The Biblical Hebrew perfective short *yiqtol* and the 'consecutive tenses'. Some methodological reflections

Comparative research uniformly testifies that the short *yiqtol* in Biblical Hebrew has an historical background in an old short prefixed conjugation *yaqtul* with perfective meaning.[1]

The short *yiqtol* is attested in the archaic Hebrew poetry in freestanding form. It has indicative past meanings and jussive meanings (Notarius 2013: 307).

Table. Short *yiqtol* for past time and jussive meanings (Tiberian vocalization)

	indicative (past)	jussive
Archaic Hebrew poetry:	*Ø-yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*	*Ø-yiqtol*, *wə-yiqtol*
Classical prose	*wayyiqtol*	*Ø-yiqtol*, *wə-yiqtol*

In Classical prose indicative meanings of short *yiqtol* are found with radical word-order restriction in the form *wayyiqtol*. In other positions it has been replaced by *qātal*. The jussive short *yiqtol* is retained in freestanding form in the classical language.

The scholarly positions concerning *wayyiqtol* are illustrated in the debate about the Tel Dan inscription. The Aramaic text is reasonbly contemporary with the Classical Hebrew period. As you all know, it is a retrospective report.

וישכב . אבי . יהך אל] . אבהו[הֿ .

ויעל . מלך י]שׁ[4ראל . קדם . בארק . אבֹי[ן] .

ו[יֿהמלך . הדד [.] א[יתי [.] 5אנה .

ויהך . הדד . קדמי].

ו[אפק . מן . שֿבע[תֿ .   ] 6 י מלכי .

ואקתל . מל]כן שב[עֿן אֿסרי . א[לפי . ר]7כב . ואלפי פרש .

[וקתלת . אית . יו]רם . בר . [אחאב .] 8מלך . ישראל .

וקתל]ת . אית . אחז]יהו . בר]. יורם . מל]9ך . בית דוד .

ואשֹֿם .]

---

[1] Kouwenberg (2010); Huehnergard (2005). Baranowski (2016a: 1): "If there is anything absolutely certain in the historical understanding of the Semitic verbal system, it is the reconstruction of a short prefixed form with the perfective meaning, used typically as the past tense in the indicative and as the directive-volitive form.".

'³and my father **laid down** (and) went to [his ancestors.] Now the king of ⁴Israel **had** formerly **entered** in my father's land. [But] Hadad **made me king**. ⁵And Hadad **went** before me, [and] **I departed** from seven[...] ⁶of my kingdom. **And I killed** seve[nty ki]ngs, who harnessed thou[sands of cha]⁷riots and thousands of horsemen. [And I killed Jo]ram, son of [Ahab,] ⁸ king of Israel, and [I] killed [Ahazi]yahu, son of [Joram, kin]⁹g of the house of David; **and I set** [... and I overthrew]' (KAI⁵ 310:3-9; Biran and Naveh 1993; 1995)²

This early Aramaic inscription aroused an intense debate on the conjunction *wa* in *wayyiqtol* in Biblical Hebrew. The inscription contains a number of verbal forms that semantically and syntactically are similar to the classical Hebrew *wayyiqtol*:

ואשׄמׄ ,ואקתל ,ויהך ,ו[...]ׄהמלך ,ויעל ,וישכב,

The scholarly discussion came to focus on the *waw* in front of the five (or possibly seven) narrative prefix forms. In Biblical Hebrew such a *waw* would be considered 'consecutive' or 'conversive', and thus a central feature in the system of 'consecutive tenses'.

Muraoka (1995a; 1995b; 1998; with Rogland 1998) took the position that Biblical Hebrew was unique:

- 'inversive *waw*' is a unique innovation in Biblical Hebrew;
- two different *waw* existed only in Biblical Hebrew;
- ו in Aramaic can only be a normal *wa*, so ו in *w-yqtl* must be a 'simple *waw*';
- there is no need to assume a "conversion" of *yqtl* in Aramaic.

The majority of scholars have disagreed with Muraoka:[3]

- *w-yqtl* in the Aramaic of Tel Dan has the same form and meaning as *wayyiqtol* in Biblical Hebrew;
- the ו in *w-yqtl* in Tel Dan must be a 'conversive' or 'consecutive *waw*';
- there were two different *wa* in both early Aramaic and Biblical Hebrew.

