⁹ 16:15 (עשה); 17:2 (כופר); 24:11 (עשה); 26:5 (על[ה]); 35:6 (מלא); 40:6 (נולד[ו]); 49:21 (הטמא); 53:10 (הקדשתה and נדרתה), 13–14 (נדרתה x2).

Appendix 29

Past perfect *qatal* in QH

Some probable cases: 1QM 11:2 (בטח);⁵⁰ 14:3 (סדרו); 4Q166 II 4 (שלח); 4Q175 I 21 (כלה); 4Q200 fr. 4 2 (נשבע); 4Q200 fr. 6 3 (נראה); 4Q215 fr. 1–3 4 (נולדה); 4Q252 II 5 (עשה = Gen 9:24), 7 (ברך); IV 6 (שכב); 4Q265 fr. 7 12–13 (הובא and הובאה); CD 1:10 (דרשוהו), 12 (עשה), 16 (גבלו); 3:13 (נותרו), 14 (תעו); 5:2 (קרא), 3 (נפתח); 4Q379 fr. 22 ii 7 (כ[ל]ה); 4Q385a fr. 18 i a–b 8 (צוה), 10 (עשו); 4Q463 fr. 1 1 (אמר); 11QPs^a 19:10 (מכרוני); 21:11 (תעיה); with במטרם); 27:11 (נתן); 28:13 (משח; with משי).

Note also the irrealis use of *qatal* in CD 2:20 (ויהיו כלא היו).

Appendix 30

Qatal in conditional clauses in QH

1QS 7:1 (קלל), 2 (דבר), 3 (דבר); 8:26 (שגג); 4Q159 fr. 2–4 9 (ענה and כחש); 4Q258 VII 1 (הלך); 4Q265 fr. 4 ii 4 (נפל); CD 9:16 (נמצא); 15:4 (עבר); 4Q266 fr. 6 ii 2 (ראתה), 12 (השיגה); 4Q270 fr. 6 iii 14 (דבר); 4Q274 fr. 1 i 5 (נגעה); fr. 2 i 8 (נגע); 4Q278 fr. 1 5 (נגע); 4Q415 fr. 11 11 (נפרזה); 4Q416 fr. 2 iii 6 (שמו); 4Q525 fr. 14 ii 14 (נספיתה); 11QT^a 57:18 (מתה); 58:6 (בא; might be a PTC), 11 (נצחו).

difference – they both indicate anteriority. The type with בלוא occurs several times among the alleged cases of absolute future *qatal* in Hodayot discussed in 2.1 and appendix 1.

⁴⁸ Less likely, the form could be a *yiqtol* 1p ("and afterwards we will go up").

⁴⁹ García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:1236–1237) reconstruct a *weqatal*, translating "he shall consecrate....," instead of Yadin's מלא [אשר, "who has been ordained..." (Yadin 1983, 2: 65).

⁵⁰ This passage (ואת גולית הגתי איש גבור חיל הסגרתה ביד דויד עבדכה כיא בטח בשמכה הגדול ולוא) illustrates the fact that *qatal* covers all types of anteriority. We might interpret the verb as a stative simple past ("he trusted in") or a fientive past perfect ("he had put his trust in") – and in a present context, a stative present interpretation or a fientive present perfect may be possible. The HVS makes no such distinctions.

Note also *qatals* with **כִּי־אִם** ("unless"): 1QS 5:14 (שבו); 1QH^a 20:36 (השכלתני and פתחתה), 37 (הכינזות[ה]); CD 5:15 (נלחץ); 10:23 (היה); 11:4 (כובסו); 12:13 (נקרעו); 13:15 (הוֹדִיעַ); 4Q269 fr. 8 ii 4 (הוֹזו); also 4Q271 fr. 2 11); 4Q274 fr. 1 i 7 (טהרה).

Appendix 31

Relative tense usage of *yiqtol* and *weqatal* in QH

In 4Q377 fr. 2 ii 11 (וכמלאך ידבר מפיהו), the *yiqtol* rather clearly indicates habitual or iterative action in the past. The same meaning may be attributable to the *weqatal* in 11QPs^a 21:11 (אני נער בטרם תעיתי ובקשתיה). However, see 6.2.2 and appendix 45 for further remarks on this and other potential habitual, iterative, durative *weqatals* in QH. The *yiqtol* in 11QPs^a 21:12 (באה לי) may be habitual/durative as well or indicate a shift to future reference. There are several *yiqtol*s in the following lines, which may or may not be interpreted as referring to habitual, durative, or possibly prospective events in the past. However, future reference seems to be possible, too (see the discussion in Van Peursen 2004, 116–119).

In 4Q385a fr. 18 i a–b 7 (ויצום את אשר יעשו בארץ שביא[ם]), the *yiqtol* probably indicates future/modality in a past context. In line 9, the *weqatal* (וְשָׁמְרוּ) seems to continue the same line of thought (cf. Dimant 2001, 160: "And he commanded them what they should do" and "and they should keep").

In 4Q385 fr. 6 7, according to various translations, the *yiqtol* (תֵּלֵךְ) refers to habitual/iterative or durative action in the past,⁵¹ and the same seems to apply to the *weqatals* in lines 10 and 12.⁵² The text is clearly dependent on Ezek 1, where other *yiqtol*s refer to habitual or durative action in the past. However, in both texts, the verbs might be describing a general fact (how the creatures always move/will move, rather than how they were moving when Ezekiel saw them).

In 4Q422 III 9, there are two *yiqtol*s in a past context (יִרְאֶה and יִשִּׁית). The latter clearly indicates some sort of modality or habituality in the past ("so that a man would/could not see"), while the former seems to refer to action contemporaneous with the preceding *qatal*. Habitual or iterative action seems to be out of the question. Alternatively, it could be seen as an

⁵¹ Dimant 2001, 44: "upon two (legs) each living creature was walking." García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:769: "walked" (they call the fragment Frag. 4).

⁵² These and other *weqatals* with past reference are very difficult to assess. Are they non-anteriors (indicating habitual events or contemporaneousness) or unclassical anterior *weqatals* (*weqatālti*)? Other examples are 4Q219 I 14 (וְזָרְשׁוּ); 4Q370 fr. 1 i 4 (וּפְצוּ); 4Q372 fr. 1 3 (וְזָבְדוּ); 4Q373 fr. 1a–b 7 (וְעִשִּׂיתִי). See 6.2.2 and appendix 45 for further discussion.

archaic, simple past use of *yiqtol* (< **yaqtul*),⁵³ or, maybe more likely, an initial *waw* has simply been lost?

Several other cases are more speculative, relying on reconstructed material or presupposing a simple past reading of other verb forms in the vicinity. Thus, 4Q225 fr. 2 ii 8 might include two references to the future in the past (אמצא x2): "And [in all this the Prince of the Mastemah was testing whether] he would be found weak, and whether A[braham] should not be found faithful" (VanderKam and Milik 1994, 151). However, as is evident, the context is heavily reconstructed. The same applies to 4Q227 fr. 2 6 (ישגו): "s]o that the ri[ghteous] should not err" (VanderKam and Milik 1994, 174), with a substantial hole in front of the extant part. Also, even more conjectural, 11Q12 fr. 4 1 (למען ידעו), "so tha]t [the sons of men] would know"; García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude 1998, 213).⁵⁴ Similarly, as noted in 2.1.1, CD 10:10 (ישלימו) might be a future in the past, but such an interpretation is not necessary.

4Q185 fr. 1–2 ii 14 exhibits a rather perplexing use of *yiqtol* (כן תתן in תתן). Allegro's present tense translation (1968, 87) seems odd in connection with "his fathers" ("as she is given to his fathers, so shall he inherit her").⁵⁵ García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 1:381) use the past tense ("as she was given"). If this is true, an iterative/habitual reading is possible.

In 4Q437 fr. 2 i 8, a *yiqtol* is followed by a *qatal* (יעטף רוחי בצר לי שמעתה) (קולי), which is rendered as a past concomitant action by Weinfeld and Seely (1999, 313), introduced by a reconstructed כיה: "When] my spirit was fainting away [be]fo[re me] in my affliction you heard my voice" (Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:917: "my spirit would faint"). In line 10 of the same fragment two additional *yiqtol*s in פן-clauses (אטבע and שוטפני) following a *qatal* might indicate future/modality in the past.⁵⁶ However, the preceding *qatal* might have present reference (present perfect). Hence, the *yiqtol*s might have present reference as well. This type of ambiguity is very widespread. Since Hebrew never marks absolute time reference by means of explicit verb forms, the anterior forms always potentially function as present perfects as well as simple past (from a translational point of view). Hence,

⁵³ Elgvin and Tov 1994, 431: "He plac[ed dark]ness." They do not refer specifically to the verb form.

⁵⁴ If the reconstructed text is correct, the reference might be to the general present/future in relation to S rather than an expression of future or modality in the past.

⁵⁵ Note that if the verb is passive, it must be a *hof*.

⁵⁶ Weinfeld and Seely 1999, 313: "you delivered me lest I drown [...] lest [it] sweep over me." The reference of the English verbs is not clear. The same applies to the rendering in García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:917: "you saved me from sinking in it [...] from drowning me."

non-anterior forms are interpretable as referring to the past or the present depending on the interpretation of the anterior forms. This is mainly a problem in poetry and non-narrative prose.

E.g., the *yiqtol* יפחדו in 4Q166 II 6 follows a *qatal* and a *wayyiqtol* (ולמתעיהם שמעו וכבדום וכאלים יפחדו מהם בעורונם). If these are interpreted as simple past they would seem to situate the *yiqtol* in a past context expressing concomitant action (Allegro 1968, 32, "yet they listened to those that misled them, and honoured them, and in their blindness feared them like gods"; cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:331). However, since the function of the passage might be a description of the present conduct of the wicked, a shift from present perfect anterior forms to a non-anterior form with present or future reference makes sense as well ("they have listened"; "and they have honoured"; "they fear/will fear"). Similarly, the *yiqtol* יבוא in 1Q27 fr. 1 i 4 (ולוא ידעו מה אשר יבוא עליהמה ונפשמה לוא מלטו מרז נהיה) is probably a simple future (if the preceding ידעו is a stative present), but it might be a future in the past (if ידעו means "they didn't know"). Other examples include 1QH^a 13:16 (פן יטרפו ... סגרתה); 4Q159 fr. 2–4 3 (לבלתי ימכר) ... ויצו); 4Q268 fr. 1 8 (הסתרתי פני ... [עד] אשר ישלימו עונם); 4Q389 fr. 8 ii 5 (ויבינו ... עד מה יבוא); 11QT^a 59:9 (געלה ... עד יאשמו).

In some contexts, the interpretation of unvocalized *w+yiqtol*s further complicates the matter. Are they *wayyiqtol*s or *weyiqtol*s (see 6.2.4)? If they are *wayyiqtol*s, are they simple past or present perfect? See, e.g., 4Q434 fr. 1 i 12 (ויזחן מלאכו סבין]ב] ... פן ישחיתם) or in the very fragmentary 4Q391 fr. 55 5 (וישאלוני דברים א]ם] ידבר). Sometimes, a simple *yiqtol* is translated as a simple past tense (apparently as a reflex of archaic **yaqtul*), e.g. in 4Q434 fr. 7b 3 (וישם אואביהם כדמן וכאפר ישחקם), which Weinfeld and Seely (1999, 284) render as "And he made their enemies like dung, like dust did he pulverize them." Given the general scarcity of archaic anterior *yiqtol*, this interpretation seems unlikely; the *yiqtol* must refer to durative/concomitant action in the past or to the future, possibly as an explicit volitive (and the preceding *w+yiqtol* could be a volitive *weyiqtol*).

The past reference of several other *yiqtol*s is very dubious. 4Q169 fr. 3–4 i 5 and 7 (יתלה and יכה) could be considered simple past (very unlikely) or (more likely) habitual/iterative in the past, but nothing prevents a future interpretation (cf. Penner 2015, 184ff.). Likewise in 4Q385a fr. 5a–b 8 (יקראו), "who by the name of the God of Is]rael were called" (Dimant 2001, 141). The same verb occurs in 387 fr. 3 5 (ib., 192). Again, the verb might have present/future reference. The same applies to the only two cases of past habitual *yiqtol* noted by Penner (2015, 191, with n. 91): 1QS 4:23 (יריבו) and 24 (יתהלכו).

Note also the case of *yiqtol* after אַז possibly referring to the past in 4Q381 fr. 69 6 (תטהר). The few other cases of אַז in a past context are followed by *qatal* (approx. seven cases: 1Q19 fr. 7 1; 4Q216 V 10; 4Q222 fr. 1 3; 4Q223–224 fr. 2 iv 14; 4Q370 fr. 1 i 2; 11QPs^a 26:12; 28:13 [with אַזי]).

There seem to be no clear cases of טרם with *yiqtol* in a past context, while a few cases of בטרם with *qatal* are found (1QH^a 5:25; 7:27; 9:9; 4Q180 fr. 1 2; fr. 2–4 ii 10; CD A 2:7; 4Q300 fr. 1a ii–b 1). Cf. Kesterson 1984, 7–8.

Appendix 32

PTCs in past context in QH

4Q221 fr. 7 2	מצליה. Very fragmented. Since the genre and content is known (Jub 39:4, based on Gen 39:3 with the same PTC) the interpretation seems clear. Of course, the influence from the biblical text is evident. ⁵⁷
4Q223–224 fr. 2 iv 13	וּלְבָא וּמְדַחֵק. Again very fragmented. The first verb might be a finite form rather than a PTC – a <i>wayyiqtol</i> , a simple <i>qatal</i> , or a <i>weqatal</i> – but the second one is clearly a PTC. Ethiopic Jub 37:24 has a <i>waw</i> with <i>qatala</i> plus 'anza with <i>yəqattal</i> , indicating concomitant action.
4Q223–224 fr. 2 v 2	שׁוֹכֵב. Also very fragmented, but see Ethiopic Jub 39:10.
4Q225 fr. 2 ii 5 and 7	שִׁמְחִים וְאוֹמְרִים and מְלֹאכֵי קוֹדֵשׁ עוֹמְדִים בּוֹכִים.
4Q306 fr. 1 5	וְיִקְצֵף וְהַכְּלָבִים אוֹכְלִים]. This case is quite uncertain and the interpretation of the PTC depends on the reading of the preceding form as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> or <i>weyiqtol</i> . ⁵⁸
4Q379 fr. 12 6	וְהַיּוֹרְדָן מְלֵא מִ[ם] עַל כָּל גְּדוֹתָיו וְשׁוֹטֵף [ב] מִיָּמִינוּ.
11Q12 fr. 9 3].הוא יוצא מן]. The context is heavily reconstructed but the Ethiopic version (Jub 12:28) indicates that the context is past. The PTC seems to have the derived immediate future meaning, "and told him that] he was leaving" (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude 1998, 218; Ethiopic version: VanderKam 1989, 77).

1QS 7:1 (הואה קורה בספר או מברך) may be an additional case. Smith (1999, 315) refers to CD 5:6–7 as "narrative, anterior use" of the PTC, using past tense in his translation. However, this passage probably refers to the present behavior of the ungodly.

⁵⁷ On the Jubilees and pseudo-Jubilees fragments, see VanderKam and Milik 1994. For the Ethiopic text of Jubilees, see VanderKam 1989.

⁵⁸ Lim (2000, 253) takes the *w+yiqtol* as a *weyiqtol*, translating "and he will be stirred to wrath (?) and the dogs eat." García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:671) read והכלבים אוכל, which they translate as "and the dogs, food."

Geiger's skepticism towards PTCs with past reference in QH seems exaggerated (2012, 27 and 484). Though the cases are few, they cannot all be denied (see, e.g., *ib.* 285, n. 301, on 4Q223–224 fr. 2 iv 13).

Appendix 33

PTC with **היה** in QH

- 1Q17 fr. 1 6 (היה הוּלַן[ך]).
 1Q22 fr. 1 iii 9 (ה[י] שטים).
 1QS 1:18–19 (מברכים ... יהיו; in the following lines, 20–24; 2:1–2, 4, 10, there are more PTCs, which may depend on the initial יהיו in 1:18); 5:2 (... להיות להיות), 24 (להיות ... פוקדם).
 1Q28b IV 25–26 (ות[ה]יה ... משרת ... ומפיל).
 1QM 2:1 (תהיינה); 7:12 (יהיה מהלך); 8:1 (יהיו ... בחרים); 6–7 (להיות משרתים); the expression יהיו מריעים occurs in 8:11–12; 9:1, 7; 16:9; 17:15.
 1QH^a 23:10–11 (ל[ה]יות ... מתחזק ... ועומד)?
 2Q20 fr. 1 3 (היו נותנים).
 4Q174 fr. 1–2 i 6 (להיות מקטירים).
 4Q177 fr. 1–4 8 (x2) היה מתאבל).⁵⁹
 4Q200 fr. 2 3 (הי[ה] ז[ל]ן);⁶⁰ fr. 6 2–3 (והיו ... מברכים ... ותומחים).
 4Q221 fr. 5 6 (היה מתאבל); cf. 4Q177).
 4Q225 fr. 2 ii 10 (יהיה אהב)?
 4Q258 I 2 (משיבים ... להיות); II 3 (להיות פוקדים).⁶¹
 4Q365a fr. 2 i 6 (והיו אוכלים).
 4Q385a fr. 18 ii 4 (ויהי ... מקונן).
 4Q390 fr. 2 i 4–5 (יהיו מפרים).
 4Q394 fr. 3–7 i 15–16 (י[ה]יו [מסיא[י]ם]), 19 (יהיה ... מזה).
 4Q421 fr. 11 3 (יהיה חונה).
 4Q471 fr. 1 7 (יהיו מלמדי ח[ר]ב).⁶²
 4Q477 fr. 2 ii 2 (היה מרען)?
 4Q503 fr. 64 5 (להיות מהללים).
 4Q511 fr. 35 4 (והיו ... ומשרתים)?
 11QPs^a 21:14 (עלה היתה)?
 11QT^a 15:15 (יהיה עומד); 31:7 (יהיו באים); 32:10 (יהיו מניחים), 11 (יהיו באים), 14 (יהיו מעלים); 15 (יהיה נוגעים); 33:7 (יהיו מקדשים); 14 (יהיו מעלים); 14 (יהיו מעלים) ... אובדים) ... אובדים);

⁵⁹ The *hitp.* of this root seems to function in an active sense.

⁶⁰ This seems to be an imperative of היה with a PTC. In lines 4 and 6 of the fragment, the same construction is reconstructed: היה עושה (Fitzmyer 1995, 65). Cf. Geiger 2012, 357.

⁶¹ The PTC in 4Q258 VIII 7 (להיות איש מקנא) is probably attributive.

⁶² This is clearly not a predicative active PTC, but García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:950–951) read the passage as ל[מ]ען יהיו מלמדים and translate it as "in order to instruct."

34:7 (יהיו טובחים); 7–11 (זיהיו כונסים); several PTCs in the following lines seem to be dependent on the initial form of היה(?); 35:12 (יהיו מערבים); 37:11 (יהיו), 10 (יהיו אוכלים ושותים), 3 (יהיו אוכלים), 14 (יהיו מבשלים); 38:1 (יהיו אוכלים), 10 (יהיו אוכלים ושותים), 3 (יהיו אוכלים); 40:2 (יהיו אוכלים); 42:15–16 (יהיו עולים ויושבים); 43:5 (יהיו אוכלים), 6 (יהיו אוכלים); 45:3 (יהיו בא), 4 (יהיו מתערבים); 46:7 (יהיו עולים), 9–10 (יהיו באים), 17–18 (יהיו באים), 13 (יהיו יוצאים), 15 (תהיה ... יורדת), 47:8 (יהיו עושים), 12 (יהיו מביאים); 48:13 (תהיו קוברים); 57:10 (יהיו שומרים), 13 (יהיו שומרים); 58:8 (יהיו שומרים); 59:4–5 (יהיו שומרים); the following PTCs may be dependent on the initial והיו as well).⁶³

11QT^b 1:14 (יהיו מקריבים); 10:5 (יהיו מבשלים); 11:23 (יהיו בא).

Appendix 34

Potential "performative" type *qatal*s in late documentary texts

Mur 22:1 (מכר); Mur 29:1 (מכר), 10 (מכר), 18 (כתב); Mur 30:1 (מכר), 10 (מכר), 20 (מכרתי); Mur 42:8–9 (כתבה x2); Mur 46:11 (כתבה); Mur 48:7 (כתבה); Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 44:2 (רצו וחלקו), 28–30 (כתב x3); Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 45:5 (אמר), 7 (החכרנו or החכתי), 14 (אחכרתי), 22 (אחכרתי); Naḥal Ḥever (P. Yadin) 46:2 (אמר), 3 (החכרתי), 4 (חכרתי), 8 (אחכרתום); XHev/Se 49:3 (איתודי),⁶⁴ 14a (כתב).⁶⁵

Appendix 35

Further examples of relative tense usage of *qatal* in RH

m. Šeb. 2:7 and 2:9	Both cases include the expression לְשָׁעֵבֶר, "according to the one [= the year] which has passed."
m. Ter. 1:5	וְלֹא מִמְעַשֵּׂר רֵאשׁוֹן שְׁנֵטְלָה תְרוּמָתוֹ, וְלֹא מִמְעַשֵּׂר שְׁנֵי וְהֶקְדָּשׁ שְׁנֵפְדוּ
m. Ter. 1:10	אֵין תּוֹרְמִין מִדְּבַר שְׁנֵטְלָה מִלְאֲכָתוֹ עַל דְּבַר שְׁלֹא נִגְמְרָה מִלְאֲכָתוֹ
m. Ter. 6:2	תְרוּמָה שְׁלֹא זָכָה בָּהּ פְּהֵן ... תְרוּמָה שְׁזָכָה בָּהּ פְּהֵן
	The <i>qatal</i> s in the two relative clauses are interpretable as past perfects or present perfect (or future perfect), depending on the interpretation/translation of the <i>qatal</i> in the main clauses. Hebrew does not distinguish such types of anteriority.
m. Ter. 8:1	מֵת בְּעֵלְיָהּ אוֹ גְרֵשָׁהּ
	In the context, these verbs (and several more in the preceding lines) clearly have present relevance ("hot news" perfect, "and they said

⁶³ Yadin (1983, 1:34) provides a less comprehensive list of occurrences in 11QT^a.

⁶⁴ The derivational stem is probably due to Aramaic influence, cf. Broshi and Qimron 1994, 290 and 294.

⁶⁵ This verb is not found in the text presented by Broshi and Qimron (1994).

Appendices

	to her: 'Your husband has died!' or 'he has divorced you!"). The passage continues in 8:2 where the verb נטמאת exemplifies the same use of <i>qatal</i> ("they said to him: 'You have become unclean!"). Note that further on in the text the notion "you were unclean" (already at the time when you started eating heave-offering, as opposed to having become unclean while eating) is expressed with an adjective plus היה (טמא היית). The verb form itself (<i>qatal</i>) is the same in both cases, and the latter construction, in another context, might indicate present perfect rather than simple past – but in the context under discussion, the contrasting use of these different constructions seems to be a way for Hebrew to mark the distinction without having access to separate tense forms.
m. Ma ^c as. 1:6	אף על פי שְמַרְח
m. °Or. 1:2	אף על פי שְלֹא כָּבְשׁוּ
'Abot R. Nat. 2 ⁶⁶	שבזמן שאדם נכנס ביניהם מאכילין אותו ומשקין אותו ומלבישין אותו ומכסין אותו ונותנין לו ממון הרבה. כיון שהיה כאחד מהם כל אחד ואחד מכיר את שלו ונוטלו
	Both נכנס (if it is a <i>qatal</i> form and not a PTC, "at the time when a man has entered/enters among them, they feed him etc.") and היה (following כיון ש־, "as soon as he has become as one of them") indicate anteriority in relation to the surrounding PTCs.
'Abot R. Nat. 3 ⁶⁷	והעמיד לה עדים
	Must be past perfect (cf. Goldin, "Now, the man had stationed witnesses to observe her"). The following verb form is another <i>w+qatal</i> (ובא), which must, however, be interpreted as a simple past. A fine illustration of the fact that RH (and Hebrew in general) cannot distinguish these two types of anteriority.
'Abot R. Nat. 6 ⁶⁸	בן ארבעים שנה היה ולא שנה כלום
	Another case of past perfect <i>qatal</i> , "he was forty years old and had not studied anything."

⁶⁶ Schechter 1887, 14; trans. Goldin 1955, 25.

⁶⁷ Schechter 1887, 15; Goldin 1955, 27.

⁶⁸ Schechter 1887, 28; Goldin 1955, 41.

Appendix 36

Further examples of relative tense usage of *yiqtol* in RH⁶⁹

m. Šeb. 9:3	וְלָמָּה אָמְרוּ שְׁלֹשׁ אַרְצוֹת? שְׂיִהְיוּ אוֹכְלִין ...
	יְהִי might refer to a past or general present context.
m. Bik. 3:7	נִמְנְעוּ מִלְהִבִּיא, הִתְקִינוּ שְׂיִהְיוּ מִקְרִין ...
	The same ambiguity as in the preceding example.
m. Ma ^c as. Š. 5:2	כָּרַם רְבָעִי הָיָה עוֹלָה לִירוּשָׁלַם ... וּמִשְׂרָבוּ הַפְּרוֹת, הִתְקִינוּ שְׂיִהְיָ נִפְדָּה ... וּתְנַאי הָיָה הַדָּבָר, שְׂאִימְתִי שְׂיִרְצוּ יִחְזַר הַדָּבָר לְכַמוֹת שְׂהָיָה ... וּתְנַאי הָיָה, אִימְתִי שְׂיִפְנֶה בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ יִחְזַר הַדָּבָר לְכַמוֹת שְׂהָיָה
	In this passage, the past context of the <i>yiqtol</i> s seems clearer than in the preceding examples.
m. Roš Haš. 4:1	מִשְׁחָרַב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הִתְקִין רַבִּן יוֹחָנָן בֶּן זְכַאי, שְׂיִהְיוּ תוֹקְעִין בְּכָל מְקוֹם ...
'Abot R. Nat. 1 ⁷⁰	מִפְנֵי מָה נִתְעַכַּב מֹשֶׁה כָּל שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים וְלֹא שָׂרָה עָלָיו דְּבוּר בְּשִׁבִיל שִׁימְרָק מִכָּל אֲכִילָה וְשִׁתִּיָּה שֶׁהִיָּה בְּמַעֲוֹ עַד שֶׁעָשָׂה שְׁנַתְקַדֵּשׁ וַיְהִי כַּמְלֵאכֵי הַשָּׁרָת. ... כְּדֵי שִׁיִּקְבַּל עָלָיו דְּבַרֵי תוֹרָה בְּאִימָה ...
	"Why was Moses delayed all six days and why didn't the word come to rest on him? In order that he would become clean from all the food and drink which was inside him, until the time that he had become sanctified, and (in order) that he would become like the ministering angels [...] so that he would receive upon him words of Torah with fear [...]."
'Abot R. Nat. 7 ⁷¹	וְלָמָּה עָשָׂה אִיּוֹב ד' פִּתְחִים לְבֵיתוֹ כְּדֵי שֶׁלֹּא יִהְיוּ עֲנִיִּים מִצְטַעְרִים לְהִקְיָף אֶת כָּל הַבַּיִת. הִבָּא מִן הַצָּפוֹן יִכְנַס כְּדַרְכוֹ ...
	"And why did Job make four doors for his house? So that the poor would not have the trouble of going around the entire house: the one coming from the north would enter from his own direction..."
'Abot R. Nat. 7 ⁷²	וְכַשִּׁימְצָא אוֹרְחִין מְכַנִּיסֵן בְּתוֹךְ בֵּיתוֹ
	"and when he [Abraham] found travellers he brought them into his house."

⁶⁹ Some cases of "past posterior"/future in the past use of *yiqtol* in various RH texts are identified by Bar-Asher Siegal (2017, 76, 77, and 79) though he does not really treat the difference between relative and absolute tense in his paper.

⁷⁰ Schechter 1887, 1.

⁷¹ Schechter 1887, 33.

⁷² Schechter 1887, 34.

Appendix 37

Examples of PTCs in past context (without היה) in RH

m. Bik. 3:7	בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה כָּל מִי שֶׁהוּא יוֹדֵעַ לְקֵרוֹת, קוֹרָא, וְכָל מִי שֶׁאֵינוֹ יוֹדֵעַ לְקֵרוֹת, מְקַרֵּין אוֹתוֹ
m. Roš Haš. 4:2	שָׁפֵל עֵיר שֶׁהִיא רוֹאָה וְשׁוֹמֵעַת וּקְרוּבָה וְיִכּוֹלָה לְבֹא – תּוֹקֵעִין
m. °Abod. Zar. 2:6	חֵלֶב שֶׁחֲלָבוּ גוֹי וְאֵין יִשְׂרָאֵל רוֹאֵהוּ ⁷³
m. Soṭah 7:8	עוֹשִׂין לוֹ בֵּימָה ... וְהוּא יוֹשֵׁב עָלֶיהָ ... חֲזוֹן הַכְּנֻסֹת נוֹטֵל סֶפֶר תּוֹרָה וְנוֹתְנָה לְרֵאשׁ הַכְּנֻסֹת ...
m. Tamid 3:7	נֹטֵל אֶת הַמִּפְתָּח וּפֹתַח אֶת הַפֶּשֶׁשׁ, נִכְנָס לְתָא, וּמִן הַתָּא אֵל הַהֵיכָל, עַד שֶׁהוּא מַגִּיעַ לְשַׁעַר הַגְּדוֹל

Appendix 38

Aspect in RH: Simple finite forms vs. the participial construction

In each of the following three examples, the participial construction indicates ongoing, concomitant action ("imperfective"), while the *qatal* marks a single, punctual event ("perfective"):

m. Ber. 2:1	הָיָה קוֹרָא בְּתוֹרָה, וְהִגִּיעַ זְמַן הַמִּקְרָא
m. Ber. 3:5	הָיָה עוֹמֵד בְּתַפְלָה, וְנִזְכָּר שֶׁהוּא בַעַל קָרִי
m. °Erub. 5:4	הָיָה מוֹדֵד וְהִגִּיעַ לְגֵיא אוֹ לְגֵדֵר

Note the contrast between the "perfective" and "imperfective" in the following examples where the same verb occurs in *qatal* and the participial construction.⁷⁴

"Perfective"	"Imperfective"
הִתְפַּלֵּל, וְלֹא יָרְדוּ גְשָׁמִים (m. Ta'an. 3:8)	רַבִּי נְחוּנְיָה בֶן הַקָּנָה הָיָה מִתְפַּלֵּל בְּכַנְיָסוֹ לְבֵית הַמְדְרֵשׁ ... (m. Ber. 4:2)
קָרָא וְלֹא דִקְדַק בְּאוֹתֵי תִיָּה (m. Ber. 2:3)	הָיָה קוֹרָא בְּתוֹרָה ... (m. Ber. 2:1)
הַמוֹכֵר פְּרוֹת לְחֵבְרוֹ, מְשַׁף וְלֹא מְדַד – קָנָה; מְדַד וְלֹא מְשַׁף, לֹא קָנָה (m. B. Bat. 5:7)	הָיָה מוֹדֵד וְהִגִּיעַ לְגֵיא אוֹ לְגֵדֵר ... (m. °Erub. 5:4)

⁷³ The same sequence occurs in 2:7, without the negation.

⁷⁴ Bar-Asher Siegal (2017, 77–79) notes a few similar examples of the aspectual opposition, which – as will be recalled – he sees as the primary opposition in RH.

