

Articles in JHS are being indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, [RAMBI,](http://jnul.huji.ac.il/rambi/) and [BiBIL.](http://bibil.net/) Their abstracts appear in Religious and Theological Abstracts. The journal is [archived](http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/201/300/journal_hebrew/index.html) by Library and Archives Canada and is accessible for consultation and research at the Electronic Collection site maintained by [Library and Archives Canada.](http://collectionscanada.ca/electroniccollection/003008-200-e.html) ISSN 1203–1542 [http://www.jhsonline.org](http://www.jhsonline.org/) and <http://purl.org/jhs>




**Journal of Hebrew Scriptures**

Volume 15, Article 8 [DOI:10.5508/jhs.2015.v15.a8](http://dx.doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2015.v15.a8)

Sequences of Verbal Forms and Taxis in Biblical Hebrew

**GIOVANNI LENZI**



**SEQUENCES OF VERBAL FORMS AND**

**TAXIS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW**[**\***](#_bookmark0)

GIOVANNI LENZI

PICCOLA FAMIGLIA DELL’ANNUNZIATA

1. **THE USE OF TENSES IN CLASSICAL BIBLICAL HEBREW**
   1. ***A VEXED QUESTION***

Verbal syntax is undoubtedly a major issue in the study of the grammar of Biblical Hebrew (BH). This aspect of BH has long been considered an enigma and, as a result, many potential explanations have been proposed. In recent years, new and more sophisticated theories based on modern linguistic models have also been elaborated (for detailed presentations, see McFall 1982; Cook 2012: 77–175, 273–75).

After briefly presenting the most important approaches to this issue (§ 1.2), I will put forward my own theory (§ 2). I will then present supporting data, first regarding *past/anterior* sequences (§ 3) and then for *non-past/non-anterior* sequences (§ 4). In the corollaries, I will briefly examine the imperative (§ 5.1) and phasal aspects (§ 5.2), then describe the doubling of sequences (§ 5.3). I will subsequently discuss the usage of this same syntax across the different literary genres (§ 6.1), the necessity of other kinds of analysis (§ 6.2) and the problem of diachrony (§ 6.3). I will conclude with a few final considerations (§ 7).

* 1. ***DIFFERENT APPROACHES***

In scholarly research there have been at least seven approaches to the verbal system:

* + 1. The traditional view held that *qatal* indicates a past tense and *yiqtol* a future tense. A prefixed *waw* has the power to “convert,” so to speak, these two tenses. Japhet ha-Levi (10th century C.E.) called this prefix “*waw* of future,” העתידי וו. Dunash ben Labrat (also from the 10th century) referred to it as “*waw* oblique,” עוטפת וו. David Kimchi (12th century) called it “*waw* of service,” השרות וו; and Elias Levita (15th century) termed it “*waw* conversive” הפוך וו (McFall 1982: 3, 8, 10, 176). Modern theories have tried to offer more nuanced definitions in order to open the way to new approaches, coining expres- sions such as “*waw* inductive” (Gell 1821: 76), “*waw* consec-

\* I would like to thank Prof. Steven E. Fassberg for his helpful comments on an earlier version of this study, as well as Elena Hogan for helping me refine the English of this paper.

utive” (Böttcher 1868: 192–93; Ewald 1891: 244; Driver 1892: 71; GKC § 49), “*waw* relative” (Hitzig 1833: 27)—a definition recently revised by Waltke and O’Connor (1990: 477)—, or “*waw* inversive” (Joüon and Muraoka § 117).

* + 1. Following the aspectual approach, *qatal* and *yiqtol* are not seen as tenses, but as aspects: *perfect* and *imperfect*, i.e., “finished” vs. “incomplete” (Ewald 1891: 3) or “completed” vs. “incipient” (Driver 1892: 1–6); “constative” vs. *“*cursive” (Brockelmann 1956: 39–45); “perfective” vs. “non-perfective” (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 474–78).
    2. According to the historical-comparative approach, the several meanings of *qatal* and *yiqtol* can be explained as evolu- tions of different older verbal forms. Bauer distinguished between nominal (from a West Semitic *qatálta*) that expresses past tense, and *waw*-nominal (from a Proto Semitic *qataltá*) that expresses future; as well as between a long *yiqtol* (from \**yaqtulu*), which expresses present-future, a short *yiqtol* (from *\*yaqtul*) that expresses jussive mood, an “Affekt” *yiqtol* (from *\*yaqtula*), ex- pressing intention, and a *waw-yiqtol* (from \**yaqtul*), which has kept the original protosemitic preterite meaning*.* In other words, both in the case of *weqatal* as well as in the case of *way- yiqtol*, the *waw* does not change the value of the verb; on the contrary, this value is retained (Bauer and Leander 1922: 273– 76). Some authors affirm that the *yiqtol* with a preterite meaning can be found even without *waw* (Held 1962: 282). This histor- ical-comparative approach can also be combined with the above-outlined aspectual approach (Meyer 1972: 39–57). In the past few years, most scholars have accepted the distinction between short *yiqtol* (\**yaqtul*) and long *yiqtol* (\**yaqtulu*; see espe- cially Rainey 2003).
    3. The sequential approach: In this approach, the tense value of a verbal form is not absolute but is determined by the nature of the preceding expression, and it agrees in meaning with the introductory dominant verb. There are four kinds of sequences introduced by “past,” “future,” “present” and “imperative” (Gell 1821: 8–12; Lambdin 1971: 107–9, 118–19, 162–65, 279–82; Jenni 1981: 106–7 and for *weqatal* also Driver 1892: 118, 125–29, 143–46). A combination of this approach with the aspectual approach is offered by Waltke and O’Connor (1990: 525, 554).
    4. The modal approach: According to Joosten (2012: 25–27) *qatal* expresses *realis* and represents an action that has taken place before the reference time; *wayyiqtol* expresses *realis* and denotes events contemporaneous with a point of reference anterior to the enunciation; the participle expresses contemporaneity with the enunciation; finally, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* are two nonindicative forms that express *irrealis* (future-modal). According to Ḥatav (1997: 29), on the grounds of a discourse-representation-structure analysis, it is necessary to combine sequentiality (*wayyiqtol* and *wqatal*) with modality (*wqatal* and *yiqtol*)*,* progression (*qotel*) and perfect (*qatal*).
    5. The discourse-pragmatic approach asserts that ver- bal forms do not express fixed times or aspects but possess

functions according to the context (narrative or direct speech), the level of communication (foreground or back- ground) and the axis of time (past, present, future). In par- ticular, Niccacci (1991: 15–29; 2006) distinguishes the fol- lowing verbal forms and grammatical constructions: *qatal*, x*- qatal*, *weqatal,* indicative *yiqtol*, jussive *yiqtol*, x*-yiqtol*, *weyiqtol*, narrative *wayyiqtol*, continuative *wayyiqtol*, imperative, x- imperative, non-verbal sentence. In narrative contexts, the form in the foreground is the narrative *wayyitol*, while in direct speech—in order to express future—the foreground forms are *yiqtol* and *weqatal.*

* + 1. The grammaticalization approach views the verbal forms not as fixed elements, but as “grams,” i.e., verbal grammatical constructions that reflect any portion of the prototypical grammaticalization path. Grams acquire and combine values that belong to several semantic domains such as taxis, aspect, tense and mood. For Cook, *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* are products of the resultative path: *qatal* in BH is categorized as perfect-perfective aspect (irrealis *qatal* and *weqatal* also derive from *qatal*), *wayyiqtol* is categorized as a past tense (in narrative), *yiqtol* is the product of the progres- sive path and is categorized in BH as an imperfective-irrealis aspect (Cook 2012: 249, 268–71). According to Andrason, *qatal*, *yiqtol, weqatal* and *wayyiqtol* are four different grams: BH *yiqtol* derives from a split functional movement (i.e., as the imperfective and modal ability paths, which jointly derive from a single lexically transparent and cognitively plausible input), a reduplicated participle as reconstructed for the Proto-Semitic \**yaqattal* (Andrason 2010). *Wayyiqtol* (from

*\*yaqtul*) represents a resultative diachrony at an advanced moment of its development; its consecutive force depends on the incorporation of a coordinative-consecutive lexeme (*\*wa <* \**pa*; Andrason 2011a: 44–46). *Weqatal* as well as *qatal* historically derive from the same construction (the Proto- Semitic verbal resultative adjective *\*qatal*). The two formations, however, underwent distinct developments corresponding to different functional paths and therefore must be treated as two distinct phenomena (Andrason 2011b: 46). *Weqatal* represents a modal contamination which a Proto-Northwest Semitic consecutive and contingent input periphrasis (composed of the contingent coordinative-consecutive lexeme \**wa* and a resulting verbal adjective \**qatal[a]*) originally experienced in conditional apodoses (Andrason 2011c).

Finally, it can be observed that it is not possible to make a clear distinction between the different approaches. In particular, while scholars who proposed the sequential approach did not completely reject the traditional view that the *waw* has some “power,” even those scholars who defend the last three approaches admit the existence of some intro- ductory verbal categories or continuative forms, as in the sequential approach (see for instance Joosten 2012: 44–45; Cook 2012: 294).

1. **A NEW APPROACH**

What I propose in this article is a partially new approach: I will offer a simple descriptive model of the BH verbal system and I will try to prove that in one phase of BH the prominent func- tions of the verbal forms depended on a combination of se- quences and taxis*.*

* 1. ***THE NEED FOR A NEW APPROACH***

Given the breadth of interpretation offered by previous approaches is it really necessary to propose a new one? I maintain that it is, for the following three reasons:

1. This approach allows us to explain some sentences that up to now have remained obscure, especially in poetic texts;
2. it can help explain more precisely some sentences that we understand now in a generic way only;
3. it can help us better understand the evolution of BH.
   1. ***AN EMPIRICAL DATA COLLECTION***

This study is not based on panchronic methodology, diachronic analysis, or comparative linguistics. It only represents the first step toward a more complete analysis, i.e., it offers an empirical data collection based on synchronic analysis.

In this article I present a list of examples, providing either my own translation, that of the *Revised Standard Version* (RSV) or, more frequently, that of the *New Revised Standard Version* (NRSV). I pay special attention to instances that are considered marginal—or even incorrect—according to other approaches.

* 1. ***ONLY ONE PH ASE***

There is no doubt that BH is composed of different functional languages (Zatelli 2004). The aim of the present study is not to offer a solution that is valid for all kinds of BH, but to propose an explanation for the syntax of *one* phase in the language’s development. This syntax was the dominant one, though not the only one, in Standard BH (compare § 6.3), both in prose and in poetry. I will therefore not be dealing with Archaic BH or Late BH, as they lie outside the scope of this contribution.

* 1. ***SUFFIX CONJUGATION AND PREFIX CONJUGATION***

As we have seen, most scholars distinguish the following verbal and nominal forms in BH: long *yiqtol*, short *yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*, *qatal*, *weqatal*, *qotel*, imperative. In this study it is not possible to examine the entire verbal system and for reasons of space I will omit the discussion of *qotel*.

The distinction between long *yiqtol* (ֶהשׂﬠֲ ַי ), short *yiqtol* (שַׂﬠַי ) and *wayyiqtol* (שַׂﬠיַּ ַו ) corresponds to the morphological aspect of the verb and it is fully acceptable from a historical point of view (Joosten 2012: 13–15, among others). The same could perhaps be hypothesized for the distinction between *qatal* and *weqatal* (see for instance Andersen 2000: 39–42).

Nevertheless, it is necessary to distinguish between the morphological and historical aspects of the verbal forms and their syntactical use.

In Standard BH, one finds different verbal forms in the same sentence that have the same syntactical value, especially in poetry: *yiqtol* can be found alongside *wayyiqtol* (3.4.1: Gen 37:7; Isa 63:3; 3.4.3: 1 Sam 1:10–11; 1 Kgs 1:1; 2 Sam 2:28; 3.4.3:

Deut 4:41; 2:12; 3.4.4: Ps 8:6–7; 24:2; 44:3.10; 66:6; 69:22;



74:14b; 78:13–15.20.42–50.64; 80:6–7; 81:7–8; 105:40; 114:3;

Jer 2:14–15), *wayyiqtol* occurs after *yiqtol* (4.3.3: Ps 42:6) and *qatal* can be found where one would expect *weqatal* (4.4.1: Gen 17:15–16; Lev 26:44; 4.4.2 Ps 11:2; 4.4.3: Ps 73:18; 110:6;

132:17; Isa 11:8; 19:7; 51:1; 4.4.3: Ps 110:6; 132:17; 5.1: Ps

22:22; 71:3).

For this reason I hypothesize that *at one point in the develop- ment of BH*, long and short *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* were used in an analogous way—presumably due to their similarity—and the same was true for *qatal* and *weqatal*. I identify the first unit (long and short *yiqtol + wayyiqtol*) as Prefix Conjugation (PC; see Fig- ure 1) and the second (*qatal* and *weqatal*) as Suffix Conjugation (SC; see Figure 2).



Obviously, this could seem to be an over-simplification. More complex approaches have been proposed for this issue. For instance, according to Qimron (1998: 31–43), the use of long and short עתיד is influenced by the position of the verb in the clause. According to Torres Fernández (2013: 219–20), some long *wayyiqtol* forms represent dialectal variants. Bloch (2007; 2010) postulates that these kinds of problems can be solved on either linguistic or text-critical grounds (the influence of modal forms, dialectal variants, scribal errors and so on). But the most radical and intriguing approach is Van de Sande’s theory of the “inexistence” of the *wayyiqtol* and of the *weqatalti* as converted, inverted or consecutive forms (Van de Sande 2008: 203–38).

All these approaches are possible and well argued, but for the purpose of this synchronical analysis it will be sufficient to adopt our simple theory. It will only be necessary to multiply our examples in order to show that any combination of forms (short and long *yiqtol* in first or second position, *wayyiqtol*, *weyiqtol*) in any order is accounted for.