It is striking that practically none adopted the natural standpoint for both early Aramaic and Classical Hebrew:

---

[2] The *w-yqtl* forms are underlined in the text (quoted from KAI⁵), and emphasized in the translation.
[3] Fales (2011: 559); Huehnergard (2005: 165); Emerton (1994); Rainey (2003: 405); (Kottsieper 1999: 62).

- that there was only one 'natural language connective' *wa* ('and').[4]

Tropper (1996; 1998) and Van de Sande (2008: 206 with n. 3) have argued for a single conjunction *wa* in Biblical Hebrew, but have met with little response, because they could not give an account for the system of 'consecutive tenses' with only a normal conjunction *wa*.[5] For such a standpoint to be acceptable, Classical Hebrew text-linguistics must be understandable with just one *wa*. This is what must be explained with the natural standpoint:

1. why *wa* has two formal variants (*wə-* and *way-*) in the Masoretic text (§1)
2. the linguistic reality behind *wa* in the 'consecutive tenses' (§2)
3. how long *yiqtol* was distinguished from short *yiqtol* in SBH (§3)
4. why *qātal* came to alternate with *wayyiqtol* (§4)
5. why *wə-qātal* acquired imperfective meanings and came to alternate with long *yiqtol* (§5)

In this paper I will touch upon number 1 and 2, and start with the differentiation of the conjunction *wa*. After that I continue with the linguistic reality behind *wa* in the 'consecutive tenses'.

My paper is based on:

- a *corpus* of SBH texts: the Pentateuch and the Book of Judges.
- and a *database* of classified syntactic samples from the corpus (6200 records).

I use the term 'Classical Hebrew' for this corpus. It is intentionally restricted to secure a reasonably consistent synchronic state of SBH.

We start with the question why *wa* has two variants, *wə* and *way*, the first with vowel sign *šəwā mobile* and the second with *pataḥ* and *dāḡēš forte* (cf. Khan

---

[4] For the term 'natural language connective', see Van Dijk (1977: 58).

[5] Tropper's ideas about *wa* (1996; 1998) have not won the favour of current Hebrew scholarship. It is an important article, based on a comparative Semitic approach, but in his examples he does not differentiate between different diachronic stages in the biblical texts and treats poetry side-by-side with prose. Van de Sande's (2008: 206 etc.) main contributions to the question are 1) that that there is only one *wa* in Biblical Hebrew (with normal coordinating function), and 2) that the difference in pronunciation between *waC-* and *wə-* is a Masoretic innovation. But Van de Sande is unable to explain why *wə-qātal* clauses can take imperfective meanings and why such clauses interact with long *yiqtol* clauses. Both authors lack a text-linguistic perspective and are unable to explain how a three-part verbal system (short *yiqtol*, long *yiqtol*, *qātal*) is related to the 'consecutive tenses'.

1991: 241 n. 17).[6] As is well known today the *šəwā* was read by the Tiberian Masoretes as a full vowel with the same quality as *paṯaḥ*:[7]

וְיִקְטֹל was read [wa-yiqṭōl] 'and let him kill'

וַיִּקְטֹל was read [way-yiqṭōl] 'and he killed'

The difference in the reading of the two types of clauses is just a gemination. The vowel quality of the conjunction was the same for both variants of the *wa* (Khan 2013: 98; 2013a). In view of recent research on the role of *dāḡēš forte* in the Masoretic sign system it is likely that the gemination after *wa* was introduced to avoid the homophony between the jussive *wa-yiqtol* and indicative *wa-yiqtol* in discourse continuity clauses, both having a short *yiqtol*.

This masoretic effort to avoid homophony, is a type of 'orthoepic' strategy (Khan 2018: 341, 344).[8] According to Khan it is an old feature in the reading tradition, that probably originated in the second Temple period (Yeivin 1980: 49, 294; Khan 2018: 341, 344). It is old, but it is not a feature of Classical Hebrew.