Appendix 39

Alleged simple past *weqatal* (McFall 1982, 194, point 4, and 203)

Gen 26:10	מה־זאת עֲשִׂיתָ לָנוּ כְּמַעַט שָׁכַב אֶחָד הָעַם אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וְהִבֵּאתָ עָלֵינוּ אָשָׁם
	Future/modal. Possibly interrogative ("and will you bring guilt upon us?!").
Lev 26:41	אֲרֹאֲנִי אֵלֶיךָ עִמָּם בְּקָרִי וְהִבֵּאתִי אֹתָם בְּאֶרֶץ אֲיִבֵיהֶם
	Simple future. Note the preceding <i>yiqtol</i> . Most translations understand both verbs as a direct continuation of the line of thought in the subordinate clauses in v. 40. However, the verbal forms clearly argue against this and suggest a return to the main discourse of prediction.
Deut 17:4	וְהִגַּדְתָּ לָּהּ וְשִׁמְעָתָ וְדַרְשָׁתָּ הֵיטֵב וְהִנֵּה אָמַת נָכוֹן הַדֹּבֵר גַּעֲשֶׂתָּהּ הַתּוֹעֵבָה הַזֹּאת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל
	The alleged problematic form is <i>וְדַרְשָׁתָּ</i> . However, the meaning of this and the two preceding <i>weqatals</i> is clearly future/modal. Note that <i>וְשִׁמְעָתָ</i> has penultimate stress due to pause.
1 Kgs 19:18	וְהִשְׁאֲרֵתִי בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁבַעַת אֲלָפִים כָּל־הַבְּרָפִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־כָרְעוּ לְבַעַל וְכָל־הַפָּה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נָשַׁק לוֹ
	Future. McFall probably got his past reading from Paul (Rom 11:4, κατέλιπον).
Jer 6:17	וְהִקְמַתִּי עָלֵיכֶם צָפִים הַקְּשִׁיבוּ לְקוֹל שׁוֹפָר וַיֹּאמְרוּ לֹא נִקְשִׁיב
	Future. The <i>weqatal</i> is part of direct speech and not on the same level as the following <i>wayyiqtol</i> .
Jer 12:3	וְאַתָּה יְהוָה יַדְעֶנָּה תִּרְאֵנִי וּבְחַנְתָּ לִּבִּי אֶתָּה הַתִּקְּמָה כָּצֹאן לְטִבְחָהּ וְהִקְדַּשְׁם לְיוֹם הַרְגָּהּ
	General present or future? There is no compelling reason for a past reading (as in LXX and KJV).
Jer 20:9	וְאָמַרְתִּי לֹא־אֶזְכְּרֶנּוּ וְלֹא־אֶדְבַּר עוֹד בְּשִׁמוֹ וְהָיָה בְּלִבִּי כְּאִשׁ בַּעֲרַת עֵצָר בְּעִצְמֹתַי וְנִלְאַתִּי כְּלֵבָל וְלֹא אוּכַל
	General present (or past iterative/habitual).
Ezek 29:7	בְּתַפְשָׁם בָּהּ בַּכַּפֶּךָ תִּרְוֶץ וּבִקְעָתָ לָהֶם כָּל־כִּתְּףָ וּבְהִשְׁעָנָם עָלֶיךָ תִּשְׁבֵּר וְהִעֲמַדְתָּ לָהֶם כָּל־מִתְנָיִם
	Both forms (<i>וּבִקְעָתָ</i> and <i>וְהִעֲמַדְתָּ</i>) are clearly past iterative/habitual.
Amos 4:7	וְגַם אֲנֹכִי מִנְעַתִּי מִכֶּם אֶת־הַגֹּשֶׁם בְּעוֹד שְׁלֵשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים לְקִצְרֵי וְהִמְטַרְתִּי עַל־עִיר אֲחַת וְעַל־עִיר אֲחַת לֹא אִמְטִיר חֶלְקָהּ אֲחַת תִּמְטַר וְחֶלְקָהּ אֲשֶׁר־לֹא־תִמְטִיר עָלֶיהָ תִּיבֶשׂ
	<i>וְהִמְטַרְתִּי</i> is clearly past iterative/habitual, cf. the following <i>yiqtol</i> s.

Appendix 40

Weqatálti in the OT

This list contains *weqatáltis* from unproblematic root/stem types, without *ne-siga* or pause (including lesser pause without vowel lengthening). *Weqatáltis* from the same verbs (same person/number) are noted if attested.

<p>Lev 10:19⁷⁵ הן היום הקריבו את-חטאתם ואת-עלתם לפני יהוה ותקראנה אתי פאלה ואכלתי חטאת היום הייטב בעיני יהוה</p>	<p>2 Sam 13:5 ... למען אשר אראה ואכלתי מידה</p>
<p>1 Sam 17:35⁷⁶ וניצאתי אחריו והפתיו והצלתי מפיו ויקם עלי והחזקתי בזקנו והפתיו והמיתיו</p>	<p>Ezek 34:10 ... הנני אל-הרעים ודרשתי את-צאני מידם והשבתיים מרעות צאן ולא-ירעו עוד הרעים אותם והצלתי צאני מפיהם ולא-תהיין להם לאכלה</p>
<p>1 Kgs 3:11 יען אשר שאלת את-הדבר הזה ולא-שאלת לה ימים רבים ולא-שאלת לה עשר ולא שאלת נפש איבך ושאלת לה הבין לשמע משפט</p>	<p>Deut 13:15 ודרשת וקרת ושאלת היטב והנה אמת נכון הדבר ...</p>
<p>Ps 37:10 ועוד מעט ואין רשע והתבוננת על-מקומו ואיננו</p>	<p>It is difficult to know whether stress shift is supposed to occur with this root and stem type. There seems to be only one comparable case (Job 31:29, וְהִתְעַרְרָתִי), which has penultimate stress as well, though with distinctive accent. If the verb in Ps 37:10 is anterior, it might be understood as an interrogative ("And yet a little while and there is no wicked person – and have you looked at his place? – and he is not (there)!") or as irrealis in an implicit conditional clause. In Ps 37:36, other anterior forms (<i>wayyiqtol</i>s, <i>qatal</i>) seem to function in a similar manner. However, note that the version of Ps 37:10 found in</p>

⁷⁵ ואכלתי probably indicates irrealis anteriority.

⁷⁶ Only וְהִתְעַרְרָתִי is entirely free from possible interference from root type, pause, etc. (having a conjunctive accent, in contrast to וְהִתְעַרְרָתִי; וְהִתְעַרְרָתִי is from a problematic root type, and forms with object suffixes provide no evidence). As noted in 8.2 (with n. 22), the intention behind the consonant text was probably non-anterior *weqatáltis* indicating habituality or iterativity.

Appendices

	4Q171 fr. 1–2 ii 6 has the form ואתבוננה, i.e. a 1s <i>weyiqtol</i> (cohortative) or 1s <i>wayyiqtol</i> (pseudo-cohortative).
Ps 86:13 כִּי־חִסְדְּךָ גָדוֹל עָלַי וְהַצַּלְתָּ נַפְשִׁי מִשְׂאוּל תַּחֲתֶיךָ	
Job 7:4 אִם־שָׁכַבְתִּי וְאִמְרַתִּי מִתִּי אָקוּם וּמִדַּד־עָרֵב וְשָׁבַעְתִּי נִגְדִים עַד־יִנְשָׁף	This is a difficult verse. וְשָׁבַעְתִּי has penultimate stress that cannot be the result of pause etc. (conjunctive accent). An anterior reading makes sense (stative?).
Job 16:15 שָׁק תִּפְרַתִּי עָלַי גִּלְדִי וְעַלְלַתִּי בְּעַפְרֵי קִרְנִי	
Ecll 1:13 וְנָתַתִּי אֶת־לִבִּי לְדַרוֹשׁ ...	Gen 17:8 וְנָתַתִּי לְךָ וּלְזַרְעֶךָ אֶת־אֶרֶץ מִגְרִיךָ ...
Ecll 2:5 עָשִׂיתִי לִי גִּנּוֹת וּפְרָדְסִים וְנִטְעַתִּי בְהֵם עֵץ כָּל־פְּרִי	Jer 42:10 אִם־שׁוֹב תִּשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ הַזֹּאת וּבְגִיתִי אֶתְכֶם וְלֹא אֶהְרַס וְנִטְעַתִּי אֶתְכֶם וְלֹא אֶתּוֹשׁ ...
Ecll 2:14 וְנִדְעַתִּי גַם־אֲנִי שְׂמִקְרָה אֶחָד יִקְרָה אֶת־כָּלֶם	Judg 6:37 אִם טַל יִהְיֶה עַל־הַגֹּזֶה לְבִדָּה וְעַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ חָרֵב וְנִדְעַתִּי כִּי־תוֹשִׁיעַ בְּיַדִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ
Ecll 2:15 וְאִמְרַתִּי אֲנִי בְּלִבִּי ... וְדַבַּרְתִּי בְּלִבִּי ...	Exod 3:13 הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי בָּא אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאִמְרַתִּי לָהֶם Jer 1:16 וְדַבַּרְתִּי מִשְׁפָּטִי אוֹתָם עַל כָּל־רָעָתָם
Ecll 4:1 וְשָׁבַתִּי אֲנִי וְאָרְאָה אֶת־כָּל־הַעֲשָׂקִים ...	Gen 28:21 וְשָׁבַתִּי בְּשָׁלוֹם אֶל־בֵּית אָבִי וְהָיָה יְהוָה לִי לְאֱלֹהִים
Ecll 4:7 וְשָׁבַתִּי אֲנִי וְאָרְאָה הַכֹּל תַּחַת הַשָּׁמַשׁ	
Ecll 8:15 וְשָׁבַחְתִּי אֲנִי אֶת־הַשְּׂמֵחָה	
Neh 9:7 אֲתָה־הוּא יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְתָּ בְּאַבְרָם וְהוֹצֵאתוֹ מֵאוּר כַּשְׂדִּים וְשָׁמַתְּ שְׁמוֹ אַבְרָהָם	2 Kgs 4:29 חָגַר מְתַנְיָה וְקוֹחַ מִשְׁעַנְתִּי בְּיָדְךָ וְלֹךְ כִּי־תִמָּצָא אִישׁ לֹא תִבְרַכְנוּ וְכִי־יִבְרַכְךָ אִישׁ לֹא תַעֲנֶנּוּ וְשָׁמַתְּ מִשְׁעַנְתִּי עַל־פְּנֵי הַנָּעַר
1 Chr 29:17 וְנִדְעַתִּי אֱלֹהִי כִּי אַתָּה בַּחֵן לִבְבִּי	See Ecll 2:14 above.

Appendix 41

Potential anterior *weqatals* in the ancient inscriptions

The clearly non-anterior cases are listed in appendix 21.

A few *weqatals* occur in very fragmentary passages and cannot be used as evidence: KAjr 20:2 (כל אשר ישאל מאלֹ חנן [] ונתן לה יהו כלבבה); Uza 2:9 (על [] אצר ימת והיה תרן); Uza 2:12 (פנִיכה [] והתערערתה).

The context of the possibly anterior *weqatals* discussed in the main text:

Arad 3:1–8	אל אלישב ועת תן מן היין 111 ב וצוך חנניהו על באר שבע עם משא צמד חמרם וצררת אתם בצק וספר החטם והלחם ולקחת ...
Arad 16:1–6	אחד חנניהו שלח לשלם אלישב ולשלם ביתך ברכתך ליהוה ועת כצאתי מביתך ושלחתי את ה[כ]סף 8 ש לבני גאליהו [ב]י[ד]ע[ז]ריהו ואת [] ...

Appendix 42

Anterior *weqatal* in Qumran, pt. 1

Scholars investigating the major documents from Qumran have noted only few anterior *weqatals*.

Smith (1991) finds no anterior *weqatals* in the texts he examines (the Pesharim, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, 1QM, 11QT^a and 4QMMT). Thorion-Vardi (1985, 73–74) notes one case in CD 20:23 (ושבו) and Kesterson (1984, 172–174) mentions the same occurrence plus CD 19:34 (ושבו) and 20:11 (ומאסו).

CD 19:33–35	ויעזבם ויפנו בשרירות לבם [] כן כל האנשים אשר באו בברית החדשה בארץ דמשק וישבו ויבגדו ויסורו מבאר מים החיים לא יחשבו בסוד עם ובכתבם לא יכתבו מיום האסף «יור מורה»
CD 20:10–12	כמשפט רעיהם אשר שבו עם אנשי הלצון ישפטו כי דברו תועה על חקי הצדק ומאסו בברית ואמנה אשר קימו בארץ דמשק והוא ברית החדשה
CD 20:23	[] בית פלג אשר יצאו מעיר הקדש וישענו על אל בקץ מעל ישראל ויטמאו את המקדש וישבו עוד אל דרך העם בדברים מעטים

The fact that the same form occurs in CD 19:34 and 20:23 (שוב) may be mere coincidence. However, it may be the case that the writer wanted to make sure that the verbs were not misinterpreted as forms of ישב, which might have happened if he used a *wayyiqtol*. Kesterson (1984, 173) notes that ומאסו in CD 20:11 is virtually synonymous with the preceding expression (דברו תועה). In any case, all three instances are not actual QH but stem from the documents found in the Cairo Genizah.

Penner (2015, 198, n. 12) notes only three cases of "past *wqtls*," viz., 1QH^a 19:37 (והכינותה),⁷⁷ CD 20:23 (already noted above), and 11QT^a 54:16 (ופדיתכה).

1QH ^a 19:33–37	ברוך את[ה] אדוני כי אתה פעלתה אלה ותשם בפי עבדכָּה הַזֹּדוֹת תְּלִי[ה] וְתַחֲנַה וּמַעֲנָה לְשׁוֹן וְהַכִּינּוּתָה לִי פְּעוּלָתָה
	והכינותה seems to be anterior but in a poetic (and fragmented) context it is difficult to be sure. 1QH ^a 7:35 has a similar passage with a simple <i>qatal</i> , which might support the anterior reading.
11QT ^a 54:15–17	והנביא ההוא או חולם החלום יומת כי דבר סרה על יהוה אלוהיכה אשר הוציאכה מארץ מצרים ופדיתכה מבית עבדים להדיחכה מן הדרך אשר צויתכה ללכת בה ובערת הרע מקרבכה
	והכינותה seems to be clearly anterior but the shift in personal reference is strange. The passage derives from Deut 13:6. In the MT, we have אֱלֹהֵיכֶם (instead of אלוהיכה), followed by two attributive PTCs with definite articles (הַמּוֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וְהַפְּדֶה מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים). In the scroll, we find a relative clause with a simple <i>qatal</i> 3sm followed by the <i>weqatal</i> in question, in the first person (cf. the following relative clause אשר צויתכה vs. MT אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ).

In addition, I have found the following cases from Hodayot, which seem to be anterior *weqatals* as well: 1QH^a 26:33 (והשכלנו) and 26:34 (והכלנו), cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:203 ("and [we] have understood" and "and [we have recognized]").⁷⁸ The text is very fragmentary and is better preserved in 4Q427 fr. 7 ii 14 (the verb before the first *weqatal* is a simple *qatal* functioning as a present stative, ידענוכה; the one before the second *weqatal* is another simple *qatal* indicating present perfect, כִּי־אֵינּוּ; in Hebrew, of course, these notions are functions of the same anterior category). The *weqatals* seem to be anteriors, possibly of the present stative type (Stegemann 2009, 309: "and we understand"; "And[we] recognize").

Furthermore, two cases from the Damascus Document might be interpreted as anteriors, viz. 4Q266 fr. 6 i 7 (והפך and ופלה), see appendix 43 for further discussion.

⁷⁷ Penner refers to 1QH^a 19:37 as 19:34 in his book although it is called 19:37 in his database.

⁷⁸ In García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, the references are Col. XXVI bottom, line 8 and line 9.

Appendix 43

Anterior *weqatal* in Qumran, pt. 2: Potential – but mostly unlikely – anterior *weqatals* in the documents from Qumran

In addition to the cases noted in Siegismund 2017, 210–213,⁷⁹ several other cases of potential anterior *weqatals* have been found. Most have been treated as anterior *weqatals* in various translations. The following list contains the cases discovered so far, with alternative interpretations. Some are in fragmentary documents (as in the cases from Siegismund 2017) while others are from the major sectarian texts.

1Q26 fr. 1 7 (ואמר)	Milik 1956, 102, "Et il m'a dit." Milik reads לי while BibleWorks and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 1:66) read לו. ⁸⁰ Since a 2sm is clearly involved in the passage, the verb form may be a <i>w+imperative</i> , cf. Maier (1995, 1:237), "und sage mir." If it is a <i>weqatal</i> , it may have ordinary non-anterior meaning (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:67, "and says to him").
1QS 6:27 (יה[וה] ושיעה?)	García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 1:84–85) read a <i>weqatal</i> , yet translate without "and" ("[he h]as taken the law into his own hands"). Maier 1995, 1:184, "[und hat er sich] auf eigene Faust [geh]olfen." There is no reason to reconstruct the <i>waw</i> .
1QS 8:11 (ונמצאו)	García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 1:89), "but which has been found." A non-anterior reading is possible (cf. Maier 1995, 1:188). The final <i>waw</i> might be a mistake (in the parallel passage in 4Q258 VI 5, the form is ונמצא, i.e., it might be a <i>nif</i> . PTC).
1QM 17:1 (ושנן and ושם)	Treated as anteriors by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 1:141), Maier (1995, 1:151), and others. However, there is no reason not to interpret the forms as ordinary non-anteriors (cf. García Martínez 1996, 112).

⁷⁹ The following cases from Siegismund 2017 are translated as simple past in one or more translations but are open for alternative interpretations (note that some are reconstructions by various scholars): 1Q34^{bis} fr. 3 ii 7 (וכתב), 8 ([והקימותה]); 4Q160 fr. 7 2 (ונלויתי), 4 (ובחרתי); 4Q163 fr. 1 3 (ובלע); 4Q185 fr. 1–2 ii 11 (והרג); 4Q223–224 unit 2 I 51 ([ועש]ה); Unit 2 IV 25 ([והרגו]); 4Q273 fr. 5 2 (וכסתה); 4Q274 fr. 3 i 1 ([וקר]א); 4Q298 fr. 1 3 ([והשיב]ו); 4Q365 fr. 6a ii 4 ([ונש]כח/בת); 4Q370 I 5 ([ו]אבדם); 4Q372 fr. 1 3 (וּלְבָדוּ), 16 (וקרא), 20 (ופתח); 4Q378 fr. 3 ii + 4 5 ([ו]שמענו); 4Q380 fr. 1 ii 1 ([ו]עשה); 4Q382 fr. 104 4 ([ו]הִלְשַׁלְתָּה); 4Q388a fr. 7 (*olim* fr. 1) ii 1 (ושברו ועשו); 4Q389 fr. 1 (*olim* fr. 6) 3 (ובקשו), fr. 8 (*olim* fr. 1) ii 7 (ושברו ועשו); 4Q414 fr. 13 3 (והִלְקִם); 4Q415 fr. 11 7 (וחרה) and ([ו]נגפו); 4Q422 III 8 ([ו]היה); 4Q423 fr. 3 + 4 5 (וקדשתי); 4Q434 fr. 1 ii 3 (ודרשו); 4Q458 fr. 1 6 (ועִמְדוּ וּשְׁפִיטוּ); 4Q464 fr. 3 ii 5 (וּשְׁכַב); 4Q464^a 2 (ועִמְדוּ וּשְׁפִיטוּ); 4Q479 fr. 3 4 (וחשפו); 4Q504 fr. 1–2 ii 16 (והצלתנו); 4Q509 fr. 3 3 (ואספתה), fr. 97–98 i 9 (וכתב); 4Q510 fr. 1 6 (ונתתם); 4Q521 fr. 1 ii 2 ([ו]שמעת[ם]), fr. 7 + 5 ii 14 (וקדמו); 4Q525 fr. 14 ii 16 (והייתה), fr. 23 11 (והִלְבִּי); 5Q9 fr. 1 1 (והיה); 5Q12 fr. 1 1 (והיו); 6Q9 fr. 32 2 (ונגפו); 11Q12 fr. 1 3 ([ו]היו); 11Q13 II 5 ([ו]סִתְּרוּ).

⁸⁰ In García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, the reference is Frags. 1+2, line 8.

Appendices

1QH ^a 6:12 (והי'ה) and 6:16 (וחזקתה)	Newsom's translation in Stegemann 2009, 95: "and was" and "and you have strengthened." The context is quite fragmentary and nothing demands an anterior interpretation.
1QH ^a 14:27 (וּגְשַׁן)	Stegemann 2009, 197: "and [my life] reached the gates of death" (cf. ib., 192, on "the continuation of a (consecutive) imperfect clause with a syndetically connected clause in the perfect tense"). Others have preferred to read a noun (וּגְשַׁן in BibleWorks, e.g.). In any case, the preceding verb form is <i>w+yiqtol</i> . This might be a <i>weyiqtol</i> (in which case we might have an unclassical indiscriminate use of non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> and non-anterior <i>weqatal</i>), or it might be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (in which case a poetic shift to an ordinary non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> cannot be excluded).
1QH ^a 15:4 (וּגְשַׁן)	Stegemann 2009, 213: "And they have reviled me." The context is too fragmentary for the anterior reading to be persuasive.
1QH ^a 16:7 (והיו)	Stegemann 2009, 223: ("And they were there..."). An ordinary non-anterior reading makes perfect sense.
1QH ^a 20:17 (והשב'ת)	Stegemann 2009, 260, "and you have made an end." The rather fragmentary context does not preclude a non-anterior interpretation.
1QH ^a 20:22 (והפזו)	This is the reading in García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:192 (the line number is 19 in this edition), translated as "and they fled away." Stegemann (2009, 251) reads וְהִפְזוּ and translate "they make haste" (ib., 260).
4Q160 fr. 3–4 ii 2 (והעלהו)	Allegro 1968, 10: "and he lifted him up." The form is probably a <i>w+imperative</i> (cf., e.g., García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:313).
4Q219 II 35 (והיי'ה)	The form is heavily reconstructed. It corresponds to an Ethiopic <i>wakona</i> , i.e. an anterior וְהִי'ה. Despite the Ethiopic <i>wa-</i> we might reconstruct a simple <i>qatal</i> – or possibly an irregular long <i>wayyiqtol</i> ?
4Q254 fr. 8 7 (והבדיל)	Brooke 1996, 227: "and he distinguished" (cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1: 509). The extremely fragmentary context provides no argument for an anterior interpretation.
CD 12:14 (ונשפך)	García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 1: 571) translate the passage as: "And fish they should not eat unless they have been opened up alive, and their blood poured away" (cf. Maier 1995, 1:26). However, a non-anterior interpretation is possible. In this case, the <i>weqatal</i> is not directly coordinated with the preceding <i>qatal</i> introduced by אִם כִּי but rather constitutes an independent step in the proceedings ("and their blood will/must be poured away").
4Q266 fr. 6 i 7 (והפך and וּפָרַח)	These forms may be anteriors. They seem to be part of a הנהגה-clause with a simple <i>qatal</i> (... וּרְאֵה הַכֹּהֵן וְהָנָא בָאָה הַרוּחַ בְּרוּשׁ). However, בָּאָה might be a PTC, and in a similar description in line 12, PTCs are used (עוֹלָה וַיִּגְרַדְתָּ). We might read the <i>weqatals</i> as PTCs or claim that non-anterior <i>weqatals</i> make sense.
4Q300 fr. 1b 1 (והגידו)	Schoors (2002, 74) notes that in the passage אִמְרֵי הַמֶּשֶׁל וְהַגִּידוּ הַחִידָה "no imperfect consecutive is used," seemingly implying that וְהַגִּידוּ is an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . Yet, he does not give an anterior translation

Appendices

	("They utter the parable and relate the riddle"). It seems preferable to interpret both והגידו and אמרו as imperatives.
4Q370 fr. 1 i 1 (ו[שפך])	Newsom 1995, 91: "and] poured out" (cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:733). The <i>waw</i> is reconstructed. The form might be a simple <i>qatal</i> or a <i>wayyiqtol</i> ?
4Q372 fr. 4 3 (ועשיתי)	Schuller and Bernstein 2001, 185: "and I did." There is practically no context and no reason for an anterior interpretation.
4Q379 fr. 27 2 (ואבו)	Newsom 1996, 283: "and they desired." The lack of context provides no argument for the anterior interpretation.
4Q381 fr. 78 6 (ורוטה)	Schuller 1998, 159: "and the la[nd] was saturated[." Again, the text is too fragmentary to support this interpretation.
4Q382 fr. 12 6 (והגדו)	Olyan (1994, 371) translates the passage (ו[] נאצו והגדו לי) as "they spurned and told me." There is hardly any context. The form might be a <i>w</i> +imperative.
4Q382 fr. 109 1 (והשאתה)	Olyan 1994, 404: "and you have acted as a creditor for them (?)." No context at all.
4Q388a fr. H 2 (ואמר]	Dimant 2001, 216: "and he said." No context.
4Q391 fr. 63 1 (ולבשו)	Smith 1995, 186: "and they dressed/will dress." There is no context and no reason to treat the form as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> .
4Q403 fr. 1 ii 11 (וקדש]	García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:821, "and he sanctified." There seems to be no good argument for an anterior reading. Newsom (1998, 282) translates as "and He consecrates" and notes that the <i>waw</i> may be a <i>yod</i> , i.e. a <i>yiqtol</i> (ib., 285).
4Q405 fr. 23 ii 3 (וחרת)	Newsom 1998, 362, "and He inscribed his glory." This interpretation is not necessary. The form might be a noun (ib., 363; cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:835, "and his glorious inscription").
4Q408 fr. 3+3a 5 (יענו]	García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:838–839 = Frags. 1+1b) reconstruct the form as ו[ענו and translate as "answered." There seems to be no basis for this interpretation.
4Q411 fr. 1 ii 8 (וגאל)	Steudel 1997, 161, "and redeemed" (also García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:841). The context provides no arguments for an anterior interpretation.
4Q418 fr. 8 11 (ונפלה)	Strugnell and Harrington (1999, 93) take this as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> ("And fallen is"), coordinated with a preceding simple <i>qatal</i> . However, an alternative interpretation is possible. The preceding <i>qatal</i> is clearly part of direct speech (פן יומר בזוני) and the <i>weqatal</i> might mark a return to the sequence, which includes the preceding <i>yiqtol</i> introduced by פן (cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:865), "lest he says: he has thieved me, and it falls"; the line number is 9 rather than 11).
4Q418 fr. 227 2 (והייתה]	Strugnell and Harrington 1999, 440, "And thou hast been." They observe that it is not clear whether the form is "a converted or non-converted perfect verb" and that "in Qumran Hebrew the non-converted usage seems more frequent, but both usages occur." As argued here, the real situation is that there are very few convincing non-converted <i>weqatals</i> in QH but numerous ordinary converted

Appendices

	forms. In the present case, there is no reason for an anterior interpretation.
4Q422 fr. 9 1 (ואסף)	Elgvin and Tov 1994, 428, "and he gathered." The text is extremely fragmentary ([יעשו ידיו ואסף]). They translate the preceding <i>yiqtol</i> as past tense as well ("his hands acted"). There is no reason for this treatment of the forms (except for the assumption that this must be a past narrative).
4Q437 fr. 2 i 14 (ונסמך)	The context might suggest that this is an anterior <i>qatal</i> (אותך אדוני (זכרתי ונסמך לבי ל[פני]ך שברתי). However, the form may be a <i>nif</i> . PTC, or, alternatively, a shift to non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> (general present/future) cannot be ruled out.
4Q464 fr. 3 ii 5 (ושכב)	Eshel and Stone 1995, 222, "and lay with [his fathers]" (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:943, "And he lay"). Nothing seems to prevent a non-anterior reading. In fact, the comparison with Gen 15:15 suggests that a future/modal reading may be preferable. This was noted in Siegismund 2017, 213, but we should add that the form may in fact be a <i>w+imperative</i> (cf. Gen 15:15 with 2sm <i>yiqtol</i>).
4Q475 fr. 1 3 (והגיד)	Elgvin 2000, 466, "and told them." Nothing seems to support the anterior interpretation (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:957: "and he will tell").
4Q480 fr. 1 i 5 (וניסה)	Larson and Schiffman 1996, 302, "and he tried (?)." There is no context and no reason for an anterior interpretation.
4Q521 fr. 7+5 ii 8 (ופתח)	Puech 1998, 24, "et a ouvert." The same form (partially reconstructed) in line 9 is treated in the same way. There seems to be no good reason for interpreting these forms as anteriors (cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1047, "and opens").
4Q522 fr. 9 ii 11 (והשלוני)	Puech 1998, 57, "aussi m'ont-ils trompé." The reading offered by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:1049) seems more reasonable ("And the Shilonite").
11QT ^a 45:9 (ובאה)	Yadin's translation (1983, 2:192) seems to imply an anterior interpretation, "and when the sun is down." Similarly in García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1263, "and after the sun has set." However, the Hebrew clause is not subordinate and a simple non-anterior, coordinated reading is preferable, "and on the third day he shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe, and the sun shall set. Then he shall enter etc." Cf. 11QT ^b 15:1 below.
11QT ^a 55:17 (ועבד, והלך, והשתחוה)	Yadin (1983, 2:249) treats these as anteriors ("and has gone etc."). This is a reworking of Deut 17:3. In the MT, the forms are <i>way-yiqtol</i> s. The MT forms seem to function as a kind of future perfect. The preceding form is a simple <i>yiqtol</i> and the following is a <i>weqatal</i> (in v. 4). In the scroll, the more straightforward <i>weqatals</i> are used and there is no reason to interpret them as anteriors (cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1277). See 6.2.4 in the main text.
11QT ^a 58:12 (ושברום והכום)	This is a conditional passage (beginning in line 11), והיה אם נצחו את ... אויביהמה ושברום והכום לפי הרב ונשא את שללמה ונתנו ... The simple <i>qatal</i> after אם indicates anteriority in a present/future context (present perfect/future perfect) and it might be claimed that one or more of the

Appendices

	following <i>weqatals</i> should be interpreted in the same way – i.e., as part of the conditional protasis. The question is which <i>weqatal</i> marks the beginning of the apodosis. I would suggest the first one, which means that all the <i>weqatals</i> indicate ordinary non-anteriority. Yet, Yadin (1983, 2:262) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (2000, 2:1279–1281) choose one of the following <i>weqatals</i> (not the same) as the beginning of the apodosis. However, since they render the entire conditional clause including the simple <i>qatal</i> in the general present, there is no reflection of the potential anterior <i>weqatals</i> . Even if (some of) the <i>weqatals</i> belong to the protasis, an anterior interpretation is unnecessary, cf. 66:5 below.
11QT ^a 66:5 (והחזיק and ושכב)	García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1289, "and he coerced her and lay with her." This is a version of Deut 22:25 (וְאִם־בִּשְׂדֵה יִמָּצֵא ... (הָאִישׁ אֶת־הַנְּעִר הַמְּאֲרָשָׁה וְהַחֲזִיקָהּ הָאִישׁ וְשָׁכַב עִמָּהּ). The scroll has a <i>qatal</i> (indicating anteriority in the sense of present perfect or future perfect) instead of the MT <i>yiqtol</i> יִמָּצֵא. Hence, the <i>weqatals</i> might be claimed to be anterior <i>weqatals</i> . However, a shift from present/future perfect to simple future/general present is possible ("if the man has met the woman in the field etc., and he grabs her and lies with her"). Yadin (1983, 2:297) renders all the verbs (including the simple <i>qatal</i>) as simple present tense.
11QT ^b 15:1 (ובאה)	García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1303, "and when the su[n] has set." See 11QT ^a 45:9 above.

Appendix 44

Anterior *weqatal* in Qumran, pt. 3

In Siegismund 2017, 215–217, the following nine cases were found to be the most likely anterior *weqatals* in the various minor Qumran documents:

4Q200 fr. 6 1 (והעלהו)	[] כתבו את כול [המעשה הזה והעלהו
4Q200 fr. 6 2 (והיו)	והיו המה {ותומהים} מברכים ו[מהללים את אלהים] [ומודים אותו על מע]ש[ו הגדול ותומהים
	והיו is followed by PTCs and the whole construction clearly indicates durative/concomitant action. A "double durative" interpretation (i.e., a non-anterior, habitual <i>weqatal</i> with a PTC) seems unlikely (cf. Stipp 1991, 538; see 6.2.1). Hence, it seems preferable to interpret the <i>weqatal</i> as a simple anterior with the PTC as the only indication of durativity.
4Q200 fr. 7 ii 4 (ותמ[ו])	ותמ[ו] דברי תודת טובי
4Q216 VII 11 (ובחר)	ובחר בזרע יעקוב ב[כל מאשר ראיתי
4Q223–224 Unit 2 IV 18 (והשליך)	... אז דרך יעקוב את קש[תו והשליך] את החץ הראשון ...
4Q252 IV 6 (ו[א]מר)	פשרו אשר הוכיחו אשר שכב עם בלהה פילגשו ו[א]מר בכו[רי] [א]תה ...