* 1. ***THE SEQUENCES***

I will begin outlining my theory by identifying the sequences of verbal forms in Standard BH. It is possible to identify two kinds of sequences involving SC or PC. The first includes the following patterns:

1. SC
2. SC + SC . . . ; SC + *waw* + SC . . .
3. SC + PC . . . ; SC + *waw* + PC
4. x + *waw* + PC . . .
5. SC + PC + SC . . . ; SC + *waw* + PC + *waw +* SC . . .
6. x + *waw* + PC + *waw* + SC . . .

In this table, “x” indicates any element: a secondary clause (with conjugated or not conjugated verbs), an indication of time, a non-verbal form (NV) or even any previous narrative or discourse.

I do not consider *waw* + PC (i.e., *wayyiqtol*) as a possible beginning of a sequence in this phase of BH. Nevertheless, the *waw* is necessary to connect “x” to PC.

The second kind includes the following patterns:

1. PC
2. PC + PC + . . . ; PC + *waw* + PC . . .
3. PC + SC; PC + *waw* + SC . . .
4. x + *waw* + SC . . .
5. PC + SC + PC . . . ; PC + *waw* + SC + *waw +* PC . . .
6. x + *waw* + SC + *waw* + PC . . .

Likewise, I do not consider *waw* + SC (i.e., *weqatal*) as a possible beginning of a sequence in this phase of BH. Nevertheless, the *waw* is necessary to connect “x” to SC.

At this point we must ask ourselves: What is the differ- ence between the two kinds of sequences and, what is the dif- ference between sequences of the same kind?

* 1. ***TWO KINDS OF SEQUENCES***

If we do not analyze the single verbal forms independently, but rather take sequences as units, it is possible to make a distinc- tion between the two kinds of sequences. Omitting for the moment the hypothetical construction, we can state that the first group of sequences denotes: past perfect (anterior past,

3.4.3 Exod 12:35), simple past (3.1.3: Gen 1:1), present perfect (anterior present, 3.1.1: Josh 7:11), present (5.2.1: Ps 65:10) and future perfect (anterior future, 3.4.4: Isa 4:4). The second denotes: present (4.1.3: Ps 121:1), future (4.1.1: 1 Sam 18:11) and future in the past (posterior past, including prospective, 4.1.2: 2 Kgs 13:14).

This short list is not an innovation and roughly cor- responds to the taxonomies of meaning for *qatal* and *yiqtol* in many grammar books (Cook 2012: 78–79). In particular, it

should be remembered that the categories of anteriority and posteriority have been applied to the Hebrew verbal system for a long time (see for instance Joüon 1923: 509); while the cate- gory of prospective was introduced in this field more recently by Joosten (1999: 17–18; 2012: 281–83). I consider the category of “anteriority” to be distinct from the category of “tense” as it is defined by Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994: 54).

What is clear in these sequences is that if the first verbal form has any value, the following verbal forms have the same value. For instance, if SC has a past perfect value, the following verbal forms (whether SC or PC) will have a past perfect value, while if SC has a future perfect value the following verbal forms (whether SC or PC) will have a future perfect value.

The difficulty is that this remains true even when the sequences do not start with an introductory dominant verb. For instance, if a sequence starts with “x + *waw* + PC,” PC assumes its temporal value from “x” (or from the context), and the fol- lowing verbal forms (whether SC or PC) will have the same value as the first PC.

To try to pinpoint a rule, we can state that the first group of sequences expresses absolute past and anterior, so that we can define them as “past/anterior sequences”; while the second group expresses absolute future, posterior, and present, so that we can define them as “non-past/non-anterior sequences” (compare Rogland 2003: 11).

These temporal values seem to represent the prominent meaning of the sequences, but, as we will see, the opposition between the two groups can be used in some contexts to dis- tinguish between different phasal aspects (§ 5.2).

Lastly, when heading a sequence, both SC and PC can be translated into English with a present tense. However, in the case of the former, this applies only under certain circum- stances: namely, with stative verbs (3.1.1: Josh 14:6); in performative utterances (see the discussions in Rogland 2003: 115–26; Andrason 2011d); and, lastly, to denote some phasal aspects (§ 5.2).

* 1. ***TAXIS***

At this point it is opportune to explain the difference between the sequences in each of the two groups. In other words, we must understand why the author does not employ only two sequences: SC + SC . . . and PC + PC . . . In order to do so, it is necessary to introduce a new category: taxis. This term is defined by Maslov in the following way:

Taxis is a category which defines the “action” denoted by the predicate in terms of its relations with another “ac- tion,” named or implied in the given utterance, that is, the chronological relations between them (simultaneity, prec- edence or sequence) (Maslov 1988: 64).

I will adopt this category in order to explain BH syntax. This approach is not completely new; in particular, Michel (followed by Wagner 1997: 291) based his theory on a concept very close to taxis. Building on the results of previous studies (Köhler,

Nyberg and Brockelmann), Michel concluded: “Das perfectum drückt eine unabhängige Handlung aus . . . ; das imperfectum bezeichnet eine abhängige Handlung” (1960: 256). Unfortu- nately, Michel combined this clear distinction with a philo- sophical approach and the result was a complex and rather un- clear theory.

“Independency” and “Dependency” are logical categories. However, they also include chronological relations. Michel explained: “If a perfectum follows syndetically or asyndetically on an imperfectum or a participle, it does not advance” (Eng- lish translation: Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 471). Put differ- ently: the perfect is simultaneous or contemporaneous with the previous verbal form.

It should be noted that Michel tried to offer a definition of verbal forms which was valid for both past and future sequences. In other words, he based his theory on “fixed taxis.” In this article I instead present a theory based on “relative taxis,” where the functions of the verbal forms are not abso- lute, but relative to the sequences in which they are used.

Finally, it should be noted that the category of “taxis” has recently been applied to Hebrew grammar by Andrason (2011a; 2011b; 2011d) in order to define the evolution of grams. Kuryłowicz (1973: 115–16) also explains the syntax of Semitic languages according to this category, but in his opinion *qatal* expresses anteriority and *yiqtol* simultaneity. Ḥatav (1997: 175– 88; 2004: 514.518) employs the terms “anteriority” and “sim- ultaneity” to define *qatal,* and “sequentiality” to define *wayyiqtol*(*w + ay + yiqtol*), *weyiqtol* (*w + yiqtol*) and *weqatal* (*w + qatal*)*.*

* 1. ***SEQUENCES AND TAXIS***

I combine the concept of taxis with that of sequences and examine sequences involving SC and PC in prose and poetry, but I do not follow the sequential approach in several respects:

1. I do not assign to the introductory verb the role of determining the function of the following verbal forms.
2. I consider not only the first and second place in a sequence, but also those which follow, so that I analyze not only SC + PC sequences, but also SC + PC + SC sequences.
3. In these sequences, I do not distinguish between *way- yiqtol,* short *yiqtol* (*\*yaqtul*) and long *yiqtol* (*\*yaqtulu*) or between *qatálti* and *qataltí*. I seek to show that in this phase of BH (in poetry especially) the function of a verbal form depended on the position in the sequence and not on any morphological or phonetic element.
4. I do not distinguish between the main level of com- munication (foreground) and the secondary level of communi- cation (background). The verbal forms SC and PC can be used on both levels.
5. I consider the taxis not only as a “chronological” rela- tion, but also as a “logical” one.

In light of the above, I attempt to demonstrate that:

1. SC and PC have different functions in a *past/anterior*

sequence and in a *non-past/non-anterior* sequence.

1. In a *past/anterior* sequence, SC denotes a co-ordinate element, whereas PC denotes a sub-ordinate (usually succes- sive) element.
2. In a *non-past/non-anterior* sequence, PC denotes a co- ordinate element while SC denotes a sub-ordinate (usually suc- cessive) element.
   1. ***CO-ORDINATION AND SUB-ORDINATION***

As these remarks indicate, the present theory is based on a dis- tinction between two categories: co-ordination and subordi- nation. Co-ordination is intended here as a verbal form which does not advance the time or the logic of narration/discourse. Sub-ordination denotes for its part a verbal form which advances the time or the logic of narration or discourse.

The writer uses co-ordination (syndetically or asyndeti- cally) in the following instances:

* + 1. Beginning: to initiate a new sequence.
    2. Epexegesis: to repeat the same action/state using dif- ferent words.
    3. Parenthetical remark: to add some particularity to the previous action/state/event.
    4. Parallelism: to describe an action/state/event which is contemporary to/parallel with/opposite to the first.
    5. Negation: to negate an action/state/event which is contemporary to/parallel with/opposite to the first.
    6. Lists: to present a series of parallel actions/states/ events.
    7. End: to stop the chain of events.
    8. Generic parallelism: to describe an action paral- lel/opposite to a previous section.
    9. Rhetoric: to underline an element in a chain.

All these usages are clearly connected one to the other. Often they indicate a description or a circumstance, but it should be stressed that this is not their only use. In a *past/anterior* sequence, SC is more often used in the main level of communi- cation (foreground) than in the second level of communication (background), that is to say, it often has a *narrative* character, although it expresses contemporaneity.

It is clear that if the usage of SC indicates that time does not go forward, the writer needs another conjugation in order to describe a non-parallel action. This is what PC does. I assign to PC (with or without *waw*) in *past/anterior* sequences what Waltke and O’Connor assign exclusively to *wayyiqtol*:

Relative *waw* with a prefix form represents a situation that is usually successive and always subordinate to a preceding statement. The succession may be either absolute or sub-

jective, and often the distinction between them is blurred. Temporal sequence depends on objective fact outside the control of the speaker; logical sequence, by contrast, sub- jectively exists in the way a speaker sees the relationship between situations. Sometimes with *wayyqtl* a situation is represented as a logical entailment from (a) preceding one(s) or a logical contrast with it/them or as a sum- marizing statement of it/them. (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 547; compare Joüon 1923: 91).

As stated, I do not consider such a sub-ordination to depend on the *waw*: in a *past/anterior* sequence we can also apply this category to *yiqtol* without *waw*. It is obvious that there is no limit to the number of following actions and therefore there is no limit in the usage of PC.

The usage of SC and PC in a *non-past/non-anterior* sequence is simply the flipping of the usage of SC and PC in a *past/ anterior* sequence: in *non-past/non-anterior* sequences the coordi- nation value is expressed by PC and the sub-ordination value by SC. Nevertheless, here we must distinguish between *epistemic* PC and *deontic* PC (Warren 2002: 150), which corresponds to the traditional distinction between *indicative yiqtol* and *volitive yiqtol*. In the present study we can only examine the first type of PC.

As we shall see, in both cases word order within the sen- tence is irrelevant.

* 1. ***THE MEANINGS OF SC AND PC***

As we have seen, SC and PC have different meanings depend- ing on the context.

In the first group of sequences, when SC appears in the first position it has a temporal value (*past/anterior*); when it appears in following positions it has a taxis value (*co-ordination*). In the second group, SC does not appear in the first position and always has a taxis value (*sub-ordination*).

The same can be said for PC: in the first group, PC does not appear in the first position and always has a taxis value (*sub- ordination*). In the second group of sequences, when PC appears in the first position it has a temporal value (*non-past/non-ante- rior*); when it appears in following positions it has a taxis value (*co-ordination*).

1. **THE VERBAL FUNCTIONS IN A *PAST/ANTERIOR***

**SEQUENCE**

* 1. ***SC AS FIRST VERB***

## SC as the First Verb in Main Sentence in Direct Speech

We can start our explanation by examining the syntax of direct speech where the situation is quite clear: when SC is the first verbal form in a sequence it represents the first action, state or event.

This first verbal form can indicate the first action/event if it is a fientive verb, or a state if it is a stative verb. It may or may not be the first word in the sentence: in this phase of BH, word order inside a sentence does not affect the function of a verbal form. Therefore we can assign the same function in the sequence to this conjugation whether or not it comes as a first word inside the sentence.

Josh 7:11 (verb-subject)

Israel **has sinned** (NRSV). Josh 14:6 (subject-verb)

You *too* **know**.

חָ ָטא ִי ְשׂרָ ֵאל

ַאתָּה ָידַ ְﬠ ָתּ

SC is used in the first position of a sequence even when it does not represent the predicate in the sentence:

Josh 7:20 (subject as predicate)

ח ָטאִית

It is true; I **am the one who sinned** (NRSV).

אָ ְמ ָנה אָ ֹנ ִכי

It should be noted that BH does not allow simple past, present perfect and past perfect to be distinguished; consequently, SC is used also for an antefact. See for instance:

1 Sam 2:30

אָמוֹר ָא ַמרְ ִתּי בּיתְ� . . .

I **had promised** that your family . . . (NRSV).

Furthermore, BH does not allow a distinction between realis and irrealis, see Cook (2012: 202; compare Joosten 2012: 208–

12), who quotes Gen 26:10:

ה ָﬠם אֶת־אִ ְשׁ ֶ�תּ

ַחד אַ

ַכב שָׁ

כּ ְמ ַﬠט

וּנלּ

ִשׂי ָת ﬠ

מה־זּ ֹאת

What is this you have done to us? One of the people

**might** easily **have lain** with your wife (NRSV).

## SC as First Verb in a Secondary Clause

In secondary clauses as well, when SC is the first verbal form in a chain, it represents the first action/state/event.

1. Sam 17:28 (x-*qatal*)

כּי ל ַמ ַﬠן ְראוֹת ה ִמּ ְל ָח ָמה ָירָ ְד ָתּ

For you **have come down** just to see the battle (NRSV). 1 Sam 26:21 (verb-subject)

ֲא ֶשׁר ָי ְקרָה ַנפְ ִשׁי בְּ ֵﬠי ֶני�

Because my life **was precious** in your sight (NRSV).

SC can be used to describe an antefact:

Gen 20:18 (infinitive-*qatal*)

תּ ַחת

א ִבי ֶמ ֶל�

לֵבית

כּל־ ֶר ֶחם

דﬠַ בּ

ַצר ְיה ָוה ﬠ

כּי־ﬠָצֹר

For the LORD **had closed** fast all the wombs of the house of Abimelech (NRSV).