For Classical Hebrew it is reasonable to reckon with a persisting homophony between an indicative narrative *wa-yiqtol* and a jussive *wa-yiqtol*, both expressing discourse continuity, but in different domains:[9]

ויקטל [wa-yiqṭol] 'and he killed'

ויקטל [wa-yiqṭol] 'and let him kill'

So far I have touched upon the historical reason for the two variants *wə-* and *waC-*. It is time to turn to the linguistic reality behind *wa* in the 'consecutive tenses'.

It is one of the cornerstones of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics that two of the principal verb forms in the verbal system are 'consecutive'. One of them is *wayyiqtol*. They form series of main-line consecutive clauses. Clauses that break

---

[6] The conjunction *wa* has been used in all Semitic languages, even Akkadian (early Sargonic time, Kienast 2001: 395, 438; Kogan 2014: 42). It was a monosyllabic proclitic particle *wa- in the earliest Semitic stage (Huehnergard 2008: 241f). This *wa* has been retained in living usage in all Westsemitic languages.

[7] The Tiberian vowel signs constituted a poorly understood fossil of the reading tradition (Khan 2018: 324). In the reading, *šəwā mobile* was read as a full short vowel [a] with the same quality as *paṯaḥ* (Khan 2013: 98; 2013a).

[8] An example is Prov 26:17 עַל־רִיב לֹא־לֹו [llo: lo:].

[9] For the term 'discourse continuity', see below in this paper. For 'domain', see Cohen (2014).

the main-line pattern are 'non-consecutive'. Hebrew text-linguistics is concerned with the nature of this consecution, and the function of the non-consecutive clauses. This can be summarized in a table displaying the essence of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics:

Table. *The essence of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics (Tiberian vocalization of wa).* Affirmative clauses

	Consecutive clauses	Non-consecutive clauses
Narrative & report:	***way**-yiqtol*	*(wə)-X-qātal*
Instruction & forecasting:	***wə**-qātal*	*(wə)-X-yiqtol*

Characteristic features of consecutive clauses are:

1. the initial 'consecutive *waw*' (bold type in the table),
2. the initial position of the (finite) verb.

A non-consecutive clause is characterized by having a constituent (X) before the verb. The alternation between the two clause-types can be summarized as what I call "Tenet 1* of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics" (quoted from a forthcoming book), where '*' indicates a preliminary formulation:

- Tenet 1*. A series of ***wa**-VX* clauses is interrupted by a clause with *(wa)-XV* pattern.[10]

This formula subsumes the labour of generations of Biblical Hebrew scholars, since it is the legacy of the system of 'consecutive tenses'. It contains the germ of a clause-linking approach to the verbal system.[11]

Non-consecutive clauses more often than not start with a normal *wa*, but can also be asyndetic.[12] The most frequent alternatives in Tenet 1* of Classical Hebrew text-linguistics are:

- Tenet 1a*. ***wa**-VX* is interrupted by *wa-XV*. The most frequent case.

---

[10] With terminological inspiration from Hornkohl (2018) and Buth (1995).

[11] For a history of research, see McFall (1982) and Van de Sande (2008: 23-200). For a clause-linking approach, see Isaksson (2014; 2015; 2017).

[12] In my corpus I have registered 117 non-consecutive clauses of the *Ø-X-qātal* type and 355 of the *wa-X-qātal* type. Similarly I have 76 non-consecutive clauses of the type *Ø-X-yiqtol* with long *yiqtol*, but 171 of the type *wa-X-yiqtol* with long *yiqtol*. Cf. Pardee (2012: 292 n. 37), "many, probably most, disjunctive clauses are introduced by a conjunction". I disregard in this paper the (more trivial) case of non-consecutive clauses introduced by other conjunctions. I also disregard negated clauses.

- Tenet 1b*. **wa**-*VX* is interrupted by *Ø-XV*.[13]

The boldface **wa** in the formula indicates the assumption by Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics that the *wa* before a consecutive clause has a special nature: it is a 'consecutive *waw*'. This is the term adopted by most scholars, though some still use 'conversive', 'inversive', 'energic', or some other distinguishing term.