Appendices

	According to Brooke (1996, 204), there is not enough space to reconstruct a <i>wayyiqtol</i> instead of the probable anterior <i>weqatal</i> [א]מר [ו].
4Q372 fr. 1 31 (והתבוננתי)	אני ידעת[י] והתבוננתי וה ^{oo}]
4Q418 fr. 69 ii 11 (ושקדנו)	איכה תאמרו יגענו בבינה ושקדנו לרדוף דעת
4Q418 fr. 69 ii 13 (ויעפ[נו])	האמור יאמרו יגענו בפעלות אמת ויעפ[נו]

Appendix 45

Possible non-anterior *weqatals* in a past context (concomitance, habituality) in the documents from Qumran (Siegismund 2017, 213–215)

4Q219 I 14 (וּדְרִשׁ[תִּי])	תְּמִיד [ד את א] לְוַהֲיִנּוּ וּדְרִשׁ[תִּי] אוֹתוֹה בְּכוֹל לְבִי []
	The adverb תמיד and the Ethiopic version (Jub 21:2; see VanderKam 1989, 114) with <i>halloku 'anza+yəqattal</i> forms seem to support a habitual interpretation. Cf. also the PTCs in the Latin version (ib., 276).
4Q370 I 4 (ופצו)	... ומים נבקעו מתהמות כל ארבות השמים נפתחו ופצו כל תהמו[ת מ]מים אדרים
	This case may not be a very good example. There are several simple <i>qatals</i> in the vicinity and it makes sense to read the <i>weqatal</i> as a simple past event, i.e. as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . Yet, the meaning of the verb ("overflowing") seems to allow a concomitant reading.
4Q373 fr. 1 (a+b) 7 (ועשיתי)	ועשיתי קלעי מזור ע]ם קשתות ...
	As in the preceding case, a simple past interpretation makes sense. However, a habitual/durative reading is possible.
4Q385 fr. 6 (<i>olim</i> fr. 4) 9 (והית[ה]), 10 (ודבקה), and 12 (והיה)	והית[ה יד] אדם מחברת מגבי החיות ודבקה ב[כנפיהן] [והא] [ופ] [נ] [ים] אופן חובר אל אופן בלכתן ומשני עברי הא[ופנים שבלי אש] והיה בתוך גחלים חיות כגחלי אש]
	This is not a string of separate events but rather a description. The <i>weqatals</i> might indicate past habituality/ongoingness (yet, note that passages such as this need not refer to the past but may be general present descriptions). There is a <i>yiqtol</i> with the same habitual/ongoing meaning in line 7 (תלך), as is also the case in the similar passage in MT Ezek 1. However, the use of the verb היה in this context might suggest that an anterior interpretation is to be preferred. Note that ודבקה may be a PTC, as argued by Dimant (2001, 48).

Appendices

11QPs ^a 21:11 (ובקשתיה)	אני נער בטרם תעיתי ובקשתיה באה לי בתרה ועד סופה אדורשנה
	The context of <i>ובקשתיה</i> seems to be clearly past and a habitual or progressive interpretation is possible, cf. the following <i>yiqtol</i> אדורשנה (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1175, "I kept investigating her"). However, the latter form may represent a shift to present/future reference (the Greek version has ἐκζητήσω, Sir 51:14; cf. Van Peursen 2004, 116). Van Peursen (ib., 137) finds the non-anterior ("imperfective" in his terminology) interpretation of <i>ובקשתיה</i> unconvincing and prefers to interpret the form as a "copulative perfect," i.e. as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . Since the expression of past habituality etc. was never mandatory in Hebrew, cases such as this remain problematic and very difficult to decide. See also appendix 31.

Appendix 46

Problematic *weyiqtol*s in Joosten's CBH⁸¹ and Joosten's method of elimination (2012a, 309–311)

Num 16:5 (וידע)	Textual corruption? The root is I-y (<i>weqatal</i> ?). Note that the Samaritans have ויודע, which makes the <i>weyiqtol</i> <i>hif.</i> reading clear (unless it is a <i>gal</i> PTC?).
Deut 2:4 (וייראו)	I-y (<i>weqatal</i> ?). In this case, the consonant text with two <i>yods</i> points to a <i>weyiqtol</i> reading – but 4QDeut ^h has one <i>yod</i> only. Note that the Samaritans have two <i>yods</i> in all the other instances of this verb, where the MT has only one.
Deut 13:12 (וייראון)	I-y (<i>weqatal</i> ?). The form has a paragogic <i>nun</i> , which makes a <i>weqatal</i> reading difficult. Joosten, however, suggests that the <i>nun</i> might be a secondary feature (2012a, 311, n. 123; but see also Joosten 2015, 32). The form occurs right after a simple, non-initial <i>yiqtol</i> with a seemingly non-volitive meaning.
Deut 16:19 (ויסלף)	"Poetic syntax." This is more or less the same sentence as Exod 23:8.
Deut 17:13; 19:20; 21:21 (וייראו)	I-y (<i>weqatal</i> ?). On these cases, see also Joosten 2015, 30–34.
Josh 3:13 (ויצמדו)	Textual corruption.
Josh 7:9 (וישמעו)	Joosten does not provide any explanation for the elimination of this one. It seems to be a rather clear example of non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Josh 19:29 (ויירי)	Textual corruption. The <i>qere</i> has a <i>weqatal</i> while the <i>ktiv</i> has a <i>weyiqtol</i> . This is an example of the older consonant text having a

⁸¹ Cases from Genesis and Exodus are discussed in the main text (6.2.3).

Appendices

	later, unclassical form in contrast to the later vocalization – unless, of course, the <i>ktiv</i> is to be interpreted as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> , as the apparatus in BHS suggests. Note that if it is a <i>weyiqtol</i> it can be interpreted as an unclassical expression of habitual/progressive action in the past.
1 Sam 10:5 (וַיְהִי)	Joosten does not treat this case explicitly, but refers generally to cases of non-volitive וַיְהִי as a subtype of textual corruption. Note that 4QSam ^a has a <i>weqatal</i> here.
1 Sam 28:19 (וַיִּתֵּן)	Textual corruption. Joosten (2012a, 310, n. 119) refers to Driver (1913, 218), who removes the first part of the verse (with the <i>weyiqtol</i>) because it is "out of place where it stands." Driver reconstructs the verse based on the second part of the verse in the LXX. However, the <i>weyiqtol</i> is represented in the LXX (καὶ παραδώσει). As the text stands, it seems to be rather clearly non-volitive. On the other hand, it might be argued that it makes sense to read the form as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> instead (translate as present perfect)?
2 Sam 5:24 (וַיְהִי)	Not treated explicitly. וַיְהִי is considered a type of textual corruption.
1 Kgs 11:39 (וַאֲעֲבֹד)	Textual corruption. The verse is missing in the LXX, "suggesting that it may have been added by a later hand," according to Joosten (2012a, 310, n. 120).
1 Kgs 14:5 (וַיְהִי)	Not treated explicitly. וַיְהִי is considered a type of textual corruption. Note further that the LXX apparently read the form as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> , which seems to make good sense. In this case, the verb in question indicates the transition from the direct speech back to the narrative. A similar case of misunderstanding a <i>wayyiqtol</i> as a <i>weyiqtol</i> might be found in 1 Sam 12:3a (וַאֲעֲלִים), which makes more sense as a continuation of the preceding questions about Samuel's past behavior. As it stands, it makes little sense as a volitive. The <i>weyiqtol</i> in 1 Sam 12:3b (וַאֲשִׁיב), on the other hand, does make sense as a volitive, continuing the volitive sequence initiated by the imperative at the beginning of the verse.
1 Kgs 14:16 (וַיִּתֵּן)	Joosten provides no explanation for this case. It seems to be a rather clear case of non-volitive usage.

Elsewhere, Joosten mentions two additional non-volitive cases: Deut 32:39 (וַאֲחַקֶּה), 41 (וַתִּאֲחַז). However, these are from a poetical segment of possibly archaic character and are probably eliminated on that account (Joosten 2012a, 418). In addition, outside of his specific list, Joosten refers to 1 Kgs 1:2, which displays a seemingly random interchange of *weqatal* and possibly non-volitive *weyiqtol*. He explains the unexpected *weyiqtol* as a late intrusion (ib., 297; the form is lacking in the Greek Antiochene text).

Appendix 47

Examples of potential blurring of the distinction between *weqatal* and *weyiqtol* in Joosten's CBH

Gen 41:34 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וְהָמֵשׁ)	In the passage in Gen 41:34–36, the sequence of volitive <i>weyiqtols</i> is interrupted by a single <i>weqatal</i> . In the Samaritan rendering of this verse, the form is a <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Gen 42:20 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיִאֱמָנוּ)	A jussive interpretation makes sense ("and may your words be believed") but it might as well be a simple consecutive event ("and (then) your words will be believed").
Exod 2:7 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְתִינֶק)	The form makes sense as a volitive. However, a non-volitive reading might work as well, cf. the <i>weqatal</i> in 4QExod ^b (וְהִינֶקָה; Ulrich 2010, 30).
Exod 8:12 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וְהָיָה)	The passage contains several commands. In similar contexts, <i>weyiqtols</i> are often found (as in the Samaritan version of this verse).
Exod 14:17a (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיִבְאֹו)	The preceding verb is a PTC ("I am hardening Egypt's heart") and the following verb is a <i>weyiqtol</i> marked as cohortative. It is possible to understand וְיִבְאֹו as a volitive but we might have expected a <i>weqatal</i> indicating simple non-anteriority (future). Cf. Exod 14:4 (וְיִרְדֹּף)?
Exod 28:3 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וְעָשׂוּ)	A volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> might have been expected (cf. Exod 27:20, וְיִקְהוּ).
Exod 35:10 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיַעֲשׂוּ)	The preceding verb is an ordinary, non-initial <i>yiqtol</i> . However, the context does not preclude a volitive reading and the preceding <i>yiqtol</i> may be non-initial because of a focus-fronted subject. In the context, a jussive reading and a simple indicative reading both seem to make sense. Note that the Samaritans have <i>weqatal</i> .
Lev 9:6 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיָרָא)	It is difficult to argue that this form <i>must</i> be volitive.
Lev 15:24 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְתָהִי)	Joosten (2012a, 339–340) refers to this as a problematic case, where one would expect a <i>weqatal</i> . However, he prefers to see the <i>weyiqol</i> as volitive after all, as a kind of outburst in the middle of the legal text, "an expression of the legislator's outrage." This is important – if we allow such an interpretation in CBH, the way should be open for a volitive interpretation of many seemingly non-volitive cases in the LBH corpus as well.
Lev 24:14 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וְרָגְמוּ וְסָמְכוּ)	In the context (after הוֹצֵא אֶת־הַמִּקְלָל אֶל־מַהוֹץ לְמַחֲנֶה), we might expect <i>weyiqtols</i> rather than <i>weqatals</i> .
Num 17:3 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיִהְיֶינּוּ)	Joosten (2012a, 309, n. 111) refers to this as a "difficult case," probably indicating "light subordination," i.e. a type of volition (according to Joosten's approach). In fact, without introducing the notion of subordination from the translation, a volitive as well as a non-volitive interpretation seems to make sense. The Samaritan version of this verse has a <i>weqatal</i> . Note that the LXX apparently read

Appendices

	the <i>w+yiqtol</i> as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (καὶ ἐγένοντο) – or possibly the translator had a <i>weqatal</i> before him, which was interpreted as an unclassical anterior usage of the form?
Num 22:6 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְאֶגְרִשׁוּנִי)	Cf. the very similar sentence in Num 22:11 with a <i>weqatal</i> (וְגִרְשָׁתִּי). How do we decide whether these verbs mean the same thing or not?
Num 23:19 (<i>weyiqtols</i> ; וַיִּתְנַחֵם וַיִּכְזֹב)	These two cases are interpreted by Joosten as subordinate volitives (2012a, 154). However, as argued in 3.7, there is no subordination in such cases. Rather, it should be possible to read the occurrences as real volitives. In fact, this might make sense ("God is not a man – and let him lie [so as to prove otherwise...]"). Alternatively, a non-volitive reading as a short interrogative outburst maybe makes better sense ("God is not a man – and can/will he lie?"), cf. the question in the last part of the verse.
Num 24:19 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וַיִּרְדֵּךְ)	This case (in poetic/prophetic discourse) is surrounded by <i>weqatals</i> . A single volitive verb may seem strange. However, the intention behind the consonant text may have been a <i>weqatal</i> from the root ירד.
Num 35:2 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וַנִּתְּנוּ)	Following the imperative צו, a <i>weqatal</i> seems odd, compared to <i>weyiqtols</i> in other similar contexts (cf. Joosten 2012a, 296).
Deut 10:2 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְאָכַתָּב)	A volitive reading makes sense (though formally unmarked as a cohortative). Yet, a simple non-anterior (future) meaning is appropriate as well. Hence, we might have expected a <i>weqatal</i> .
Judg 11:37 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וַיִּרְדְּתִי)	A single <i>weqatal</i> in a volitive sequence. Again, it is clearly possible (and probable) that the forms have their classical meaning. Yet, a similar passage in a "late" text might be taken as evidence of a certain blurring of the distinction.
Judg 19:11 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וַיִּלְוִי) vs. 19:13 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וַלְלוּ)	Again, a distinction between an explicitly volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> vs. a not-explicitly volitive <i>weqatal</i> makes sense in these very similar passages. However, since the contexts cannot help us out, it seems impossible for us as non-native speakers to rule out an unclassical, indiscriminate usage.
1 Sam 2:10 (<i>weyiqtols</i> ; וַיִּרְם וַיִּתְּן)	The preceding verb is a <i>yiqtol</i> (וַיִּהְיֶה יָדִין אֶפְסֵי־אֶרֶץ). In poetry, a sudden, volitive outburst makes sense – but a non-volitive reading (simple future prediction) cannot be ruled out in the context.
1 Sam 17:46–47 (<i>weyiqtols</i> ; וַיִּדְעוּ, 2x)	Most often, we find this verb in <i>weqatal</i> instead of <i>weyiqtol</i> . Some cases of <i>weyiqtol</i> (1 Kgs 18:37 and 2 Kgs 19:19) are rather clearly volitive, while the two occurrences in 1 Sam 17:46–47 could be non-volitive or volitive. In any case, the root is I-y.
1 Sam 24:16 (<i>weyiqtols</i> ; וַיִּרְבֵּ, וַיִּרְאֵ וַיִּשְׁפָּטֵנִי)	The preceding verbs are <i>weqatals</i> . How do we decide whether there is a difference of meaning or the forms are used indiscriminately? Joosten (2012a, 298) claims that the <i>weqatals</i> express a wish, translating them as "may the Lord therefore be judge" etc. Alternatively, the <i>weyiqtols</i> may be non-volitives indicating simple future.
2 Sam 13:5 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וַעֲשֶׂתָּה)	It is difficult to argue that there must be a difference of meaning between the <i>weqatal</i> and the preceding <i>weyiqtol</i> (וַתִּבְרַחְנִי).

Appendices

2 Sam 17:1–3 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְאָרְדָּפָה, וְאָקוּמָה, וְאָבּוֹא, and וְאָשִׁיבָה)	This passage is another example of <i>weyiqtol</i> s co-occurring with <i>weqatals</i> (וְהִתְרַדְּתִי, וְנָס, and וְהִכִּיתִי in v. 2). It is possible to interpret the forms as volitive and non-volitive, respectively, assuming that the system works in the classical way. Otherwise, in the context, it would seem to make sense to attribute the same meaning (either volitive or non-volitive) to all these verbs.
2 Sam 22:43 and 22:46 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְאֶשְׁחַקֵּם and וְיִתְקַגְרוּ)	Simple, non-initial <i>yiqtol</i> s occur in the immediate context of both cases. Due to the poetic nature of the passage, a volitive reading may be possible (especially v. 46).
2 Sam 24:2 (<i>weqatal</i> ; וְיִדְעֻתִּי)	The <i>weqatal</i> may be somewhat unexpected. In the version of the text preserved in 1 Chr 21:2, the form is a clearly volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> (וְאֶדְעָה) but contrary to Eskhult's view (2000, 87) that the <i>weyiqtol</i> is an unclassical substitution, the usage in 2 Sam might attest to an unclassical blurring of the distinction between the forms.
1 Kgs 15:19 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיַעֲלֶה)	A volitive reading makes sense, and the unshortened form does not necessitate a non-volitive analysis. However, the clause makes sense as a non-volitive as well.
1 Kgs 18:5 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיִנְחֶה)	Though Joosten (2012a, 147) sees the <i>weyiqtol</i> as an example of subordinate volition, it seems possible to read the passage as non-volitive.
1 Kgs 22:6 (<i>weyiqtol</i> ; וְיִתֵּן)	Cf. 1 Kgs 22:12 and 22:15 with <i>weqatals</i> . Also cf. 2 Chr 18:5 (with <i>weyiqtol</i>), 18:11 (<i>weqatal</i>), and 18:14 (<i>weyiqtol</i>). Is the variation in these similar cases deliberate and meaningful? Are the forms used indiscriminately with the same meaning? The first <i>weyiqtol</i> (1 Kgs 22:6; 2 Chr 18:5) might seem unexpected as it is uttered by the prophets in what appears to be a prediction (false, of course, but still a prediction). On the other hand, the difference between the <i>weqatal</i> in 1 Kgs 22:15 and the <i>weyiqtol</i> in 2 Chr 18:14 (in Micaiah's rendering of the prophecy) might make sense as an attempt to make sure that Micaiah does not lie by phrasing the words as a wish rather than a prediction. Cf. Johnson 1979, 62, "Möglicherweise will der Chronist den Worten im Munde Michas ein weniger kategorisches Gepräge geben."

Appendix 48

Supposedly non-volitive *weyiqtol* in so-called LBH (Joosten 2012a, 309, n. 115, and 399)

Ecclesiastes (7:7; 8:10; 12:4–7) (11 total)	All cases seem to be non-volitive. However, 7:7 should be eliminated (poetic parallel, which is a reason for elimination in CBH).
--	---

Appendices

<p>Daniel (8:12; 9:25; 11:4–7, 10, 11, 15–19, 22, 25, 28, 30, 36, 40, 42, 45; 12:4, 10, 12–13) (34 total)</p>	<p>A few might be interpreted as volitives (9:25; 12:4, 10, 12–13).⁸² One could possibly be eliminated due to textual corruption (8:12; cf. LXX < <i>wayyiqtol</i>?). Yet, most cases seem to be non-volitive. The 25 <i>weyiqtols</i> in chapter 11 alternate with <i>weqatals</i> and simple <i>yiqtols</i> without any apparent distinction.</p>
<p>Nehemiah (3:14–15; 6:13; 8:15; 9:27–28) (7 total)</p>	<p>Several of these cases are problematic in some way. The only (comparatively) clear case of non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> in Neh is 6:13 (following a simple <i>yiqtol</i> introduced by למען; the next verb is <i>weqatal</i>, למען-אירא ואעשה-כן ותטאתי והיה להם לשם רע למען יחרפוני).⁸³</p>
	<p>In 3:14 (ואת שער האשפות הוזיק מלפניה כן-רכב שר פלדו בית-הכפרם הוא יבגו) (ואעמיד דלתתיו מנעליו ובריהיו הוא), the LXX seems to have read הוא as הוא (αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ), followed by καὶ plus aorist (2x), the first one not represented by anything in the MT. Likewise, the verbs in 3:15 are Greek aorists (and most of v. 15 seem to be lacking in some LXX mss.).</p>
	<p>In 8:15, the LXX only has one verb (καὶ ὅπως σημάνωσιν σάλπιγγιν) representing the MT's וְאָשַׁר יִשְׁמְעוּ וַיַּעֲבִירוּ קוֹל. A comparison of the Hebrew and Greek text suggests that something is missing after וְאָשַׁר יִשְׁמְעוּ and that the <i>weyiqtol</i> should be vocalized as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (cf. the Peshitta, which has the equivalent of a <i>qatal</i>).</p>
	<p>The cases in chapter 9 are represented by καὶ plus aorist in the LXX. Though there are simple <i>yiqtols</i> in the passage, there are <i>wayyiqtols</i> as well, and the <i>weyiqtols</i> may have been intended as <i>wayyiqtols</i>. However, if the cases in 9:27–28 and the ones in 3:14–15 are read as <i>weyiqtols</i>, they must be interpreted as expressions of durative (3:14–15) or iterative action (9:27–28) in the past.⁸⁴ There are simple <i>yiqtols</i> in the immediate context, with the same meaning, and in classical usage, we expect these to alternate with <i>weqatals</i>, not <i>weyiqtols</i>. However, in</p>

⁸² In another context, Joosten notes the possible volitive reading of Dan 12:13 (2012a, 402). The four cases in 9:25 and 12:13 are 2sm, which is unexpected in classical usage. Cf., however, Num 17:25 (וַתִּכַּל). Though probably volitive, the verb is a 2sm, which is unclassical. Note, however, that the form may be repointed as a 3sf (ib., 150–151). Other 2sm *weyiqtols* in the classical books are Exod 15:17 and 19:3, and 2 Kgs 19:25 (?). On the question of second person *weyiqtol*, see also the remarks by Rezetko (2009, 248–249), according to whom this usage cannot be considered a feature of the LBH corpus.

⁸³ Cf., however, the similar case in Exod 23:12 noted in 6.2.3.

⁸⁴ As noted in 3.8, Joosten is adamant that *yiqtol* (and *weyiqtol*) do not indicate durative or concomitant action (this is the domain of the PTC). Thus, he refers to the *weyiqtols* in Neh 3:14–15 as prospective (2012a, 282) or as iterative (ib., 398–399). However, such interpretations make little sense in the context.

Appendices

	such past iterative/durative passages, the explicit expression of iterativity/durativity is often abandoned in favour of <i>wayyiqtol</i> s or <i>qatals</i> (cf. 3.1 in the main text). Hence, the consonant text may have indicated <i>wayyiqtol</i> s. In any case, the same usage is attested in the classical corpus as well. ⁸⁵
2 Chronicles (2:15; 7:14, 20; 12:8; 20:9; 24:11; 34:25) (16 total)	Practically all of these seem to be interpretable as volitives. וַאֲנַחְנוּ נִכְרַת עֲצִים מִן־הַלְבָּנוֹן כְּכַל־צִרְכָּה וַנְּבִיאָם לָהּ רַפְסָדוֹת עַל־יָם (2:15) וַנְּבִיאָם (יָפוּ וְאַתָּה תַעֲלֶה אֹתָם יְרוּשָׁלַם) may be an unmarked cohortative (the corresponding v. in 1 Kgs 5:23 is quite different).
	In 7:14 (וַיִּכְנַעוּ עַמִּי אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא־שְׁמִי עָלֵיהֶם וַיִּתְפַּלְלוּ וַיִּבְקְשׂוּ פָנַי וַיָּשׁוּבוּ מִדְּרָכֵיהֶם) (הָרָעִים וְאֲנִי אֲשַׁמֵּעַ מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶסְלַח לַחַטָּאתָם וְאָרְפָּא אֶת־אֲרָצָם), the first four cases could be jussives (and, in Joosten's terms, they might be cases of "light subordination": "...if I send plague among my people that my people [...] might humble themselves etc.?"). The following two would be (unmarked) cohortatives. However, note the possible unclassical anterior <i>weqatal</i> in v. 16 (וְהִקְדַּשְׁתִּי), which could indicate that the passage in general is marked by unclassical usage. ⁸⁶
	In 7:20 (וַנְּתַשְׁתִּים מֵעַל אֲדָמָתִי אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לָהֶם וְאַת־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר הִקְדַּשְׁתִּי לַשָּׁמַיִם) (אֲשַׁלִּיךְ מֵעַל פָּנָי וְאֲתַנְּנוּ לְמִשָּׁל וְלִשְׁנֵינָה בְּכָל־הָעַמִּים וְאֲתַנְּנוּ) (in contrast to Eskhult 2000, 87, n. 16, who seems to see this case as an example of unclassical usage). The corresponding verse in 1 Kgs 9:7 has a <i>weqatal</i> , but the sentence is quite different, so no conclusions can be drawn from a direct comparison.

⁸⁵ Cf. the clear case in 1 Kgs 13:33 (6.2.3). Joosten (2012a, 155) interprets this *weyiqtol* as a "subordinate volitive" in a past context, translating the sequence הִקְדַּשְׁתָּ יְמֵלָא אֶת־יְדוֹ וַיְהִי כִּהְיֶיךָ כְּמֹזוֹת as "any who wanted, he consecrated to be priests for the high places." However, if this is permissible in CBH, why not in LBH? The cases in Nehemiah might be translated using the same method, e.g., "he was building it in order to/that he might set its doors etc." (Neh 3:14) or "in accordance with your great mercy you would give them saviours that they might save them/to save them etc." (Neh 9:27). However, since the alleged subordinate usage is really only a translational convenience, the most likely explanation is to interpret such cases in CBH as well as in LBH as non-volitive, unclassical use of *weyiqtol* with the same meaning as simple *yiqtol* (unless the forms are revocalized as *wayyiqtol*s). Note also the consonant text of Josh 19:29, which might be an additional example (appendix 46). Similarly, Bloch (2007, 164, n. 75) suggests reading וַתִּבְרָכָה in 1 Sam 1:7 as a *weyiqtol*. Cf. also Rubinstein 1955, 185–186.

⁸⁶ According to Cohen (2013, 172–173), all the verb forms in the passage have the same meaning, including the infinitive construct in v. 17. They have all "undergone a certain degree of neutralization." However, nothing prevents us from making a distinction between the *weqatals* and *weyiqtol*s in regard to degree of volition and there is no reason to understand the infinitive as a finite verb as Cohen does. He translates the passage וְאַתָּה ...וְלַעֲשׂוֹת... אַם־תֵּלֶךְ לִפְנֵי כְּאֲשֶׁר הֵלַךְ דָּוִד אָבִיךָ וְלַעֲשׂוֹת... as "As for you, if you will walk before me as your father walked before me, and will do...". Instead, the infinitive should be understood as dependent on the main verb (תֵּלֶךְ) and as coordinated with the preceding phrase (...כְּאֲשֶׁר...).

	Though the preceding verb forms in 2 Chr are <i>weqatals</i> and a simple, non-initial <i>yiqtol</i> , similar seemingly strange shifts from <i>weqatal</i> to (volitive) <i>weyiqtol</i> occur in CBH, e.g. Exod 14:4, 17; 1 Kgs 1:2.
	In 12:8 (כי יהיו־לו לעבדים וינדעו עבודתי ועבודת ממלכות הארצות) וינדעו may be volitive. In any case, the root is I-y, and the intention behind the consonant text might have been a <i>weqatal</i> . Similar cases in the CBH corpus are eliminated.
	The three cases in 20:9 (אם־תבוא עלינו רעה חרב שפוט ודבר ורעב נעמדה לפני) (הבית הזה ולפניו כי שמך בבית הזה ונזעק אליך מצרתנו ותשמע ותושיע) are clearly interpretable as volitives, one (unmarked) cohortative (cf. the preceding נעמדה) and two jussives. The jussives, however, are 2sm, which is unclassical.
	In 34:25 (ותחת אשר עזבוני ויקטירו לאלהים אחרים למען הכעיסני בכל מעשי ידיהם) might be interpreted as a jussive. Yet, reading the form as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> might be more to the point. The LXX has καὶ plus aorist and v. 21 (פי־גדולה תמת־יהנה אשר נתכה בנו) might substantiate this reading. In fact, if we compare 2 Chr 34:25 with the corresponding v. in 2 Kgs 22:17 (<i>weqatal</i> ונצתה), it might be argued that the consonant text (<i>wayyiqtol</i>) of the version in 2 Chr is more classical than the possibly unclassical anterior usage of <i>weqatal</i> in 2 Kgs (note that 2 Kgs 22 also has a simple <i>qatal</i> from the same root in v. 13, indicating that the <i>weqatal</i> in v. 17 could be interpreted as an anterior).
	In 24:11 (ויהי בעת יביא את־הארון אל־פקדת המלך ביד הלויים וכראותם פי־רב) הכסף וכל סופר המלך ופקיד פהו הראש ויערו את־הארון וישארו וישבהו אל־מקמו (פה עשו ליום ביום ויאספוקסו לרב), in contrast, the unclassical iterative/habitual usage of <i>weyiqtol</i> seems to be attested. However, as in the similar cases from Nehemiah, the intention behind the consonant text may have been <i>wayyiqtol</i> s (cf. LXX καὶ plus aorists). Note that Joosten (2012a, 398–399) refers to the <i>weyiqtol</i> s in 2 Chr 24:11 as iterative. Nonetheless, he maintains that the <i>weqatal</i> in the same verse is not iterative since, according to him, there are no examples of this usage in LBH (ib., 404).

Appendix 49

Variants in verbal usage in the biblical Qumran scrolls

Not included are mere orthographical variants (plene or defective spelling, addition of final *-h* on 2sm *qatal*, etc.) and variants that seem irrelevant for the questions treated in this dissertation (sg. vs. pl., use of a different root, different stems, passive/active, etc.). If the variants have (potential) relevance for the understanding of the evolution of the consecutive forms and the semantics of the verbal forms, this is explicitly noted in the comments. In many cases, a variant verb form in a Qumran scroll simply attests to a

Appendices

different way of expressing a similar line of thought (e.g. the use of imperative+vocative instead of jussive 3sm+subject) or an entirely different content or structure of the passage in comparison to the MT.

MT		Qumran scroll = Q	Comments	
Gen 1:9	וְתִרְאֶה	4QGen ^k	וּתְרָא	MT volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> with unclassical unshortened form. Q short. As noted in appendix 18, the form may be a <i>weyiqtol</i> or <i>wayyiqtol</i> (cf. LXX). Either way, the MT is more unclassical.
Gen 1:14	וְהָיוּ	4QGen ^g	וְהָיוּ	The preceding verb is a jussive. MT possibly shows an unclassical blurring of <i>weqatal</i> and <i>weyiqtol</i> (<i>weqatal</i> with volitive meaning?). On the other hand, Q might be claimed to have a non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Gen 1:22	יָרֶב	4QGen ^g	יִרְבֶּה	MT jussive form (short), but non-initial (due to fronted subject with contrastive focus?). Q may reflect a non-volitive reading. Alternatively, it might be claimed that the long form is simply a reflection of the (unclassical) generalization that initial forms (and forms after <i>waw</i>) are short while others are long.
Gen 41:11	בְּנַחֲלָמָה	4QGen ^c	וּנְחָלִם	The MT has the ("late") pseudo-cohortative (typical of QH).
Gen 41:30	וְקָמוּ	4QGen ^j	וּקְמוּ	Q seems to have an unclassical non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Exod 2:3	וְתִשָּׂם	4QExod ^b	[וְתִשָּׂם]	Q has a plus before this verb (וְתִשָּׂם) (לְשַׁפְּחֶתָהּ לְכִי). Hence, [וְתִשָּׂם] might be an unclassical second person <i>weyiqtol</i> . However, a <i>wayyiqtol</i> as in the MT makes sense as well (with unexpected long form). An alternative reconstruction would be [וְתִשָּׂם], i.e. a 1p <i>weyiqtol</i> with (unmarked) cohortative meaning.
Exod 2:7	וְתִינֶקֶת	4QExod ^b	וְהִינֶקֶת	As noted in appendix 47, it is difficult to decide whether a volitive or non-volitive reading is more appropriate here. The MT may be an unclassical non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> but not necessarily.