See also Gen 26:15; Josh 24:32.

## SC as the First Verb in a Main Sentence in Narration

Here we can examine the function of SC in the main sentences in narration. We must start from a problematic verse: Gen 1:1.

In ancient times the first word יתשִׁ רֵאבּ was considered a noun

in the absolute state employed in an adverbial locution of time,

and the following verb רָאבּ was taken as representing the first

action of the narrative. This interpretation underlies all the ancient versions, for instance the LXX: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. In recent times, a different opinion has gained currency among scholars: the first word is seen as a noun in the con- struct state (*in the beginning of*) and introducing a subordinate clause: *in the beginning when God created* (Niccacci 1991: 30–31; this opinion was already held by Rashi)*.* According to this view,

the verb רָאבּ does not indicate the first action of the narrative,

but background information.

I do not consider the possibility that יתשִׁ רֵאis a construct state as a definitive argument against the ancient interpretation. The word ַאחַר , for instance, comes in a construct state (Joüon and Muraoka § 103) whether it is employed as a conjunction (*after the time when*) or as an adverb (*after that*). Compare:

Jer 41:16b

**After** he had slain Gedaliah (NRSV). Gen 18:5a

את־ ְגּדַ ְל ָיה

ה ָכּה

אַחר

תַּ ֲﬠבֹרוּ

אַחר

ְבּ ֶכם ל

ֶל ֶחם ְו ַס ֲﬠדוּ פת־

ו ֶא ְק ָחה

Let me bring a little bread, that you may refresh your- selves, and **after that** you may pass on (NRSV).

In the same way, in Gen 1:1 יתשִׁ רֵאבּ

locution.

could be an adverbial

If we accept this hypothesis, we can conclude that there is no difference between direct speech and narration syntax: in both cases when SC is placed in the first position of the sequence it indicates the first action/state/event.

SC can also introduce a new section in the main narrative:

Josh 9:3 (subject-verb)

. . . וְּמע שׁ

The inhabitants of Gibeon **heard** . . .

ויֹ ְשׁבֵי ִגבְעוֹן

See also 1 Kgs 14:1. This kind of sentence is in the foreground and always incorporates the most important elements of the sequence.

1. Kgs 15:19 (verb-subject)

ﬠל־ ָה ָארֶץ

מ ֶל�־אוּשּׁר

בָּא פוּל

King Pul of Assyria **came** against the land (NRSV).

See also Josh 10:33 (introduced by אז).

1. Sam 28:3 (antefact)

Now Samuel **had died** (NRSV).

מֵת

שׁוְּמוּ ֵאל

## SC as the First Verb in a Main Sentence in Poetry

Likewise, in poetry, when SC is the first verbal form in a chain, it represents the first action/state/event.

Ps 11:1 (x-*qatal*)

In the LORD I **take refuge** (NRSV). Ps 39:2 (*qatal*)

ח ִסיִית

בַּיה ָוה

I **said** . . . .

Ps 40:2 (infinitive-*qatal*)

א ַמרְ ִתּי . . .

I **waited** patiently for the LORD (NRSV).

ק ִוּיִית ְיהוָה

קַ ֹוּה

* 1. ***OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE FIRST PLACE OF A SEQUENCE***

A new sequence can be introduced not only by SC but by any other element (see examples in GKC § 111), in particular by the *macrosyntactic* signal ויהי, by NV, or by a secondary clause.

In this phase of BH, if the author employs ויהי, he/she

wishes to stress that the new sequence is related (temporally or logically) to a previous event (compare the use of PC, § 3.4). Sometimes such a relationship is explicit:

Josh 1:1

. . . השֶׁ מ

After the death of Moses . . . (NRSV).

א ֲח ֵרי מוֹת

ו ְיהִי

In the usage of ויהי there is no difference between narration and direct speech:

Gen 41:13

כּן ה ָיה

פּ ַתר־ ָלנוּ

כּ ֲא ֶשׁר

ו ְיהִי

As he interpreted to us, so it turned out (NRSV).

* 1. ***SC AFTER ANOTHER SC***

If SC follows another SC, it expresses co-ordination.

## SC + SC in a Main Sentence in Direct Speech

1. ***Epexegesis***

Gen 37:33 (infinitive-verb-subject, *qatal* without *waw*)

טָרֹף טֹרַף יוֹסֵף

ָכ ָלְתהוּ א

ח ָיּה ָר ָﬠה

A wild animal **has devoured** him; Joseph **is** without doubt **torn** to pieces (NRSV).

Isa 41:4 (*weqatal*)

מִי־פָ ַﬠל ְו ָﬠָשׂה

Who **has performed** and **done** this? (NRSV).

See also Josh 4:7 (x*-qatal* without *waw*); 2 Sam 24:17 (*waw-*x-

*qatal*); 2 Kgs 19:21 and Isa 34:2 (*qatal* without *waw*).

# *Parenthetical Remark*

1 Sam 30:14

כּ ֵלב

ָדה ְו ַﬠל־ ֶנ ֶגב ליהוּ

ִתי ְו ַﬠל־ ֲא ֶשׁר ה ְכּ ֵר

ְשׁטנוּ ֶנ ֶגב פַּ

א ַנחְנוּ

באֵשׁ׃

שׂרַ ְפנוּ

ואֶת־ ִצ ְק ַלג

We **had made a raid** on the Negeb of the Cherethites and on that which belongs to Judah and on the Negeb of Caleb; and we **burned** Ziklag down (NRSV).

# *Parallelism*

Gen 20:5 (subject-verb)

א ִחי הוּא

א ְמרָה

ְו ִהיא־ ַגם־ ִהוא הוא

ִתי

אָ ַמר־לִי א

הל ֹא הוּא

**Did** he not himself **say** to me, ‘She is my sister?’ And she herself **said**, ‘He is my brother’ (NRSV)

See also Gen 41:13; Judg 1:7; 1 Sam 18:8; 2 Sam 17:15.

# *Negation*

See for instance 2 Sam 18:29.

# *List*

Gen 27:37 (*waw-*x-*qatal*)

ל ֲﬠ ָב ִדים ְו ָד ָגן

ל� ְו ֶאת־כּל־א ָחיו ָנתִַיתּ לוֹ

שַׂ ְמ ִתּיו ס ַמ ְכִיתּו

ֵהן ְגּ ִביר ותִירֹשׁ

I **have** already **made** him your lord, and I **have given** him all his brothers as servants, and with grain and wine I **have sustained** him (NRSV).

See also Josh 7:11 (וגם-verb); 1 Sam 12:3.

## SC + SC in a Secondary Clause

1. ***Epexegesis***

Deut 2:30

כִּי־ ִה ְקָשׁה ְיה ָוה אֱ� ֶהי� אֶת־רוּחוֹ ְואִ ֵמּץ אֶת־ ְל ָבבוֹ

For the LORD your God **had hardened** his spirit and

**made** his heart **defiant** (NRSV).

See also in poetry Ps 102:4 (x-*qatal*)

# *Parallelism*

1. Sam 7:1

מ ָכּל־א ְי ָביו׃

מ ָסּ ִביב

ה ִני�ַ־לוֹ

בּ ֵביתוֹ ַויה ָוה

ה ֶמּ ֶל�

כּי־ ָישַׁב

Now when the king **was settled** in his house, and the LORD **had given** him rest from all his enemies around him (NRSV).

# *Negation*

1 Kgs 3:11

ֶאת־הַ ָדּ ָבר הַ ֶזּה ְול ֹא־שָׁ ַא ְלתּ . . . ְול ֹא־ שָׁ ַא ְלָתּ

א ֶשׁר

י ַﬠן

שָׁ ַא ְל ָתּ . . . ְושָׁ ַא ְלָ.תּ . .

Because you **have asked** this, and **have** not **asked** . . . and

**have** not **asked** . . . and **have asked** . . . (NRSV).

*Qatal* and not-*qatal* are equivalent.

## SC + SC in a Main Sentence in Narration

1. ***Epexegesis***

1 Kgs 11:1–2 (subject-verb; x-*qatal*)

בּהֶם דָּ ַבק

נָ ִשׁים ָנ ְכ ִרוֹיּת ַרוֹבּת . . . אָ ַהב

ו ַה ֶמּ ֶל� שְׁ�מה

שְׁ�מה ל ַא ֲה ָבה׃

King Solomon **loved** many foreign women . . . Solomon

**clung** to these in love (NRSV).

# *Parenthetical remark*

1 Kgs 15:1–2

ﬠל־

ִב ָיּם אֲ

ַל� מָ

בּן־ ְנ ָבט

ָי ָר ְב ָﬠם ל ֶמֶּל�

ְשׂ ֵרה ﬠ

שׁמ ֶנה

וּ ִב ְשׁ ַנת

בּירשׁוָּ ָל�

ַל� מָ

שׁ ִנים

שׁ�שׁ

יהוּ ָדה׃

Now in the eighteenth year of King Jeroboam son of Nebat, Abijam **began to reign** over Judah. He **reigned** for three years in Jerusalem (NRSV).

# *Parallelism*

Gen 19:23–24 (subject-verb)

בָּא צֹ ֲﬠרָה׃

ָה ָא ֶרץ ְולוֹט ﬠל־

השֶּׁ ֶמשׁ ָיצָא

The sun **rose** on the earth and *at that moment* Lot **came** to Zoar.

1 Sam 4:11 (subject-verb)

חָ ְפ ִני וּ ִפי ְנחָס׃

מֵתוּ

ב ֵני־ ֵﬠ ִלי

ואֲרוֹן אֱ� ִהים ִנ ְלָקח וּ ְשׁ ֵני

The ark of God **was captured**; and the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, **died** (NRSV).

A few verses later, in 1 Sam 4:17, we see the same syntax in direct speech.

See also Gen 18:20; Josh 11:13; Judg 3:24; 1 Sam 9:17.

# *Negation*

2 Kgs 3:3

ִי ְשׂ ָראֵל דָּ ֵבק אֶת־

א ֶשׁר־ ֶה ֱח ִטיא

בֶּן־ ְנבָט

בּ ַחטּ ֹאות ָירָ ְב ָﬠם

רַק

לֹא־סָר מִ ֶמּ ָנּה׃

Nevertheless he clung to the sin of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which he caused Israel **to commit**; he **did** not **de- part** from it (NRSV).

## SC + SC in Poetry

1. ***Epexegesis***

Ps 85:3–4 (*qatal* without *waw*)

ְפָתּ ָכל־ﬠֶבְ ָר ֶת� א ַס

ָלה׃ סֶ

ִסּיָת ָכל־חַ ָטּאתָם כּ

�ֶמּﬠ

ןוֲֹﬠ

נשָׂא ָת

אַ ֶ�פּ׃

מחֲרוֹן

ה ִשׁיבוֹת

You **forgave** the iniquity of your people; you **pardoned** all their sin. Selah. You **withdrew** all your wrath; you **turned** from your hot anger (NRSV).

# *Parallelism*

Ps 9:6 (*qatal* without *waw*)

גּ ַﬠרְ ָתּ גוֹיִם א ַבּדְ ָתּרָ ָשׁע

You have **rebuked** the nations, you have **destroyed** the wicked (NRSV).

# *Negation*

Compare, for instance, Ps 102:18.

# *List*

Ps 74:13–15 (x-*qatal* and *qatal*)

ﬠל־הַ ָמּ ִים׃

ְ�זּ ָים ִניםבְ ָﬠ ַתנִּי

אתָּה פוֹ ַררְ ָתּ ָתּ ָרא ֵשׁי ִשׁ ַבּרְ

ל ִצ ִיּים׃

ל ָﬠם

מ ֲא ָכל

וּנֶּנ תְּ תּ

ָי ָתן ל ְו

אתָּה ִרצְַּצָתּ ָרא ֵשׁי

מ ְﬠ ָין ָו ָנחַל

ַקְﬠָתּ בָ

אתָּה

אתָּה הוֹ ַבְ ָתּשׁ ַנ ֲהרוֹת אי ָתן׃

You **divided** the sea by your might; you **broke** the heads of the dragons in the waters. You **crushed** the heads of Leviathan; you gave him as food for the creatures of the wilderness. You **cut** openings for springs and torrents; you **dried** up ever-flowing streams (NRSV).

This array of SC is correctly interrupted by one occurrence of PC (see § 5.3). See also Jer 2:8.

* 1. ***PC IN THE SECOND POSITION***

It is clear that if the usage of SC indicates that time does not go forward, the writer needs another conjugation in order to describe a non-parallel action. As I have salready mentioned, this is what PC does.

## 3.4.1 + PC in Direct Speech

Gen 24:35

מאד ַו ִיּ ְגדָּל

את־ ֲאדֹ ִני

�ַרבּ

ויה ָוה

The LORD has greatly blessed my master, and he **has become wealthy** (NRSV).

Gen 37:7 (*waw-x-yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol*)

מּתֵי ֶכם

א ֻל

ֶבּי ָנה תְ ֻס

ְו ַגם־ ִנ ָצּ ָבה ְו ִה ֵנּה א ֻל ָמִּתי

ק ָמה

ו ִה ֵנּה

ַותִּ ְשַׁ ֲתּח ֶויןָ ַל ֲא ֻל ָמּתִי׃

Suddenly my sheaf rose and stood upright; then your sheaves **gathered** around it, and **bowed** down to my sheaf (NRSV).

Isa 63:3 (*we-yiqtol*)

בְּאַ ִפּי

א ִתּי ְו ֶא ְדרְ ֵכם

אין־ ִאישׁ

ִדּי וּ ֵמ ַﬠ ִמּים ל ַב

וּפּ ָרה ָדּ ַר ְכ ִתּי

א ְג ָא ְל ִתּי

ַדי ְו ָכל־ ַמ ְלוּבּ ַשׁי ﬠל־ ְבָּג

ָמתִי וְ ֵיז ִנ ְצ ָחם בּ ֲח

ו ֶארְ ְמ ֵסם

I have trodden the wine press alone, and from the peoples no one was with me; I **trod** them in my anger and **tram- pled** them in my wrath; their juice **spattered** on my gar- ments, and stained all my robes (NRSV).