But the main arguments in favour of a special consecutive *wa*, must be refuted:

1. As has been argued above, the differences in vocalization represent an innovative feature of the Tiberian reading tradition.
2. The impression of a 'conversion' is just an impression, caused by a diachronic retention (in *way-yiqtol*) and a diachronic semantic innovation (in *wə-qātal*).[14] Symmetry is not a feature that must be expected in a living language.
3. The range of meanings exhibited by 'consecutive *waw*' corresponds to the semantic variety of 'copulative *waw*'. Both can express temporal succession, logical result, elaboration, simultaneity, etc.[15]

Before going on it is necessary to update the terminology. In the system of 'consecutive tenses' it is not a question of tenses, but of clauses. And 'consecutive' is a vague and narrow description of all the clausal relations that are displayed in the linking with *wa*. Instead of 'consecutive' it is more pertinent to regard the linking with *wayyiqtol* an expression of *pragmatic discourse continuity*.[16] Tenet 1 of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics should be reformulated in terms of continuity and discontinuity and without the assumption of a 'consecutive *waw*'.

Tenet 1 (update): Pragmatic discourse continuity // discontinuity in affirmative clauses:[17]

- Tenet 1a. *wa-VX // wa-XV*. The typical clause-linking.[18]

---

[13] There are also a few cases of *Ø-qātal* clauses that serve special purposes, like expressing simultaneity or elaboration or the beginning of a new unit, usually in direct speech: Gen 18:11, 30:6, 31:41, 42:30, 48:14; Exod 14:3, 32:8; Num 17:11; Deut 3:19, 9:16; Jos 11:12 (narrative); Judg 2:17 (elaboration in narrative), 20:31 (simultaneity in narrative).

[14] Pardee (2012: 290) proposes the term "*w*-retentive forms" for both *wayyiqtol* and *wə-qātal*. But *wə-qātal* has developed imperfective meanings which can not be called retentive of a perfective grammatical morpheme *qatVl*.

[15] Garr (1998: lxxxvi). For this point I must refer to the chapter "The Proto-Semitic conjunction *wa* in Standard Biblical Hebrew" in my forthcoming book.

[16] With terminological inspiration from Hornkohl (2018: 48f); Buth (1995); Bailey and Levinsohn (1992: 180).

[17] Where '//' signals a 'discourse discontinuity' ('is interrupted by'). In my opinion '*X*' can not be a simple negation such as *lō*, see note 20.

[18] Hornkohl (2018: 54) calls the discontinuous clause-type ('*wa-XV*') "*waw*-less", which is incorrect.

- Tenet 1b. *wa-VX* // *Ø-XV*. A less frequent linking.

As can be seen in Tenet 1 (update), the traditional assumption of a special 'consecutive *wa*' would imply a *redundancy* in the signalling of pragmatic continuity (cf. Hornkohl 2018: 33). The fundamental alternation between discourse continuity and discourse discontinuity already has a signal: the switch from a *wa-VX* clause type to one with *XV* word order.[19] The traditional assumption of a special 'consecutive' *wa* is unwarranted. An assumption of one 'natural language connective' *wa* is enough (Van Dijk 1977: 58).

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

Tenet 2 of Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics (prose texts):

- Tenet 2. The clause type *wa-V(X)* is necessary and sufficient for pragmatic discourse continuity in affirmative clauses.[20]

Here *wa* is necessary and *V* is necessary. No clausal element can be inserted between *wa* and *V*, because this would make the clause signal discontinuity. In this text-linguistic sense it is pertinent to speak of an inseparable union between *wa* and the verb in discourse continuity clauses. The inseparable union was a reality on the textual level in Classical Hebrew, but not necessarily on the morphological level.

A *wa-V(X)* clause signals *pragmatic continuity*, and may, according to context, express *thematic continuity*, *action continuity* and *topic continuity* (cf. Hornkohl 2018: 48; Buth 1995: 97; Givón 1983: 7). *wayyiqtol*, with short *yiqtol* and normal *wa*, is one of the typical clause types that signal discourse continuity in Classical Hebrew.

A 'discontinuous' type of clause, *(wa)-XV*, may signal the beginning of a literary unit, topic or focus (on *X*), anteriority, simultaneity, background, elaboration,

---

[19] For an evaluation of recent approaches in Biblical Hebrew text-linguistics, see Hornkohl (2018). I am indepted to Hornkohl as well as Buth (1995) for clarifying the pragmatic dimension of discourse discontinuity and its signalling by a *XV* word order. Also Pardee (2012: 292) observes that "the sentence beginning with something other than a *w*-retentive form ... serves to contrast on many possible levels".