Appendices

Exod 3:17	וְאָמַר	4QExod ^b	וְאָמַרְהָ	Q has the ("late") pseudo-cohortative.
Exod 5:8	נִזְכָּחָה	4QExod ^b	וְנִזְכָּחָה	The <i>weyiqtol</i> in Q is clearly volitive.
		4QGen–Exod ^a	וְנִזְכָּחָה	
Exod 5:11	קָחֻ	4QExod ^b	וּקְחוּ	MT simple imperative, Q <i>w</i> +imperative.
Exod 9:29	יִחְדְּלוּן	4QExod ^c	יִחְלוּ	Q has no paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Exod 9:30	תִּירְאוּן	4QExod ^c	תִּירְאוּ	Q has no paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Exod 10:13	וַיֵּט	4QExod ^c	וַיֵּטָה	Q has the unexpected long form.
Exod 15:14	יִרְגְּזוּן	4QExod ^c	וַיִּרְגְּזוּ	The MT <i>yiqtol</i> probably indicates concomitant action in the past. Q has no paragogic <i>nun</i> . The form with <i>w</i> may be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> or an unclassical non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> with the same meaning as in the MT (the <i>yiqtol</i> in MT v. 15 is preserved as such in Q).
Exod 17:2	תִּנְסוּן	4QExod ^c	תִּנְסוּ	Q has no paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Exod 18:16	כָּא	4Qpaleo-Exod ^m	וְ[כֹא]	Unclear.
Exod 24:7	וַנְשַׁמְעָה וַנְשַׁמְעָה	4Qpaleo-Exod ^m	[וְנִשְׁמַעֵנוּ]	See 6.2.3, with n. 28, in the main text.
Exod 32:11	יִחַרְהָ	4Qpaleo-Exod ^m	יִחַר	The short form in Q is unexpected (in a non-volitive clause introduced by הַלְמָה).
Exod 40:10	וּקְדַשְׁתָּ	4QExod–Lev ^f	וּקְדַשׁ	Is Q 3sm <i>weqatal</i> or <i>w</i> +imperative? The same 2sm <i>weqatal</i> in v. 11 is preserved as such in Q.
Exod 40:12	וְהִקְרַבְתָּ	4QExod–Lev ^f	תִּקְרַבְתָּ	The MT has <i>weqatal</i> +objects, Q objects+ <i>yiqtol</i> (reflecting the classical interchange of forms).
Lev 2:8	וְהִבֵּאתָ	4QLev ^b	וְהִבֵּא	Q <i>w</i> +imperative or 3sm <i>weqatal</i> (cf. LXX)?
Lev 14:49	וּלְקַח	4QLev–Num ^a	לְקַח	A simple <i>qatal</i> makes no sense here. It must be a mistake for <i>weqatal</i> .
Lev 16:23	כְּבָאוּ	4QLev–Num ^a	וְכָבְאוּ	Unclear.
Lev 17:4	הִבֵּיאוּ	4QLev ^d	יִבֵּיאוּ	Q has the same form as in MT v. 9. See 3.1 in the main text.
Lev 20:3	וּלְחַלְלֵל	11QpaleoLev ^a	וּחַלְלֵל	The form in Q could be interpreted as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> (coordinated with וְתִתְּנוּ). However, it seems more

Appendices

				likely that the form is <i>w</i> +infinitive (coordinated with ט]מא) as in the MT. In this case, the MT may be more unclassical (superfluous use of <i>l</i> -).
Num 16:5	וְהִקְרִיב	4QNum ^b	הִקְרִיב	The preceding passage is missing in Q. It is difficult to make sense of a simple <i>qatal</i> if the meaning of the passage is the same as in the MT. Q probably reflects the text type attested in the LXX (past reference, aorist form), cf. Jastram 1994, 221.
Num 16:5	יִבְחַר	4QNum ^b	בַּחַר	Again, the LXX has an aorist, and the passage seems to have past reference, unlike the MT (Jastram 1994, 221).
Num 20:26	וְהִפְשֵׁט	4QNum ^b	וְהִפְשֵׁט]טָתָה	Q (and the Samaritan Pentateuch) has a non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> in contrast to MT <i>w</i> +imperative. According to Joosten (2012a, 379–380, with n. 10), <i>weqatal</i> continuing imperatives (in v. 25) is rare in LBH but frequent in CBH.
Num 23:3	וְאֵלְכָה	4QNum ^b	וְאֵנוּכִי אֵלְךָ	MT volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> , Q preposed subject pronoun and simple <i>yiqtol</i> .
Num 31:50	לְכַפֵּר	4QNum ^b	וּכְפָרְךָ	The MT has an adverbial (final) <i>l</i> +infinitive. The form in Q may be a <i>w</i> +imperative or a <i>weqatal</i> (2sm or 3sm). The following part is missing.
Num 36:6	תִּהְיֶינָה	4QNum ^b	הֵינָה	Q seems to have an absolute infinitive, not attested in the MT.
Deut 1:11	יִסֶּף	4QDeut ^h	יִוְסֶף	Q has a long form although the verb (in the MT at least) is clearly jussive. This is probably due to the fact that the word is not initial (preposed, focused subject = God). Alternatively (and less likely), the form might be interpreted as a non-volitive (i.e. as a simple prediction). In this case, the following <i>weyiqtol</i> (וַיְבַרֵךְ) might be an unclassical non-volitive?
Deut 2:4	וַיִּירָאוּ	4QDeut ^h	וַיִּירָאוּ	The MT may have an unclassical non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> . Q may have a <i>weqatal</i> . Cf. appendix 46.
Deut 5:1	שָׁמַע	4QDeut ^l	שָׁמַע]עָהּ	Q has the long form of the imperative (cf. the end of appendix 51).
		4QDeut ⁿ	שָׁמַעָהּ	
		4QDeut ^o	שָׁמַעָהּ]	

Appendices

Deut 5:33	תִּלְכוּ	4QDeut ^l	תלכוֹן	Q seems to have a paragogic <i>nun</i> (but the passage is very fragmentary).
Deut 7:22	כִּלְתֶּם	4QDeut ^m	לכלותמהֹן	Q has <i>l-</i> before the infinitive (but not in 4QDeut ^e and 5QDeut).
Deut 8:3	יִדְעוּן	4QDeut ^c	ידעו	The MT has an unexpected "paragogic" <i>nun</i> on a <i>qatal</i> . Q has the ordinary form (4QDeut ^e and 4QDeut ^f have the MT form).
Deut 9:28	הוֹצֵאתָנוּ	1QDeut ^a	יוצאנוֹן	Unclear. The text is extremely fragmentary.
Deut 11:9	תִּאָרִיכוּ	4QDeut ^k	תאריכוֹן	Q has a paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Deut 13:5	תִּלְכוּ	1QDeut ^a	תלכוֹן	Q has a paragogic <i>nun</i> .
		4QDeut ^c	תלכוֹן	
Deut 14:24	שָׂאתוּ	1QDeut ^a	לשתו	Q has <i>l-</i> in front of the infinitive.
Deut 18:8	יֹאכְלוּ	4QDeut ^f	יאכלוֹן	Q has a paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Deut 20:3	שָׁמַע	4QDeut ^f	שמעה	Q has the long form of the imperative (cf. the end of appendix 51).
Deut 28:15	תִּשְׁמַע	4Qpaleo-Deut ^f	תשמעוֹן	Q has a paragogic <i>nun</i> (2pm; MT 2sm).
Deut 28:22	וַיִּדְפּוּךָ	4QDeut ^c	ירדפוֹךָ	In accordance with the classical interchange, Q has a simple <i>yiqtol</i> without <i>w-</i> while the MT has a <i>weqatal</i> . The preceding passage is lost in the scroll.
Deut 32:42	אֲשַׁכִּיר	4QDeut ^l	אשכירֹה	Q seems to have a marked cohortative form.
Deut 32:43	וַיִּכְפֹּר	4QDeut ^l	ויכפר	Though it is difficult to state with certainty in a poetic/hymnic context, the form in Q seems to be an unclassical non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> . ⁸⁷
Deut 33:29	וַיִּכְחָשׁוּ	4Qpaleo-Deut ^f	יכהֹןשׁו	The <i>weyiqtol</i> in the MT is clearly volitive and so is the initial simple <i>yiqtol</i> in Q.
Judg 6:3	וַעֲלוּ	4QJudg ^a	∅	The last part of this verse is missing in Q.

⁸⁷ Notarius (2013, 93) suggests that the *weyiqtol* in Q may be more authentic than the MT *weqatal*. She bases this suggestion on the assumption that non-anterior *weqatal* as known from CH was not in regular use in the archaic language. According to Notarius (ib., 290–291), the "system of sequential tenses" had not "decisively crystalized" at this stage. However, the argument that the so-called archaic poems are in fact that old is not persuasive (cf. appendix 9 on archaic poetry).

Appendices

1 Sam 2:10	יִרְעֵם	4QSam ^a	וִירְעֵם	Extremely fragmentary. The structure of the passage must be different from the MT. The form in Q may be a volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> . Note that the MT has two <i>weyiqtols</i> in the last part of the verse (possibly volitive, but it is difficult to decide in a poetic context, cf. appendix 47). Possibly וִירְעֵם is a <i>wayyiqtol</i> , cf. LXX aorist.
1 Sam 2:16	וַיֹּאמֶר	4QSam ^a	וְעֵנָה ... וְאֵלֶיךָ	The MT abandons the use of explicitly iterative/habitual forms here while Q uses <i>weqatals</i> (iterative/habitual non-anteriority). Cf. n. 8 in ch. 3. There is no reason to see these forms as anterior <i>weqatals</i> .
1 Sam 2:16	קִטְרוֹן יִקְטִירוֹן	4QSam ^a	יִקְטֵר הַכֹּהֵן	Q has no paragogic <i>nun</i> (the form is 3sm).
1 Sam 2:16	וְאֵם-לֹא לְקַחְתִּי	4QSam ^a	וְלִקְחַתִּי	The problematic MT <i>qatal</i> (performative?) is a <i>weqatal</i> in Q. If the reconstructed 1s is correct, the form refers to the future. Alternatively, we might reconstruct a 3sm and read the form as a return to the description of the habitual past behavior of Eli's sons. In the following lines, Q has a few habitual past <i>yiqtols</i> not attested in the MT.
1 Sam 2:20	וַיֹּאמֶר	4QSam ^a	לֵאמֹר	The MT habitual/iterative <i>weqatal</i> is an introductory infinitive in Q. This clearly does not mean that the scribe of the scroll did not understand this use of <i>weqatal</i> since several other cases are found in the text (including some not attested in the MT).
1 Sam 2:20	וְהִלְכוּ	4QSam ^a	וַיִּלְךְ הָאִישׁ	Q shifts from iterative/habitual to simple anterior <i>wayyiqtol</i> (like the MT did in v. 16). There is no need to see the Q form as an unclassical <i>weyiqtol</i> .
1 Sam 2:21	כִּי-פָקַד	4QSam ^a	וַיִּפְקַד	An ordinary <i>wayyiqtol</i> in Q.
1 Sam 2:22	וַיִּשְׁמַע	4QSam ^a	וַיִּשְׁמַעַן	Ordinary <i>wayyiqtol</i> in Q, cf. 2:20.
1 Sam 2:22	וַיַּעֲשׂוּן	4QSam ^a	עוֹשִׂים	Q uses the PTC instead of <i>yiqtol</i> for the expression of iterative/habitual events. This reflects a trend that comes to dominate in late stages of the language. However, as evident

Appendices

				from the previous lines, the scribe was clearly at home with a more classical usage as well.
1 Sam 2:25	אִם־יִהְיֶה טָא	4QSam ^a	אם [הטוא] יהטא	Q seems to have an absolute infinitive that is not attested in the MT. Conversely, the absolute infinitive in MT v. 30 (אָמור) seems to be missing in Q.
1 Sam 2:36	וְאָמַר	4QSam ^a	לאמור	Q uses an introductory infinitive instead of a finite form.
1 Sam 8:11	וְרָצוּ	4QSam ^a	ורצי[ם]	Too fragmentary to draw conclusions from. Q seems to have a PTC instead of <i>weqatal</i> .
1 Sam 10:5	וַיְהִי	4QSam ^a	וְהִיָּה	The MT seems to have an unclassical non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> while Q has the expected <i>weqatal</i> .
1 Sam 10:14	וַנְּבֹא	4QSam ^a	ונבואה	Q uses the pseudo-cohortative on a <i>wayyiqtol</i> .
1 Sam 10:27	∅	4QSam ^a	ונקר ונתן	This passage does not occur in the MT. Two of the additional verbs are <i>weqatals</i> . ⁸⁸ They seem to indicate past habituality, though the context and interpretation of the second one is a bit unclear (maybe it is a PTC?). In any case, there is no convincing argument that these forms must be anterior <i>weqatals</i> .
1 Sam 14:29	עָכַר	4QSam ^a	עכור	Unclear. Absolute infinitive instead of a finite form or emphatic usage?
1 Sam 15:30	וְשׁוּב	4QSam ^a	שוב	Q simple imperative, MT <i>w</i> +imperative.
1 Sam 16:2	תִּקַּח	4QSam ^b	ק[ח]	Q seems to use the imperative instead of 2sm <i>yiqtol</i> .
1 Sam 18:5	יִשְׁכָּלֵל	4QSam ^a	וישכליל	The MT has a <i>yiqtol</i> in past iterative/habitual function. Q seems to have a <i>wayyiqtol</i> and another division of the passage. In the MT, וַיֵּצֵא דָוִד seems to be a separate clause, followed by a new two-clause sentence (בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחֵנּוּ נְשָׂאֵל יִשְׁכָּלֵל). In Q, most of the text is lost but וַיֵּצֵא דָוִד must have been taken with בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַחֵנּוּ נְשָׂאֵל while וישכליל introduces a new segment. Cf. Rezetko and Young 2014, 514. In any case, there is no

⁸⁸ For an alternative reading (absolute infinitives), see Rezetko and Young 2014, 495.

Appendices

				convincing argument that וישכַּן־לֵיל is an unclassical <i>weyiqtol</i> .
1 Sam 21:5	∅	4QSam ^b	ואכלתם	A non-anterior (future/modal) <i>weqatal</i> not attested in the MT.
1 Sam 23:11	הַגְדִּינָא	4QSam ^b	הגידה	Q has the long imperative but no emphatic particle.
1 Sam 23:20	רַד	4QSam ^b	ירד	Q uses 3sm jussive instead of 2sm imperative. Note also the unclassical infinitive in this line (לרדה vs. MT לְרַדָּה).
1 Sam 23:22	עָרוֹם יַעְרוֹם	4QSam ^b	יַעְרוֹם	The absolute infinitive seems to be missing in Q.
2 Sam 4:4	הָיָה	4QSam ^a	ויהי	The <i>qatal</i> in the MT belongs with the preceding passage (בְּיַד־הַמֶּשֶׁשׁ שָׁנִים הָיָה) while the <i>wayyiqtol</i> in Q must be an introductory ויהי introducing the following temporal phrase (ב[ב]יָא).
2 Sam 4:11	הָרָגוּ	4QSam ^a	הרג	The form in Q has been interpreted as an absolute infinitive (see the discussion in Rezetko and Young 2014, 494). The same interpretation has been proposed for 1 Sam 31:4 and 2 Sam 3:34. Yet, the contexts are not entirely clear and the implications remain uncertain.
2 Sam 5:8	וַיָּגַע	4QSam ^a	יגע	This passage is difficult. The classicality of the MT <i>weyiqtol</i> is questionable.
2 Sam 5:9	וַיִּבֶן	4QSam ^a	ויבנה	Q has an unexpected unshortened form (note that the following word – which is not attested in the MT – begins with a laryngeal, עיר). It might be claimed that the <i>heh</i> really belongs to the following noun (העיר)?
2 Sam 6:9	וַיֵּאמֶר	4QSam ^a	לאמר	Q uses an introductory infinitive instead of a finite form.
2 Sam 6:13	וַיְהִי	4QSam ^a	והיה	Q might be an unclassical anterior <i>weqatal</i> . On the other hand, the context is clearly habitual/iterative. See also next entry.
2 Sam 6:16	וַהֲיָה	4QSam ^a	ויהי	In this case, the situation is the opposite of the one in the preceding entry. Here, however, the meaning cannot be iterative/habitual (on the unlikely progressive/ongoing character of

Appendices

				cases such as this, see 6.2.1 in the main text).
2 Sam 8:2	וַיִּמְדָּד	4QSam ^a	ומדד	The <i>weqatal</i> in Q may be iterative/habitual. Alternatively, it may be an unclassical anterior <i>weqatal</i> .
2 Sam 11:6	שְׁלַח	4QSam ^a	שְׁלַחָה	Q has a long imperative.
2 Sam 12:16	וַיָּבֹא וְלֶן וַיִּשְׁכַּב	4QSam ^a	ויב[ו]א וישכב בשק	The MT <i>weqatals</i> may be iterative/habitual (cf. the seven days in v. 18) or unclassical anteriors. The forms in Q should be read as <i>wayyiqtol</i> s and not as unclassical <i>weyiqtol</i> s.
2 Sam 14:21	הִשָּׁב	4QSam ^c	והשב	MT imperative, Q <i>w</i> +imperative.
2 Sam 15:1	וַיַּעַשׂ	4QSam ^c	יע[ו]שה	The MT has <i>wayyiqtol</i> +adverb+subject. Q has <i>w</i> +subject+ <i>yiqtol</i> . Since the following material is missing in Q, it is difficult to see if the <i>yiqtol</i> could be iterative/habitual (if the content is the same as in the MT, such meaning seems inappropriate; yet, the following lines are clearly iterative/habitual).
2 Sam 15:2	וַיֹּאמֶר	4QSam ^c	וענה	Q is probably iterative/habitual. This is not a convincing case for anterior <i>weqatal</i> . On this and the following entries, see 3.1 in the main text.
2 Sam 15:2	וְהִשְׁכַּיִם	4QSam ^a	ה[ו]שכמ	Q seems to have <i>w</i> +subject+ <i>qatal</i> . The MT has <i>weqatal</i> (iterative/habitual past)+subject.
2 Sam 15:2	וַיְהִי	4QSam ^a	וה[ו]יה	Q uses iterative/habitual <i>weqatal</i> .
2 Sam 15:2	וַיִּקְרָא	4QSam ^a	וקרא	Q uses iterative/habitual <i>weqatal</i> .
2 Sam 15:2	וַיֹּאמֶר	4QSam ^a	ואמר	Q uses iterative/habitual <i>weqatal</i> .
2 Sam 15:6	וַיִּגְנֹב	4QSam ^a	ו[ג]נב	Again, the Q form is probably an iterative/habitual <i>weqatal</i> rather than an unclassical anterior (unless it is possible to read a <i>wayyiqtol</i> as in the MT).
2 Sam 15:14	כִּי לֹא־ תִּהְיֶה־לָּנוּ פְּלִיטָה	4QSam ^c	[תהי לנו פליטה]	Q seems to have a positive jussive rather than a negative simple <i>yiqtol</i> . The variants seem to express the same fundamental idea in two different ways. However, the scroll is quite fragmentary.

Appendices

2 Sam 18:5	שָׁמְעוּ	4QSam ^a	שמעים	Q renders the ongoing character of the action explicit by using a PTC.
2 Sam 21:6	יִגְתֹּן	4QSam ^a	ונתתם	Q seems to use an ordinary non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> instead of initial (probably jussive) <i>yiqtol</i> .
2 Sam 22:39	וְאָכְלִים וְאָמְחָצִים	4QSam ^a	אמה]צם	On these occurrences, see appendix 9.
2 Sam 22:40	תִּכְרִיעַ	4QSam ^a	ותכרע	
2 Sam 22:41	וְאֶצְמִיתֶם	4QSam ^a	אֶצְמִית]ם	
2 Sam 23:7	יִשְׁרְפוּ	11QPs ^a	ושרפו	The <i>weqatal</i> in Q is clearly non-anterior. However, the passage seems to make little sense with the conjunction. Perhaps we should read a <i>y</i> -?
2 Sam 23:10	וַיָּךְ	1QSam	ויכה	Q has an unexpected unshortened form.
	וַיַּעַשׂ	1QSam	ויע[ש]ה	
2 Sam 23:12	וַיָּךְ	1QSam	ויכה	
2 Sam 24:16	הָיָה	4QSam ^a	עומד	Q has a PTC (indicating past ongoingness without הָיָה), cf. 1 Chr 21:15
2 Sam 24:18	הָקָם	4QSam ^a	ו]הקם	Q seems to have <i>w</i> +imperative.
1 Kgs 1:37	יִהְיֶה	5QKgs	יהי	The form in Q corresponds to the <i>qere</i> of the MT.
1 Kgs 8:7	פְּרָשִׁים	4QKgs	פרשי	The construct PTC in Q seems less "verbal" than the absolute PTC in the MT.
2 Kgs 8:4	סִפְרָה־נָּא	6Qpap-Kgs	ספר נא	The MT has the long form of the imperative.
Isa 1:18 ⁸⁹	וְנִנְקָחָהּ	4QIsa ^f	ונו[נ]ח	Q lacks the cohortative suffix.
Isa 1:25	וְאָסִירָהּ	4QIsa ^f	וא[ס]יר	
Isa 1:26	וְאָשִׁיבָהּ	4QIsa ^f	וא[ש]יב	
Isa 2:2	יְהִיָּה	4QIsa ^e	∅	יְהִיָּה is missing in Q and וְהָיָה at the beginning of the verse must be interpreted as a "real verb" rather than merely introductory (as in the MT).
Isa 5:19	יְחִישָׁהּ	4QIsa ^b	ו]יחיש	The meaning is clearly volitive in both the MT and Q.
	וְתִקְרַב וְתִבּוֹאָהּ	4QIsa ^b	וְתִקְרַב וְתִבּוֹא	The MT and Q disagree on the placement of the irregular third person cohortative suffix.

⁸⁹ Note that I discuss the great Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a) separately in appendix 50.

Appendices

Isa 5:25	וְתָהִי	4QIsa ^f	וְתָהִי]ו	Extremely fragmentary. Q seems to have an unshortened <i>wayyiqtol</i> .
Isa 5:29	וְשָׁאג	pap4Q-Isa ^p	יִשְׁאָג	Q agrees with the MT <i>qere</i> .
Isa 11:8	הִדְהָה	4QIsa ^c	יִהְיֶה	Q seems to harmonize the verb with the preceding verbs. Cf. 3.3.1 in the main text.
Isa 11:14	יָבֹזוּ	4QIsa ^c	וּבְזוּ	Q seems to have a <i>weqatal</i> (ordinary non-anterior) instead of the MT <i>yiqtol</i> . The preceding part of the verse is lost.
Isa 13:2	וְיָבֹאוּ	4QIsa ^a	יָבֹאוּ	The initial <i>yiqtol</i> in Q and the <i>weyiqtol</i> in the MT both seem to be volitive.
Isa 22:17	וְעֹטְדָה	1QIsa ^b	וְיַעֲטֹד	Though most of the context is missing, the forms in Q seem to be non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> s. However, a volitive reading may be possible.
		4QIsa ^a]וְיַעֲטֹד	
Isa 23:2	עֲבֹר	4QIsa ^a	עֲבֹרוּ	Q seems to be a <i>qatal</i> 3p instead of the non-predicative PTC in the MT? The implications are unclear.
Isa 23:11	הִרְגִּיזוּ	4QIsa ^c	לְהִרְגִּיז	Q uses an adverbial (final) <i>l</i> +infinitive (cf. the end of the verse in the MT, לְשִׂמְד)
Isa 23:15	וְנִשְׁכַּחַת	4QIsa ^c	וְנִשְׁכַּחַת	MT <i>w</i> +PTC <i>sf</i> (or <i>weqatal</i> 2sf?), Q <i>weqatal</i> 3sf.
	יִהְיֶה	4QIsa ^c	וְהָיָה	The structure of the overall passage must be different in Q to allow for a <i>weqatal</i> (ordinary non-anterior) instead of the MT non-initial <i>yiqtol</i> (the preceding adverb must belong with the previous clause in Q; but the preserved text is fragmentary).
Isa 23:18	יִהְיֶה	4QIsa ^c	וְהָיָה	The <i>weqatal</i> in Q is clearly non-anterior. However, the addition of the conjunction makes the reading of the preceding clause difficult.
Isa 24:12	וְנִשְׁאָר	4QIsa ^c	וְנִשְׁאָר	In contrast to Muraoka's view (2000b, 210), there is no reason to see the <i>weqatal</i> in Q as anterior. The context seems to refer to the future or the general present with use of <i>qatal</i> and <i>wayyiqtol</i> indicating present perfect as well as <i>yiqtol</i> s. Hence, וְנִשְׁאָר is likely to be an ordinary non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> (cf. v. 6 with the same form in the MT).

Appendices

Isa 24:14	יָרַנּוּ	4QIsa ^c	ורננו	Unproblematic non-anterior <i>weqatals</i> in Q. צָהָלוּ in the MT may be problematic (revocalize as imperative, as suggested in the apparatus in BHS?).
	צָהָלוּ	4QIsa ^c	וצהלו	
Isa 24:22	וְאֶסְפוּ אֶסְפָּה	4QIsa ^c	ואסף אסוף	Q seems to have an absolute infinitive (אסוף) not attested in the MT (ordinary noun, אֶסְפָּה). Note in addition the difference between passive 3p and active 3sm in the <i>weqatal</i> (this occurs quite often and has not been noted systematically in the present list).
Isa 28:16	יִסַּד	1QIsa ^b	יוסד	Q has a PTC in contrast to the problematic form in the MT.
Isa 29:2	וְהִיָּתָה	4QIsa ^k	וְהִיָּתָה	The scroll is quite fragmentary. The form may be a simple <i>yiqtol</i> or a volitive or non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> ?
Isa 37:30	אָכַל	4QIsa ^b	אָכַל	Q may be an imperative rather than an absolute infinitive? However, at the end of the verse, Q may have an absolute infinitive (אָכַל) as attested in the MT <i>ketib</i> (<i>qere</i> = w+imperative 2pm).
Isa 39:1	וַיִּשְׁמַע	4QIsa ^b	כי שמע	The MT has a past perfect <i>wayyiqtol</i> while Q uses the same construction as in Kgs 20:12.
Isa 43:4	וְאָתָּן	1QIsa ^b	ואתנה	The MT may not be volitive. Q is clearly marked as cohortative. However, the form may be understood as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (with pseudo-cohortative).
Isa 43:8	הוֹצִיא	1QIsa ^b	אוציא	The MT is a <i>qatal</i> 3sm (or an imperative with irregular vocalization). The form in Q may reflect a blurring of ה and א or it may be a 1s <i>yiqtol</i> (a verb indicating simple future is not entirely out of place in the context).
Isa 43:12	וְהִשְׁמַעְתִּי	1QIsa ^b	השמעתי	Q has an unproblematic simple <i>qatal</i> , the MT a possibly problematic anterior <i>weqatal</i> .
Isa 46:6	וַיִּשְׁכְּרוּ	1QIsa ^b	וישכרו	The <i>weyiqtol</i> s seem to be non-volitive. However, note that the verb occurring in between these two cases is also a non-volitive in the MT (וַיִּעֲשֶׂהוּ).
	וַיִּסְגְּדוּ	1QIsa ^b	ויסגדו	
Isa 48:13	וַיַּעֲמְדוּ	4QIsa ^d	ויעמדו	A volitive interpretation of the <i>weyiqtol</i> in Q is possible. Alternatively,

Appendices

				it might even be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> . There is no convincing argument that it is a non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
		4QIsa ^c	וי]עמדו	
Isa 48:14	אָהבו	4QIsa ^c]אוהב]	Q seems to have a PTC instead of the MT finite form? The context is missing in Q.
Isa 48:15	והצליח	4QIsa ^c	וא]צליח	The form in Q may reflect a blurring of ה and א or it may be a 1s <i>w+yiqtol</i> . In the latter case, it may be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> . There is no clear evidence for a non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Isa 49:3	אָתפּאָר	1QIsa ^b	הת]פאר	Q seems to have a (present perfect) <i>qatal</i> (probably 1s?) instead of the MT <i>yiqtol</i> .
Isa 49:7	וְקָמוּ	1QIsa ^b	יְקוּמוּ	The MT has an apparently indiscriminate use of <i>weqatal</i> and <i>weyiqtol</i> in this verse (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ). This possibly unclassical usage is less apparent in Q. Though the part with the MT <i>weyiqtol</i> is missing, the <i>waw</i> on the word following יְקוּמוּ might indicate that the next verb in the scroll was a simple <i>yiqtol</i> ? No conclusions can be drawn.
Isa 51:11	נָסוּ	4QIsa ^c	ו]נסו	Very fragmentary. If the form in Q is a <i>weqatal</i> , there is no reason for an anterior interpretation (the context is clearly future; the MT <i>qatal</i> indicates anteriority in this context, i.e. present perfect/future perfect). Alternatively, the form in Q might be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (with the same anterior meaning as the MT <i>qatal</i>).
Isa 52:15	יְקַפְּצוּ	1QIsa ^b	וְקַפְּצוּ	Q seems to have a different division of clauses and accordingly a <i>weqatal</i> (ordinary non-anterior) instead of MT <i>yiqtol</i> , following the classical rules.
Isa 53:3	נְבִיזָה	1QIsa ^b	וּנְבִיזָה	The form is probably a PTC. Alternatively, the form in Q might be a 1p <i>wayyiqtol</i> ?
Isa 53:10	יֵאָרִיךְ	4QIsa ^d	וְהֵאָרִיךְ	The extra <i>waws</i> in Q lead to the expected classical shift from <i>yiqtol</i> to <i>weqatal</i> .
Isa 53:11	יִשְׁבַּע	4QIsa ^d	וְשָׁבַע	

Appendices

Isa 55:12	תצאון	1QIsa ^b	תצאון	Q has a paragogic <i>nun</i> not attested in the MT (but the following verb has a <i>nun</i> in both versions).
Isa 56:12	אקחה	1QIsa ^b	אקה	Q has no cohortative suffix.
Isa 57:13	וירש	4QIsa ^d	וירש	The difference may be merely orthographical. Otherwise, the form in Q may represent a <i>weqatal</i> in contrast to the probably non-classical, non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> in the MT?
Isa 57:17	ואכהו ואסתר ואקצה	4QIsa ^d	ואכהו ואסתר ואקצה	Q has an extra <i>w+yiqtol</i> . However, all three forms may be <i>wayyiqtol</i> s in Q. The MT <i>weyiqtol</i> s (vocalization) are less transparent.
Isa 57:18	ואשלם	1QIsa ^b	ואשלמה	Q has an explicit (pseudo-?) cohortative form. This and the preceding <i>w+yiqtol</i> s may be interpreted as <i>wayyiqtol</i> s (cf. LXX). The <i>weyiqtol</i> s in the MT are potentially non-volitive?
Isa 59:4	בטוח ... ודבר ... הרו ... והולידו	1QIsa ^b	בטחו ... דברו ... הרו ... והולידו	The four MT absolute infinitives are <i>qatal/weqatal</i> 3p in Q (though הרו may be an absolute infinitive, such an interpretation seems unlikely in view of the other forms). והולידו might be claimed to be an anterior <i>weqatal</i> but there is no decisive argument for this reading (cf. the shift from <i>qatal</i> to <i>yiqtol</i> in v. 5, יארגו, בקעו). Note also that there is no <i>waw</i> in front of דברו.
Isa 60:6	יבשרו	1QIsa ^b	יבשרון	Q has a paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Isa 63:3	אגאלתי	1QIsa ^b	גאלתי	Q has a more straightforward <i>qatal</i> while the MT form may be a combination of <i>yiqtol</i> and <i>qatal</i> ? The preceding <i>w+yiqtol</i> s are vocalized as <i>weyiqtol</i> s in the MT. In Q, they might be <i>wayyiqtol</i> s?
Isa 63:5–6	ואביט ... ואשתומם ... ואבוס ... ואוריד ...	1QIsa ^b	ואביטה ... ואשתוממה ... ואבוסה ... וארידה ...	Q has explicit (pseudo-?) cohortative forms. In Q, the forms may be interpreted as <i>wayyiqtol</i> s in contrast to the possibly unclassical MT <i>weyiqtol</i> s?
Isa 65:23	ייגעו	1QIsa ^b	יגעו	The difference is probably purely orthographical. Otherwise, the form in Q might be a <i>qatal</i> ?
Jer 8:7	ישמרו	4QJer ^a	ישמרו	The MT has a "gnomic" <i>qatal</i> , Q a <i>yiqtol</i> .
Jer 9:11	ויבן	4QJer ^a	ויבן	A <i>yod</i> seems to have been added above the line. The resultant form is

Appendices

				an unexpected unshortened form (in a context that seems to be volitive).
Jer 10:15	פְּקֻדָּתָם	4QJer ^b	פְּקֻדָּתִים	MT noun with possessive suffix, Q possibly 1s <i>qatal</i> with object?
Jer 12:14	נִתְּשָׁם	4QJer ^a]נִתְּוֹשָׁם]	The MT active PTC seems to be passive in Q? The context is too fragmentary to decide if the difference could be intentional.
Jer 19:9	וְהֶאֱכַלְתִּים	4QJer ^c	וּיֵאָזְלוּ	There seems to be no reason for reconstructing an (unclassical) <i>weyiqtol</i> . The form in Q might be an ordinary non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> . Cf. LXX καὶ ἔδονται.
Jer 21:8	נִתַּן	4QJer ^c	נִתַּתִּי	Q seems to have a performative <i>qatal</i> , generally considered more classical than the PTC in such contexts.
Jer 22:14	וְקָרַע	4QJer ^c	קָרַע	Q passive PTC or absolute infinitive? The implications are unclear.
Jer 30:18	וְנִבְנְתָה	4QJer ^c	וְנִבְנָה	MT <i>weqatal</i> 3sf, Q <i>w+PTC</i> ? Or <i>weyiqtol</i> 1p (unlikely)?
Jer 31:8	וְקִבְצָתִים	4QJer ^c	וְאִקְבְּצָם	The <i>weyiqtol</i> in Q may be non-volitive. However, especially since the preceding verb has not been preserved (MT מְבִיא), we can hardly exclude a volitive reading.
Jer 47:4	לְהִכְרִית	2QJer	וְהִכְרַתִּי	This variant seems to go against the tendency often claimed to exist in the Qumran documents for extended use of <i>l</i> +infinitive.
Jer 48:29	שָׁמְעֵנוּ	2QJer	שָׁמְעוּ נָא	MT <i>qatal</i> 1p, Q imperative 2pm.
Jer 48:37	גִּרְעָה	2QJer	תִּגְרָע]	MT passive PTC indicating a (future) state, Q <i>yiqtol</i> indicating a simple future event.
Ezek 1:13	יִצָּא	4QEzek ^b	יָצָא	The form in Q may be a defective PTC, a <i>qatal</i> or an iterative/habitual <i>yiqtol</i> (cf. v. 12 in the MT).
Hos 14:6	וְיָדָה	4QXII ^c	יָדָה	Both versions seem to be volitive?
Joel 1:14	קָרְאוּ	4QXII ^c	וְקָרְאוּ	MT imperative, Q <i>w+imperative</i> .
Joel 4:16	וְרָעְשׁוּ	4QXII ^c	וְיִרְעְשׁוּ	The <i>w+yiqtol</i> in Q may be a non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> corresponding to the MT <i>weqatal</i> . However, since the preceding passage has been lost in the scroll, the form may be interpretable as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (cf. the <i>qatal</i> forms in MT v. 15).