## + PC in a Secondary Clause

1 Sam 15:24

בּקוֹ ָלם׃

ָה ָﬠם ָו ֶאְ ַשׁמע את־

כּי ָי ֵרא ִתי

Because I feared the people and **obeyed** their voice (NRSV).

## + PC in Narration

1 Sam 1:10–11 (*wayyiqtol* and *waw*-infinitive-*yiqtol*)

תִ ְב ֶכּה׃ ַותִּדֹּר ֶנדֶר

ְיה ָוה וּ ָבכֹה ﬠל־

. . . ַותְִּ ַתפּ ֵלּל

She **prayed** to the LORD, and **wept** bitterly. She **made**

this vow (NRSV).

I consider הכֶּ ְב תִ a punctual action. The insertion of the infini- tive shows that the author considered *yiqtol* equivalent to *way- yiqtol*. See also 1 Kgs 3:4.

Deut 4:41 (long *yiqtol* without *waw*, with אז)

ﬠ ִרים

שׁ�שׁ

ֶשׁה מ

אָז ַי ְבדִּיל

. . .

. . . then Moses **set apart** three cities (NRSV).

See also Josh 8:30; 19:50; 22:1; 2 Sam 12:31; 1 Kgs 3:4; 8:1; 2

Kgs 3:24–26.

PC is also used in negative sentences when the writer wishes to stress that the following verbal form is successive:

1. Kgs 1:1 (*yiqtol*)

ָג ִדים ְול ֹא ִיחַם לוֹ׃ בּ ְבּ

ַו ְי ַכ ֻסּהוּ בּ ָיּ ִמים

ו ַה ֶמּ ֶל� ָדּ ִוד ָז ֵקן בּא

King David was old and advanced in years; and although they covered him with clothes, he **could** not **get warm** (NRSV).

1. Sam 2:28 (*yiqtol*)

א ֲח ֵרי

ָה ָﬠם ְול ֹא־ ִירְ ְדּפוּ עוֹד כּל־

ָפר ַו ַיּ ַﬠ ְמדוּ וֹשּׁבּ

ְת ַקע יוֹ ָאב וִיּ

ִי ְשׂרָ ֵאל

Joab sounded the trumpet and all the people stopped; they no longer **pursued** Israel (NRSV).

See also 1 Sam 1:7.

In some instances, the logical subordination of PC is clear even when there is no succession:

Gen 32:25–26

ה ָשּׁ ַחר׃

תוֹלﬠ דﬠ

וֹמּﬠ

אישׁ

ַבוֹדּ ַו ֵיּאָ ֵבק ל

. . . ַו ִיּ ָוֵּתר ַי ֲﬠקֹב

בּ ַכף־ ְירֵכוֹ

כּי ל ֹא ָיכֹל לוֹ ַו ִגּיַּע

ו ַיּרְא

Jacob **was left alone**; and a man **wrestled** with him until daybreak. When the man **saw** that he did not prevail against Jacob, he **struck** him on the hip socket (NRSV).

In this example no succession is involved: the action of wrest- ling was not over when the man struck Jacob, but it is clear that רְאיַּ ַו and ַעגּיִּ ַו are sub-ordinate to ֵבק אָיֵּ ַו . See also Gen 37:34–35.

It is very rare that PC is not the continuation of a single

verbal form. However, it can be considered the continuation of the previous narrative: see, e.g., 1 Sam 15:1. This is the explanation for many of the so-called “initial *wayyiqtol.*”

When SC represents an antefact, the following PC can indicate an action/state/event that continues the antefact, or an action/state/event that occurs later (GKC § 111n-x).

Exod 12:35

ַר ִים כְּ ֵלי־כֶ ֶסף מ ִמּצְ

ֶשׁה ַו ִיְּ ֲשׁאלוּ מ

ְד ַבר כּ

וּשָׂﬠ

וּ ְב ֵני־ ִי ְשׂרָ ֵאל

וּ ְכ ֵלי ָז ָהב וּ ְשׂ ָמ�ת׃

The Israelites **had done** as Moses told them; they **had asked** the Egyptians for jewelry of silver and gold, and for clothing (NRSV).

See also Josh 2:6.

Josh 13:12

ַויֹּרִ ֵשׁם׃ משֶׁה

ָפ ִאים ַו ַכּיֵּם ה ְר

ֶתר מֶיּ

הוּא ִנשְׁ ַאר

He alone **was left** of the survivors of the Rephaim and

*later* Moses **defeated** them and **driven** them **out**. Deut 2:12 (subject-verb, *yiqtol*)

שׂﬠָו ִיירָוּשׁם

ִנים וּבְ ֵני לפָ

ִרים החֹ

וּ ְבשֵׂ ִﬠיר ָישְׁבוּ

Moreover, the Horim **had** formerly **inhabited** Seir, but the descendants of Esau **dispossessed** them (NRSV).

## + PC in Poetry

Ps 8:6–7 (x + PC; *wayyiqtol*, *waw-*x-*yiqtol* and *yiqtol*)

ַﬠ ְטּרֵהוּ׃ ַתּ ְמִישׁ ֵלהוּ תּ

ִהים ְו ָכבוֹד ְו ָה ָדר מ ֱא�

טﬠַ מּ

ו ְתּ ַח ְסּרֵהוּ

ְבּ ַמ ֲﬠ ֵשׂי ָידֶי�

Yet you **have made** them a little lower than God, and **crowned** them with glory and honor. You **have given** them dominion over the works of your hands (NRSV).

Ps 24:2 (*waw-*x-*yiqtol*)

כּי־הוּא ﬠל־ ַי ִמּים ְי ָס ָדהּ ְו ַﬠל־ ְנ ָהרוֹת ְיכוֹנְ ֶנ ָה

For he has founded it on the seas, and **established** it on the rivers (NRSV).

Ps 44:3 (*wayyiqtol*, *yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*)

ִמּים ַו ְתַּ ְלּשׁ ֵחם׃ לאֻ

תּרַע

אתָּה ָי ְד� וֹגּ ִים הוֹ ַר ְתּשָׁ ַותִּ ָטּ ֵﬠם

You with your own hand drove out the nations, but them you **planted**; you **afflicted** the peoples, but them you **set free** (NRSV).

Ps 44:10 (negative; *yiqtol*)

אף־ ָז ַנ ְח ָתּ ַותַּ ְכ ִלי ֵמנוּ ְולֹא־תֵ ֵצא בּ ִצ ְבאוֹתינוּ

Yet you have rejected us and abased us, and **have** not

**gone out** with our armies (NRSV). Ps 66:6 (x-*yiqtol*)

ברָ ֶגל

ָהר ַי ַﬠְברוּ בּ ָנּ

ָבּ ָשׁה ל ַי

ה ַפ� ָים

He turned the sea into dry land; they **passed** through the river on foot (NRSV).

Ps 69:21–22 (*wayyiqtol* and *waw-*x-*yiqtol*)

וָ ַא ִין וְ ַל ְמ ַנ ֲח ִמים וְל ֹא לָנוּד

ָו ָאנוָּשׁה ָו ֲאַ ֶוּקה לבִּי

ָרה שׁבְ

ח ְרפָּה

מֶץ׃

ר ֹאשׁ ְו ִל ְצ ָמ ִאי ַי ְשׁקוּני בּ ָברוִּתי

מ ָצאתי׃ ַו ִתּיְּנוּ

Insults have broken my heart, so that I **am in despair**. I **looked** for pity, but there was none; and for comforters, but I found none. They **gave** me poison for food, and for my thirst they **gave** me vinegar **to drink** (NRSV).

Ps 74:14 (*yiqtol*)

ל ִצ ִיּים׃

ל ָﬠם

מ ֲא ָכל

תְִּ ֶתּנוּנּ

ל ְו ָיתָן

אתָּה ִר ַצּ ְצתָּ ָרא ֵשׁי

You crushed the heads of Leviathan; you **gave** him as food for the creatures of the wilderness (NRSV).

Ps 78:13–15 (*wayyiqtol* and *yiqtol*)

בַּ ִמּדְ ָבּר

צרִים

ֵנד . . . ְי ַב ַקּע כּמוֹ־

בּ ַקע ָים ַו ַיּ ֲﬠ ִבירֵם ַו ַיּ ֶצּב־ ַמ ִים

He divided the sea and **let** them **pass** through it, and **made** the waters **stand** like a heap. . . . He **split** rocks open in the wilderness (NRSV).

Ps 78:20 (*wayyiqtol* and *waw*-x-*yiqtol*)

הֵן הִ ָכּה־צוּר ַו ָיּזוּבוּ מ ִים וּנ ָח ִלים ִישְׁטֹפוּ

Even though he struck the rock so that water **gushed out**

and torrents **overflowed** (NRSV). Ps 78:42–50 (*wayyiqtol* and *yiqtol*)

בּ ִמ ְצ ַר ִים

א ֶשׁר־ ָשׂם

ִנּי־ ָצר׃ מ

א ֶשׁר־ ָפּ ָדם

את־ ָידוֹ יוֹם

ל ֹא־ ָז ְכרוּ

א ֵרי ֶהם ְו ֹנ ְז ֵלי ֶהם

ל ָדם ְי

ֵדה־צֹ ַﬠן׃ ַו ַיּהֲ ֹפ� בּ ְשׂ

אתוֹתיו וּמוֹ ְפ ָתיו

ַויּ ֹא ְכ ֵלם וּ ְצ ַפרְ ֵדּ ַ� ַותַּ ְשׁ ִחיֵתם׃ ﬠרֹב

בּ ֶהם

בּל־ ִישְׁ ָתּיוּן׃ ְישַׁ ַלּח

בַּבָּ ָרד ַגּפְ ָנם

ל ַא ְרבֶּה׃ ַיהֲרֹג

ִסיל ְיבוּלם ִוי ִגי ָﬠם ל ָח

ו ִתּיֵּן

ל ְר ָשׁ ִפים׃

ָרם וּ ִמ ְק ֵני ֶהם בּ ִﬠי

ָבּ ָרד ל

ָנ ַמל׃ ַו ַיּסְ ֵגּר בּ ֲח

ו ִשׁ ְקמוֹתם

מ ְל ֲא ֵכי

ַל ַחת מ ְשׁ

ָו ַז ַﬠם ְו ָצ ָרה ﬠ ְבָרה

וֹפּא

חרוֹן

ישַׁ ַלּח־בָּם

רָ ִﬠים׃ ְיפַ ֵלּס ָנ ִתיב ל ַאוֹפּ

They did not keep in mind his power, or the day when he redeemed them from the foe; when he displayed his signs in Egypt, and his miracles in the fields of Zoan. He **turned** their rivers to blood, so that they could not drink of their streams. He **sent** among them swarms of flies, which **devoured** them, and frogs, which **destroyed** them. He **gave** their crops to the caterpillar, and the fruit of their labor to the locust. He **destroyed** their vines with hail, and their sycamores with frost. He **gave** over their cattle to the hail, and their flocks to thunderbolts. He **let loose** on them his fierce anger, wrath, indignation, and distress, a company of destroying angels. He **made** a path for his an- ger (NRSV).

Ps 78:64 (negative; *yiqtol*)

תִ ְב ֶכּי ָנה׃

ָפלוּ ְו ַא ְל ְמ ֹנ ָתיו ל ֹא בּ ֶח ֶרב ָנ

כֹּ ֲה ָניו

Their priests fell by the sword, and *after this* their widows

**made** no lamentation.

Ps 80:6–7 (*wayyiqtol*, *yiqtol* and *waw-x-yiqtol*)

תִּישׂ ֵמנוּ

שׁ ִלישׁ׃

ְד ָמעוֹת בּ

ִדּ ְמ ָﬠה ַו ַתְּשׁקמוֹ ל ֶחם

ה ֱא ַכ ְל ָתּם

א ְי ֵבינוּ ִי ְל ֲﬠגוּ־לָמוֹ׃

ֵכ ֵנינוּ ְו ל ְשׁ

מדוֹן

You have fed them with the bread of tears, and **given** them tears to drink in full measure. You **made** us the scorn of our neighbors; our enemies **laughed** among themselves.

Ps 81:7–8 (*yiqtol*, *wayyiqtol*, *yiqtol*)

קרָא ָת

ֲﬠבֹרְ ָנה׃ ַבּ ָצּרָה תּ

דוּדּמ

כּ ָפּיו

שׁ ְכמוֹ

מ ֵסּ ֶבל

ה ִסירוֹ ִתי

מ ִרי ָבה

ﬠל־מי

א ְבָ ְחנ�

בּ ֵס ֶתררַ ַﬠם

ֶﬠ ְנ� אֶ

ו ֲאַ ְחלּ ֶצ ָךּ

I relieved your shoulder of the burden; your hands **were freed** from the basket. In distress you called, and I **res- cued** you; I **answered** you in the secret place of thunder; I **tested** you at the waters of Meribah (NRSV).

Ps 105:40 (*wayyiqtol* and *waw*-x-*yiqtol*)

שׁ ַמ ִים ַישְׂ ִבּי ֵﬠם׃

ָלו ְו ֶל ֶחם שׂ

שָׁ ַאל ַו ָיּבֵא

He asked, and he **brought** quails, and **gave** them food from heaven in abundance (NRSV).

Ps 114:3 (*wayyiqtol* and *yiqtol*)

לאָחוֹר

ַיּרְ ֵדּן יִסֹּב ה

ה ָיּם ָר ָאה וַ ָיּ ֹנס

The sea looked and **fled**; Jordan **turned** back (NRSV). Jer 2:14–15 (x-*yiqtol*)

ﬠָ ָליו

ל ַבז׃

ָיה ה

�ַ וּדּמ

בּ ִית הוּא

אם־ ְי ִליד

ה ֶﬠ ֶבד ִי ְשׂ ָר ֵאל

ישְׁ ֲאגוּ כ ִפרִים

Is Israel a slave? Is he a homeborn servant? Why then has he become plunder? The lions **have roared** against him (NRSV).