[20] In my estimation, simple negated clauses of the types *wə-lō-qātal* and *wə-lō-yiqtol* (long) signal discourse continuity in spite of the fact that a clausal element (only the negation) has been allowed to enter between the conjunction and the verb. In Biblical Hebrew the invasive *qātal* morpheme has taken over the application field of negated realis short *yiqtol* (the Proto-Hebrew **wa-lō-yVqtVl* which is attested in Amarna Canaanite but not in Biblical Hebrew). By contrast, *wə-lō-yiqtol* (long) is a retention.

"as well as some of those parameters at the same time" Hornkohl (2018: 50). An example of *pragmatic discontinuity* is found in example (1) below:

(1) *Ø-XV* (= Tenet 1b)

בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ׃

'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' (Gen 1:1)

According to Tenet 2 this is a clause that can not express discourse continuity. There is no initial *wa* and a non-verbal clausal constituent is put before the verb. This clause expresses discourse discontinuity (Tenet 1b), and the pragmatics of the clause makes it a signal of a new literary unit and the start of a narrative main-line. There is nothing before this clause to connect to, so the clause is asyndetic (lacks the connective *wa*). The initial position of *X* (בְּרֵאשִׁית) probably sets the focus on the temporal reference ('In the beginning'). In this way a simple but fundamental coding of discontinuity can fulfil a double function in the text: to signal focusing and a new literary unit.[21] The example shows that a clause that breaks the discourse continuity can be, and often is, a main line clause.

Example of *wa* and *discourse discontinuity* and background:

(2) *wa-XV* + *wa-NCl* + *wa-XV* (= Tenet 1a)[22]

וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם׃

'Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.' (Gen 1:2, NIV)

Example (2) is built up of three clauses, all introduced by *wa*: *wa*-subject-*qātal*, *wa*-verbless clause (NCl), and *wa*-subject-active participle (PA). The three clauses signal 'action discontinuity' and are descriptions of the state that was the result of the creational act in example (1). Genesis 1:2 is background in relation to verse 1 och verse 3.

---

[21] "Language users evidently made use of a single multi-functional structure, the XV order, effectively to halt forward progress of the default discourse continuity iconically communicated by the *waw*-consecutive forms for purposes of specially marking both genuine topics and whole clauses" (Hornkohl 2018: 51).

[22] I am aware that *wa-NCl* is not accounted for in the simplified inventory of discontinuity clauses presented under the lable 'Tenet 1' in the present paper. A verbless clause like *wa-NCl* cannot be subsumed under the formula '*wa-XV*' and has to be given a separate case formula (e.g. Tenet 1c. *wa-VX* // *wa-NCl*).

The next example of *wa* signals discourse continuity:

(3) *wa-VX + wa-VX*

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי־אוֹר׃

'Then God said, "Let there be light," and there was light.' (Gen 1:3, Wenham 1987: 2, 18)

In Genesis 1:3 appear for the first time clauses of the pattern *wa-VX*, and thus expressing action continuity (Tenet 2). The two *wayyiqtol* clauses signal temporal sequentiality in relation to the main line action clause in Gen 1:1, and temporal or logical sequentiality in relation to the background clauses in Gen 1:2.[23]

Summary

I have discussed the Biblical Hebrew perfective short *yiqtol* in the framework of the system of 'consecutive tenses'. I have concluded:

1. The gemination in *wayyiqtol* was introduced to distinguish two homophones in the reading tradition, both expressing discourse continuity: indicative perfective [wa-yiqṭōl] and jussive [wa-yiqṭōl]. The *wa* in these clauses is a normal 'natural languages connective' *wa*.
2. A *wa* immediately before a finite verb signals 'discourse continuity' (*wa-VX*). *wayyiqtol* is a discourse continuity clause with a normal *wa* and a short *yiqtol* (which is a reflex of the old Semitic perfective *yaqtul*).

I have not discussed:

3. why *qātal* came to alternate with *wayyiqtol*;
4. long *yiqtol* and how it was distinguished from short *yiqtol*;
5. *wǝ-qātal* and why it came to receive imperfective meanings;
6. why *wǝ-qātal* came to alternate with long *yiqtol*.

