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NOTES ON THE LENGTHENED IMPERFECT CONSECUTIVE IN LATE BIBLICAL HEBREW

Ambjörn Sjörs

1.0. Introduction

It is widely assumed that the verb form used in the third-person volitive, i.e., jussive יִקְּטוֹל, is derived from the same verbal grammatical morpheme as the verb form used in the so-called imperfect consecutive, וַיְקַטּול.¹ This assumption is based, among other things, on the morphological identity between the jussive and the imperfect consecutive vis-à-vis the imperfective in certain stems and roots, such as III-ו/y verbs. Compare, for example, the ‘full’ imperfective יִהְיֶה ‘he/it will be’ and the ‘short’ jussive יְהִי ‘let him/it be’ and imperfect consecutive וַיְהִי ‘and he/it was’. In the first person, however, the imperfect consecutive and the volitive, i.e., the cohortative, are usually distinct, at least in the earlier books of the Hebrew Bible according to the Masoretic text.

¹ This investigation is a result of a research project funded by Vetenskapsrådet (The Swedish Research Council), dnr 2016-00206, and Uppsala University. I would also like to express my gratitude to the two anonymous peer reviewers for their remarks on an earlier version of this article, as well as the editors for numerous proofs.
For example, while the imperfect consecutive typically displays short forms whenever they obtain, the cohortative is characteristically lengthened by the so-called paragogic heh after the final radical: compare cohortative ʾeqṭoḥā, imperfect consecutive wāʾeqṭōl, and imperfective ʾeqṭōl. At the same time, paragogic heh is rarely and almost never written when the final radical is either ʾ or w/y (Revell 1988, 419, n. 3), which means that in these cases the cohortative morphologically coincides with the imperfective. Thus, the ʾeqṭol form of a III-w/y verb that displays a non-short form is analysable as either lengthened or full, and, from a formal point view, volitive or imperfective, e.g., אֶרְאֶה ‘may I see’ and ‘I shall see’.

In later forms of Hebrew, in turn, paragogic heh is frequently used also in the first-person imperfect consecutive. For example, in Ecclesiastes and the core Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) books of Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, 59 of 116 examples of the first-person imperfect consecutive are lengthened with paragogic heh (Hornkohl 2014, 162). In the Masoretic Pentateuch, on the other hand, the corresponding numbers are only 4 out of 105. In non-biblical texts from Qumran, in turn, lengthening is determined by word order, so that ʾqṭlḥ is used as a rule in clause-initial position, whether or not preceded by w-, and whether w- is conjunctive or conversive (Qimron 1997, 198).² In other words, the first-person imperfect consecutive is practically always lengthened.

² The Great Isaiah Scroll seems to indicate the existence of different scribal practices. As is well known, 1QIṣa⁵ can be divided into two parts
According to the common explanation, the use in the first-person imperfect consecutive of a verb form that looks like the cohortative is due to analogy with the use of one and the same verb form in the imperfect consecutive and the jussive in other grammatical persons. Indeed, even while the full (or lengthened) form of III-w/y verbs predominates in the first person, only three out of 269 examples are full in the third-person singular and second-person masculine singular in LBH (Hornkohl 2014, 174).

At the same time, the distribution of the first-person imperfect consecutive in LBH is at first sight not homogenous. The books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, for example, provide evidence based on the physical layout of the manuscript (DJD 32/2, 40–41): columns i–xxvii (Isaiah 1–33) and columns xxviii–liv (Isaiah 34–66). Now, the first part of the scroll has the lengthened prefix conjugation on only two occasions (ואמרה 'and I said' [Isa. 6.8, 11]) where the Masoretic text has unlengthened forms (Kutscher 1974, 326). The second part, in turn, evinces the same practice as the non-biblical texts (Qimron 1997, 178), and consistently has lengthened forms after w-. Notably, this distribution between lengthened and unlengthened forms dovetails with the distribution of other orthographic and morphological features. Thus, it is possible that the scribe of the second half of 1QIsa, or the scribe of some source text to it, applied the same principle as found in the non-biblical compositions when handling the morphology of the imperfect consecutive in the first person.

See Bergsträsser (1929, 22) and more recently Hornkohl (2014, 165–70). Lengthening of the imperfect consecutive in Qumran Hebrew may also be viewed in the light of a preference for lengthened lexemes in general, such as מְאָדָה 'much' (MT מְאָד) and שם 'there, thither' (MT שם), see Fassberg (2003).
dence of both lengthened and unlengthened imperfect consecutive. The book of Chronicles, however, displays only unlengthened forms. Japhet (1968, 338) has suggested that the absence of the lengthened imperfect consecutive in Chronicles is indicative of “a normative linguistic principle which is applied in Chr. in contrast to all the other texts of the same period.” Polzin (1976, 54–55), in turn, has noted that the reverse could also be the case, and that the lengthened imperfect consecutive was indiscriminately used as misunderstood archaisms in Ezra and Nehemiah. Polzin (1976, 55) alternatively suggests that the situation may reflect different scribal practices: the tradition underlying the book of Chronicles was uniform and used only the unlengthened imperfect consecutive. The use of both lengthened and unlengthened forms in Ezra and Nehemiah, on the other hand, may be due to a plurality of scribal traditions. The evidence for the imperfect consecutive in other compositions that are usually held to be late is limited. There are three attestations of the first-person imperfect consecutive in Ecclesiastes. Two of them are forms of רָּאָה ‘see’ and are full (Eccl. 4.1, 7). The other verb form is lengthened (Eccl. 1.17). There are six lengthened verb forms in Ps. 119 (55, 59, 106, 131, 147, 158) and one unlengthened (52).