See also Ps 78:58 (*yiqtol*); 80:6–7 (*yiqtol*); Isa 41:5 (*weyiqtol*, *yiqtol*

and *wayyiqtol*).

Isa 4:4 (future perfect, *waw-*x-*yiqtol*)

ִצוֹיּן ְואֶת־ ְדּ ֵמי ְירוּ ָשׁ ַל� בּנוֹת־

ָי ִדי�ַ

אִם ָר ַחץ אֲדֹ ָני אֵת צֹאַת

ִמ ִקּרְ ָהּבּ

Once the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and **cleansed** the bloodstains of Jeru- salem from its midst.

See also Isa 6:11 (compare GKC §§ 106o, 107l).

* 1. ***COMING BACK TO SC***

If the writer needs a co-ordinate verbal form after PC, he/she comes back to SC.

## 3.5.1 PC + SC in Direct Speech

1. ***Epexegesis***

Gen 41:11(x*-qatal* without *waw*)

וֹמ�ח

כּ ִפ ְתרוֹן

אישׁ

ִני ָוהוּא א

א ָחד

ְי ָלה בּ ַל

חלוֹם

ו ַנּ ַח ְל ָמה

חָ ָל ְמנוּ׃

We dreamed on the same night, he and I, each **having a dream** with its own meaning (NRSV).

# *Parallelism*

Deut 6:22–23 (*waw*-x-*qatal*)

משָּׁם

בּ ִמ ְצרַ ִים . . . ְואוֹתנוּ הוִֹציא

. . . תת

ו ִיּ ֵתּן ְיה ָוה אוֹ

The LORD displayed before signs . . . against Egypt. He

**brought** us **out** from there (NRSV). 1 Kgs 12:29

בּדָן

בּ ֵבית־אֵל ְואֶת־ ָהאֶ ָחד ָנתַן

ו ָיּ ֶשׂם אֶת־הָאֶ ָחד

He set one in Bethel, and the other he **put** in Dan (NRSV).

Here, there are two perfectly symmetrical actions in the fore- ground. See also 1 Kgs 3:20.

# *List*

1 Sam 22:10 (with *waw*)

ה ְפּ ִל ְשׁ ִתּי ָנתַן

ָגּ ְל ָית ח ֶרב

בּיהָוה וְ ֵצידָה ָנתַן לוֹ וְ ֵאת

ַו ִיּ ְשׁ ַאל־לוֹ

לוֹ׃

He inquired of the LORD for him, [**and**] **gave** him provi- sions, **and gave** him the sword of Goliath the Philistine (NRSV).

See also Deut 3:8–13 (without *waw*).

# *Generic Parallelism*

1 Sam 19:5 (verb as first word; without *waw*)

ְשׂ ָר ֵאלרָ ִאי ָת ַו ִשׂתְּ ָמח ל ָכל־ ִי

ָﬠה ְגדוֹ ָלה וּשׁתּ

ו ַיּ ַשׂﬠ ְיה ָוה

And the LORD brought about a great victory for all Israel. You **saw** it, and rejoiced (NRSV).

## 3.5.2. PC + SC in Narration

1. ***Epexegesis***

Josh 11:12 (verb-subject, without *waw*)

ה ֱחרִים אוֹתם

ִפי־ ֶח ֶרב ל

ו ַיּ ֵכּם

He struck them with the edge of the sword, he utterly

**destroyed** them.

See also 1 Sam 14:35.

# *Parenthetical Remark*

Num 7:6–8

אל־

ְו ֶאת־ ַה ָבּ ָקר ַו ִיּ ֵתּן אוֹ ָתם את־ ָה ֲﬠ ָג�ת

ֶשׁה מ

ַחקּיִּ ַו . . .

ל ְב ֵני ֵגרְוֹשׁן

ה ָבּ ָקר ָנתַן

ַבּ ַﬠת א ְר

ָג�ת ְו ֵאת ה ֲﬠ

יתֵּ שׁ

ה ְל ִו ִיּם׃ את

לבְ ֵני

ָבּ ָקר ָנתַן ה

שׁמ ַנת

ָג�ת ְו ֵאת ה ֲﬠ

ְר ַבּע א

ָד ָתם׃ ְו ֵאת ﬠבֹ

כּ ִפי

ﬠבֹ ָד ָתם

כּ ִפי

מ ָר ִרי

So Moses took the wagons and the oxen, and gave them to the Levites: two wagons and four oxen he **gave** to the Gershonites, according to their service; and four wagons and eight oxen he **gave** to the Merarites, according to their service (NRSV).

See also Josh 6:15; 6:23; 1 Sam 6:12.

# *Parallelism*

Gen 19:36–38

. . . ןבּ

ִכי ָרה ה ְבּ

ֶהן׃ ַו ֵתּ ֶלד מ ֲא ִבי

בנוֹת־לוֹט

יתֵּ שׁ

. . . ַו ַתּ ֲה ֶריןָ

ו ַה ְצּ ִﬠי ָרה ַגם־ ִהוא ָי ְלדָה בֵּן

Thus both the daughters of Lot became pregnant by their father. The firstborn bore a son . . . the younger also **bore** a son (NRSV).

These sorts of sequences are very frequent: see for instance Gen 4:3–4; 18:33; 25:5–6; 27:5–6; 35:18; 40:21–22; 41:51–52;

41:54; Josh 4:12; 6:25; 10:13. In all these occurrences the paral- lelism is between two symmetrical actions in the foreground (in this respect I agree with Cook 2012: 297). There is no differ- ence in the aspect, in the tense, or in the function of these ver- bal forms.

# *Negation*

1 Sam 3:18 (with *waw*)

מִמֶּוּנּ

כחֵד

את־כּל־ ַה ְדּ ָב ִרים וְלֹא

שׁמוּאל

ו ַיּ ֶגּד־לוֹ

So Samuel told him everything **and hid** nothing from him (NRSV).

Josh 11:11 (without *waw*)

כּל־

ֲח ֵרם ל ֹא נוֹתר ה

ִפי־ ֶח ֶרב ל

א ֶשׁר־ ָהּבּ

את־כּל־ ַה ֶנּ ֶפשׁ

וּכּיַּ ו

ְנשָׁ ָמה

And they put to the sword all who were in it, utterly destroying them; there **was** no one **left** who breathed (NRSV).

See also Josh 13:14.

# *List*

Josh 15:2–3 (with *waw*)

הפּ ֶנה ֶנ ְג ָבּה׃

מן־ ַה ָשׁלֹּן

ה ֶמּ ַלח

ֵצה ָים מ ְק

ֶהם ְגּבוּל ֶנ ֶגב ל

ו ְי ִהי

מִ ֶנּ ֶגב

ָנה ְוﬠָ ָלה צִ

ַר ִבּים ְו ָﬠַבר ﬠ ְק

ל ַמﬠֲ ֵלה

אל־מ ֶנּ ֶגב

ו ָיצָא

הקַּ ְרקָ ָﬠה׃

א ָדּרָה ְו ָנַסב

ְצרוֹן ְוﬠָ ָלה חֶ

ֵנ ַ� ְו ָﬠַבר בּרְ

ל ָק ֵדשׁ

And their south boundary ran from the end of the Dead Sea, from the bay that faces southward; it **went out** southward of the ascent of Akrabbim, **passed** along to Zin, and **went up** south of Kadesh-barnea, **along** by Hez- ron, **up** to Addar, and **made a turn** to Karka.

# *End of the Chain of Events*

Gen 41:57 (subject-verb)

אל־יוֹ ֵסף

ל ְבּשֹׁר

ְצ ַר ְימָה מִ

וָּאבּ

ו ָכל־ ָה ָא ֶרץ

All the world **came** to Joseph in Egypt to buy grain (NRSV).

Gen 45:15 (verb-subject)

אִוֹתּ׃

אחָיו

כֵןדִּ ְבּרוּ

ﬠ ֵליהֶם ְו ַא ֲחרֵי

ל ָכל־ ֶאחָיו ַו ֵיּבְ ְךּ

ו ְי ַנשֵּׁק

And he kissed all his brothers and wept upon them; and after that his brothers **talked** with him (NRSV).

See also Exod 12,50; Josh 6:14; with *waw*: Josh 11:11; 11:23; 14:15; 24:33; Judg 1:8. Usually, the new sequence that follows begins with ויהי.

# *Generic Parallelism*

Josh 4:14

את־יְהוֹ ֻשׁ ַ�

ההוּא ִדּגַּל יְה ָוה

םוֹיּבּ

On that day the LORD **exalted** Joshua (NRSV).

In this case, SC is not parallel to another single verbal form, but rather to the entire previous chain. See also Josh 4:19; 11:12.

# *Rhetoric*

The writer wishes to underline an element in a chain.

Josh 4:9

הֵ ִקים ְיהוֹ ֻ�שַׁ

*Those* twelve stones Joshua **set up**.

## 3.5.3 PC + SC in Poetry

***Epexegesis***

Ps 78:21

א ָב ִנים

ֵרה שׂﬠְ

שׁוְּ ֵתּים

ב ִי ְשׂרָ ֵאל׃

ָלה ﬠָ

ְו ַגם־ ַאף ב ַי ֲﬠקֹב

ו ִיּ ְת ַﬠ ָבּר ְו ֵאשׁ ִנ ְשּׂ ָקה

He was full of rage; a fire was kindled against Jacob, his anger **mounted** against Israel (NRSV).

See also Ps 78:24.31.57 (without *waw*).66.

1. **THE VERBAL FUNCTIONS IN A *NON-PAST/NON- ANTERIOR* SEQUENCE**
   1. ***PC AS THE FIRST VERB***

When PC falls in the first position it indicates the first *non- past/non-anterior* action/state/event. It may or may not be the first word in the sentence.

## PC as the First Verb in Direct Speech

1 Sam 18:11

I **will pin** David to the wall (NRSV). 1 Sam 17:32 (subject-verb)

ָד ִוד וּבַ ִקּיר בְ

אַ ֶכּה

Your servant **will go** (NRSV).

## PC as First Verb in a Secondary Clause

ﬠ ְבדְּ� ֵילֵ�

Also in secondary clauses when PC is the first verbal form in a chain, it represents the first *non-past/non-anterior* action.

1 Sam 31:4

פּן־יָבוֹאוּ הָ ֲﬠ ֵר ִלים הָ ֵא ֶלּה . . .

So that these uncircumcised **may** not **come** . . . (NRSV).

In a past context, PC represents a “future in the past” action:

2 Kgs 13:14

ֲאשֶׁר יָמוּת וֹבּ

[. . . the illness] of which he **was to die** (NRSV).

## PC as the First Verb in a Main Sentence in Poetry

In poetry, when PC is the first verbal form in a chain it repre- sents the first *non-past/non-anterior* action.

Ps 121:1 (*yiqtol*)

I **lift up** my eyes to the hills (NRSV).

ﬠי ַני אֶל־ ֶה ָהרִים

אָשּׂא

* 1. ***OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE FIRST PLACE OF A***

***SEQUENCE***

As a *past/anterior* sequence can begin in any given way, and not only with SC, a *non-past/non-anterior* can also begin in any given way. For instance:

1 Sam 9:8 (non-verbal sentence)

. . . ֶסף כּ

שֶׁקל

ִדי ֶר ַבע ב ָי

ה ֵנּה ִנ ְמ ָצא

Here, I have with me a quarter shekel of silver . . . (NRSV).

1. Sam 17:25 (*we-haya*)

א ֶשׁר־ ַי ֶוּנּכּ . . .

The man who kills him . . . (NRSV).

* 1. ***PC AFTER ANOTHER PC***

ה ִאישׁ

ו ָה ָיה

If PC comes after another PC it expresses co-ordination.

## PC + PC in Main Sentence in Direct Speech

1. ***Epexegesis***

Josh 6:26

בִּבְכֹרוֹ יְיַ ְסּ ֶד ָנּה וּבִ ְצ ִﬠירוֹ ַיצִּיב דְּ ָל ֶתי ָה׃

At the cost of his firstborn he **shall lay** its foundation, and at the cost of his youngest he **shall set up** its gates! (NRSV).

Both sentences clearly describe the same curse.

# *Parenthetical Remark*

1 Kgs 11:11–12

א�־

ַﬠ ְב ֶ�דּ׃ ל

ֶלי� וּנ ַת ִתּיה מָﬠ

ַמּ ְמ ָל ָכה את־ה

א ְקרַע

קרֹ�ַ

א ְקרָ ֶﬠ ָנּה׃

�ְנ בּ

מַיּד

ִבי� א

ָדּ ִוד ל ַמַﬠן

ֶשׂ ָנּה א ֱﬠ

בּ ָי ֶמי� ל ֹא

I **will** surely **tear** the kingdom from you and give it to your servant. Yet for the sake of your father David I will not do it in your lifetime; I **will tear** it out of the hand of your son (NRSV).

# *Parallelism*

Gen 27:39–40

מ ָﬠל׃ ְו ַﬠל־

ה ָשּׁ ַמ ִים

ָא ֶרץ יִ ְהיֶה מוֹ ָשׁ ֶב� וּ ִמ ַטּל ה

ַמ ֵנּי מ ְשׁ

ה ֵנּה

חרְ ְ�בּ תִ ְח ֶיה

See, away from the fatness of the earth **shall** your home **be**, and away from the dew of heaven on high. By your sword you **shall live** (NRSV).

See also Josh 18:5b; 2 Sam 7:14.

# *List*

1 Sam 8:11–17

ל ְפ ֵני

ְבוֹתּ וּ ְב ָפ ָר ָשׁיו ְו ָרצוּ בּ ֶמ ְר ַכּ

ְבּ ֵני ֶכם ִיקָּח ְו ָשׂם לוֹ אֶת־

ֶמרְ ַכּ ְב.וֹתּ . .