References:

---

[23] In this interpretation of Gen 1:1-3 I follow the majority view among the commentators represented by Westermann (1976). For Gen 1:3 see also Wenham (1987: 2, 15-16, 18). This is not the place to give a full account of SBH text-linguistics according to the lines sketched out in this paper (which concerns short *yiqtol* and the 'consecutive tenses'). I agree with Hornkohl (2018: 53) that the "explanatory power of a continuity/discontinuity approach is largely untested", but the terminology is intuitive and certainly promising.

Bailey, N. A., and S. H. Levinsohn. 1992. "The function of preverbal elements in independent clauses in the Hebrew narrative of Genesis". *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5 no. 3: 179-207.

Baranowski, Krzysztof J. 2016. *The verb in the Amarna letters from Canaan.* Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Baranowski, Krzysztof J. 2016a. "The Biblical Hebrew *wayyiqtol* and the Evidence of the Amarna Letters from Canaan". *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 16: 1-18.

Biran, Avraham, and Joseph Naveh. 1993. "An Aramaic stele fragment from Tel Dan". *Israel Exploration Journal* 43 no. 2-3: 81-98.

Biran, Avraham, and Joseph Naveh. 1995. "The Tel Dan inscription: A new fragment". *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 no. 1: 1-18.

Blau, Joshua. 2010. *Phonology and morphology of Biblical Hebrew: An introduction.* Linguistic studies in ancient West Semitic 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbraun.

Buth, Randall John. 1995. "Functional grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic. An integrated textlinguistic approach to syntax". In *Discourse analysis of biblical literature. What it is and what it offers*, edited by Walter Ray Bodine. 77-102. The Society of Biblical Literature: Semeia studies. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press.

Cohen, Eran. 2014. "The domain: A formal syntactic unit above sentence level". In *Strategies of Clause Linking in Semitic Languages: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Clause Linking in Semitic Languages 5-7 August 2012 in Kivik, Sweden*, edited by Bo Isaksson and Maria Persson. 233-252. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 93. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Van Dijk, Teun Adrianus. 1977. *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse.* Longman linguistics library 21. London: Longman.

Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. 2002. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften.* 5th enlarged and rev. ed. Vol. 1 <*Texte*>. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (= KAI⁵).

Emerton, John Adney. 1994. "New evidence for the use of *waw* consecutive in Aramaic". *Vetus Testamentum* 44: 255-258.

Fales, Frederick Mario. 2011. "Old Aramaic". In *The Semitic languages: An international handbook*, edited by Stefan Weninger, Geoffrey Khan, Michael P. Streck and Janet C. E. Watson. 555-573. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 36. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Fischer, Wolfdietrich. 2002. *A grammar of Classical Arabic.* Translated by Jonathan Rodgers. 3d rev. ed. New Haven & London: Yale UP.

Garr, W. Randall. 1985. *Dialect geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E.* Philadelphia, PA.: University of Pennsylvania Press. Reprint, Winona Lake, 2004.

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. 111-118. Studies in ancient oriental civilization 67. Chicago: Oriental institute of the University of Chicago.

Hornkohl, Aaron D. 2018. "Biblical Hebrew tense–aspect–mood, word order and pragmatics: Some observations on recent approaches". In *Studies in Semitic linguistics and manuscripts: A liber liscipulorum in honour of professor Geoffrey Khan*, edited by Nadia Vidro, Ronny Vollandt, Esther-Miriam Wagner and Judith Olszowy-Schlanger. 27-56. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 30. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

Huehnergard, John. 2005. "Features of Central Semitic". In *Biblical and Oriental essays in memory of William L. Moran*, edited by Agustinus Gianto. 155-203. Biblica et orientalia 48. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Huehnergard, John. 2008. "Afro-Asiatic". In *The ancient languages of Syria-Palestine and Arabia*, edited by Roger D. Woodard. 225-246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huehnergard, John. 2017. "Arabic in its Semitic context". In *Arabic in context: Celebrating 400 Years of Arabic at Leiden University*, edited by Ahmad Al-Jallad. 3-34. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Khan, Geoffrey. 1991. "Morphological markers of individuation in Semitic languages and their function in the Semitic tense system". In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress,*

1989. Band 2, Cushitic, Egyptian, Omotic, Semitic, edited by Hans G. Mukarovsky. 235-244. Beiträge zur Afrikanistik 41. Wien.