Appendices

Amos 5:15	שָׁאוּ	4QXII ^g	שָׁאוּ	MT imperative, Q <i>qatal</i> 1p (scribal mistake?; but cf. LXX, μεμισήκαμεν).
Amos 7:8	שָׁם	4QXII ^c	שָׁמָיִם	Q seems to have a performative <i>qatal</i> , generally considered more classical than the PTC in such contexts.
Obad 1:4	שָׁם	4QXII ^g	תָּשִׁים	MT passive PTC (indicating a present or future state), Q <i>yiqtol</i> 2sm (indicating general present/future; the clause is a conditional clause).
Obad 1:15	יָשׁוּב	4QXII ^g	שׁוּבוּ	MT <i>yiqtol</i> 3sm, Q imperative 2pm or infinitive with 3sm suffix? The form as written in Q is difficult to interpret in the context.
Jon 1:8	הַגִּידָה	4QXXI ^a	הַגִּדּוּ	Q has the ordinary imperative, MT has the long form.
Jon 2:10	אֲשַׁלְמָהּ	4QXII ^g	אֲשַׁלֵּם	Q lacks the cohortative suffix.
Jon 3:3	וַיִּקָּם	4QXII ^g	[וַיִּקָּוּ]	Q may have an unshortened form (mere orthography?).
Zech 4:4	וַאֲמַר	4QXII ^e	וַאֲמַרְהָ	Q has the pseudo-cohortative <i>way-yiqtol</i> .
Zech 5:9	וַאֲרָא	4QXII ^e	וַאֲרָא[וּ]	Q has the pseudo-cohortative <i>way-yiqtol</i> (the preceding verb seems to have been written in the same way but then erased).
Zech 5:10	וַאֲמַר	4QXII ^e	וַאֲמַרְהָ[וּ]	Q has the pseudo-cohortative <i>way-yiqtol</i> .
Mal 2:16	וְכַסָּה	4QXII ^a	יִכְסֹוּ	MT <i>weqatal</i> , Q <i>yiqtol</i> . The beginning of the verse is difficult in the MT (כִּי־שָׁנָא שְׁלַח) and the variant form in Q is problematic as well (כִּי אִם שְׁנַתָּה שְׁלַח).
Mal 2:17	הוֹגְעָתֶם	4QXII ^a	וְהוֹגְעַתֶּם	There is no reason to see the form in Q as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . The following verb is a non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> and וְהוֹגְעַתֶּם makes sense as non-anterior too. Alternatively, we may be dealing with a scribal slip (putting the <i>waw</i> in the wrong position, cf. הוֹגְעֵנוּ for MT הוֹגְעָנוּ later in the verse).
Mal 3:17	וְהָיָו	4QXII ^a	וְהָיָו	Though the context is mostly missing, the form in Q seems to be an unclassical, non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Ps 9:5	יִשְׁבְּתָהּ	11QPs ^c	וּשְׁבַתָּהּ	MT <i>qatal</i> , Q <i>weqatal</i> from another root (unless the <i>waw</i> is to be read as a <i>yod</i>). The second verb is a non-predicative (circumstantial) PTC in the MT but a simple <i>qatal</i> in Q. In a poetic text it is difficult to argue that וּשְׁבַתָּהּ

Appendices

				must be an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . It seems possible to read "for you have made (or established) my right..., and (now that you have done that) you will return to the throne; you have judged with justice"?
	שׁוֹפֵט	11QPs ^c	שפטתה	
Ps 17:13	פִּלְטָה	11QPs ^c	פ[לט]	The MT has the long form of the imperative, Q the ordinary short form.
Ps 18:2	אַרְחֻמָּךְ	11QPs ^c	רחמ[תיכה]	Q has a (stative present?) <i>qatal</i> , which might be considered more classical than the MT <i>yiqtol</i> . However, the <i>yiqtol</i> may refer to the future rather than indicate stative present.
Ps 18:4	אַקְרָא	11QPs ^c	אקראה	Q has a cohortative suffix (unexpected on this root type).
Ps 18:17	יִקְחֵנִי	11QPs ^c	ויקח[ני]	Both may be volitive. Alternatively, the form in Q (where the context is missing) might be parsed as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> . In any case, there is no reason to interpret the form as a non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Ps 22:16	תִּשְׁפָּתֵנִי	4QPs ^f	שופט]	Q seems to have a PTC from a different root (or orthographical?). The interpretation of the fragmentary Q text is unclear, as are the implications of the variant.
Ps 25:5	וְלִמְדָנִי	11QPs ^c	למ[דני]	MT <i>w+</i> imperative, Q simple imperative.
Ps 30:11	וְתִחַנֵּנִי	4QPs ^r	וי[חנני]	MT <i>w+</i> imperative, Q either volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> or <i>wayyiqtol</i> (cf. LXX και ἠλέησέν). The preceding verb (MT imperative, LXX aorist) has not been preserved in Q.
Ps 33:8	יִירָאוּ	4QPs ^q	יראו	This variant is probably purely orthographical. Alternatively, the form in Q may be a <i>qatal</i> or an imperative?
Ps 33:9	וַיְהִי	4QPs ^q	והיה	The <i>weqatal</i> in Q may be anterior. However, the preceding and following words have been lost. It seems possible to make sense of a non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> here (as a general description of God's power).
Ps 33:10	הַפִּיר	4QPs ^q	הפר	Probably orthographical. Alternatively, the form in Q might be an imperative?

Appendices

Ps 33:12	הַהֲיָה?	4QPs ^d	וְהִיָּה	This must be a scribal mistake – the MT has the name of God and a <i>weqatal</i> makes no sense here (right after the word אשר).
Ps 35:15	וְנִאָּסְפוּ נִאָּסְפוּ	4QPs ^a	נִאָּסְפוּ]	Q seems to lack the (potentially non-anterior) <i>weqatal</i> .
Ps 35:16	חַרְקוּ	4QPs ^a	חַרְקוּ	MT absolute infinitive, Q <i>qatal</i> 3p?
Ps 38:6	נִמְקוּ	4QPs ^a	וְנִמְקוּ	Q may be an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . However, since the passage is a general description of the state of the psalmist, a non-anterior interpretation might be possible. Only the final part of the preceding verb (MT <i>qatal</i>) has been preserved and it may have been a <i>yiqtol</i> in Q?
Ps 38:17	הִגְדִּילוּ	4QPs ^a	יִגְדִּילוּ	Q uses <i>yiqtol</i> (general present), MT <i>qatal</i> (present perfect) in the description.
Ps 50:21	וְאֶעֱרָכָה	4QPs ^c	וְאֶעֱרֹךְ	Q lacks the cohortative suffix.
Ps 52:11	אֶוֹדְדָה	4QPs ^c	וְאֶוֹדְדָה	Both seem to be volitive (the verb in the second half of the verse is a <i>weyiqtol</i> in the MT and in Q).
Ps 66:16	שִׁמְעוּ	4QPs ^a	וּשְׁמַעוּ	MT simple imperative, Q <i>w+</i> imperative.
Ps 67:6	יִדְוֹדָה	4QPs ^a	וּיְדַוְּכָה	Both are volitive.
Ps 69:6	לְאִנְלִיתִי וְאִשְׁמֹתִי	4QPs ^a	לֹא לִוִּיתִי וְאִשְׁלִמְנִי	The MT nouns seem to be finite verbs in Q. The implications are unclear. Cf. also v. 13.
Ps 69:11	וְאֶבְכֶּה	4QPs ^a	וְאָכַח	The MT has an unexpected long form, Q has the expected short <i>wayyiqtol</i> (from a different root).
Ps 69:15	∅	4QPs ^a	[וְיִקְחֵנִי	This verb does not occur in the MT. It may be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> or a volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> ? The interpretation of the passage in Q is difficult.
	אֶנְצָלָה	4QPs ^a	הֲצִילֵנִי	MT 1s cohortative, Q imperative.
Ps 69:18	מִמֶּה	4QPs ^a	מִמֶּה [רָה	Q seems to have the long form of the imperative. Alternatively, the form may be parsed as an adjective.
Ps 69:19	קִרְבָּה	4QPs ^a	קִרְבָּה	The MT has the long form of the imperative.
Ps 71:2	תִּצְלִינִי וּתְפַלְטֵנִי ... הִטָּה וְהוֹשִׁיעֵנִי	4QPs ^a	הִצְלִינִי תְפַלְטֵנִי ... הִטָּה הִצְלִינִי	The potentially problematic 2sm <i>weyiqtol</i> in the MT is not found in Q.

Appendices

Ps 71:11	ותַּפְּשׂוּהוּ	4QPs ^a	תַּפְּן־שׁוּהוּ	MT <i>w</i> +imperative, Q simple imperative.
Ps 71:13	יִכְלוּ	4QPs ^a	ויִכְלִין	Both are clearly volitive.
Ps 89:20	ותִּאמֶר	4QPs ^x	תִּאמֶר	The context in Q is very fragmentary and it does not seem possible to draw any conclusions from these variants.
	שׁוֹיִתִּי	4QPs ^x	שׁת	
Ps 89:23	לֹא יַעֲבֹדוּ	4QPs ^x	לַעֲבֹדָתְךָ	The <i>l</i> +infinitive in Q must depend on a finite verb in the hole at the start of the line. Hence, there is no reason to interpret this as a "finite" use of the infinitive.
Ps 91:2	אִמַּר	11Q-apocrPs	הֵאָמַר	MT 1s <i>yiqtol</i> , Q PTC with definite article. Note that there are several other variants in this scroll (changed order of elements, different roots or grammatical persons). In v. 14, MT אֲשַׁבֵּחַהּ is represented by וְ in Q (this could be <i>weqatal</i> , volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> , or something else). At the end of the psalm, Q has the verb ויעֲבֹדוּ (not attested in the MT), which seems to be a volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> .
Ps 92:12	תִּשְׁמַעְנָה	1QPs ^a	שִׁמְעָה]	The MT has a poetic shift from <i>wayyiqtol</i> to <i>yiqtol</i> . Q seems to have harmonized the <i>yiqtol</i> to a <i>qatal</i> (3sf rather than 3pf). The preceding verb (MT וַתִּבְטֵט) has not been preserved in Q.
Ps 92:15	יִהְיֶה	4QPs ^b	וְיִהְיֶה	In the fragmentary context it is impossible to say anything about a possible different structure of the passage in Q as opposed to the MT. In any case, there is no reason to see וְיִהְיֶה as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> .
Ps 93:1	הִתְאַזָּר	11QPs ^a	[וְיִתְאַזָּר	MT <i>qatal</i> , Q <i>wayyiqtol</i> (apparently with a different division between the clauses in the passage).
Ps 102:16	וַיִּירָאוּ	4QPs ^b	וַיִּירָאוּ	Both seem to be volitive.
Ps 103:3	הִרְפָּא	4QPs ^b	וַרְפָּא	MT PTC with definite article, Q is probably <i>w</i> +PTC. Alternatively, it may be a (probably non-anterior) <i>weqatal</i> ?
Ps 104:1	לִבְשָׁתְךָ	4QPs ^d	תִּלְבַּשׁ	The MT has a (stative present) <i>qatal</i> , Q a (general present or future) <i>yiqtol</i> .

Appendices

Ps 104:5	יִסַּד	4QPs ^d	יוסד	Q uses a PTC instead of the MT <i>qatal</i> (cf. several other verses in this psalm). Due to the meaning of the verb, the PTC seems to be nominal rather than an expression of progressive or concomitant action.
Ps 104:10	יְהַלְכוּן	4QPs ^d	יהלכו	Q lacks the paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Ps 104:22	וַיֵּאֲסֹפוּן	4QPs ^d	ויאספו	Q lacks the paragogic <i>nun</i> and has a preposed <i>waw</i> . Though the context is largely missing, this <i>weyiqtol</i> seems to be non-volitive.
		11QPs ^a	ויאספון	Cf. above, though this form has the paragogic <i>nun</i> .
	יִרְבְּצוּן	4QPs ^d	ירבצו	Q lacks the paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Ps 104:27	יִשְׁבְּרוּן	11QPs ^a	ישברו	Q lacks the paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Ps 104:28	וַיִּלְקְטוּן	11QPs ^a	וילקטון	Q seems to be a non-volitive <i>weyiqtol</i> . However, as always, it is difficult to decide in poetry. Note that the MT has a (potentially problematic) <i>weyiqtol</i> in v. 30.
	יִשְׁבְּעוּן	11QPs ^a	ישבעו	Q lacks the paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Ps 104:29	וַיִּגְוְעוּן	11QPs ^a	ויגועו	See וַיִּלְקְטוּן in v. 28 above (but in v. 29 the paragogic <i>nun</i> is missing).
	יִשׁוּבוּן	11QPs ^a	ישובו	Q lacks the paragogic <i>nun</i> .
Ps 104:30	וַיִּבְרְאוּן	11QPs ^a	ויבראו	See וַיִּלְקְטוּן in v. 28 above.
Ps 104:31	יְהִי	11QPs ^a	ויהי	The MT is clearly volitive and the same is probably the case in Q (volitive <i>weyiqtol</i>).
Ps 107:13	וַיִּשְׂעֵם	4QPs ^f	וישעם	The conjunction in Q is difficult in light of the preceding passage. Maybe וַיִּשְׂעֵם is a mere spelling mistake? The form may be interpretable as a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (cf. LXX)?
Ps 107:14	וַיִּצְיֵאֵם	4QPs ^f	וויציאם	Q is probably a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (cf. LXX)?
Ps 107:15	יִוְדוּ	4QPs ^f	ה]ודו	MT <i>yiqtol</i> 3p (jussive), Q probably imperative?
Ps 107:27	וַיַּחְוֶגוּ	4QPs ^f	ויחגו	MT <i>yiqtol</i> , Q <i>weyiqtol</i> ? The following verb in the MT is a (potentially problematic) <i>weyiqtol</i> as well. However, in Q, the <i>w+yiqtol</i> s might be parsed as <i>wayyiqtol</i> s?

Appendices

Ps 107:28	יִצְיָאֵם	4QPs ^f	וישעים	See v. 13 above.
Ps 107:29	יָקָם	4QPs ^f	ויופך	Q is probably a <i>wayyiqtol</i> (cf. LXX)?
Ps 107:36	ויושב	4QPs ^f	וישב	The form in Q seems to be a mere orthographical variant (rather than a <i>wegatal qal</i>).
Ps 107:39	וימַעַטוּ	4QPs ^f	ימַעַטוּ	In the fragmentary context of Q it is not possible to make sense of this variant.
Ps 109:5	וישימו	4QPs ^f	יסימו	The preceding verb is a <i>yiqtol</i> . Q seems to harmonize while the MT shifts from (general present/future) <i>yiqtol</i> to (present perfect?) <i>wayyiqtol</i> .
Ps 109:31	יעמד	11QPs ^a	עמד	Q seems to have a stative present <i>qatal</i> , which might be considered more classical than the MT <i>yiqtol</i> . However, the <i>yiqtol</i> may indicate future or general present rather than stative present? The preceding word is כִּי, thus the form in Q may be the result of simple haplography.
Ps 118:16	עשה	11QPs ^a	עשתה	MT PTC sf, Q <i>qatal</i> 3sf (present perfect, "gnomic"?).
Ps 119:15	אשיחה	4QPs ^h	אשיח	Q lacks the cohortative suffix.
Ps 119:17	אחיה	4QPs ^h 11QPs ^a	ואחיה	Both variants are clearly volitive (Q volitive <i>weyiqtol</i>).
Ps 119:18	ואביטה	4QPs ^h	אביט	The MT is clearly volitive. The same may be the case in Q though the cohortative suffix is missing.
Ps 119:22	גל	11QPs ^a	גול	Both may be imperatives, or the MT may be a <i>qatal</i> ?
Ps 119:47	ואשתעשע	11QPs ^a	ואשתעשעה	Q has the cohortative suffix (cf. the preceding verses in the MT).
Ps 119:49	זכר	11QPs ^a	זכורה	Q has the long form of the imperative.
Ps 119:69	אצור	11QPs ^a	אצורה	Q has the cohortative suffix.
Ps 119:70	שעשעתי	11QPs ^a	שע[ש]ועי	The MT <i>qatal</i> seems to be a noun with possessive suffix in Q.
Ps 119:130	יָאִיר	11QPs ^a	והאר	Q seems to be a <i>w+</i> imperative. Likewise the form פָּתַח at the beginning of the verse seems to be an imperative in

Appendices

				Q, as opposed to the noun in the MT (פָּתַח).
Ps 119:164	הִלְלִיתִיךָ	11QPs ^b	אֵה[ללכה	The MT has a (present perfect) <i>qatal</i> , Q seems to have a (general present/future) <i>yiqtol</i> .
Ps 119:172	תַּעַן	11QPs ^a	תַּעֲנָה	Q has an unexpected unshortened form in an initial (probably jussive) <i>yiqtol</i> .
Ps 130:7	פְּדוּת	11QPs ^a	פָּדָה	Q seems to have a <i>qatal</i> instead of the noun in the MT.
Ps 132:16	אֶלְבִּישׁ	11QPs ^a	א[לבי]שָׁה	Q has a cohortative suffix
	רִנָּן	11QPs ^a	∅	The MT absolute infinitive is missing in Q.
Ps 135:21	בָּרוּךְ	11QPs ^a	יִבְרַכְכָּה	MT passive PTC, Q initial <i>yiqtol</i> (jussive).
Ps 136:11	וַיִּזְעַא	11QPs ^a	וַיִּזְעִיא	Q has an unexpected unshortened <i>wayyiqtol</i> .
Ps 136:15	וַנְעַר	11QPs ^a	נַעַר	Q has a simple <i>qatal</i> instead of the (potentially anterior) <i>weqatal</i> in the MT.
Ps 139:9	אֶשָּׂא	11QPs ^a	אִשְׂאָה	Q has a cohortative suffix (unexpected on this root type).
Ps 139:11	וְאָמַר	11QPs ^a	וְאוֹמְרָה	Q has the pseudo-cohortative suffix. However, the form in Q may be parsed as a real cohortative (<i>weyiqtol</i>).
Ps 140:5	שְׁמְרָנִי	11QPs ^a	שׁוֹמְרָנִי	This variant may be orthographical (imperative). Alternatively, the form in Q may be a PTC?
Ps 141:6	וְשָׁמְעוּ	11QPs ^a	יִשְׁמְעוּ	MT (non-anterior) <i>weqatal</i> , Q <i>yiqtol</i> (according to the classical interchange when not using the conjunction).
Ps 141:7	וּבְקַעַ	11QPs ^a	יִבְקַעַ	MT PTC ("like one who plows and breaks up the ground"), Q <i>yiqtol</i> ("like the plowman breaks up...").
Ps 142:5	הִבִּיט	11QPs ^a	אִבִּיטָה	MT imperative and <i>w</i> +imperative, Q 1s cohortatives (simple and <i>weyiqtol</i>).
	וּרְאָה	11QPs ^a	וְאוֹרְאָה	
Ps 142:8	הוֹצִיאָהּ	11QPs ^a	הוֹצֵא	The MT has the long imperative, Q the simple form. Cf. the next entry.
Ps 143:1	שָׁמַעַ	11QPs ^a	שָׁמְעָה	MT simple imperative, Q long. Cf. the preceding entry.
Ps 143:3	רָדַף	11QPs ^a	יִרְדּוּף	In this verse, Q seems to have a higher degree of poetic shifting between

Appendices

				(present perfect) <i>qatal</i> and (general present/future) <i>yiqtol</i> than the MT. The opposite seems to be the case in the next verse.
Ps 143:4	יִשְׁתּוּמַם	11QPs ^a	וישתומם	The form in Q seems to be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> like the verb at the beginning of the verse in the MT (וַתִּתְעַטֵּף). I.e., less poetic shifting between the verb forms than the MT, as opposed to the preceding verse.
Ps 143:5	אֲשׁוּחַח	11QPs ^a	אשיחה	Q has the cohortative suffix (and a different root or stem).
Ps 144:5	וַתִּרַד	11QPs ^a	ורד	Q has <i>w+imperative</i> instead of the unclassical MT 2sm <i>weyiqtol</i> . Note that both the MT and the scroll have 2sm <i>weyiqtol</i> in v. 6 and <i>w+imperative</i> in v. 7.
Ps 145:5	אֲשִׁיחָה	11QPs ^a	אשיח	Q lacks the cohortative suffix. Note that Ps 145 in this ms. contains several verbs not attested in the MT (mostly ברוך).
Ps 148:5	יְהַלְלוּ	11QPs ^a	הללו	MT <i>yiqtol</i> 3p (jussive), Q imperative (cf. the preceding verses).
Job 14:14	אִיחַל	4Qpaleo-Job ^c	איחל]	Q seems to have the cohortative suffix
Job 33:11	יִשְׁמַר	4QJob ^a	שמר	Q seems to have (present perfect) <i>qatal</i> instead of the MT (general present) <i>yiqtol</i> . The preceding verb has not been preserved in Q (MT יִשֹּׁם, vocalized as a jussive).
Job 36:23	אָמַר	4QJob ^a	יאמר	Q seems to have a higher degree of poetic shifting between (present perfect) <i>qatal</i> and (general present/future) <i>yiqtol</i> than the MT, which has two <i>qatals</i> .
Job 36:27	יִזְקֶנּוּ	4QJob ^a	וזקו]	The <i>weqatal</i> in Q is clearly non-anterior (following the classical shift from <i>yiqtol</i> to <i>weqatal</i> when the conjunction is present).
Job 37:1	יִתֵּר	4QJob ^a	יתר	Q has a simple <i>yiqtol</i> instead of the (potentially problematic) <i>weyiqtol</i> in the MT.
Job 37:14	וְהִתְבּוֹנֵן	4QJob ^a	התבונן	MT <i>w+imperative</i> , Q simple imperative.
Prov 15:19	סִלְלָהּ	4QProv ^b	סוללה	The form in Q may be a noun instead of the passive PTC in the MT?

Appendices

Prov 15:28	לְעִנּוֹת יִהְיֶה	4QProv ^b	לענות	The infinitive in Q seems to be predicative. However, the finite verb may have been accidentally omitted.
Song 1:4	אֶהְבִּיבֶךָ	6QCant	אהובים	MT (stative present) <i>qatal</i> , Q passive PTC.
Song 3:2	אֶקְוֶמָה נָא	4QCant ^b	אקום נא	Q lacks the cohortative suffix.
Song 4:1	גָּלְשׁוּ	4QCant ^a	גלש[ות]	Q seems to have a PTC instead of the MT <i>qatal</i> .
Song 4:8	תְּבוֹאֵי	4QCant ^b	אבאי	The form in Q is mysterious... ⁹⁰
Eccl 6:4	יִלְדָּה	4QQoh ^a	הלך	Q has a <i>qatal</i> instead of MT <i>yiqtol</i> , in harmony with the preceding verb (MT בָּא), which was apparently understood as a <i>qatal</i> (both forms in Q indicating present perfect/simple past referring to stillborn children).
Lam 1:7	זְכֹרָה	4QLam	זכורה	MT <i>qatal</i> 3sf (subject Jerusalem), Q seemingly long imperative (with following vocative Yahweh). The MT and Q are quite different in this passage.
Lam 1:8	חָטָא	4QLam	חטוא	Q seems to have an absolute infinitive instead of the MT noun.
Lam 1:14	יִשְׁתַּרְגֵּנוּ עָלָיו	4QLam	וישתרג עולו	Q divides the passage differently. The <i>w+yiqtol</i> must be a <i>wayyiqtol</i> and the second word is the subject ("his yoke") rather than a <i>qatal</i> verb.
Lam 1:16	בּוֹכֵיהָ	4QLam	בכו	The MT has a predicative PTC (subject אֲנִי), Q has no אֲנִי and בכו seems to be a <i>qatal</i> with the following עֲנִי (in the plural) as the subject. The following verb (MT יִרְדֶּה, Q יִרְדֶּה) may also be a <i>qatal</i> 3sf in Q.
Lam 5:1	הִבִּיטָה	5QLam ^a	הביטה	The form in Q corresponds to the MT <i>qere</i> with a cohortative suffix.
Dan 8:3	וְאֶשָּׂא	4QDan ^b	ואשאה	Q has the pseudo-cohortative suffix (on a III-' root).
Dan 8:4	וְהִגְדִּיל	4QDan ^b	ו[הגדל]	The variant may be merely orthographical. Alternatively, the form in Q may be an absolute infinitive, or maybe there was no <i>w</i> -? No conclusions can be drawn.
Dan 9:16	יִשְׁבֹּנָא	4QDan ^c	ישובן]	Q seems to have an unexpected unshortened form in a jussive. However,

⁹⁰ Tov (2000, 215) notes that a *taw* "could have been written in the hole to the right of the first letter of this word," though "this assumption is less plausible."

				not much remains of the passage. Hence, the intention may not be volitive in Q.
Dan 10:10	וְתִנְיַעֲנִי	6Qpap-Dan	לְהִנְיַעֲנִי	The infinitive in Q must be adverbial (final) in relation to the preceding finite verb (MT נִגְעָה). This is not a "finite" use of the infinitive.
Dan 10:19	וְאִמְרָה	4QDan ^a	וְאִמְר[The pseudo-cohorative suffix is missing in Q.
	יְדַבֵּר	4QDan ^a	דַּבֵּר	MT 3sm <i>yiqtol</i> (jussive), Q imperative (the subject in the MT is a vocative in Q).
Dan 11:1	עֲמָדִי	4QDan ^c	עֲמָדָתִי	The MT has no finite verb and a rather strange use of an infinitive. Q has an ordinary <i>qatal</i> 1s.
Dan 11:15	וְיִשְׁפֹּךְ	4QDan ^c	וְשָׁפַךְ	In this particular instance, Q seems to have a more classical form than the (apparently non-volitive) MT <i>weyiqtol</i> . However, some of the other <i>weyiqtol</i> s in the passage are also attested in Q.
		4QDan ^a		
Dan 11:17	וְעָשָׂה	4QDan ^c	יַעֲשֶׂה	Q seems to have a simple <i>yiqtol</i> instead of the MT (non-anterior) <i>weqatal</i> .

Appendix 50

Excursus on verbal usage in IQIsa^a

According to Kutscher (1974, 78), 1QIsa^a is an example of a "popular" text close to the vernacular of the day and "used for study, home reading, and perhaps even in the Synagogue" as opposed to other "model" or "standard" texts. In Kutscher's view, the MT is such a "standard" text.⁹¹

Kutscher's description of the scroll as a "popular" version has not gone unchallenged (see e.g., Høgenhaven 1984). On a more general level, many scholars have argued that the MT should not be seen as the original text but rather as one text type among others, with a history of development of its own.⁹² It is obviously true that not everything in the MT must be original and

⁹¹ Kutscher 1974, 77: "A different recension, unanimously agreed at least to be of a more archaic type is still extant however. I refer to the MT."

⁹² See, e.g., Young 2013, 104, and the detailed criticism of "MT bias" by Rezetko and Young (2014, 59–116). They emphasize that they are not simply "MT bashing" (ib., 116, n. 266), yet they do go out of their way to undermine the MT's status as a conservative,

there are examples of traits that seem to be preserved in a more archaic form in non-MT mss. However, we may not need to abandon Kutscher's approach entirely. The view of the MT as a type of text that is (in general) linguistically archaic and conservative as opposed to (generally) less conservative texts like the Isaiah scroll might be a convenient (general) description. However, the details are a lot less clear-cut and every variant needs to be evaluated on its own terms.

According to Kutscher (1974, 17), the development that had taken place in spoken Hebrew between the composition of the biblical text and the time of the scribe of 1QIsa^a meant that the language of the text "frequently seemed strange to him, and at times he did not understand it properly" (in addition, Kutscher suggests that the native language of the scribe may have been Aramaic rather than Hebrew).⁹³ Therefore the scribe (unlike the scribes of more conservative "standard" mss., who tended to stay closer to some kind of archaic norm) would frequently emend the text he was copying, "sometimes aware of what he was doing, but frequently unconsciously – to bring it into closer accord with the language as he knew it" (ib., 17). Rubinstein (1955, 181) notes that some of the unclassical constructions in the scroll might have arisen "quite undesignedly," i.e. as the result of the tendency to use syndetic constructions rather than asyndesis, and that it "need not necessarily be assumed that the *tense of the verb* is due to Aramaic or late-Hebrew influence." However, in most cases at least, we must assume that the final product made some kind of sense to the scribe. As Kutscher (1974, 18) puts it, "his 'mistakes' are also valuable in that they frequently reflect the language with which he was most conversant." Possible instances of variants that could be the result of more or less mechanical mistake are 6:1 (עוֹזִיָּה אֲרָאָה, MT עֲזִיָּהוּ וְאֲרָאָה); 9:3 (בּוֹ וְהִחַתֵּת, MT בּוֹ הִחַתֵּת); 45:24 (יְבוֹא וְיִבְשׁוּ, MT יְבוֹאוּ יְבוֹשׁוּ); 48:15 (מִי יִגֹּר, MT מִי יִגֵּר); 54:15 (אֲפִי קָרָאתִי וְהִבִּיאֹתִיהוּ, MT אֲפִי קָרָאתִי מִי יִגֵּר).