ו ֶאת־ ְבּנוֹתי ֶכם ִיקָּח . . .

הוֹטּ ִבים ִיקָּח ְו ָנתַן

ְשׂדוֹ ֵתיכֶם ְו ֶאת־כַּ ְר ֵמיכֶם ְו ֵזי ֵתיכֶם ו ֶאת־

ַל ֲﬠ ָבדָיו׃

ל ָס ִרי ָסיו ְו ַל ֲﬠ ָב ָדיו׃

ִל ְמ ַלא ְכוֹתּ׃

ְוכַ ְר ֵמי ֶכם ַי ְשׂﬠֹר ְו ָנ ַתן ֶכם . . . ִיקָּח ְו ָשׂﬠָה ְו ַז ְר ֵﬠיכֶם ְו ֶאת־ ַﬠ ְבדֵי

צ ֹא ְנכֶם ַי ְשׂﬠֹר

ל ֲﬠ ָב ִדים׃

ְהיוּ־לוֹ תִּ

ו ַאתֶּם

He **will take** your sons and appoint them to his chariots and to be his horsemen, and to run before his chariots; . . . He **will take** your daughters . . . He **will take** the best of your fields and vineyards and olive orchards and give them to his courtiers. He **will take one-tenth** of your grain and of your vineyards and give it to his officers and his cour- tiers. He **will take** your male and female slave . . . and put

them to his work. He **will take one-tenth** of your flocks, and you **shall be** his slaves (NRSV).

The series of PC is correctly interrupted four times by SC (see § 4.4).

## PC + PC in a Secondary Clause

1. ***Epexegesis***

Josh 1:8 (with אז)

ַתּ ְצ ִלי�ַ

תְּ ִכּשׂיל

ְדּ ָר ֶכ� ְואָז אֶת־

כּי־ ָאז

For then you **shall make** your way prosperous, and then you **shall be** successful (NRSV).

See also 2 Sam 16:18.

# *Parallelism*

Num 23:24

לֹא ִישְׁ ַכּב עד־י ֹאַכל ט ֶרף ְו ַדם־ ֲחלָלִים ִישְׁ ֶתּה׃

It does not lie down till it **devours** the prey, and **drinks**

the blood of the slain (RSV).

# *List*

Ps 72:12–14 (*yiqtol*, short *yiqtol*, *waw*-x-*yiqtol*, x-*yiqtol* and *we*- *yiqtol*)

מ ַשׁ ֵוּ ַ� ְו ָﬠ ִני ְו ֵאין־עֹ ֵזר לוֹ

א ְביוֹן

כּי־ ַיצִּיל

יָ ֹחס ﬠל־ ַדּל ְו ֶא ְביוֹן

ו ַנפְוֹשׁת אבְיוֹ ִנים יוֹ ִשׁי�׃

מִ�וֹתּ וּמֵ ָחמָס ִי ְגַאל ַנ ְפשָׁם

ו ֵיי ַקר ָדּ ָמם בּ ֵﬠי ָניו׃

For he **delivers** the needy when they call, the poor and those who have no helper. He **has pity** on the weak and the needy, and **saves** the lives of the needy. From oppres- sion and violence he **redeems** their life; and **precious is** their blood in his sight.

## PC + PC in a Main Sentence in Poetry

1. ***Epexegesis***

Ps 42:6 (*yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol*)

מַה־ ִתּ ְוֹתּשֲׁחִיח ַנ ְפשִׁי ַותֶּ ֱה ִמי ﬠָ ָלי

Why **are you cast down**, O my soul, and are you **dis- quieted** within me? (NRSV).

See also Ps 9:9 and 29:8 (x-*yiqtol* and *yiqtol* without *waw*).

# *Parallelism*

Ps 22:8 (subject-verb, *yiqtol*)

בְ ָשׂפָה ָי ִניעוּ רֹאשׁ׃

לִי ַי ְפִיטרוּ

כּל־רֹאַי ַי ְל ִﬠגוּ

All who see me **mock** at me; they **make mouths** at me, they **shake** their heads (NRSV).

See also Ps 29:9 (*yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol*); 102:27 (x-*yiqtol* and *yiqtol*).

# *Negation*

See Isa 40:31.

# *List*

See Ps 18:26–30 (x-*yiqtol*); Isa 41:19 (*yiqtol*).

* 1. ***SC IN THE SECOND POSITION***

SC in the second position expresses sub-ordination.

## + SC in Direct Speech

Gen 17:15–16 (*weqatal* and *waw-*x*-qatal*)

שׁ ָמהּ׃

שָׂרה

ָרי כּי שׂ

את־ ְשׁ ָמהּ

ְשׁ ְ�תּ ל ֹא־ ִת ְק ָרא א

שׂ ַרי

ןבּ �ל

ָנּה מִמֶּ

ָתהּ ְו ַגם ָנתִַיתּ א

וּ ֵברַ ְכ ִתּי

As for Sarai your wife, you shall not call her Sarai, but Sarah shall be her name. I **will bless** her, and moreover I **will give** you a son by her (NRSV).

Lev 26:44 (*negative*)

ֵבי ֶהם ל ֹא־מְ ַאְ ִסתּים ְולֹא־ א ְי

בּ ֶא ֶרץ

בּ ְהיוֹתם

ו ַאף־ ַגּם־ז ֹאת

ג ַﬠ ְלִיתּם ל ַכ�תָם

Yet for all that, when they are in the land of their enemies, I **will** not **spurn** them, or **abhor** them so as to destroy them utterly (NRSV).

In these two occurrences of PC the writer underlines the fact that the two verbal forms are successive even though negative.

1 Sam 20:18 (not *weqataltí*)

ָמ ָחר חֹדשׁ ְו ִנ ְפ ֕קַ ְדָתּ

Tomorrow is the new moon; you **will be missed** (NRSV).

See also 1 Sam 2:16.

## . . . + SC in a Secondary Clause

Deut 4:19

את־ ַהשֶּׁ ֶמשׁ . . .

ַמ ְי ָמה ְורָ ִאי ָת ה ָשּׁ

ֶני� ﬠי

וּ ֶפן־ ִתּ ָשּׂא

And lest you lift up your eyes towards the heavens and **see**

the sun . . . Eccl 2:24

יּשׁ ֹאכל ְו ָשׁ ָתה

ָא ָדם בּ

אין־טוֹב

There is nothing better for mortals than to eat and **drink**

(NRSV).

In this example there can be no doubt that both PC and SC are in the foreground, and that there is no difference in the aspect of the action.

Ps 11:2 (without *waw*)

ﬠל־ ֶיתֶר

ח ָצּם

ק ֶשׁת וֹכּננוּ

ָשׁ ִﬠים ִי ְד ְרכוּן ה ְר

כּי ה ֵנּה

For look, the wicked bend the bow, they **fit** their arrow to the string.

See also Ps 73:27.

***4.4.3.* + SC in Poetry**

Ps 110:6 (*qatal* without *waw*)

ﬠל־ ֶא ֶרץ ַר ָבּה׃

מַחץ ר ֹאשׁ

ֵלא ְג ִווֹיּת מָ

וֹגּבּיִם

יָ ִדין

He will execute judgment among the nations; he **will fill** them with corpses; he **will shatter** heads over the wide earth (NRSV).

Ps 132:17 (*qatal* without *waw*)

ל ְמ ִשׁי ִחי׃

ְכ ִתּי ֵנר ﬠרַ

ָד ִוד ל

ֶרן ק

שׁם א ְצ ִמי ַ�

There I will cause a horn to sprout up for David; I **will prepare** a lamp for my anointed one.

Ps 73:18 (*qatal* without *waw*)

ל ַמוּשּׁאוֹת׃

ַפּ ְלָתּם ה

לָמוֹ

תּ ִשׁית

א� בּ ֲח ָלקוֹת

Truly you set them in slippery places; you **make** them **fall**

to ruin (NRSV).

Isa 11:8 (*waw*-x-*qatal*)

הדָה׃

צ ְפעוֹ ִני ָגּמוּל ָידוֹ

מאוּ ַרת

פּ ֶתן ְו ַﬠל

ﬠל־ ֻחר

ו ִשׁ ֲﬠ ַשׁע יוֹ ֵנק

The nursing child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child **shall put** its hand on the adder’s den (NRSV).

Isa 19:7 (*qatal* without *waw*)

ֹוְכל מ ְזרַע יְאוֹר ִייבַשׁ ִנדַּף

And all that is sown by the Nile will dry up, **be driven away** (NRSV).

Isa 51:11 (*qatal* without *waw*)

שָׂוֹשׂן ְושִׂ ְמ ָחה ַי ִשּׂיגוּן ָנסוּ יָגוֹן ַו ֲא ָנחָה׃

They shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing

**shall flee** away (NRSV).

# *SC + PC*

If the writer needs a co-ordinate element after SC, he/she comes back to PC.

## *4.5.1* SC + PC in Direct Speech

1. ***Epexegesis***

1 Kgs 1:35

תַּ ְחתָּי

ﬠל־כּ ְס ִאי ְוהוּא ִימְ��

ו ָי ַשׁב

He shall sit on my throne and **shall be king** in my place

In 1 Kgs 1:13 the verbal forms are in reverse order (see also 1 Kgs 1:17.30). See also Lev 26:42 (reference to the same cov- enant).

# *Parenthetical Remark*

Exod 12:8

ﬠל־ ְמרִֹרים

ִלי־ ֵאשׁ וּ ַמוֹצּת צ

ֶזּה ה

ְי ָלה בּ ַלּ

את־ ַה ָבּ ָשׂר

ו ָא ְכלוּ

י ֹא ְכ ֻלהוּ׃

They shall eat the lamb that same night; they **shall eat** it roasted over the fire with unleavened bread and bitter herbs (NRSV).

# *Parallelism*

Gen 17:20–21

אָ ִקים

ְכ ִתּי . . . ְו ֶאת־ ְבּרִי ִתי בּ ַר

הֵנּה

שׁ ַמ ְﬠ ִתּי�

ִי ְשׁ ָמ ֵﬠאל ִי ְצחָק וּ ְל ֶאת־

As for Ishmael, I have heard you; I bless him . . . , but my covenant I **will establish** with Isaac.

God will do such and such with Ishmael, but, *at the same time,* he will establish his covenant with Isaac.

Deut 2:28

תִֶּןתּ־ ִלי ְו ָשׁתִיתִי

ֶכּ ֶסף בּ

ִני ְו ָא ַכ ְל ִתּי וּ ַמ ִים תּ ְשׁ ִבּ ֵר

ֶכּ ֶסף בּ

א ֶכל

You shall sell me food for money, so that I may eat, and

**supply** me water for money, so that I may drink (NRSV).

The second action follows the first, but the third is parallel to the first. For this reason the writer comes back to PC. The last action follows the third and must be a SC.

# *End of the Chain of Events*

Exod 3:20

א ֶשׁר

אתַי

ִנ ְפ ְל בְּכֹל

את־ ִמ ְצרַ ִים

את־ ָידִי ְו ִה ֵכּיתִי

ו ָשׁ ַל ְח ִתּי

אתְ ֶכם׃

ְו ַא ֲח ֵרי־כן ְישַׁ ַלּח בּ ִקרְוֹבּ

א ֱשׂﬠֶה

So I will stretch out my hand and strike Egypt with all my wonders that I will perform in it; after that he **will let** you **go**. (NRSV).

# *In order to Underline an Element in a Chain*

Gen 17:20

ָﬠ ָשׂר ְנ ִשׂי ִאם שׁ ֵנים־

מאד

בּ ְמאד

אתוֹ

ְו ִה ְר ֵבּי ִתי אתוֹ

ו ִה ְפ ֵרי ִתי

יוֹליד וּ ְנ ַת ִתּיו לגוֹי ָגּדוֹל׃

I will make him fruitful and exceedingly numerous; *even* he **shall be** the father of twelve princes, and I will make him a great nation.

Compare also Gen 17:6, 16.

***4.5.2.* SC + PC in Poetry**

# *Epexegesis*

Ps 77:13

. . . ְו ָה ִגי ִתי בְ ָכל־פָּ ֳﬠ ֶל� וּבַ ֲﬠ ִלילוֹ ֶתי� אִישׂ ָחה׃

. . . I will meditate on all your work, and **muse** on your mighty deeds (NRSV).

Joel 2:20 (short *yiqtol*)

צ ֲח ָנתוֹ . . .

ְאוֹשׁ ְו ַת ַﬠל ב

וﬠָ ָלה

Its stench and foul smell **will rise up** . . . (NRSV).

# *Parallelism*

Isa 49:11

ל ָדּ ֶר� וּ ְמ ִס� ַתי ְירֻמוּן׃

כל־ ָה ַרי

ו ַשׂ ְמ ִתּי

And I will turn all my mountains into a road, and my highways **shall be raised up** (NRSV).

See also Isa 49:22.

# *End of the Chain of Events*

Jer 46:26

מ ֶל�־בָּבֶל

מ ַב ְקשֵׁי ַנ ְפשָׁם וּבְ ַיד ְנבוּכַ ְד ֶראצַּר

וּ ְנתַתִּים בְּ ַיד

כּי ֵמי־ ֶקדֶם ְנאֻם־ ְיה ָוה

תְּכּשֹׁן

וּבְ ַיד־ ֲﬠבָ ָדיו ְו ַא ֲח ֵרי־כן

I will hand them over to those who seek their life, to King Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon and his officers. Afterward Egypt **shall be inhabited** as in the days of old, says the LORD (NRSV).

1. **COROLLARIES**
   1. ***THE IMPERATIVE***

Most scholars have recognized sequences headed by impera- tives. My theory asserts that in these sequences the imperative does not possess any special function, while SC keeps its sub- ordinate function exactly as when it comes after PC (for a dif- ferent opinion on precative *qatal*, see Andrason 2013). Below are a few examples demonstrating that the *waw* is not relevant:

Ps 22:22 (*waw-*x*-qatal*)

ﬠ ִני ָתנִי׃

וּ ִמ ַקּ ְר ֵני ֵר ִמים א ְר ֵיה

מ ִפּי

הוֹ ִשׁי ֵﬠ ִני

Save me from the mouth of the lion! And from the horns of the wild oxen **rescue** me!