Khan, Geoffrey. 2013. *A short introduction to the Tiberian Masoretic Bible and its reading tradition.* Second ed. Gorgias Handbooks. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias.

Khan, Geoffrey. 2013a. "Shewa: Pre-modern Hebrew". In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, edited by Geoffrey Khan. 543-554. Leiden: Brill.

Khan, Geoffrey. 2018. "How was the dageš in Biblical Hebrew בתים pronounced and why is it there?". *Journal of Semitic Studies* 63 no. 2: 323-351.

Kienast, Burkhart. 2001. *Historische semitische Sprachwissenschaft.* Mit Beitr. von Erhart Graefe (Altaegyptisch) und Gene B. Gragg (Kuschitisch). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kogan, Leonid. 2014. "*Waw sargonicum.* On Parataxis in Sargonic Royal Inscriptions". *Zeitschrift für Assyriologi* 104 no. 1: 42-55.

Kogan, Leonid. 2015. *Genealogical classification of Semitic: The lexical isoglosses.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kottsieper, Ingo. 1999. „„... und mein Vater zog hinauf ...". Aspekte des älteren aramäischen Verbalsystems und seiner Entwicklung". In *Tempus und Aspekt in den semitischen Sprachen. Jenaer Kolloquium zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, edited by Norbert Nebes. 55-76. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 2010. *The Akkadian verb and its Semitic background.* Languages of the ancient Near East 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Lipiński, Edward. 1997. *Semitic languages: Outline of a comparative grammar.* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 80. Leuven: Peeters.

McFall, Leslie. 1982. *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System. Solutions from Ewald to the Present Day.* Sheffield: Almond.

Milgrom, Jacob. 1991. *Leviticus 1-16: A new translation with introduction and commentary.* The Anchor Yale Bible 3. New York: Doubleday. Reprint, 2009.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1995a. "Linguistic notes on the Aramaic inscription from Tel Dan". *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 no. 1: 19-21.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1995b. "The Tel Dan inscription and Aramaic/Hebrew tenses". *Abr-Nahrain* 33: 113-115.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1998. "Again on the Tel Dan inscription and the Northwest Semitic verb tenses". *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 11: 74-81.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, and M. F. Rogland. 1998. "The waw consecutive in Old Aramaic? A rejoinder to Victor Sasson". *Vetus Testamentum* 48 no. 1: 99-104.

Notarius, Tania. 2013. *The verb in archaic Biblical poetry: A discursive, typological, and historical investigation of the tense system.* Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics 68. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

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. 285-318. Studies in ancient oriental civilization 67. Chicago: Oriental institute of the University of Chicago.

Rainey, Anson F. 2003. "The *yaqtul* preterite in Northwest Semitic". In *Hamlet on a hill: Semitic and Greek studies presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, edited by M. F. J. Baasten and W. T. van Peursen. 395-407. Leuven, Paris, Dudley, Mass.: Peeters.

Tropper, Josef. 1996. "Aramäisches *wyqtl* und hebräisches *wayyiqtol*". *Ugarit-Forschungen* 28: 633-645.

Tropper, Josef. 1998. "Althebräisches und semitisches Aspektsystem". *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 11: 153-190.

Van de Sande, Axel. 2008. *Nouvelle perspective sur le système verbal de l'hébreu ancien: Les formes *qatala, *yaqtul et *yaqtulu.* Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain 57. Louvain; Paris; Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Institut orientaliste de l'Université catholique de Louvain.

Wenham, Gordon J. 1987. *Word biblical commentary.* Vol. 1, *Genesis 1-15.* Waco, Tex.: Word Books.

Westermann, Claus. 1976. *Genesis.* Vol. 1, *Genesis 1-11*. 2nd ed. Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament I:1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Yeivin, Israel. 1980. *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah.* Translated by E. J. Revell. Masoretic Studies 5. Missoula: Scholars Press.