Concerning the verbal system, Kutscher argues that the variants found in 1QIsa^a as opposed to other Isaiah scrolls and the MT reflect the development of the system that can be observed between BH and RH. He states (ib., 351) that the use of verb forms in the scroll suggests that the scribe "preferred the *waw* conjunctive to the *waw* conversive," i.e., reflecting the abandonment of the system of the consecutive forms (*wayyiqtol* and non-anterior *weqatal*) in ordinary speech.

archaic text and underline the complete fluidity of the traditions, primarily in order to undermine the arguments for linguistic dating of texts.

⁹³ Note that some scholars think that one scribe copied the first half of the scroll and another scribe the second half (Ulrich and Flint 2010, 63).

The scribe also "tended to use the imperf. form to indicate future time and the perf. to indicate past time exclusively," which is the way the forms are used, according to Kutscher, in RH (ib., 351). This observation, however, is inadequate, for RH as well as for the language of the scroll (on RH, see 4.4 in the main text).⁹⁴ In some cases, a clearly non-anterior MT *weqatal* is a simple *qatal* in the scroll – in a future context. This indicates that Kutscher's overall description of the scribe's perception of *qatal* as a simple past tense is not correct. *Qatal* is a general anterior tense, not an absolute past tense. See, e.g., 24:22 (אספו, MT וְאָסְפוּ; unless the form in the scroll is an imperative?) and 30:30 (השמיע, MT וְהִשְׁמִיעַ). Likewise, 46:13 (נתתי, MT וְנָתַתִּי) is probably not a simple past tense, but what would be rendered as a present perfect or possibly a performative present tense in a language like English. There are other examples of *qatals* that cannot be simple past tense, e.g. 1:15.⁹⁵

Likewise, some *yiqtol*s in the scroll (corresponding to other forms in the MT) are not simply future tense, as Kutscher would have it. Thus in 6:1, the MT *wayyiqtol* (וְאָרְאָה) is a simple *yiqtol* in the scroll (אָרְאָה) and assuming that we are to make sense of the passage as it stands (being clearly situated in a past context), it must be a continuous/durative usage of *yiqtol* – a usage, which Kutscher claims was unknown to the scribe (ib., 352). This claim is made in connection with 6:4, where the MT has the continuous/durative *yiqtol* וְיָלֵא while the scroll has the *qatal* נִמְלֵא (and in 6:3 the scroll has a PTC vs. MT *weqatal*; note that both versions use the PTC at the beginning of v. 2). However, 6:2 includes three similar *yiqtol*s, both in the MT and the scroll. Note also the two *yiqtol*s in 48:19 (MT וְיָכַרְתָּ and וְיִשְׁמְדוּ). They may be interpreted as futures in the past but were not changed by the scribe. A general present (as opposed to future tense) use of *yiqtol* seems to be attested in 10:13 (וְיֹאמַר, MT אָמַר) and 30:24 (וְזָרָה, MT יָזְרָה).

Kutscher (ib., 352) admits that some variants go against the general tendencies and he notes that since the style is poetic, it is sometimes possible

⁹⁴ Earlier in the book, Kutscher gives a quite different description of the verbs in RH: "יקטל" was now used as a modus and subjunctive, קטל the perfect, with the participle indicating the present and future" (1974, 42).

⁹⁵ According to Kutscher (1974, 353), this substitution (MT תָּרְבוּ, Q הִרְבוּ) is inexplicable. However, the strange thing is not the shift from *yiqtol* to *qatal* but the shift in person from 2pm to 3p (we might be dealing with a mere scribal slip). In a clause introduced by כִּי, a *qatal* with future perfect function is not unexpected. It simply shows that Kutscher's claim that *qatal* had become an exclusive past tense is wrong.

to interpret the different use of verbs in the scroll without assuming a difference in the basic perceptions of the verbal system.⁹⁶ Such reservations seem very relevant for many of the verbal substitutions noted by Kutscher (ib., 352–358), as well as for others that he did not remark upon.⁹⁷ In fact, most of the variants do not necessarily indicate that the scribe had a different perception of the functioning of the HVS. E.g., there is a large number of *w+iyqtols* in the scroll, some of which are *weqatals* in the MT, and some of which are simple *iyqtols*. However, when a form has an extra *waw* in the scroll, how do we know if the scribe intended the same tense that the simple form has in the MT or if he had another sense of the passage in mind? Similarly, when *w+iyqtol* corresponds to a *weqatal* in the MT, it is not always easy to determine if the intended meaning is the same as in the MT or if the difference in verb form also implies a different interpretation of the passage in question.

Many *w+iyqtols* in the scroll (not attested in the MT) are probably *weiyqtols*, as Kutscher says, but some might be *wayyiqtols*.⁹⁸ When it comes to the forms that are parsed as *weiyqtols*, not all of them can automatically be assumed to reflect an unclassical use of the form as the equivalent of *weqatal*. A number of these forms might be interpreted as volitives, i.e., following classical usage. However, since the general non-anterior meaning of *iyqtol*, *weqatal*, and the presumed unclassical *weiyqtol* can be close to a modal reading, it is often impossible to distinguish between the two uses. We have no native speaker intuition and cannot always decide whether a *weqatal* and a

⁹⁶ There are two general tendencies in the scroll that influence the way the verbal system is used: harmonization (whereby a verb is changed into the same form as a preceding or following verb) and a preference for syndetic expressions, i.e. a widespread addition of "and" before many words, not just verbs (ib., 422). However, there are many examples of the opposite developments. Thus, a variant verb form sometimes gives a heightened sense of "disharmony" compared to the MT, as in 25:12; 46:2; 51:16; 66:8. In several instances, there is only one variant in a passage where many verbs could potentially have been treated in the same way. There are also many instances of missing *waws* in the scroll as opposed to the MT, e.g. MT *weiyqtol* (sometimes non-volitive?) vs. simple *iyqtol* in the scroll (see 5:29–30; 13:2; 14:13; 43:4; 45:24).

⁹⁷ Note also the general survey of forms with *waw* in the scroll and without *waw* in the MT (ib., 414–424) and the survey of the opposite situation (ib., 425–429). Also cf. Rubinstein 1955 and 1963.

⁹⁸ A *wayyiqtol* reading seems possible in the following cases (among others): 24:9 (וימר); 29:11–12 (?; ויאמר x2), 15 (ויהי); 34:10 (ותחרב); 37:27 (ויבשו); 40:6 (ואומר); 41:2–3 (ויקראהו) and (ויקראוהו), 25 (וירמוס and ויקרא), 42:21 (ויגדל); 44:19 (ואצלה); 48:14 (ויגיד); 50:4 (ועיר x2); 56:4 (ויבחרו); 57:2 (ויבוא and וינוחו), 14 (ויואמר); 66:9 (ואעצורה).

weyiqtol mean "the same thing" or a subtle difference of more explicit volitive modality is to be attributed to the *weyiqtol*. The following *weyiqtol*s in the scroll (MT *yiqtol* or *weqatal*) might be interpretable as volitives: 8:14 (וּיְהִי); 10:26 (וַיַּעֲרֹךְ); 21:6 (וַיִּגִּיד); 22:4 (וַאֲמַר); 24:9 (וַיִּמַּר); 26:11 (וַיַּחֲזֹק); 27:4 (וַאֲצִיִּתְנָה); 34:10 (וַתַּחֲרֹב); 42:11 (וַיִּרְוֶנּוּ), 23 (וַיִּקְשֹׁב and וַיִּאֲזִין); 43:9 (וַיִּגִּידוּ); 44:19 (וַאֲצִלָּה); 45:23 (וַתִּשְׁבַּע); 48:13 (וַיַּעֲמֹדוּ), 14 (וַיִּגִּיד and וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ); 56:12 (וַנִּקַּח and וַיְהִי); 57:13 (וַיִּקַּח and וַיִּרְשׁ); 66:9 (וַאֲעֲצֹרָה). The following are some of the most probable cases of simple non-anterior *weyiqtol*s, i.e., where a *weqatal* would be expected: 2:11 (וַיִּשַׁח); 3:7 (וַיִּשָּׂא), 24 (וַיְהִי); 4:3 (וַיְהִי), 5 (וַיִּבְרָא); 5:5 (וַיְהִי x2); 7:17 (וַיִּבִּיא); 11:8 (וַיִּשְׁעֶשַׁע); 13:16 (וַיִּשְׁסוּ); 17:13 (וַיִּגְעַר); 20:5 (וַיִּבְוֹשׁוּ); 27:6 (וַיִּצִיֵּץ and וַיִּפְרַח); 33:12 (וַיְהִי); 38:15 (וַאֲמַר); 39:7 (וַיְהִי); 40:31 (וַיַּעֲלוּ); 46:6–7 (וַיִּשְׂאוּהִי and וַיִּסְגֹּדוּ); 52:1 (וַיִּבּוֹא), 13 (וַיִּרְוֶם); 53:10–11 (וַיִּאֲרֹךְ and וַיִּשְׁבַּע); 60:7 (וַיַּעֲלוּ); 62:9 (וַיְהַלְלוּ); 65:8 (וַיִּאֲמַר). In many of these cases, however, a volitive reading might make sense. Note, however, that there are also several forms of this type in the MT (e.g. 5:29–30, 40:30, 42:23, 43:9, or 46:6–7).

Concerning anterior *weqatal*, it is often possible to make sense of the passages in question with a classical non-anterior reading of the *weqatal* because the content of the passage allows for a shift between anteriority and non-anteriority (e.g. 34:2, הַחֲרִימִם וְנִתְּנָם; MT הַחֲרִימִם וְנִתְּנָם; 52:9).

According to Kutscher (and/or Rubinstein), the following cases are anterior. However, a non-anterior interpretation seems possible for all of them:

9:5 וּקְרָא MT וַיִּקְרָא	Kutscher (1974, 354) cannot see how Rubinstein (1955, 182, n. 1, and 187–188) could "suppose (with some hesitation), that this is a <i>waw</i> conservative." Yet, nothing in the context precludes a non-anterior reading – the child has been born etc., and he will call his name etc.
18:6 וַעֲזָבוּ MT וַיַּעֲזְבוּ	Kutscher (1974, 353) states that the use of <i>weqatal</i> instead of the MT <i>yiqtol</i> in this sentence is due to the presence of simple <i>qatals</i> in the preceding verse, thus implying that the <i>weqatal</i> is anterior like the simple forms. However, there is no compelling reason for this interpretation – rather, the difference is simply that the scroll connects two sentences with a <i>waw</i> , and accordingly the verb is changed from simple <i>yiqtol</i> to <i>weqatal</i> , in accordance with classical usage.
22:7 וְהָיָה MT וַיְהִי	Both Kutscher (ib., 354) and Rubinstein (1955, 182; 1963, 69, n. 2) see this <i>weqatal</i> as anterior. To be sure, such an interpretation is possible (the <i>weqatal</i> "translates" the <i>wayyiqtol</i> according to unclassical usage), yet the form may be a classical non-anterior, more clearly situating the passage in the future while retaining the other anterior forms for the expression of anteriority in this future setting (present perfect/future perfect). Possibly, if the scribe had a <i>w+yiqtol</i> before him, he may have interpreted it as a <i>weyiqtol</i> , which was then "corrected" into a more classical <i>weqatal</i> . However, the <i>w+yiqtol</i> s in the following verse were not changed. The LXX has future tense.

Appendices

22:19 והדפתיך MT וְהִדְפַּתִּיךָ	The form is the same in both versions but Kutscher (1974, 352) claims that the scribe of the scroll interpreted the <i>weqatal</i> as an anterior. However, this conclusion seems unnecessary. Kutscher's argument is the final verb of the verse (MT וְהִדְפַּתִּיךָ), which is הִרְסַךְ in the scroll. According to Kutscher, this is a mistake for a <i>qatal</i> 1s, which was used due to influence from the verb at the beginning of the verse, which was a simple <i>w+qatal</i> in the eyes of the scribe. However, it seems equally plausible that the intention behind the odd form הִרְסַךְ was a 1s <i>yiqtol</i> . In this case, there is no need to claim that וְהִדְפַּתִּיךָ is anterior.
28:29 והגדיל MT הִגְדִּיל	Kutscher does not seem to mention this form, not even in the general list of additional <i>waws</i> . Rubinstein (1955, 181) notes it as an anterior. However, a non-anterior reading makes sense ("has made wonderful [...] and will make great").
36:21 והחרישו MT וַיַּחְרִישׁוּ	Both Kutscher (1974, 354) and Rubinstein (1955, 181; 1963, 69, n. 2) interpret this as an anterior. Note that the parallel in 2 Kgs 18:36 has the same <i>weqatal</i> in the MT. It is possible that the <i>weqatal</i> is anterior but it might be non-anterior, expressing durative/concomitant action. If this is the case, the <i>wayyiqtol</i> in MT Isaiah might attest to a late, misunderstood "correction" of this classical usage of non-anterior <i>weqatal</i> , which was mistakenly interpreted as an anterior and "corrected" into a <i>wayyiqtol</i> .
49:7 וקמו MT וַקְמוּ	The form is the same, yet Kutscher (1974, 352) seems to think that the scribe understood the form as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . The preceding verb is יָרְאוּ in the MT but רָאוּ in the scroll. According to Kutscher, the <i>qatal</i> in the scroll is a case of harmonization brought about by a following <i>qatal</i> but this is in fact a <i>weqatal</i> (וַקְמוּ). Accordingly, if there is a harmonization the <i>weqatal</i> must have been interpreted as an anterior <i>weqatal</i> . However, this is not a necessary reading of the passage. It is possible to shift from present perfect to future ("kings have seen, and they will rise").
66:2 והיו MT וַיְהִיו	Kutscher's (ib., 354) and Rubinstein's (1955, 181–182) anterior interpretation is surely possible. However, a non-anterior reading (future) cannot be excluded.

A number of other "new" *weqatals* in the scroll are clearly classical non-antérieurs (ושלה in 19:20 may be more classical than the potentially non-volitive *weyiqtol* in the MT, וַיִּשְׁלַח).

The following rather few instances are the ones most likely to represent actual anterior *weqatals*: 15:1 (וּנְדָמָה, MT וְנִדְמָה); 38:5 (וְרָאִיתִי, MT וְרָאִיתִי); 47:6 (וְחָלַתִּי, MT וְחָלַתִּי); 48:18 (וַיְהִי, MT וְהָיָה); 63:19 (וַיִּרְדֹּתָ, MT וַיִּרְדֹּתָ).⁹⁹

⁹⁹ Most of these are not discussed explicitly by Kutscher but he notes some of them in his general list of additions in the scroll. 9:3 (וְהִתְחַתָּה, MT וְהִתְחַתָּה) may be anterior as well. However, it is not a very clear case. The presence of a *waw* seems awkward because of the preceding objects. Kutscher (1974, 422) suggests that the *waw* is simple dittography

In sum, most *weqatals* in the scroll without a *weqatal* counterpart in the MT seem to be non-anteriors, following the classical rules. At the same time, there are a few instances of possible "corrections" of potential MT anterior *weqatals* (i.e, that may have been interpreted as such by the scribe), which seem to be *wayyiqtol*s in the scroll, e.g. 29:15 (ויהי, MT וְהָיָה) and 56:4 (ויבחרו, MT וַיִּבְחָרוּ). In addition, there are a few other cases of possibly anterior MT *weqatals*, which are simple *qatals* in the scroll, potentially reflecting a more classical usage in the scroll.¹⁰⁰

Appendix 51

Excursus on pseudo-classicisms

Joosten has treated the subject of pseudo-classicisms in several works (e.g. Joosten 1999b; 2012a, 382–384; 2012b; 2016a; for criticism of Joosten's approach, see Rezetko and Young 2014, 96–99). According to Joosten (2016a, 20), a pseudo-classicism is a late and misunderstood re-use of an archaic expression, "Late authors use words or idioms they knew from their occurrence in older texts, but whose meaning had come to be forgotten, with a new meaning based on exegesis."¹⁰¹ While the phenomenon may look like ordinary linguistic evolution, in reality "the change is not natural and organic" (ib.). According to the theory, the "phenomenon of pseudo-classicism shows with particular clarity that classical and postclassical Hebrew are not from the same general period. CBH texts became difficult to understand. They were then submitted to exegesis. Subsequently, some of this exegesis became traditional, and in the end, traditional exegesis led to a revivification of words used in the early texts. All this must have taken time" (ib.).

In the "Prolegomena" to the article (ib., 16), Joosten states that BH is "a real language, evolving along typologically predictable lines. It is not an artificial construct, created as a kind of Esperanto for sacred affairs." Although this is true in the sense that literary BH is not an artificial creation but must

caused by the preceding word בו, cf. above. In addition, a non-anterior reading might be possible.

¹⁰⁰ E.g. 37:26 (יצרתיה, MT וַיִּצְרֹתֶיהָ) and 66:7 (המליטה, MT וְהִמְלִיטָהּ). However, while the form in MT 37:26 is most likely anterior, the one in 66:7 is more ambiguous. The MT *weqatal* (with *waw* apodosis) may be non-anterior with a stylistically motivated shift from anterior to non-anterior ("Before she goes into labour, she has given birth. Before the pain comes over her, (and) she will deliver a boy").

¹⁰¹ In a similar vein, Schniedewind (2013, 148–155) argues for a "gap" in the Hebrew scribal tradition in the Babylonian and Persian periods (after most of the Bible had already been written, according to Schniedewind) as the background for pseudo-classicisms.

reflect a standardized version of what was once a spoken language, it is obvious that BH is a literary language that was never spoken as such by anybody (see 7.3 in the main text; cf. Ullendorff 1971; Knauf 1990). In fact, this emphasis on BH as a real, natural language seems oddly out of place when most of Joosten's article deals with a phenomenon that is explicitly stated to be "not natural and organic."

In spite of the general claim that late authors forgot the original meaning of the idioms, Joosten admits that in some instances, this was not the case. He states that the meaning of the expression כְּבָרַת־אֶרֶץ was known by the people responsible for the Syriac Peshitta translation (2016a, 21). Likewise, the older meaning of the expression מִלֵּא יָד, "to fill someone's hand" in the sense of "ordain to a sacred office" was preserved in some late contexts (LXX, 11QT^a, Ben Sira) (ib., 25, n. 31). Hence, such phenomena have no independent value for the dating of texts whose date is otherwise unknown (a limitation acknowledged by Joosten, as noted in n. 31 in ch. 6). Since some authors or translators clearly belonging to a late period knew the idioms, how can we state with certainty that the alleged early attestations of the idioms are not, in fact, late as well? There is no proof that the texts that use the original meaning must be earlier than the ones that use the derived meaning.

In addition, it should be noted that the unnaturalness attributed to the phenomenon is not always evident. The original meaning of the phrase מִלֵּא יָד must have been the literal one ("fill someone's hand"). The idiomatic meaning "to ordain" is clearly a derived and specialized meaning. That the literal meaning may reemerge and come to dominate the derived meaning does not seem unnatural. In Danish, a well-known example is the expression "bjørnetjeneste" ("a bear's favour"; cf. German, Swedish, etc.), originally indicating a favour that is not really a favour but harmful to the recipient (cf. La Fontaine's fable). Some speakers of contemporary Danish, however, reportedly use the word in the most obvious interpretation of the literal sense, i.e. apparently indicating a favour as huge as a bear, in other words with a positive meaning instead of the negative meaning intended by other speakers. Similarly in the Hebrew case, the "late meaning" seems to be a rather natural development in which the words are simply taken at face value, contrary to Joosten's statement (ib., 26) that it "does not result from natural development of the language."

Likewise, the alleged unnaturalness of a semantic connection between "longing" and "return" is not as obvious as Joosten (ib., 23) seems to think in his treatment of the words תְּשׁוּבָה and תְּשׁוּקָה (cf. "nostalgia"?).

Elsewhere, Joosten notes a possible pseudo-classicism in the verbal system, viz. the use of the lengthened imperative (2012a, 383–384). According

to Joosten (and others), this form indicates direction toward the speaker in CBH, while this is not always the case in LBH and QH. However, calling this a pseudo-classicism in the sense described above seems unwarranted. The "bleaching" of the assumed original directive meaning would seem to be a quite natural development, which should not necessarily be attributed to "faulty interpretation of ancient texts" (ib., 383).

Bibliography

Aartun, Kjell. 1963. *Zur Frage altarabischer Tempora*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Abegg, Martin G., Jr. 1998. "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 325–358.

Abegg, Martin G., Jr. 2011. "The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Hebrew Syntax." In *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 163–172.

Albeck, Chanoch. 1952–58. ששה סדרי משנה. 6 volumes. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.

Albeck, Chanoch. 1971. *Einführung in die Mishna*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Allegro, John M. 1968. *Qumrân Cave 4: I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Alter, Robert. 1985. *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. New York: Basic Book, Inc., Publishers.

Andersen, T. David. 2000. "The Evolution of the Hebrew Verbal System." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 13.1:1–66.

Anderson, James M. 1973. *Structural Aspects of Language Change*. London: Longman.

Andrason, Alexander. 2011a. "The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in Light of Grammaticalization: The Second Generation." *Hebrew Studies* 52:19–51.

Andrason, Alexander. 2011b. "Biblical Hebrew *Wayyiqtol*: A Dynamic Definition." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11, article 8:2–58.

Andrason, Alexander. 2011c. "The BH *Weqatal*: A Homogenous Form with No Haphazard Functions (Part One)." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 37.2:1–26.

Andrason, Alexander. 2012. "The BH *Weqatal*: A Homogenous Form with No Haphazard Functions (Part Two)." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 38.1:1–30.

Andrason, Alexander. 2013. "An Optative Indicative? A Real Factual Past? Toward a Cognitive-Typological Approach to the Precative *Qatal*." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 13, article 4:1–41.

Andrason, Alexander. 2016. "The Complexity of Verbal Semantics: An Intricate Relationship between *Qatal* and *Wayyiqtol*." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 16, article 4:1–94.

Andrason, Alexander. 2017. "Against Binarism, Simplicity, Neatness and Stasis: A Theoretical Prolegomenon to the Reality of Verbal Grams in Biblical Hebrew: From the Complexity of Semantic Maps to the Uncomplicatedness of Psychological Conceptualizations." *Folia Orientalia* 54:11–34.

Andrason, Alexander, and Christo H. J. van der Merwe. 2015. "The Semantic Potential of Verbal Conjugations as a Set of Polysemous Senses: The *Qatal* in Genesis." *Hebrew Studies* 56:71–88.

Anttila, Raimo. 1972. *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Artom, Elia S. 1965. "Sull'accento delle forme verbali ebraiche di perfetto con vav conversiva." *Annuario di Studi Ebraici* 3:7–13.

Baayen, R. Harald. 1997. "The Pragmatics of the 'Tenses' in Biblical Hebrew." *Studies in Language* 21.2:245–285.

Baden, Joel S. 2008. "The *Weyiqtol* and the Volitive Sequence." *Vetus Testamentum* 58:147–158.

Baranowski, Krzysztof J. 2015. "A Blessing in the Phoenician Karatepe Inscription?" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 60.2:317–330.

Baranowski, Krzysztof J. 2016. "The Biblical Hebrew *wayyiqtol* and the Evidence of the Amarna Letters from Canaan." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 16, article 3:1–18.

Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. 2017. "Towards a Reconsideration of the Tense-Aspect-Mood System of Tannaitic Hebrew." In *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew and Related Fields: Proceedings of the Yale Symposium on Mishnaic Hebrew, May 2014*. Edited by Aaron J. Koller and Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal. Jerusalem: Magnes Press. 59–91.

- Barré, Michael L. 1982.** "An Analysis of the Royal Blessing in the Karatepe Inscription." *Maarav* 3.2:177–194.
- Bartelmus, Rüdiger. 1985.** "Ez 37,1–14, die Verbform *w^eqatal* und die Anfänge der Auferstehungshoffnung." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 97.3:366–389.
- Bauer, Hans. 1910.** *Die Tempora im Semitischen: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Ausgestaltung in den Einzelsprachen*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Bauer, Hans, and Pontus Leander. 1965.** *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache*. Reprinted (original 1922). Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Baumgarten, Joseph. 1999.** "274–278. 4QTohorot A–C." In Joseph Baumgarten et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*. DJD 35. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 79–122.
- Beeston, Alfred F. L. 1984.** *Sabaic Grammar*. Manchester: JSS.
- Bellamy, John. 1818.** *The Holy Bible: Newly Translated from the Original Hebrew, with Notes Critical and Explanatory*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Ze'ev. 1958.** "Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Special Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Scripta Hierosolymitana 4. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press. 200–214.
- Bergen, Robert D. 1994.** "Evil Spirits and Eccentric Grammar: A Study of the Relationship between Text and Meaning in Hebrew Narrative." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 320–335.
- Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. 1929.** *Hebräische Grammatik, mit Benutzung der von E. Kautzsch bearbeiteten 28. Auflage von Wilhelm Gesenius' hebräischer Grammatik, II. Teil: Verbum*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Bergström, Ulf. 2014.** "Temporality and the Semantics of the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System." Ph.D. diss., Uppsala University.

Berlin, Adele. 1979. "Grammatical Aspects of Biblical Parallelism." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50:17–43.

Berman, Ruth A. 1978. *Modern Hebrew Structure*. Tel-Aviv: University Publishing Projects, Ltd.

Bertinetto, Pier M., and Alessandro Lenci. 2012. "Habituality, Pluractionality, and Imperfectivity." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 852–880.

Bhat, D. N. Shankara. 1999. *The Prominence of Tense, Aspect and Mood*. Studies in Language Companion Series 49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BibleWorks 9.

Binnick, Robert I. 1991. *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Birkeland, Harris. 1940. *Akzent und Vokalismus im Althebräischen, mit Beiträgen zur vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, i kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad.

Bittner, Maria. 2005. "Future Discourse in a Tenseless Language." *Journal of Semantics* 22:339–387.

Blackman, Philip. 1951. *Mishnayoth (in Six Volumes), Volume I: Order Zeraim: Pointed Hebrew Text, Introductions, Translation, Notes, Supplements (Flora, Biographies), Indexes*. London: Mishna Press Ltd.

Blake, Frank R. 1944. "The Hebrew Waw Conversive." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63.3:271–295.

Blau, Joshua. 1971. "Marginalia Semitica I." *Israel Oriental Studies* 1:1–35.

Blau, Joshua. 1977. "Marginalia Semitica III." *Israel Oriental Studies* 7:14–32.

Blau, Joshua. 2000. "A Conservative View of the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 20–25.

Bibliography

- Blau, Joshua. 2010.** *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew: An Introduction*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Bloch, Yigal. 2007.** "From Linguistics to Text-Criticism and Back: *Way-yiqṭōl* Constructions with Long Prefixed Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Studies* 48:141–170 .
- Bobzin, Hartmut. 1973.** "Überlegungen zum althebräischen 'Tempus'-system." *Die Welt des Orients* 7.1:141–153.
- Bohnemeyer, Jürgen. 2014.** "Aspect vs. Relative Tense: The Case Reopened." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32.3:917–954.
- Boneh, Nora. 2016.** "Some Thoughts on Grammatical Aspect in Modern Hebrew." In *The Morpho-Syntactic and Lexical Encoding of Tense and Aspect in Semitic: Proceedings of the Erlangen Workshop on April 26, 2014*. Edited by Lutz Edzard. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Bordreuil, Pierre, and Dennis Pardee. 2009.** *A Manual of Ugaritic*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Bravmann, M. M. 1977.** *Studies in Semitic Philology*. Leiden: Brill.
- Brockelmann, Carl. 1913.** *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen II*. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard.
- Brockelmann, Carl. 1951.** "Die 'Tempora' des Semitischen." *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 5.3/4:133–154.
- Brockelmann, Carl. 1956.** *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins.
- Brønno, Einar. 1956.** "The Isaiah Scroll DSIa and the Greek Transliterations of Hebrew." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 106: 52–258.
- Brooke, George. 1996.** "252–254a. Commentaries on Genesis and Malachi." In George Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD 22. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 185–236.
- Broshi, Magen, and Elisha Qimron. 1994.** "A Hebrew I.O.U. Note from the Second Year of the Bar Kokhba Revolt." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 45.2:286–294.

Buccelati, Giorgio. 1996. *A Structural Grammar of Babylonian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Buth, Randall. 1986. "The Taxonomy and Function of Hebrew Tense-Shifting in the Psalms (Qāṭal-Yiqṭol-Yiqṭol-Qāṭal, Antithetical Grammatical Parallelism)." *Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation* 15:26–32.

Buth, Randall. 1992. "The Hebrew Verb in Current Discussions." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5.2:91–105.

Buth, Randall. 1999. "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*. Edited by Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 79–108.

Buttenwieser, Moses. 1925. "The Importance of the Tenses for the Interpretation of the Psalms." In *Hebrew Union College Annual Jubilee Volume, 1875–1925*. Edited by David Philipson et al. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College. 89–111.

Buxtorf, Johannes. 1609. *Thesaurus grammaticus linguae sanctae hebraeae*. Basel: typis Conradi Waldkirchi.

Bybee, Joan, and Östen Dahl. 1989. "The Creation of Tense and Aspect Systems in the Languages of the World." *Studies in Language* 13:51–103.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Callaway, Phillip. 1986. "Source Criticism of the Temple Scroll: The Purity Laws." *Revue de Qumrân* 12.2:213–222.

Caudal, Patrick. 2012. "Pragmatics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 269–305.

Charlesworth, James, et al. 2000. *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*. DJD 38. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chomsky, William. 1952. *David Kimḥi's Hebrew Grammar (Mikhlol): Systematically Presented and Critically Annotated*. New York: Bloch Publishing Company.

Bibliography

Clines, David J. A., ed. 1993. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Volume 1, א*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Cohen, Ohad. 2013. *The Verbal Tense System in Late Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Studies 63. Translated by Avi Aronsky. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Collins, John J. 2010. "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 151–172.

Comrie, Bernard. 2001. *Aspect*. First published 1976. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 2006. *Tense*. First published 1985. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, Edward M. 2017. "Language Contact and the Genesis of Mishnaic Hebrew." *The Edward Ullendorff Lectures in Semitic Philology, Fourth Lecture 2016*. Published by the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge, 2017. Available online, cited 6 December 2017: <https://www.ames.cam.ac.uk/news-events/mes/hebrew-semitic/semitic-philology/pdfs/CookUllendorfflecture2016DOIFINALVERSION.pdf>

Cook, John A. 2005. "Genericity, Tense, and Verbal Patterns in the Sentence Literature of Proverbs." In *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel, and Dennis R. Magary. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 117–133.

Cook, John A. 2006. "The Finite Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Do Express Aspect." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 30:21–35.

Cook, John A. 2012. *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expression of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Cook, John A. 2014. "Putting Old Wine in New Wineskins: A New Synthesis of the Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew That Is Neither New nor a Coherent Synthesis." *Hebrew Studies* 55:379–388.

Cook, John A. 2016. "Time to Clarify." *Hebrew Studies* 57:403–421.

Cotton, Hannah, and Ada Yardeni. 1997. *Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Ḥever and Other Sites: With an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts (the Seiyâl Collection II)*. DJD 27. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coulson, Michael. 1992. *Sanskrit: An Introduction to the Classical Language*. Revised by Richard Gombrich and James Benson. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Danby, Herbert. 1933. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dassow, Eva von. 2004. "Canaanite in Cuneiform." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124.4:641–674.

De Vries, Simon J. 1965a. "The Syntax of the Tenses and Interpretation in the Hodayoth." *Revue de Qumran* 5.3:375–414.

De Vries, Simon J. 1965b. "Consecutive Constructions in the 1Q Sectarian Scrolls." In *Doron: Hebraic Studies*. Edited by Israel T. Naamani and David Rudavsky. New York: The National Association of Professors of Hebrew in American Institutions of Higher Learning. 75–87.