Ps 71:3 (*qatal* without *waw*)

צ ִוּיָת ְלהוֹ ִשׁיﬠ ִני

תּ ִמיד

לבוֹא

מעוֹן

לי לצוּר

ה ֵיה

Be to me a rock of refuge, a strong fortress, always **order**

to save me.

See also Ps 4:2; Isa 43:9.

* 1. ***PH ASAL ASPECTS***

As I have stated above, the opposition between the two groups of sequences can be used in some contexts to distinguish between different phasal or quantificational aspects (for the dif- ferent kinds of aspects compare Dick 1987: 63; Bhat 1999: 53–

54; Cook 2012: 25–26).

It is a common view that *yiqtol* is used in BH to express repeated action. Such a function is usually associated with an aspect (imperfective, cursive, frequentative, habitual, iterative, etc.) or with a mood (Ḥatav 1997: 145–46; Voitila 2001: 197 n. 90; Joosten 2002: 62). This is not completely correct, however: PC expresses repeated action only in a past context, while the examples usually offered of its use in a non-past context (see for instance GKC § 107g; Joosten 2002: 63) can be understood as expressing general present or future. Instead, a repeated action is expressed in a non-past context by SC.

In order to express habitual or iterative aspects (for a more detailed discussion on the difference between the two, see Dahl 1985: 97), as well as the durative aspect, BH uses the second group of sequences in a past context and the first group in a non-past context.

To complicate matters, this implies full homonymy between this use and that which we examined in the first part of our inquiry:

1. In a past context the second group of sequences can denote relative tense (future in the past) or aspect (habit- ual/iterative or durative).
2. In a non-past context the first group of sequences can denote anteriority or aspect (habitual/iterative or durative).

Finally, the relationship between aspects and sequences in a past context has been recognized by several authors (see for instance Lambdin 1971: 108; Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 527– 29). However, it must be added that—as always with sequences—the introductory dominant verb can be omitted.

## Habitual and Iterative in the Past and Non-Past

Gen 2:6 (past, PC + SC)

ְפּ ֵני־ ָה ֲא ָד ָמה׃ את־כּל־

מן־הָאָ ֶרץ ְו ִהְשׁקה

ואֵד ַיﬠֲ ֶלה

But a stream **would rise** from the earth, and **water** the whole face of the ground (NRSV).

Ps 122:4 (non-past, SC)

To it the tribes **go up** (NRSV).

1. Sam 15:1–2 (past, x + *waw* + SC)

ָב ִטים שְׁ

וּלﬠ

שֶׁשָּׁם

לפָ ָניו׃

אִישׁרָ ִצים

ָכּ ָבה ְוסֻסִים ַו ֲח ִמשִּׁים מרְ

א ְבשָׁלוֹם

ו ַﬠיַּשׂ לוֹ

השָּׁ ַﬠר

ﬠַל־ ַיד ֶדּרֶ�

א ְבשָׁלוֹם ְו ָﬠַמד

ו ִהְ ִכּשׁים

After this Absalom got himself a chariot and horses, and fifty men to run ahead of him. **Absalom** used to rise early and **stand** beside the road into the gate (NRSV).

In the previous example the introductory dominant verb is omitted.

Ps 33:10 (non-past, SC + SC: *qatal* without *waw*)

ﬠ ִמּים׃

מ ְח ְשׁבוֹת

הֵ ִניא

ַצת־וֹגּ ִים ﬠֲ

הֵ ִפיר

יהוָה

The LORD **brings** the counsel of the nations to nothing; he **frustrates** the plans of the peoples (NRSV).

Ps 33:13–14 (non-past, SC + SC: *qatal* without *waw*)

האָ ָדם׃

ָכּל־ ְבּ ֵני אֶת־

הִ ִבּיט ְיהוָהרָ ָאה

מִ ָשּׁמַ ִים

The LORD **looks down** from heaven; he **sees** all human- kind (NRSV).

Ps 65:10 (non-past, SC + PC + PC: *qatal*, *wayyiqtol* and

*yiqtol*)

תּ ְﬠ ְשׁרֶ ָנּה

ַו ְשׁתֹּ ְקֶ ָקהרַ ַבּת ה ָארֶץ

פּ ַקדְ ָתּ

You **visit** the earth and **water** it, you greatly **enrich** it (NRSV).

Ps 99:7 (past, PC + SC: *yiqtol* and *qatal* without *waw*)

ְוחֹק ָנתַן־ ָלמוֹ׃ ﬠדֹתָיו

שָׁ ְמרוּ

ֵלי ֶהם אֲ

ָנן ְידַ ֵבּר ﬠָ

דוּמּﬠַ ְבּ

He **spoke** to them in the pillar of cloud; they **kept** his decrees, and the statutes that he gave them (NRSV).

For further examples in the non-past, see also: Jer 8:7; Ps 88:10.14; 119:10–14; Job 6:17–20. For others in the past, see Joosten (2012: 285–87).

## Durative in the Past and Non-Past

With some verbs, the equivalent function is not habitual or iterative, but durative: “Les états et les activités représentent des usages ‘duratifs’, tandis que les procès d’accomplissement,

d’achèvement et de semelfactif entrent dans le type ‘fréquenta- tif’ ” (Voitila 2001: 206 n. 105; compare Joosten 2012: 286).

2 Sam 4:2 (past, PC)

ﬠל־ ִבּ ְנ ָימִן׃

תּ ָחֵשׁב

גּם־ ְבּ ֵארוֹת

For Beeroth **was considered** to belong to Benjamin (see Joosten 2012: 286).

Gen 31:15 (non-past, SC)

הֲלוֹא ָנ ְכ ִרוֹיּת ֶנ ְחַ ְשׁבנוּ לוֹ

**Are** we not **regarded** by him as foreigners? (NRSV). 1 Sam 9:9 (past, PC)

הרֹאֶה׃

לפָ ִנים

הַוֹיּם ִי ָקּרֵא

לָנּבִיא

כִּי

For the one who is now called a prophet **was** formerly

**called** a seer (NRSV). Isa 48:2 (non-past, SC)

כּי־מֵ ִﬠיר הקֹּדֶשׁ ִנ ְקרָאוּ

For they **call** themselves after the holy city (NRSV).

See also Jer 15:18.

* 1. ***THE DOUBLING OF SEQUENCES***

In this phase, BH had the ability to double a sequence. We have already seen two instances with SC and PC:

Ps 74:13–15

ﬠל־ ַה ָמּ ִים׃

תִנּי ִנים

שִׁ ַבּ ְר ָתּ ָראשֵׁי

ל ִצ ִיּים׃

ל ָﬠם

מ ֲא ָכל

תְִּ ֶתּנוּנּ

ל ְו ָיתָן

אתָּה ִר ַצּ ְצתָּ ָרא ֵשׁי


מ ְﬠ ָין ָו ָנחַל

ַקְﬠָתּ בָ

אתָּה

Both וּנֶּנ ְתִּתּ and ָתּﬠְ בקַ continue the verbal form תָּ ַצְצִּר . Put dif-

ferently, the sequence is doubled. We can describe this process in a simple way, see Figure 3.



The same process occurs three times in 1 Sam 8:11–17 (§ 4.3.1):


ֶאת־ ְבּ ֵני ֶכם ִיקָּח ְושָׂם . . . ְורָצוּ . . .

ְו ֶאת־ ְבּנוֹתי ֶכם ִי ָקּח . . .


ְו ֶאת־ ְשׂדוֹתי ֶכם . . . ִיקָּח ְו ָנַןת . . .

ְו ַזרְ ֵﬠי ֶכם . . . ַיﬠְשֹׂר ְו ָנַןת . . .

The scheme is quite simple, see Figure 4.



It is more difficult to observe such a process if the verbal forms are the same (SC and SC or PC and PC), see Figure 5.



A possible example, however, is provided by Exod 17:1–4:

ﬠל־ ִפּי

ל ַמסְ ֵﬠיהֶם

ִי ְשׂ ָר ֵאל מִמִּ ְד ַבּר־סִין בּ ֵני־

כּל־ ֲﬠ ַדת

ו ִיּסְעוּ

תּת הָ ָﬠם׃

שְׁ ל

מ ִים

יה ָוה ַו ַיּ ֲחנוּ בִּ ְרפִי ִדים ְו ֵאין

ְו ִנ ְשׁ ֶתּה ַויּ ֹאמר מ ִים

תּנוּ־ ָלנוּ

ﬠם־מ ֶשׁה ַויּ ֹאמרוּ

ה ָﬠם

.1 ַו ָיּרֶב

את־ ְיה ָוה׃

מה־ ְתּ ַנוּסּן

ﬠ ָמּ ִדי

מה־ ְתּ ִריבוּן

ֶשׁה מ

ל ֶהם

ל ָמּה ֶזּה

ַויּ ֹא ֶמר מ ֶשׁה

ﬠל־

ה ָﬠם

ַו ָיּ ֶלן ל ַמּ ִים

שׁם ה ָﬠם

.2 ַו ִיּ ְצָמא

בּ ָצּ ָמא׃

ֶאת־ ָבּ ַני ְו ֶאת־מ ְק ַני א ִתי ְו

ל ָה ִמית

ה ֱﬠ ִלי ָתנוּ מִמִּ ְצ ַר ִים

מ ַﬠט

ֶזּה עוֹד ה

ל ָﬠם

מה א ֱﬠ ֶשׂה

לאמר

אל־ ְיה ָוה

ֶשׁה מ

ַו ִיּ ְצ ַﬠק

וּ ְסקָ ֻל ִני׃

From the wilderness of Sin the whole congregation of the Israelites journeyed by stages, as the LORD commanded. They camped at Rephidim, but there was no water for the people to drink.

1. The people **quarreled** with Moses, and said, “Give us water to drink. “Moses said to them,” Why do you quarrel with me? Why do you test the LORD?”
2. (But) the people **thirsted** there for water; and the people complained against Moses and said, “Why did you bring us out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and live- stock with thirst?” So Moses cried out to the LORD, “What shall I do with this people? They are almost ready to stone me” (NRSV).

(I would omit the conjunction “but” from the translation of NRSV.)

If the writer had used SC to begin the second sequence, he would have lost the link with the starting point of the narra- tive. He could therefore only use PC.

The *Redaktionsgeschichte* can explain *why* we find a discus- sion between Moses and the people twice. I explain *how* this is possible: In BH, the writer can double a sequence.

Some other possible examples of this phenomenon include Gen 37:5–6; 42:18–26; Deut 31:22–30.

1. **OVERRIDING ISSUES**
   1. ***THE SAME SYNTAX IN EVERY CONTEXT***

When I started my research I believed, as many scholars did, that Hebrew syntax was different in narration, direct speech and poetry. The result of this research was thus unexpected: one finds the same sequences and the same taxis across these literary contexts.

It is usually held that a difference exists between narration and direct speech for the following reasons:

1. The first sentence of the Bible is interpreted as *in the beginning when God created*. Hence, the first verbal form of the narrative would be a *wayyiqtol* (ֹאמֶר יַּו ).
2. Twelve books in the Bible begin with PC.
3. The use of SC at the beginning of a sequence in narra- tion is considered background information.
4. There are several examples of *wayyiqtol* in narration which become *qatal* in direct speech (Niccacci 1986: 27–30), for

instance Gen 40:2 (narration) ִריסיו ס

שֵׁני

ְרעֹה ﬠל פּ

ו ִיּ ְקצֹף

becomes (direct speech): ָדיו ָב ﬠֲ ַל־ﬠ ַצף ק

ְרעֹה פּ

in Gen 41:10.

Instead, based on the results of my research I can state the following:

1. The first sentence can be understood in a traditional way: “In the beginning God created,” the first verbal form of the narrative is a *qatal* (§ 3.1.3).
2. In most instances, these twelve books represent (or at least they seek to represent) the continuation of a previous book. Hence, PC is not the first verbal form in the narrative chain. However, there are some occurrences of PC as a real absolute beginning, which I explain as a different syntax (§ 6.3).
3. *Qatal* in the beginning of a sequence usually expresses the most important information in the sequence. Hence, it should be considered a foreground form.
4. The *wayyiqtol*s in the above mentioned examples depend on the fact that the actions follow another one and are thus not the first ones in the sequence, while the *qatal*s in direct speech represent the first actions of the sequence.

In other words, there are no strong arguments in favour of two different syntaxes. On the contrary, one finds the same syntactical rules in narration and in direct speech, as is clear in the next example:

Josh 13:1

בּאָת

א ָתּה ָזקַ ְנ ָתּה

אָליו

ַויּ ֹא ֶמר ְיה ָוה בּ ָיּ ִמים

בָּא

ויהוֹ ֻ�שַׁ ָז ֵקן

ב ָיּמִים ְוהָ ָא ֶרץ ִנ ְשׁ ֲא ָרה הַ ְר ֵבּה־מְאד ל ִר ְשׁ ָהּתּ׃

Now Joshua **was old** and **advanced** in years; and the LORD said to him, “You **are old** and **advanced** in years, and very much of the land still remains to be possessed.” (NRSV).

The two couples of SC indicate the same fact that was still true when the LORD spoke. The first is a stative *qatal* and the second a fientive *qatal* without *waw.* The direct speech repeats exactly the same verbal forms and the same word order (sub- ject-verb-verb). The couples of SC are in the foreground; otherwise in the direct speech there would be no foreground action.

* 1. ***OTHER KINDS OF ANALYSIS***

In this short study, I have examined the functions of SC and PC only in simple sequences. In order to correctly understand a text, one should also consider other elements such as word semantics, rhetoric, *Redaktionsgeschichte,* and so on.