Dearman, Andrew, ed. 1989. *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

DeCaen, Vincent. 1996. "Ewald and Driver on Biblical Hebrew 'Aspect': Anteriority and the Oriental Framework." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 9.2:129–151.

Deo, Ashwini. 2012. "Morphology." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 155–183.

Dietrich, Manfred, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. 2013. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten*. 3rd ed. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Dimant, Devorah. 2001. *Qumran Cave 4 XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD 30. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 2012.** "Voice." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 937–959.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1997.** *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W., Jimmy J. M. Roberts, Choon-Leong Seow, and Richard E. Whitaker. 2005.** *Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dolgopolsky, Aron. 1999.** *From Proto-Semitic to Hebrew: Phonology. Etymological Approach in a Hamito-Semitic Perspective*. Milano: Centro Studi Camito-Semitici.
- Donaldson, Bruce C. 1993.** *A Grammar of Afrikaans*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. 1964.** *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. Band III: Glossare und Indizes. Tafeln*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. 1968.** *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. Band II: Kommentar*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. 2001.** *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. Band I*. 5th ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Driver, Godfrey R. 1936.** *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Driver, Godfrey R. 1969.** "Some Uses of *Qtl* in the Semitic Languages." In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. 49–64.
- Driver, Samuel R. 1874.** *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Driver, Samuel R. 1892.** *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*. 3rd ed. Reprinted 1998. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Driver, Samuel R. 1913. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Elgvin, Torleif. 2000. "475. 4QRenewed Earth." In Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 464–473.

Elgvin, Torleif, and Emanuel Tov. 1994. "422. 4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus." In Harold Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 417–441.

Elsness, Johan. 1994. "On the Progression of the Progressive in Early Modern English." *ICAME Journal* 18:5–25.

Elwolde, John F. 1997. "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary between Bible and Mishnah." In *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University 11–14 December 1995*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 17–55.

Emerton, John A. 1973. "The Problem of Vernacular Hebrew in the First Century A.D. and the Language of Jesus." *The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series* 24.1:1–23.

Endo, Yoshinobu. 1996. *The Verbal System of Classical Hebrew in the Joseph Story*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Eshel, Esther, and Michael Stone. 1995. "464. Exposition on the Patriarchs." In Magen Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 215–230.

Eskhult, Mats. 2000. "Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew." In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 84–93.

Eskhult, Mats. 2007. "Some Aspects of the Verbal System in Qumran Hebrew." In *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period: Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Jan Joosten and Jean-Sebastien Rey. Leiden: Brill. 29–46.

Bibliography

- Ewald, Heinrich. 1827.** *Kritische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache.* Leipzig: Hahn'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1828.** *Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des A. T.* Leipzig: Hahn'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1831.** *Grammatica critica linguae Arabicae cum brevi metrorum doctrina: Vol I.* Leipzig: Hahn'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1835.** *Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des A. T.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: Hahn'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1844.** *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des alten Bundes.* 5th ed. Leipzig: Hahn'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1855.** *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes.* 6th ed. Leipzig: Hahn'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1863.** *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes.* 7th ed. Göttingen: Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1870.** *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprach des Alten Bundes.* 8th ed. Göttingen: Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1879/1891.** *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament.* Translated by James Kennedy. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Faigenbaum-Golovin, Shira, et al. 2016.** "Algorithmic Handwriting Analysis of Judah's Military Correspondence Sheds Light on Composition of Biblical Texts." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113.17:4664–4669.
- Fassberg, Steven E. 2000.** "The Syntax of the Biblical Documents from the Judean Desert as Reflected in a Comparison of Multiple Copies of Biblical Texts." In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 94–109.
- Fassberg, Steven E. 2012.** "Which Semitic Language Did Jesus and Other Contemporary Jews Speak?" *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 74:263–280.

Fenton, Terry L. 1969. "The Hebrew 'Tenses' in the Light of Ugaritic." In *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies: Volume 4, division 4: Hebrew Language etc.* Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies. 31–39.

Filip, Hana. 2012. "Lexical Aspect." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 721–751.

Fischer, Wolfdietrich. 1972. *Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. 1995. "200. 4QTobit^e." In Magen Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 63–76.

Fludernik, Monika. 2012. "Narratology and Literary Linguistics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 75–101.

Fokkelman, Jan P. 1991. "Iterative Forms of the Classical Hebrew Verb: Exploring the Triangle of Style, Syntax, and Text Grammar." In *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax*. Edited by Karel Jongeling, Heleen L. Murre-Van den Berg, and Lucas Van Rompay. Leiden: Brill. 38–55.

Fortescue, Michael. 1984. *West Greenlandic*. London: Croom Helm.

Friedrich, Johannes, and Wolfgang Röllig (Maria G. A. Guzzo; Werner R. Mayer). 1999. *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*. 3rd ed. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Furuli, Rolf J. 2005. "A New Understanding of the Verbal System of Classical Hebrew: An Attempt to Distinguish between Semantic and Pragmatic Factors." Doctoral diss., Oslo University.

García Martínez, Florentino. 1996. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. 2nd ed. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert. J. C. Tigchelaar. 2000. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 volumes. Leiden: Brill.

Bibliography

García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude. 1998. *Qumran Cave 11, II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. DJD 23. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Garr, W. Randall. 1985. *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Garr, W. Randall. 1998. "Driver's *Treatise* and the Study of Hebrew: Then and Now." In Samuel R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*. 3rd ed. (1892). Reprinted. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. xviii–lxxxvi.

Gärtner, Uta. 2005. "Is the Myanmar language really tenseless?" In *Studies in Burmese Linguistics*. Edited by Justin Watkins. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. 105–124.

Gattnar, Anja, Johanna Heininger, and Robin Hörnig. 2016. "The Russian Perfective Present in Performative Utterance." Paper presented at the 12th European Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages, Berlin, 8–10 December, 2016.

Geiger, Gregor. 2012. *Das hebräische Partizip in den Texten aus der jüdischen Wüste*. Leiden: Brill.

Gell, Philip. 1821. *Observations on the Idiom of the Hebrew Language: Respecting the Powers Peculiar to the Different Tenses of Verbs, and the Communication of Power from Governing Verbs to Subordinates Connected with Them*. 2nd ed. London: L. B. Seeley etc.

Gesenius, Heinrich F. W. 1817. *Ausführliches grammatisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Friedrich Christian Wilhelm Vogel.

Gianto, Agustinus. 1996. "Variations in Biblical Hebrew." *Biblica* 77.4:493–508.

Gibson, John C. L. 1971. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: Volume I, Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gibson, John C. L. 1995. "The Vav Consecutive." In *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East: Festschrift E. Lipiński*. Edited by Karel van Lerberghe and Antoon Schoors. Leuven: Peeters. 93–100.

- Gmirkin, Russell. 2002.** "Tools Slippage and the Tel Dan Inscription." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 16.2:293–302.
- Goerwitz, Richard L. 1992.** "The Accentuation of the Hebrew Jussive and Preterite." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 112.2 :198–203.
- Gogel, Sandra L. 1983.** *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Goldfajn, Tal. 1998.** *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Goldin, Judah. 1955.** *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Good, Roger. 2010.** *The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles*. VTSup 136. Leiden: Brill.
- Goodwin, William W. 1965.** *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. London: Macmillan. First published in 1875.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. 1951/2006.** *Syntax and Vocabulary of Medieval Hebrew as Influenced by Arabic*. Dissertation from 1951; revised version 2006 (Jerusalem). *Non vidi*.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. 1958a.** "Die Qumran-Rollen und die hebräische Sprachwissenschaft 1948–1958." *Revue de Qumrân* 1:103–112.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. 1958b.** "Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents." In *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Scripta Hierosolymitana 4. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Magnes Press. 101–137.
- Gropp, Douglas M. 1991.** "The Function of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Annual Review* 13:45–62.
- Gross, Walter. 1976.** *Verbform und Funktion: Wayyiqtol für die Gegenwart? Ein Beitrag zur Syntax poetischer althebräischer Texte*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.
- Gross, Walter. 1987a.** Review of Beat Zuber, *Das Tempussystem des biblischen Hebräisch. Eine Untersuchung am Text*. *Biblica* 68.3:422–427.

Bibliography

Gross, Walter. 1987b. *Die Pendenskonstruktion im Biblischen Hebräisch*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.

Gvozdanović, Jadranka. 2012. "Perfective and Imperfective Aspect." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 781–802.

Gzella, Holger. 2004. *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Hackett, Jo Ann. 2004. "Phoenician and Punic." In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Edited by Roger D. Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 365–385.

Hackett, Jo Ann. 2012. "Yaqtul and a Ugaritic Incantation Text." In *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Edited by Rebecca Hasselbach and Na'ama Pat-El. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 111–117.

Hamori, Andras. 1973. "A Note on Yaqtulu in East and West Semitic." *Archiv Orientalni* 41:319–324.

Harlow, Ray. 2007. *Māori: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hartmann, Josef. 1980. *Amharische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.

Hasselbach, Rebecca. 2012. "The Verbal Endings -u and -a: A Note on Their Functional Derivation." In *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Edited by Rebecca Hasselbach and Na'ama Pat-El. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 119–136.

Hatav, Galia. 1997. *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hatav, Galia. 2004. "Anchoring World and Time in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Linguistics* 40.3:491–526.

Hatav, Galia. 2010. "Relative and Absolute Tense Interpretation in Modern Hebrew." *Hebrew Studies* 51:261–285.

Hatav, Galia. 2012. "Bound Tenses." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 611–637.

Haupt, Paul. 1878. "Studies on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, with Special Reference to Assyrian." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, New Series* 10.2:244–252.

Hendel, Ronald S. 1996. "In the Margins of the Hebrew Verbal System: Situation, Tense, Aspect, and Mood." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 9:152–181.

Hetzron, Robert. 1969. "The Evidence for Perfect **Y'aqtul* and Jussive **Yaqt'ul* in Proto-Semitic." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 14.1:1–21.

Hewson, John. 2012. "Tense." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 507–535.

Hickey, Raymond. 2012. "Internally- and Externally-Motivated Language Change." In *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Edited by Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy and Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 387–407.

Høgenhaven, Jesper. 1984. "The First Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIs^a) and the Massoretic Text: Some Reflections with Special Regard to Isaiah 1–12." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 28:17–35.

Høgenhaven, Jesper. 2015. "The Language of the Copper Scroll: A Renewed Examination." *Revue de Qumrân* 27.2:271–301.

Holes, Clive. 1995. *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties*. London: Longman.

Holmstedt, Robert D. 2005. "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs." In *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ronald L. Troxel, Kelvin G. Friebel, and Dennis R. Magary. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 135–154.

Holmstedt, Robert D. 2006. "Issues in the Linguistic Analysis of a Dead Language, with Particular Reference to Ancient Hebrew." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 6, article 11:2–21.

Bibliography

- Holmstedt, Robert D. 2011.** "The Typological Classification of the Hebrew of Genesis: Subject-Verb or Verb-Subject?" *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11, article 14:2–39.
- Holmstedt, Robert D. 2012.** "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew." In *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 97–124.
- Holmstedt, Robert D., and John Screnock. 2016.** "Writing a Descriptive Grammar of the Syntax and Semantics of the War Scroll (1QM): The Noun Phrase as Proof of Concept." In *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Kipp Davis, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill. 67–106.
- Holst, Søren. 2008.** *Verbs and War Scroll: Studies in the Hebrew Verbal System and the Qumran War Scroll*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Hornkohl, Aaron D. 2014.** *Ancient Hebrew Periodization and the Language of the Book of Jeremiah: The Case for a Sixth-Century Date of Composition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hudson, Richard A. 2001.** *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huehnergard, John. 1983.** "Asseverative **la* and Hypothetical **lu/law* in Semitic." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103.3:569–593.
- Huehnergard, John. 1987.** "'Stative', Predicative Form, Pseudo-Verb." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46.3:215–232.
- Huehnergard, John. 1988.** "The Early Hebrew Prefix Conjugations." *Hebrew Studies* 29:19–23.
- Huehnergard, John. 1991.** "Remarks on the Classification of the Northwest Semitic Languages." In *The Balaam Text From Deir 'Alla Re-Evaluated: Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Leiden 21–24 August 1989*. Edited by Jacob Hoftijzer and Gerrit van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill. 282–293.
- Huehnergard, John. 2011.** *A Grammar of Akkadian*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Huesman, John. 1956. "The Infinitive Absolute and the Waw + Perfect Problem." *Biblica* 37:410–434.

Hughes, James A. 1970. "Another Look at the Hebrew Tenses." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 29.1:12–24.

Hurvitz, Avi. 2000. "Was QH a 'Spoken' Language? On Some Recent Views and Positions: Comments." In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 110–114.

Irvine, Judith. 1989. "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy." *American Ethnologist* 16.2:248–267.

Isaksson, Bo. 2015. "The So-Called We-Qatal Conjugation in Biblical Hebrew Once Again." *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 19:71–117.

Isserlin, Benedikt S. J. 1972. "Epigraphically Attested Judean Hebrew, and the Question of 'Upper Class' (Official) and 'Popular' Speech Variants in Judea during the 8th–6th Centuries B.C." *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 1.5:197–203.

Jackson, Kent P. 1989. "The Language of the Mesha Inscription." In *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Edited by Andrew Dearman. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 96–130.

Jahn, Johann. 1809. *Grammatica linguae hebraicae*. 3rd ed. Vienna: Carol. Ferdinand. Beck.

Janssens, Gerard. 1982. *Studies in Hebrew Historical Linguistics Based on Origen's Secunda*. Leuven: Peeters.

Jastram, Nathan. 1994. "27. 4QNum^b." In Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers*. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 205–267.

Johnson, Bo. 1979. *Hebräisches Perfekt und Imperfekt mit vorangehendem w^e*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Bibliography

- Jones, Andrew R. 2015.** "Word Order and Information Structure in Finite Verb Clauses in Hellenistic Period Hebrew." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto.
- Joosten, Jan. 1989.** "The Predicative Participle in Biblical Hebrew." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 2:128–159.
- Joosten, Jan. 1992.** "Biblical Hebrew *W^eqāṭal* and Syriac *Hwā Qāṭel* Expressing Repetition in the Past." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 5.1:1–14.
- Joosten, Jan. 1999a.** "The Long Form of the Prefix Conjugation Referring to the Past in Biblical Hebrew Prose." *Hebrew Studies* 40:15–26.
- Joosten, Jan. 1999b.** "Pseudo-Classicisms in Late Biblical Hebrew, in Ben Sira, and in Qumran Hebrew." In *Sirach, Scrolls and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, Held at Leiden University, 15–17 December 1997*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 146–159.
- Joosten, Jan. 2001.** "On the Septuagint Translators' Knowledge of Hebrew." In *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 165–179.
- Joosten, Jan. 2002a.** "Do the Finite Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Express Aspect?" *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 29:49–70.
- Joosten, Jan. 2002b.** "The Indicative System of the Biblical Hebrew Verb and Its Literary Exploitation." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*. Edited by Ellen van Wolde. Leiden: Brill. 51–71.
- Joosten, Jan. 2006.** "The Disappearance of Iterative WEQATAL in the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System." In *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz. Jerusalem: Magnes. 135–147.
- Joosten, Jan. 2009.** "Short Note: A Note on *Weyiqtol* and Volitive Sequences." *Vetus Testamentum* 59:495–498.

Joosten, Jan. 2010a. "Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 351–374.

Joosten, Jan. 2010b. "Response" (to Steven E. Fassberg's paper), in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Leiden: Brill. 78–80.

Joosten, Jan. 2012a. *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose*. Jerusalem: Simor.

Joosten, Jan. 2012b. "The Evolution of Literary Hebrew in Biblical Times: The Evidence of Pseudoclassicisms." In *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 281–92.

Joosten, Jan. 2012c. *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Joosten, Jan. 2015. "The Tiberian Vocalization and the Hebrew of the Second Temple Period." In *Hebrew of the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of a Sixth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Eibert Tigchelaar and Pierre Van Hecke. Leiden: Brill. 25–36.

Joosten, Jan. 2016a. "Pseudo-Classicism in Late Biblical Hebrew." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 128.1:16–29.

Joosten, Jan. 2016b. "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *A Handbook of Biblical Hebrew: Volume One: Periods, Corpora, and Reading Traditions*. Edited by W. Randall Garr and Steven E. Fassberg. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 83–97.

Joüon, Paul. 1911. "Études de philologie sémitique." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* 5.1:355–404.

Joüon, Paul. 1923. *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical.

Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. 2009. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press.

Bibliography

- Karlsson, Fred. 1999.** *Finnish: An Essential Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Kautzsch, Emil, ed. 1910.** *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Translated by Arthur E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Kawashima, Robert S. 2010.** "'Orphaned' Converted Tense Forms in Classical Biblical Hebrew Prose." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 55.1:11–35.
- Kelly, Fred T. 1920.** "The Imperfect with Simple Waw in Hebrew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 39.1–2:1–23.
- Kesterson, John C. 1984.** "Tense Usage and Verbal Syntax in Selected Qumran Documents." PhD diss., The Catholic University of America.
- Kesterson, John C. 1987.** "A Grammatical Analysis of 1QS V, 8–17." *Revue de Qumrân* 12.4:571–573.
- Kienast, Burkhardt. 1979.** "Rechtsurkunden in ugaritischer Sprache." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 11:431–452.
- Kim, Dong-Hyuk. 2013.** *Early Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, and Linguistic Variability: A Sociolinguistic Evaluation of the Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. Leiden: Brill.
- Klein, George L. 1990.** "The 'Prophetic Perfect'." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 16:45–60.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 1994.** *Time in Language*. London: Routledge.
- Knauf, Ernst A. 1990.** "War 'Biblich-Hebräisch' eine Sprache?" *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 3.1:11–23.
- Koller, Aaron. 2012.** "Diachronic Change and Synchronic Readings: Midrashim on Stative Verbs and Participles." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 57.2:265–294.
- Koller, Aaron. 2017.** "The Social and Geographic Origins of Mishnaic Hebrew." In *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew and Related Fields: Proceedings of the Yale Symposium on Mishnaic Hebrew, May 2014*. Edited by Aaron J. Koller and Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal. Jerusalem: Magnes Press. 149–173.
- Koolhaas, Wilhelm. 1748.** *Dissertationes grammatico-sacræ: Quibus analogia temporum et modorum Hebrææ Linguae investigatur ac illustratur*. Amsterdam: Apud Gerardum Borstium.

Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 2010. *The Akkadian Verb and its Semitic Background*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Krahmalkov, Charles R. 1986. "The *Qatal* with Future Tense Reference in Phoenician." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 31.1:5–10.

Krahmalkov, Charles R. 2001. *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar*. Leiden: Brill.

Kummerow, David. 2008. "How Can the Form קָטַל ? Be a Preterite, Jussive, and a Future/Imperfective? A Brief Elaboration of the Forms and Functions of the Biblical Hebrew Prefix Verbs." *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 8–9:63–95.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1972. *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1973. "Verbal Aspect in Semitic." *Orientalia, Nova Series* 42:114–120.

Kústar, Péter. 1972. *Aspekt im Hebräischen*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag.

Kutscher, Eduard Y. 1974. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)*. (Hebrew 1959). Leiden: Brill.

Kutscher, Eduard Y. 1982. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Lambdin, Thomas O. 1978. *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez)*. Scholars Press.

Lange, Armin. 2000. "4Q468g. 4QEschatological Work A?" In Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 414–415.

Larson, Erik, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. 1996. "478–481. Miscellaneous Texts." In George Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD 22. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 295–304.

Lass, Roger. 1980. *On Explaining Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bibliography

- Lecarme, Jacqueline. 2012.** "Nominal Tense." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 696–718.
- Lee, Samuel. 1827.** *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language: Comprised in a Series of Lectures etc.* London: Printed for James Duncan.
- Lee, Samuel. 1851.** "Tenses of Hebrew Verbs." *Journal of Sacred Literature* 14:469–484.
- Levin, Cristoph. 2003.** "Das Alter des Deboralieds." In Cristoph Levin, *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 124–141.
- Levita, Elias. 1767.** *Sefer Bahur*. Berlin (originally published in 1518).
- Lightfoot, David W. 1979.** *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, David W. 2006.** *How New Languages Emerge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lim, Timothy. 2000.** "306. 4QMen of the People Who Err." In Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 249–254.
- Lin, Jo-Wang. 2012.** "Tenselessness." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 669–695.
- Lipiński, Edward. 1997.** *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1989.** *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39–48*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1992.** "Discourse Perspective on the Hebrew Verb: Affirmation and Restatement." In *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by Walter R. Bodine. Winona Lake: Indiana. 177–189.

- Longacre, Robert E. 1994.** "Weqatal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 50–98.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1995.** "Building for the Worship of God: Exodus 25:1–30:10." In *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers*. Edited by Walter R. Bodine. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 21–49.
- Lyons, John. 1968.** *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. 1977.** *Semantics: Vol 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Madvig, Johan N. 1841.** *Latinsk Sproglære til Skolebrug*. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandling.
- Maier, Johann. 1995.** *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer*. 2 volumes. München: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag.
- Mair, Christian. 2012.** "Progressive and Continuous Aspect." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 803–827.
- Malone, Joseph L. 1990.** "Pretonic Lengthening: An Early Hebrew Sound Change." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110.3:460–471.
- Marcus, Irvine D. 1970.** "Aspects of the Ugaritic Verb in the Light of Comparative Semitic Grammar." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.
- Martin, William. 1876–1878.** *Inquiries concerning the Structure of the Semitic Languages*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- McFall, Leslie. 1982.** *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System: Solutions from Ewald to the Present Day*. Sheffield: The Almond Press.
- Merwe, Christo H. J. van der. 1999.** "The Elusive Biblical Hebrew Term וַיְהִי: A Perspective in Terms of Its Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics in 1 Samuel." *Hebrew Studies* 40:83–114.
- Meyer, Rudolf. 1957.** "Das Problem der Dialektmischung in den hebräischen Texten von Chirbet Qumran." *Vetus Testamentum* 7.2:139–148.

Bibliography

- Meyer, Rudolf. 1958.** "Spuren eines westsemitischen Präsens-Futur in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran." In *Von Ugarit nach Qumran: Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Forschung: Otto Eissfeldt zum 1. September 1957 dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*. Edited by Johannes Hempel and Leonhard Rost. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann. 118–128.
- Meyer, Rudolf. 1959.** "Auffallender Erzählungsstil in einem angeblichen Auszug aus der 'Chronik der Könige von Juda'." In *Festschrift Friedrich Baumgärtel zum 70. Geburtstag 14. Januar 1958, gewidmet von den Mitarbeitern am Kommentar zum Alten Testament (KAT)*. Edited by Leonhard Rost. Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen. 114–123.
- Meyer, Rudolf. 1972.** *Hebräische Grammatik III: Satzlehre*. 3rd ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Michel, Diethelm. 1960.** *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen*. Mülheim: Mülheimer Druckereigesellschaft.
- Milik, Józef T. 1956.** "26. Un apocryphe." In Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 101–102.
- Milik, Józef T. 1961.** "44. Lettre de Šim'on (fils de Kosba) à Yešua' fils de Galgula." In Pierre Benoit, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les Grottes de Murabba'ât: Texte*. DJD 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 161–163.
- Milik, Józef T. 1962.** "Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15)". In Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân*. DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press. 201–302.
- Miller-Naudé, Cynthia L., and Ziony Zevit, eds. 2012.** *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Mitchell, David C. 2009.** "A Dying and Rising Josephite Messiah in 4Q372." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18.3:181–205.
- Moomo, David O. 2005.** "The Imperfective Meaning of *Weqatal* in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 31.1:89–106.
- Mor, Uri. 2016.** עברית יהודאית. לשון התעודות העבריות ממדבר יהודה בין המרד הגדול לבר כוכבא (Judean Hebrew: The Language of the Hebrew Documents from the Judean Desert, between the Great Revolt and the Bar Kokhba Revolt). Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.

Morag, Shelomo. 1988. "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations." *Vetus Testamentum* 38.2:148–164.

Moran, William L. 2003a. "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets." (Ph.D. diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1950). Reprinted in *Amarna Studies: Collected Writings*. Edited by John Huehnergard and Shlomo Izre'el. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 1–130.

Moran, William L. 2003b. "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background." Reprinted in *Amarna Studies: Collected Writings*. Edited by John Huehnergard and Shlomo Izre'el. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 197–218.

Morgenstern, Matthew. 2000. "6. XHev/SeEschatological Hymn." In James Charlesworth et al., *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*. DJD 38. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 193–200.

Moshavi, Adina. 2010. *Word Order in the Biblical Hebrew Finite Clause: A Syntactic and Pragmatic Analysis of Preposing*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Müller, Hans-Peter. 1988. "Das Bedeutungspotential der Afformativkonjugation: Zum sprachgeschichtlichen Hintergrund des Althebräischen, II." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 1.2:159–190.

Münster, Sebastian. 1524. *Institutiones grammaticae in hebraeam linguam*. Basel: Johann Froben.

Münster, Sebastian. 1532. *Grammatica Hebraea Eliae Levitae Germani*. Basel: Johann Froben.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1998. "Again on the Tel Dan Inscription and the Northwest Semitic Verb Tenses." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 11:74–81.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1999. "The Participle in Qumran Hebrew with Special Reference to Its Periphrastic Use." In *Sirach, Scrolls, & Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, & the Mishnah, Held at Leiden University, 15–17 December 1997*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 188–204.

Bibliography

- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2000a.** "Hebrew." In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 340–345.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2000b.** "An Approach to the Morphosyntax and Syntax of Qumran Hebrew." In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 193–214.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2002.** "The Alleged Final Function of the Biblical Hebrew Syntagm <Waw + a Volitive Verb Form>." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers from the Tilburg Conference 1996*. Edited by Ellen van Wolde. Leiden: Brill. 229–241.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2011.** *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Murtonen, Aimo. 1963–1964.** "A Historico-Philological Survey of the Main Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents." *Abr-Nahrain* 4:56–95.
- Naudé, Jacobus A. 2000.** "Qumran Hebrew Syntax in the Perspective of a Theory of Language Change and Diffusion." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 26.1:105–132.
- Naudé, Jacobus A. 2003.** "The Transitions of Biblical Hebrew in the Perspective of Language Change and Diffusion." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by Ian Young. London: T&T Clark International. 189–214.
- Naudé, Jacobus A. 2012.** "Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew and a Theory of Language Change and Diffusion." In *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 61–81.
- Nebe, G. Wilhelm. 1997.** "Die hebräische Sprache der Naḥal Ḥever Dokumente 5/6Hev 44–46." In *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995*. Edited by T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 158–173.
- Nebes, Norbert, and Peter Stein. 2008.** "Ancient South Arabian." In *The Ancient Languages of Syria-Palestine and Arabia*. Edited by Roger D. Woodard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 145–178.

- Neusner, Jacob. 1988.** *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Newsom, Carol. 1990.** "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." In *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David N. Freedman. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 167–187.
- Newsom, Carol. 1995.** "370. 4QAdmonition Based on the Flood." In Magen Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 85–97.
- Newsom, Carol. 1996.** "378–379. 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a-b}." In George Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD 22. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 237–288.
- Newsom, Carol. 1998.** "400–407. Shirot °olat HaShabbat." In Esther Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 173–401.
- Niccacci, Alviero. 1987.** "A Neglected Point of Hebrew Syntax: *Yiqtol* and Position in the Sentence." *Liber Annuus* 37:7–19.
- Niccacci, Alviero. 1990.** *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Niccacci, Alviero. 1994.** "On the Hebrew Verbal System." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 117–137.
- Niccacci, Alviero. 1997.** "Analysing Biblical Hebrew Poetry." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 74:77–93.
- Niccacci, Alviero. 2002.** "Basic Facts and Theory of the Biblical Hebrew Verb System in Prose." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*. Edited by Ellen van Wolde. Leiden: Brill. 167–202.
- Niccacci, Alviero. 2006.** "The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in Poetry." In *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 247–268.

Bibliography

- Niccacci, Alviero. 2010.** "An Integrated Verb System for Biblical Hebrew Prose and Poetry." In *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*. Edited by André Lemaire. Leiden: Brill. 99–127.
- Nielsen, Flemming A. J. (with Martin Ehrensverd). 2014.** *Bibelsk Hebraisk Grammatik – en indføring*. Copenhagen: Anis.
- Nöldeke, Theodor. 1898.** *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Chr. Herm. Tauchnitz.
- Notarius, Tania. 2013.** *The Verb in Archaic Biblical Poetry: A Discursive, Typological, and Historical Investigation of the Tense System*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nyberg, Henrik S. 1952.** *Hebreisk Grammatik*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Oblath, Michael D. 1999.** "Job's Advocate: A Tempting Suggestion." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 9:189–201.
- O'Connor, Michael. 1987.** "The Poetic Inscription from Khirbet el-Qôm." *Vetus Testamentum* 37:224–30.
- Odeberg, Hugo. 1928.** *3 Enoch or The Hebrew Book of Enoch: Edited and Translated for the First Time with Introduction, Commentary & Critical Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogihara, Toshiyuki, and Yael Sharvit. 2012.** "Embedded Tenses." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 638–668.
- Olmo Lete, Gregorio del, and Joaquín Sanmartín. 2015.** *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. 3rd ed. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill.
- Olyan, Saul. 1994.** "382. 4Qpap paraKings et al." In Harold Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 363–416.
- Orlinsky, Harry M. 1942.** "On the Cohortative and Jussive after an Imperative or Interjection in Biblical Hebrew: IV (Continued)." *The Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series* 32.3:273–277.

Orwin, Martin. 1995. *Colloquial Somali: The Complete Course for Beginners*. London: Routledge.

Owens, Jonathan. 1988. *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Owens, Jonathan. 1997. "The Arabic Grammatical Tradition." In *The Semitic Languages*. Edited by Robert Hetzron. London: Routledge. 46–58.

Palmer, Frank R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pardee, Dennis. 1983. "Visiting Ditanu: The Text of RS 24.272." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 15:127–140.

Pardee, Dennis. 1984. "Three Ugaritic Tablet Joins." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 43.3:239–245.

Pardee, Dennis. 1988. *Les textes para-mythologiques, de la 24^e campagne (1961)*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Pardee, Dennis. 2003/2004. Review of Josef Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 50:1–404.

Pardee, Dennis. 2012. "The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in a Nutshell." In *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. Edited by Rebecca Hasselbach and Na'ama Pat-El. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 285–317.

Pardee, Dennis, and Robert M. Whiting. 1987. "Aspects of Epistolary Verbal Usage in Ugaritic and Akkadian." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 50.1:1–31.

Parker, Simon B. 1997. *Stories in Scripture and Inscriptions: Comparative Studies on Narratives in Northwest Semitic Inscriptions and the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Patón, Lorenzo J. 2002. *Sefer Moznayim*. Revised and completed by Ángel Sáenz-Badillos after Patón's death. Córdoba: Ediciones Almedro.

Bibliography

- Pedersen, Johannes. 1926.** *Hebræisk Grammatik*. Copenhagen: V. Pios Boghandel/Poul Branner.
- Penner, Ken M. 2006.** "Verb Form Semantics in Qumran Hebrew Texts: Tense, Aspect, and Modality between the Bible and the Mishnah." PhD diss., McMaster University.
- Penner, Ken M. 2013.** "Verbal System, History of the Research." In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics: Vol. 3*. Edited by Geoffrey Khan. Leiden: Brill. 918–921.
- Penner, Ken M. 2015.** *The Verbal System of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Qumran Hebrew Texts*. Leiden: Brill.
- Penner, Ken M. 2016.** "The Significance of the Biblical Hebrew Verb Forms." Online (Cited 29 March 2016): http://www.academia.edu/19051651/The_Significance_of_the_Biblical_Hebrew_Verb_Forms.
- Pérez Fernández, Miguel. 1997.** *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*. Translated by John Elwolde. Leiden: Brill.
- Polzin, Robert. 1976.** *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- Prijs, Leo. 1950.** *Die Grammatikalische Terminologie des Abraham Ibn Esra*. Basel: Sepher-Verlag.
- Puech, Émile. 1992.** "Une Apocalypse messianique (4Q521)." *Revue de Qumrân* 15.4:475–522.
- Puech, Émile. 1998.** *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. DJD 25. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Qimḥi, David. 1862 (ed. Rittenberg).** *Sefer Mikhlol*. Lyck.
- Qimron, Elisha. 1986.** *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Qimron, Elisha. 1986/1987.** "Consecutive and Conjunctive Imperfect: The Form of the Imperfect with *Waw* in Biblical Hebrew." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 77.2–3:149–161.

Qimron, Elisha. 1992. "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.-200 C.E.) in the Light of the Dead Sea Documents." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Leiden: Brill. 349–361.

Qimron, Elisha. 2000. "The Nature of DSS Hebrew and Its Relation to BH and MH." In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 232–244.

Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. 1994. *Qumran Cave 4, Volume 5: Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rabin, Chaim. 1958. "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew." In *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Scripta Hierosolymitana 4. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Jerusalem: Magnes Press. 144–161.

Rabin, Chaim. 1974. *A Short History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Haomanim Press.

Rabin, Chaim. 1976. "Hebrew and Aramaic in the First Century." In *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section One: The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions, Vol. 2*. Edited by Shmuel Safrai and Menahem Stern. Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum. 1007–1039.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. 1984. "' $\bar{A}z$ Followed by Imperfect Verb-Form in Preterite Contexts: A Redactional Device in Biblical Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 34.1:53–62.

Rainey, Anson F. 1986. "The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation in the Light of Amarna Canaanite." *Hebrew Studies* 27:4–19.

Rainey, Anson F. 1996. *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets: A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by the Scribes from Canaan. Vol. II: Morphosyntactic Analysis of the Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.

Rainey, Anson F. 2015. *The El-Amarna Correspondence: A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna Based on Collations of all Extant Tablets*. 2 volumes. Edited by William M. Schniedewind and Zipora Cochavi-Rainey. Leiden: Brill.

Bibliography

- Reichenbach, Hans. 1947.** *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. New York: Macmillan.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. 1980.** "Evidence for Spoken Hebrew in Biblical Times." Ph.D. diss., New York University.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. 1990.** *Diglossia in Ancient Hebrew*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. 2010.** "Qumran Hebrew (with a Trial Cut [1QS])." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*. Edited by Lawrence Schiffman and Shani Tzoref. Boston: Brill. 217–246.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. 2015.** "The Nature of Qumran Hebrew as Revealed through *Pesher Habakkuk*." In *Hebrew of the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of a Sixth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Eibert Tigchelaar and Pierre Van Hecke. Leiden: Brill. 132–159.
- Rendsburg, Gary A., and William M. Schniedewind. 2010.** "The Siloam Tunnel Inscription: Historical and Linguistic Perspectives." *Israel Exploration Journal* 60.2:188–203.
- Renz, Johannes. 1995.** *Die althebräischen Inschriften: Teil 1, Text und Kommentar*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Reuchlin, Johann. 1506.** *De rudimentis hebraicis*. Pforzheim.
- Revell, Ernest J. 1984.** "Stress and the *Waw* 'Consecutive' in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104.3:437–444.
- Revell, Ernest J. 1985.** "The Conditioning of Stress Position in *Waw* Consecutive Perfect Forms in Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Annual Review* 9:277–300.
- Revell, Ernest J. 1987.** *Nesiga (Retraction of Word Stress) in Tiberian Hebrew*. Madrid: Instituto de Filología, Departamento de Filología Bíblica y de Oriente Antiguo.
- Revell, Ernest J. 1989.** "The System of the Verb in Standard Biblical Prose." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60:1–37.

Revell, Ernest J. 2015. *The Pausal System: Divisions in the Hebrew Biblical Text as Marked by Voweling and Stress Position*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Reymond, Eric D. 2014. *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Rezetko, Robert. 2003. "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by Ian Young. London: T&T Clark International. 215–250.

Rezetko, Robert. 2009. "What Happened to the Book of Samuel in the Persian Period and Beyond?" In *A Palimpsest: Rhetoric, Ideology, Stylistics, and Language Relating to Persian Israel*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi, Diana V. Edelman, and Frank Polak. Piscataway: Gorgias Press. 237–252.

Rezetko, Robert, and Ian Young. 2014. *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew: Steps toward an Integrated Approach*. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Richardson, Kylie. 2012. "Case." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 960–985.

Rix, Helmut. 1977. "Das keltische Verbalsystem auf dem Hintergrund des indo-iranisch-griechischen Rekonstruktionsmodells." In *Indogermanisch und Keltisch: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft am 16. und 17. Februar 1976 in Bonn*. Edited by Karl H. Schmidt. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. 132–158.

Robar, Elizabeth. 2013. "Wayyiqtol as an Unlikely Preterite." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 58.1:21–42.

Robar, Elizabeth. 2014. *The Verb and the Paragraph in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach*. Leiden: Brill.

Roberge, Paul T. 2012. "The Teleology of Change: Functional and Non-Functional Explanations for Language Variation and Change." In *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Edited by Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy and Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 369–386.

Robertson, David A. 1972. *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature.

Bibliography

- Rogland, Max. 2000.** "The Hebrew 'Epistolary Perfect' Revisited." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 13.2:194–200.
- Rogland, Max. 2003.** *Alleged Non-Past Uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew*. Assen: Royal van Gorcum.
- Rogland, Max. 2008.** "Abram's Persistent Faith: Hebrew Verb Semantics in Genesis 15:6." *Westminster Theological Journal* 70:239–244.
- Rollston, Christopher A. 2006.** "Scribal Education in Ancient Israel: The Old Hebrew Epigraphic Evidence." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 344:47–74.
- Rosén, Haim B. 1969.** "The Comparative Assignment of Certain Hebrew Tense Forms." In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies Held in Jerusalem, 19–23 July 1965*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. 212–234.
- Rosenthal, Franz. 1974.** *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rössler, Otto. 1961.** "Eine bisher unerkannte Tempusform im Althebräischen." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 111:445–451.
- Rowton, Michael B. 1962.** "The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21.4:233–303.
- Rubinstein, Arie. 1955.** "Singularities in Consecutive-Tense Constructions in the Isaiah Scroll." *Vetus Testamentum* 5.1:180–188.
- Rubinstein, Arie. 1963.** "The Anomalous Perfect with *Waw*-Conjunctive in Biblical Hebrew." *Biblica* 44.1:62–69.
- Rundgren, Frithiof. 1961.** *Das althebräische Verbum: Abriss der Aspektlehre*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Sande, Axel van de. 2008.** *Nouvelle perspective sur le système verbal de l'hébreu ancien: les formes *qatala, *yaqtul et *yaqtulu*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Sanders, James A. 1965.** *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)*. DJD 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Sasson, Victor. 1997.** "Some Observations on the Use and Original Purpose of the *Waw* Consecutive in Old Aramaic and Biblical Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 47.1:111–127.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1995.** *Cours de linguistique générale: Publié par Charles Bailly et Albert Séchehaye avec la collaboration de Albert Riedlinger. Édition critique préparée par Tullio de Mauro. Postface de Louis-Jean Calvet.* Paris: Éditions Payot & Rivages.
- Saussure, Louis de, and Bertrand Sthioul. 2012.** "The Surcomposé Past Tense." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 586–610.
- Schechter, Salomon. 1887.** *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* (מסכת אבות דרבי נתן): *Hujus libri recensiones duas collatis variis apud bibliothecas et publicas et privatas codicibus edidit, prooemium, notas, appendices, indicesque addidit Salomon Schechter.* Vienna: Ch. D. Lippe.
- Schendl, Herbert. 2012.** "Multilingualism, Code-switching, and Language Contact in Historical Sociolinguistics." In *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Edited by Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy and Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. 520–533.
- Schippers, Arie. 1997.** "The Hebrew Grammatical Tradition." In *The Semitic Languages*. Edited by Robert Hetzron. London: Routledge. 59–65.
- Schneider, Wolfgang. 1978.** *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch.* München: Claudius Verlag.
- Schniedewind, William M. 1999.** "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118.2:235–252.
- Schniedewind, William M. 2000.** "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew." In *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 245–255.
- Schniedewind, William M. 2013.** *A Social History of Hebrew: Its Origins through the Rabbinic Period.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Schoors, Antoon. 2002.** "The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works." In *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential*

Bibliography

Thought. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger. Leuven: Leuven University Press. 61–95.

Schröder, Nikolaus W. 1772. *Institutiones ad fundamenta linguae hebraeae*. 2nd ed. (1st ed. 1766). Claudiopolis: Typis Colleg.

Schüle, Andreas. 2000. *Die Syntax der althebräischen Inschriften: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik des Hebräischen*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Schuller, Eileen. 1998. "380–381. Non-Canonical Psalms." In Esther Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 75–172.

Schuller, Eileen, and Moshe Bernstein. 2001. "371–373. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition^{a-c}." In Douglas M. Gropp et al., *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh, and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*. DJD 28. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 151–204.

Schuller, Eileen, and Carol Newsom. 2012. *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Edition of 1QH^a*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Screnock, John. 2011. "Word Order in the War Scroll (1QM) and Its Implications for Interpretation." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 18:29–44.

Segal, Moshe H. 1927. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Segert, Stanislav. 1963. "Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrängemeinschaft." In *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961*. Edited by Hans Bardtke. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. 315–339.

Segert, Stanislav. 1976. *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic*. München: Verlag C. H. Beck.

Segert, Stanislav. 1983. *Altaramäische Grammatik: Mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.

Segert, Stanislav. 1984. *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language: With Selected Texts and Glossary*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- Sharvit, Shimon. 1980.** "מערכת הזמנים 'בלשון המשנה'" ("The 'Tense' System of Mishnaic Hebrew"). In *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages: Dedicated to the Memory of Prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher*. Edited by Gad B. Sarfatti et al. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press. 110–125.
- Shin, Seung-Yun. 2016.** "A Diachronic Study of the Language of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 135.2:265–281.
- Shulman, Ahouva. 2000.** "The Function of the 'Jussive' and 'Indicative' Imperfect Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 13:168–180.
- Siedl, Suitbert H. 1971.** *Gedanken zum Tempussystem im Hebräischen und Akkadischen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Siegismund, Kasper. 2013.** "Poetisk verbalbrug og sproglig datering af gammeltestamentlige tekster." *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 76.4:261–275.
- Siegismund, Kasper. 2014.** "Hebraisk *weqatal* – funktion, form og oprindelse." Master's thesis, University of Copenhagen.
- Siegismund, Kasper. 2017.** "Anterior *Weqatal* in the Hebrew Bible and the Qumran Documents." *Hebrew Studies* 58:199–220.
- Siegismund, Kasper. Forthcoming a.** "Once Again on Word Order in the War Scroll (1QM)." *Dead Sea Discoveries*.
- Siegismund, Kasper. Forthcoming b.** "The Death of a Virtuous Woman? Proverbs 31.10-31, Gnomical *Qatal*, and the Role of Translation in the Analysis of the Hebrew Verbal System." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*.
- Simonis, Johann. 1753.** *Introductio grammatico-critica in linguam Hebraicam*. Halle: Impensis Orphanotropei.
- Smith, Mark S. 1991.** *The Origins and Development of the Waw-Consecutive*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Smith, Mark S. 1994.** *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2. Vol. I*. Leiden: Brill.
- Smith, Mark S. 1999.** "Grammatically Speaking: The Participle as a Main Verb of Clauses (Predicative Participle) in Direct Discourse and Narrative in

Bibliography

- Pre-Mishnaic Hebrew." In *Sirach, Scrolls, & Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, & the Mishnah, Held at Leiden University, 15–17 December 1997*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 278–332.
- Smith, Mark. 1995.** "391. 4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel^e." In Magen Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 153–193.
- Sneddon, James N. 1996.** *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Soden, Wolfram von. 1969.** *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Sperber, Alexander. 1966.** *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to Their Solutions*. Leiden: Brill.
- Spieckermann, Hermann. 1982.** *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Stassen, Leon. 1997.** *Intransitive Predication*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (with Eileen Schuller and Carol Newsom). 2009.** *1QHodayot^d, with Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{a-f}*. DJD 40. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stein, Peter. 2013.** *Lehrbuch der sabäischen Sprache. 1. Teil: Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Steiner, Richard C. 1995.** "The History of the Ancient Hebrew Modal System and Labov's Rule of Compensatory Structural Change." In *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in Honor of William Labov. Volume 1: Variation and Change in Language and Society*. Edited by Gregory R. Guy et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 253–261.
- Steiner, Richard C. 2000.** "Does the Biblical Hebrew Conjunction -ו Have Many Meanings, One Meaning, or No Meaning at All?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119.2:249–267.
- Studel, Annette. 1997.** "411–412. Sapiential Texts." In Torleif Elgvin et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1*. DJD 20. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 159–167.

Stipp, Hermann-Josef. 1991. "w·=hayā für nichtiterative Vergangenheit? Zu syntaktischen Modernisierungen im masoretischen Jeremiabuch." In *Text, Methode und Grammatik: Wolfgang Richter zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Walter Gross, Hubert Irsigler, and Theodor Seidl. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag. 521–547.

Streck, Michael P. 1997–1998. Review of Giorgio Buccelati, *A Structural Grammar of Babylonian*. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 44–45:314–325.

Strugnell, John, and Daniel J. Harrington. 1999. "415–418c. Instruction." In John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mûsār lēMēvîn): 4Q415ff.* DJD 34. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1–503.

Swart, Henriëtte de. 2012. "Verbal Aspect." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Edited by Robert I. Binnick. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 752–780.

Talshir, David. 2003. "The Habitat and History of Hebrew during the Second Temple Period." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by Ian Young. London: T & T Clark. 251–275.

Testen, David. 1994. "On the Development of the Arabic Subjunctive." In *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics: Papers from the Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics. Volume VI: Columbus, Ohio 1992*. Edited by Mushira Eid, Vicente Cantarino, and Keith Walters. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 151–166.

Testen, David. 1998. *Parallels in Semitic Linguistics: The Development of Arabic La- and Related Semitic Particles*. Leiden: Brill.

Thorion-Vardi, Talia. 1985. "The Use of the Tenses in the Zadokite Documents." *Revue de Qumrân* 12.1:65–88.

Tov, Emanuel. 2000. "Canticles." In Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 195–219.

Trask, R. L. 1999. *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Trask, R. L. 2010. *Why Do Languages Change?* Revised by Robert McColl Millar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bibliography

- Tropper, Josef. 1995.** "Die semitische 'Suffixkonjugation' im Wandel: Von der Prädikativform zum Perfekt." In *Vom Alten Orient zum Alten Testament: Festschrift für Wolfram Freiherrn von Soden zum 85. Geburtstag am 19. Juni 1993*. Edited by Manfred Dietrich and Oswald Loretz. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. 491–516.
- Tropper, Josef. 1996.** "Aramäisches *wyqtl* und hebräisches *wayyiqtol*." *Ugaritforschungen* 28:633–645.
- Tropper, Josef. 1998.** "Althebräisches und semitisches Aspektsystem." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 11.2:153–190.
- Tropper, Josef. 2002.** *Altäthiopisch: Grammatik des Ge'ez mit Übungstexten und Glossar*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Tropper, Josef. 2006.** Review of Max Rogland, *Alleged Non-Past Uses of Qatal in Classical Hebrew*. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 51.2:417–19.
- Tropper, Josef. 2012.** *Ugaritische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2011.** *Sociolinguistic Typology: Social Determinants of Linguistic Complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ullendorff, Edward. 1971.** "Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?" *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 34.2:3–17.
- Ulrich, Eugene. 2010.** *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ulrich, Eugene, and Peter W. Flint. 2010.** *Qumran Cave 1, Volume 2: The Isaiah Scrolls: Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. DJD 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ungnad, Arthur. 1912.** *Hebräische Grammatik*. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Van Peursen, Wido Th. 1997.** "Periphrastic Tense in Ben Sira." In *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University 11–14 December 1995*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Leiden: Brill. 158–173.

Van Peursen, Wido Th. 2004. *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*. Leiden: Brill.

VanderKam, James. 1989. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. CSCO 510. Leuven: Peeters.

VanderKam, James, and Jozef T. Milik. 1994. "Jubilees (4Q216–228)." In Harold Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1–185.

Vendler, Zeno. 1957. "Verbs and Times." *The Philosophical Review* 66.2:143–160.

Verkuyl, Henk J. 1972. *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Vern, Robyn. 2011. *Dating Archaic Biblical Hebrew Poetry*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.

Verreet, Eddy. 1986. "Abriss des ugaritischen Verbalsystems." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 18:75–82.

Versteegh, Kees. 2001. *The Arabic Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Voigt, Rainer. 1997. "On the Irregular Form *yabe* in Classical Ethiopic." In *Ethiopia in Broader Perspective: Papers of the XIIIth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Kyoto, 12–17 December 1997. Vol. 1*. Edited by Katsuyoshi Fukui, Eisei Kurimoto, and Masayoshi Shigeta. Kyoto: Shokado Book Sellers. 583–595.

Voigt, Rainer. 2000. "Über die unregelmäßige Form *yabe* im Altäthiopischen. II." *Aethiopica* 3:120–131.

Voigt, Rainer. 2004. "Die Entwicklung des Aspektsystems vom Ursemitischen zum Hebräischen." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 154:35–55.

Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael O'Connor. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Warren, Andrew. 1998. "Modality, Reference and Speech Acts in the Psalms." Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University.

Bibliography

- Weinfeld, Moshe, and David Seely. 1999.** "Barkhi Nafshi (4Q434–438)." In Bilhah Nitzan et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 255–334.
- Weinrich, Harald. 1964.** *Tempus: Besprochene und erzählte Welt*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Weippert, Manfred. 1990.** "Die Petition eines Erntearbeiters aus *Māṣad Ḥāšavyāhū* und die Syntax althebräischer erzählender Prosa." In *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Stegemann. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. 449–466.
- Weitzman, Steve. 1999.** "Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119.1:35–45.
- Weninger, Stefan. 2001.** *Das Verbalsystem des Altäthiopischen, eine Untersuchung seiner Verwendung und Funktion unter Berücksichtigung des Interferenzproblems*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wikander, Ola. 2010.** "The Hebrew Consecutive *Wāw* as a North West Semitic 'Augment': A Typological Comparison with Indo-European." *Vetus Testamentum* 60.2:260–270.
- Willi-Plein, Ina. 2000.** "Zu A. Behrens, Gen 15,6 und das Vorverständnis des Paulus, ZAW 109 (1997), 327–341." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112.3:396–397.
- Wilson, Andrew M., and Lawrence Wills. 1982.** "Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll." *Harvard Theological Review* 75.3:275–288.
- Wise, Michael O. 1992.** "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran." In *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*. Abr-Nahrain Supplement Series 3. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka. Leuven: Peeters Press. 124–167.
- Yadin, Yigael. 1983.** *The Temple Scroll*. Two volumes. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society.
- Yadin, Yigael, Jonas C. Greenfield, Ada Yardeni, and Baruch A. Levine. 2002.** *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters*:

Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Yardeni, Ada. 2000. *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judaean Desert and Related Material*. 2 volumes. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.

Young, G. Douglas. 1953. "The Origin of the Waw Conversive." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12.4:248–252.

Young, Ian. 1993. *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Young, Ian, ed. 2003a. *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. London: T&T Clark International.

Young, Ian. 2003b. "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions." In *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*. Edited by Ian Young. London: T&T Clark International. 276–311.

Young, Ian. 2005. "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Masoretic Text: A Statistical Approach." In *Feasts and Fasts: A Festschrift in Honour of Alan David Crown*. Edited by Marianne Dacy, Jennifer Dowling, and Suzanne Faigan. Sydney: Mandelbaum Publishing. 81–139.

Young, Ian. 2013. "'Loose' Language in 1QIsa^a." In *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown*. Edited by Shani Tzoref and Ian Young. Piscataway: Gorgias Press. 89–112.

Young, Ian. 2016. "Ancient Hebrew without Authors." *Journal for Semitics* 25.2:972–1003.

Young, Ian. 2017. "Starting at the Beginning with Archaic Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Studies* 58:99–118.

Young, Ian, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd. 2008. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. Two volumes. London: Equinox.

Zevit, Ziony. 1984. "The Khirbet el-Qôm Inscription Mentioning a Goddess." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 255:39–47.

Zevit, Ziony. 1988. "Talking Funny in Biblical Henglish and Solving a Problem of the *Yaqtul* Past Tense." *Hebrew Studies* 29:25–33.

Bibliography

Zevit, Ziony. 1998. *The Anterior Construction in Classical Hebrew*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Zewi, Tamar, and Mikhal Oren. 2015. "Semitic Languages in Contact: Syntactic Changes in the Verbal System and in Verbal Complementation." In *Semitic Languages in Contact*. Edited by Aaron M. Butts. Leiden: Brill. 405–421.

Zuber, Beat. 1986. *Das Tempussystem des biblischen Hebräisch: Eine Untersuchung am Text*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dansk resumé

I denne afhandling behandles to centrale spørgsmål, som har domineret en stor del af udforskningen af det hebraiske verbalsystem. 1) Hvad er betydningssindholdet i de ikke-volitiver, finite verbalformer, og hvordan skal man karakterisere verbalsystemet som helhed i forhold til kategorierne tempus, aspekt og modalitet. 2) Hvordan fungerer det karakteristiske klassiskehebraiske konsekutivsystem (hvor *qatal* veksler med *wayyiqtol* og *yiqtol* med *weqatal*), hvordan er de konsekutive former *wayyiqtol* og *weqatal* opstået, og hvordan gik det til, at de igen gik ud af brug under udviklingen til rabbinisk hebraisk, hvor det klassiske system ikke længere findes (ud over i citater fra GT).

Kap. 1 præsenterer et kort overblik over centrale dele af forskningshistorien, med fokus på den tidligste periode. Det påpeges, at den absolut temporale tolkning af de bibelske verber, som ofte tilskrives de tidlige jødiske grammatikere, ikke er så indlysende som almindeligvis antaget, og det problematiske i den udbredte opfattelse af Ewalds tilgang som aspektuel fremhæves. En teoretisk diskussion af kategorierne tempus, aspekt og modalitet præsenteres, hvorefter kap. 2 går i dybden med kritik af en række forskere, der for nyligt har behandlet verbalsystemet med særlige metoder såsom statistisk optælling (Penner) og sprogtypologi (Cook). Det påpeges, at sådanne metoder ikke – som deres fortalere ellers mener – kan bruges som neutrale dommere mellem de forskellige opfattelser af verbalsystemets grundkarakterer.

I kap. 3 beskrives det klassiske verbalsystems grundlæggende funktionsmåde, inklusiv argumenter for at opfatte *qatal* og *wayyiqtol* som semantisk ækvivalente. Valget mellem de to former har at gøre med, hvorvidt sætningen indledes med "og", og hvorvidt andre elementer i sætningen skal fokuseres og dermed anbringes i frontposition. Det samme gælder forholdet mellem *yiqtol* og *weqatal*. Der argumenteres for, at relativ tempus er den kategori, der er bedst egnet til at beskrive systemet. Grundoppositionen i det klassiskehebraiske finite, ikke-volitiver verbalsystem er mellem på den ene side *qatal/wayyiqtol*, som udtrykker "før tid" (engelsk anteriority), altså alt hvad der foregår før noget andet, og på den anden side *yiqtol/weqatal*, der udtrykker "ikke-før tid" (non-anteriority), altså hvad der foregår efter eller samtidig med noget andet. Det hebraiske system kender ikke til specifikt relative tidsformer, hvorfor den samme førtidige kategori dækker både dansk simpel datid, førnutid, førdatid og førfremtid.

Kap. 4 illustrerer, at systemets relativ temporale karakter gælder alle faser af hebraisk, inklusiv rabbinisk hebraisk, som ellers ofte karakteriseres som absolut temporalt. Modsat den udbredte opfattelse, at klassisk hebraisk er aspektuelt, mens rabbinisk hebraisk er (absolut) temporalt, påpeges det, at

den voksende brug af participiet og i særdeleshed af den perifrastiske konstruktion med יהי plus participium gør, at vi må opfatte rabbinisk hebraisk som *mere* aspektuelt indrettet end sprogets tidligere udviklingstrin.

Kap. 5 præsenterer en gennemgang af baggrunden for de konsekutive former *wayyiqtol* og *weqatal*. *Yiqtol*-delen af *wayyiqtol* ses som en relikv af ursemitisk **yáqtul*, og der argumenteres for, at den særlige vokalisering og fordoblingen af den første konsonant i præfikset i *wayyiqtol* skyldes en simpel fonetisk udvikling forårsaget af trykket på præfikset. I den forbindelse understreges nødvendigheden af at antage en trykbaseret forskel mellem forløberen for *yiqtol*-delen af *wayyiqtol* (**yáqtul*) og jussiven (**yaqtúl*) på et førhebraisk (men næppe ursemitisk) stadie. Ligeledes argumenteres der for, at den analogiske udvikling af *weqatal* og dermed af det samlede klassiske konsekutivsystem giver bedst mening, hvis den karakteristiske trykflytning, som er bevidnet under bestemte betingelser i den masoretiske notation, ses som en integreret del af udviklingen i det reelt talte sprog.

Kap. 6 undersøger to slags uklassisk interferens i de før-rabbiniske tekst-korpora, førtidig *weqatal* (uklassisk substitut for klassisk *wayyiqtol*) og ikke-volitiv *weyiqtol* (uklassisk substitut for klassisk *weqatal*). Det vises, at der ikke er nogen direkte sammenhæng mellem dateringen af en tekst og forekomsten af sådanne uklassiske træk. En sen tekst kan sagtens undgå at bruge disse former.

Kap. 7 bygger videre på denne baggrund og forsvarer opfattelsen af klassisk hebraisk som et mere eller mindre standardiseret litteratursprog, som man blev ved med at bruge i en lang periode, efter at det talte sprog havde udviklet sig væk fra det klassiske system. Det diskuteres, hvordan man skal opfatte forbindelsen mellem talesprog og skriftsprog i de tidlige hebraiske inskriptioner og i Dødehavsrullerne. Mht. inskriptionerne problematiseres de konsekutive formers ofte antagede rent litterære karakter, og der argumenteres for, at disse former må have været en naturlig del af det talte sprog på et eller andet tidspunkt (men ikke nødvendigvis da de overleverede inskriptioner blev skrevet). Mht. sproget i Dødehavsrullerne påpeges det problematiske i den opfattelse, der ser en meget direkte afpejling af tidens talte sprog i skriftsproget, ligesom der fremføres en række indvendinger mod den idé, at sproget i Dødehavsrullerne skulle være en bevidst sproglig markør af sektersk art. Nogle aspekter af sidstnævnte tilgang virker imidlertid overbevisende.

I kap. 8 præsenteres en række observationer, der kan bidrage til en afklaring af afviklingen af det klassiske konsekutive system. Det påpeges, at det er utilfredsstillende at nøjes med at sige, at skriftsproget blot overtog det system, der allerede var der i det talte sprog. Denne tilgang forklarer ikke noget,

men skubber bare forklaringsproblemet bagud i tid. Det foreslås, at en kombination af flere specifikke interne faktorer i tilgift til aramæisk indflydelse bør ses som afgørende for den proces, der førte til den omtolkning af systemet, der må have været baggrunden for det system, der kendes fra rabbinsk hebraisk. Kap. 9 opsummerer de centrale konklusioner.

Bemærk desuden, at en hel del ekstramateriale forefindes i appendikser (tabeller og lister over forekomster af diverse verbalformer, en række eks-kurser osv.).

Summary

This dissertation treats two fundamental questions that have dominated much of the history of research on the Hebrew verbs. 1) What is the semantic content of the non-volitive, finite verb forms, and how are we to characterize the verbal system with respect to the categories of tense, aspect, and modality. 2) How does the classical system of consecutive forms function (*qatal* interchange with *wayyiqtol*, *yiqtol* with *weqatal*), what is the origin of the consecutive forms *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*, and why were they no longer used in Rabbinic Hebrew (apart from biblical quotations).

In ch. 1, I present a short overview of previous research, focusing on the earliest period. I note the problematic nature of the oft-repeated claim that the early Jewish grammarians analyzed the verbs in the OT as absolute tenses and of the assertion that Ewald's approach is aspectual. After a theoretical discussion of the categories of tense, aspect, and modality, ch. 2 provides a detailed criticism of recent scholarship claiming to provide objective arbitration between the various interpretations of the verbal system. I note that methods such as Penner's use of statistics and Cook's use of linguistic typology cannot provide external validation for the interpretations presented by these scholars (absolute tense and aspect, respectively).

In ch. 3, I outline the basics of the classical verbal system, including arguments that *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* are semantically equivalent. The choice between the two forms depends on the presence of "and" at the beginning of the clause and the presence of other elements in fronted focal position. The same applies to the relationship between *yiqtol* and *weqatal*. I argue that relative tense is the category that best describes the system. The basic opposition in the classical finite, non-volitive system is the opposition between anterior *qatal/wayyiqtol* (indicating every action that occurs before something else) and non-anterior *yiqtol/weqatal* (every action that occurs after something else or at the same time). The Hebrew system does not possess specific relative tense forms. Hence, the general category of anteriority covers the English simple past as well as present perfect, past perfect, and future perfect.

Ch. 4 shows that the system of relative tense is found at all stages of Hebrew, including Rabbinic Hebrew, which has often been characterized as a system of absolute tense. In contrast to the widespread view that Classical Hebrew is aspect-prominent while Rabbinic Hebrew is (absolute) tense-prominent, I emphasize that the increasing use of the participle and in particular the use of the periphrastic construction הִיהָ plus participle force us to see Rabbinic Hebrew as *more* aspect-prominent than the earlier stages of the language.

In ch. 5, I present a discussion of the background of the consecutive forms *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal*. Like most other scholars, I see the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol* as a relic of Proto-Semitic **yáqtul* and I argue that the special vocalization and the doubling of the prefix-consonant were the results of a simple phonetic process caused by the stress on the prefix of the underlying verb form. In this connection, I point out that we have to posit a stress-based distinction between the ancestor of the *yiqtol* part of *wayyiqtol* (**yáqtul*) and the jussive (**yaqtúl*) at some stage of pre-Hebrew (but probably not at the Proto-Semitic stage). Likewise, I argue that the analogical development of non-anterior *weqatal* and hence of the classical system of consecutive forms as a whole makes more sense if the characteristic stress shift (attested under certain conditions in the Masoretic notation) is seen as an integral part of the development in the language as actually spoken.

Ch. 6 is an investigation of two kinds of unclassical interference in pre-Rabbinic texts, viz. anterior *weqatal* (unclassical substitute for classical *wayyiqtol*) and non-volitive *weyiqtol* (unclassical substitute for classical *weqatal*). There is no direct link between the date of a text and the presence of such unclassical traits. A late text need not contain such forms.

Building on this foundation, ch. 7 defends the view that Classical Hebrew was a more or less standardized literary language, which remained in use for a long time after the spoken language had abandoned the use of the classical system of consecutive forms. I discuss the characterization of the language in the early Hebrew inscriptions and the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran. I argue that we cannot conclude that the inscriptions depend on a literary language to any significant degree. Specifically, I note that we have to assume that the consecutive forms were a natural part of spoken usage at some point (but not necessarily when the inscriptions were written). On the language in the texts from Qumran, I highlight the problematic nature of the claim that these texts reflect contemporary spoken language in any direct way. Likewise, I note several problems with the theory that Qumran Hebrew was a conscious creation of the presumed sect responsible for (some of) the documents. However, some aspects of the latter theory seem convincing.

In ch. 8, I present several observations that may contribute to a description of the decline of the classical system of consecutive forms. The idea that the written language merely took over a system that was already in existence in the spoken language is unsatisfactory. It simply pushes the need for an explanation backwards in time. I suggest that a combination of several specific internal factors in addition to pressure from Aramaic should be seen as decisive for the process that led to the reanalysis that must have been the basis

Summary

for the system as attested in Rabbinic Hebrew. Ch. 9 summarizes the main conclusions.

Note that a large amount of supplementary material is provided in appendices (tables and lists of various types of verbal usage, several excursuses, etc.).