For instance, the idiomatic expression “to eat and to drink” (which we have encountered twice in the examples quoted above) should be considered as a hendiadys: “to have a meal.” From a syntactical point of view it is composed of two different successive verbs, but it expresses only one concept (Cohen 2010–2011: 20–21). The same can be said for “to an- swer and to say,” “to speak and to say,” and so on (for a detailed list see Joosten 2012: 167–68). It is useful to recall Waltke and O’Connor’s explanation in this regard:

Another syntactic approach is based on the use of two Hebrew verbs in sequence, corresponding to a verb + ad- verb construction in other languages . . . Examples of such usage are furnished by verbs such שוב and יסף**,** which are often rendered with adverbs such as “again, further, con- tinually,” etc. This syntactic approach to what European languages take as an adverbial function is properly a matter for the Hebrew lexicon; once the pattern is appreciated as an integral part of Hebrew, it requires little grammatical notice (Waltke and O’Connor 1990:656).

In poetry, SC and PC are not only used in sequences, but also in more elaborated constructions such as *chiasms.* These con- structions are able to express more complex meanings such as, for instance, *merismus* (Watson 2007:205). This is a matter of rhetoric.

* 1. ***TOWARD A DIACHRONIC ANALYSIS***

In this study I have only presented a synchronic analysis. Many questions have yet to be answered, issues which require a dia- chronic analysis.

For the moment, in lieu of this type of analysis, I wish to stress one final point: I do not suppose that the “taxis syntax” was the *only* verbal syntax of Standard BH.

The existence of two syntaxes in Standard BH can be detected in the following examples:

Jer 31:29

ֶהי ָנה תּ ְק

בנִים

בֹ ֶסר ְו ִשׁ ֵנּי אָ ְכלוּ

אבוֹת

The parents **have eaten** sour grapes, and the children’s teeth were set on edge.

Ezek 18:2

אבוֹת י ֹא ְכלוּ בֹסֶר ְו ִשׁ ֵנּי הַ ָבּ ִנים תּ ְקהֶי ָנה

The parents **eat** sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.

Jeremy employs the standard pattern SC + PC (without *waw*), whereas Ezekiel uses two PCs in order to express two con- secutive actions.

Isa 37:27

חוּתּ וָבֹוּשׁ

ָיד ק ְצֵרי־

ויֹ ְשׁ ֵביהן

Their inhabitants, shorn of strength, are dismayed and

**confounded** (NRSV). 2 Kgs 19:26

חוּתּ וַ ֵיּבֹוּשׁ

ָיד ק ְצֵרי־

ויֹ ְשׁ ֵביהן

Their inhabitants, shorn of strength, are dismayed and

**confounded** (NRSV).

Isaiah keeps the standard pattern in order to indicate the same state with two verbal forms: SC + SC. 2 Kings employs *way- yiqtol* as an equivalent to *qatal*.

2 Kgs 20:12

מ ֶל�־בָּבֶל

ֹא ַד� בַּ ְל ֲא ָדן בֶּן־בַּ ְל ֲא ָדן שׁ ַלח בְּר

ה ִהיא

בָּ ֵﬠת

כּי חָ ָלה חִ ְז ִק ָיּהוּ

שָׁ ַמע

אל־ִח ְז ִק ָיּהוּ כּי

ס ָפ ִרים וּ ִמ ְנ ָחה

At that time King Merodach-Baladan son of Baladan of Babylon sent envoys with letters and a present to Heze- kiah, for he **had heard** that Hezekiah had been sick (NRSV).

Isa 39:1

ס ָפ ִרים

מ ֶל�־ ָבּ ֶבל

ְל ֲא ָדן בּן־ ַבּ

ֲא ָדן בְּל

ַד� מרֹ

שׁ ַלח

ה ִהוא

תﬠֵ בּ

ח ָלה ַו ֶיּ ֱח ָזק׃

ְז ִק ָיּהוּ ַו ִיְּ ַשׁמע כּי אל־חִ

וּ ִמ ְנחָה

At that time King Merodach-Baladan son of Baladan of Babylon sent envoys with letters and a present to Heze- kiah, for he **heard** that he had been sick and had recov- ered. (NRSV).

In a few instances, the two syntaxes appear side by side:

Ps 22:5b–6a

אֵ ֶלי� ָז ֲﬠקוּ ְו ִנְ ָמלטוּ

בּטְחוּ ַותְּ ַפ ְלּ ֵטמוֹ׃

They trusted, and you **delivered** them. To you they cried, and **were saved** (NRSV).

In the first sentence we see the standard pattern: SC + PC, but in the second we find two SCs used to express two consecutive actions.

Obviously, one could affirm that these examples are simple variants due to the carelessness of copyists. This would open the much broader question as to how much we can rely on the Masoretic text—an issue that clearly cannot be addressed in more detail in this article.

* 1. ***ARE* WAYYIQTOL*, SHORT* YIQTOL *AND LONG* YIQTOL *EQUIVALENT? ARE* QATAL *AND* WEQATAL *EQUIVALENT?***

In chapter 2.4, I hypothesized that *at one point in the development of BH*—possibly due to their similarity—long and short *yiqtol* as well as *wayyiqtol* were used in an analogous way, and the same was true of *qatal* and *weqatal*.

At the same time, however, I have refrained from affirm- ing whether or not they are actually equivalent as far as their semantics are concerned.

If they are not semantically equivalent, the two equiv- alences only concern the categories of coordination and subor- dination and the present inquiry can be considered complete.

If they are semantically equivalent, however, this means that the differences between short and long *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* and between *qatal* and *weqatal* are only phonetic and that the *waw* in the *wayyiqtol* and in the *weqatal* is nothing more than a conjunction (an idea already put forth by Lee 1827: 361).

In order to better explore this extremely important issue, further investigation dealing with the theories of Qimron, Torres Fernández, Bloch, Van de Sande and others would be necessary, an examination which lies beyond the scope of this study.

1. **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

This study presented a collection of empirical data, which appears to illustrate how, in one phase of the Hebrew language, syntax was based on a combination of sequences and taxis*.* This syntax was identical in narrative, direct speech and poetic contexts. SC and PC had different functions in a *past/anterior* sequence and in a *non-past/non-anterior* sequence. In a *past/ante- rior* sequence, SC denoted a co-ordinate element, whereas PC denoted a sub-ordinate element. In a *non-past/non-anterior* sequence, PC denoted a co-ordinate element while SC denoted a sub-ordinate element. Hence, *wayyiqtol* was not equivalent to *qatal* and *weqatal* was not equivalent to *yiqtol.* The historical dif- ferences between short and long *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* and between *qatal* and *weqatal* were lost in this phase.

However, many questions remain unanswered: When did this system begin? When did it end? Where exactly do we find it?

Even the list of syntactical constructions is not complete. In particular, due to lack of space, I did not examine the following instances:

1. Hypothetical constructions.
2. Sequences introduced by a particle such as הנה.
3. Sequences introduced by an infinitive.
4. Purpose clauses.
5. Participle.
6. Deontic PC.

All the same, what has been made clear by this analysis is that BH possessed a refined and sophisticated verbal system through which it was possible to express more than just a few nuances of meaning.

**REFERENCES**

Andersen, D. 2000. The Evolution of the Hebrew Verbal System. *ZAH* 13: 1–66.

Andrason, A. 2010. The Panchronic *Yiqtol*. Functionally Consistent and Cognitively Plausible. *JHS* 10/10.

Andrason, A. 2011a. Biblical Hebrew *Wayyiqtol*: A Dynamic Definition. *JHS* 11/7.

Andrason, A. 2011b. The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in Light of Grammaticalization: The Second Generation. *HS* 52: 19–51.

Andrason, A. 2011c. The BH *Weqatal*. A Homogenous Form with no Haphazard Functions (Part One). *JNSL* 37/2: 1– 26.

Andrason, A. 2011d. Making It Sound – The *Performative*

Qatal and Its Explanation. *JHS* 12/8.

Andrason, A. 2013. An Optative Indicative? A Real Factual Past? Toward a Cognitive-Typological Approach to the Precative *Qatal*. *JHS* 13/4.

Bauer, H., and Leander, P. 1922. *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes.* Tübingen: Niemeyer (repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1991).

Bybee, J., Perkins, R., and Pagliuca W. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Bhat, D.N.S. 1999. *The Prominence of Tense, Aspect, and Mood*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Bloch, Y. 2007. From Linguistics to Text-Criticism and Back: *Wayyiqṭōl* Constructions with Long Prefixed Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew. *HS* 48: 141–70.

Bloch, Y. 2010. The Prefixed Perfective in the Construction ֹל ְקט יִ זאָ and Its Later Replacement by the Long Prefixed Verbal Form: A Syntactic and Text-Critical Analysis. *JNSL* 36/2: 49–74.

Böttcher, F. 1868. *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache*.

Vol. 2. Leipzig: Barth.

Brockelmann, C. 1956. *Hebräische Syntax.* Glückstadt: Neu- kirchener Verlag.

Cohen, E. 2010–2011. את עשו ויבז וילך ויקם וישת ויאכל המקראית בעברית הרצף צורות של משמעותן על :הבכרה (“He ate and drank, and rose and went his way. Thus Esau despised his birthright.” Regarding the meaning of con-

secutive forms in Biblical Hebrew). *Mehqarim b-Lashon* 13: 13–37.

Cook, J.A. 2012. *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expres- sion of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew* (Linguis- tic studies in ancient West Semitic, 7). Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Dahl, Ö. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell. Driver, S. 1892. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and*

*Some Other Syntactical Problems*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ewald, H. 1836. *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament* (trans. Nicholson, J.). London: Williams and Norgate.

Gell, P. 1821. *Observations on the Idiom of the Hebrew Language.*

London: Watts.

Ḥatav, G. 1997. *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing.

Ḥatav, G. 2004. Anchoring World and Time in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Linguistics* 40: 491–526.

Held, M. 1962. *The* Yqtl-Qtl *(*Qtl-Yqtl*) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic*. In: Ben-Horin, M., Weinryb, B.D., and Zeitlin, S. (eds.)*. Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman.* Leiden: E. J. Brill. 281–90.

Hitzig, F. 1833. *Der Prophet Jesaja*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Jenni, E. 1981. *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testa- ments.* Basel: Helbing und Lichtenhahn.

Joosten, J. 1999. The Long Form of the Prefixed Conjuga- tion Referring to the Past in Biblical Hebrew Prose*. HS* 40: 15–26.

Joosten, J. 2002. Do the Finite Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Express Aspect?. *Journal of Ancient Near East Stud- ies* 29: 49–70.

Joosten, J. 2012. *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew. A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose*. Jerusalem: Simor.

Joüon, P. 1923. *Grammaire de l’hébreu biblique*. Rome: Institut biblique pontifical.

Joüon, P., and Muraoka, T. 2006. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SubBi, 27). Rome: Editrice Pontificio Intituto Biblico.

Kautzsch, E. (ed). 1910. *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar* (trans.

Cowley, A.E.). Oxford: Clarendon.

Kuryłowicz, J.K. 1973. Verbal Aspect in Semitic. *Orientalia*

42: 114–20.

Lambdin, T.O. 1971. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.

Lee, S. 1827. *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language*. London: Duncan.

Maslov, J. 1988. Resultative, Perfect and Aspect. In: Nedjalkov, V. (ed.). *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 63–85.

McFall, L. 1982. *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System: Solu- tions from Ewald to the Present Day* (Historic Texts and Inter- preters in Biblical Scholarship, 2). Sheffield: Almond Press.

Meyer, R. 1972. *Hebräische Grammatik. Band III: Satzlehre*. Ber- lin: De Gruyter.

Michel, D. 1960. *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen*. Bonn: Bouvier.

Niccacci, A. 1986. *Sintassi del verbo ebraico nella prosa biblica classica* (SBF Analecta, 23). Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.

Niccacci, A. 1991. *Lettura sintattica della prosa ebraico-biblica. Principi e applicazioni* (SBF Analecta, 31). Jerusalem: Fran- ciscan Printing Press.

Niccacci, A. 2006. Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in Poetry. In: Fassberg, S., and Hurvitz, A. (eds.). *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 247–68.

Qimron, E. 1998. בעברית העתיד צורות לפירוש חדשה הצעה הקדומה (A New Proposal for the Interpretation of Prefix Conjugation Forms in Ancient Hebrew). *Lešonenu* 61: 31– 43.

Rainey, A.F. 2003. The *Yaqtul* Preterite in Northwest Semitic. In: Baasten, M.F.J., and van Peursen, W.R. (eds.). *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor*

*T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (OLA, 118). Leuven: Peeters. 395–407.

Rogland, M. 2003. *Alleged Non-Past Uses of* Qatal *in Classical Hebrew*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Torres Fernández, A. 2013. ‘Tiempo’ y ‘aspecto’ en la conju- gación hebrea (Parte IV-1): Reflexiones de un octagenerio. *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos. Sección Hebreo* 63: 189–225.

Van de Sande, A. 2008. *Nouvelle perspective sur le système verbal de l’hébreu ancien. Les formes \*qatala, \*yaqtul et \*yaqtulu*. Louvain- la-Neuve: Peeters.

Voitila, A. 2001. *Présent et imparfait de l’indicatif dans le Penta- teuque grec. Une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction*. Helsinki: Société d’Exégèse de Finlande, and Göttingen: Vanden- hoeck & Ruprecht.

Wagner, A. 1997. *Sprechakte und Sprechaktanalyse im Alten Tes- tament.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Warren, A. 2002. Modality, Reference and Speech Acts in the Psalms. *Tyndale Bulletin* 53: 149–52.

Waltke, B.K., and O’Connor, M. P. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Watson, W.G.E. 2007. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. New York: T&T Clark.

Zatelli, I. 2004. The Study of Ancient Hebrew Lexicon. Application of the Concepts of Lexical Field and Func- tional Language. *KUSATU (Kleine Untersuchungen zur Spra- che des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt)* 5: 129–59.