See also Talshir (1988, 174): “[I]t is not unlikely that the difference between Ezra–Neh. and Chronicles reflect[s] at best two different copyists.” See further Revell (1988, 423):

The use of affixed 1st person forms with waw consecutive represents, then, a syntactic or semantic development which was standardized in a post-exilic form of literary Hebrew. It is possible that some parts of the Bible were written in a Hebrew of this sort in which the standardization
The purpose of this study is to analyse the evidence for the first-person imperfect consecutive in Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles and to explain its distribution in the different texts.

2.0. Daniel

There are 25 examples of the imperfect consecutive in the first person in Daniel: two III-三天 verbs without -h, six full III-w/y verbs, one short III-w/y verb, six unlengthened verb forms of other roots, and ten lengthened forms of such verbs, see Table 1 below.6

Table 1: First-person imperfect consecutive in Daniel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Class</th>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>‘Strong’</th>
<th>III-w/y</th>
<th>III-三天</th>
<th>Suffixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On three occasions, paragogic heh is missing from והשמע ‘and I heard’ (Dan. 8.16; 10.9; 12.7), which is conspicuous in view of והשמעה (Dan. 8.13). However, the absence of paragogic heh can presumably be explained as a result of the weakening of of this usage was either less complete than at Qumran, or has been obscured by later change.

Revell also suggests that the distribution of the affixed waw consecutive (the lengthened imperfect consecutive) in Nehemiah is different from the usual division based on content and style, which indicates that it must have arisen in the process of transmission.

6 For III-三天 verbs, see Dan. 8.3 (but cf. והשעמ לה ‘and I lifted’ 4QDan_b f16–18i+19.5 [DJD 16, 266]) and 10.5. For III-w/y verbs, see Dan. 8.2 (2x), 3, 27; 9.4; 10.5, 8.
‘ayin and subsequent assimilation of -ā. This is not entirely uncommon in the Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (Kutscher 1974, 507); see, e.g., אודִָֽיעָה־נָּ֣א (Isa. 5.5) and רְדֵּעָֽה (Isa. 5.19). Assimilation may also be at work in וָׁאֶפְתַּֽח־פִֵ֗י וָׁאֲדַבְרָּ֧ה ‘and I opened my mouth and I spoke’ (Dan. 10.16). In this case, it is the weakening of het that has caused the assimilation of -ā, cf., e.g., נָׁגִָ֥ילָה וְנִשְמְחָָׁ֖ה (Isa. 25.9). This kind of assimilation would at first sight be quite exceptional in Daniel, but finds support in a combination of two hypotheses, namely, that the gutturals first weakened among the educated Hellenised population (Kutscher 1974, 57–60), and that the author or a redactor of Daniel 7–12 was knowledgeable in Greek learning.7

The remaining two unlengthened forms occur in the last verse of Dan. 8:

1. אָנִי דְנַעֲלֵי נִהְיִתִי וְנִחְלֵיתִי יָמִִ֔ים וָׁאָׁק֕וּם וָׁאִֶֽעֱשֶָ֖ה אֶת־מְלֶָּ֣אכֶת הַמֶֶ֑לֶךְ וָׁאֶשְתוֹמֵ֥ם עַל־הַמַּרְאֶָ֖ה וְאֵָ֥ין מֵבִִֽין׃

2. I, Daniel, was exhausted and sick for days. Then I started doing the king’s work. I was appalled by the vision, it was beyond understanding.’ (Dan. 8.27)

Dan. 8.27a includes the only instance of the qal verb קוּם in the Hebrew of Daniel. The verb used for ‘stand (up)’ everywhere else is עָמַד.8 Thus, the use of קוּם, as well as the absence of paragogic

7 The source of the theory of four successive world empires, for example, can be found in Greek historiography; see Niskanen (2004, 27–43).
8 See Kutscher (1982, 84) on the use of עָמַד ‘stand up’ in LBH.
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heh from it, may be explained in light of the construction וָאִֶֽעֱשֶָ֖ה, and the fact that קוּמ is grammatical rather than lexical. In a similar fashion, the use of the short form of רָאָה 'see' in וָאֶשֵָׁ֤א אֶת־עֵינַיִּים וָאִ֔רֶא ‘I lifted my eyes and I saw’ (Dan. 10.5) may result from the formulaic nature of the phrase. Thus, in both examples it appears that the unlengthened verb forms are due to the fixed expressions in which they occur. As such, they are not necessarily generated by the writer’s own language use, but formed by force of habit.

The postscript in Dan. 8.27b, in turn, may be a redactional addition. Since the meaning of the vision has been sought in Dan. 8.15–16 and subsequently been expounded in Dan. 8.20–25, the statement in Dan. 8.27bb, that there was no interpreter (or perhaps ‘I was not understanding’), is contradictory (Hasslberger 1977, 15–17). It is possible, therefore, that Dan. 8.27b was added at a later stage to make a transition from Dan. 1–8 to chapters 9–12 (Kratz 2001, 100–1). This possibility is further corroborated by the use of verbs with the root שָמ in Dan. 8.27ba, which becomes frequent in Dan. 9 (Dan. 9.17, 18, 26, 27).

3.0. Ezra

There are 23 examples of the imperfect consecutive in the first person in Ezra: one III-3 verb with -h (according to the ketiv) and two without it, one full III-w/y verb, 16 lengthened verb forms of other roots, and two unlengthened forms of such verbs. In one
example, the imperfect consecutive is followed by a pronominal suffix.  

One of the two unlengthened verb forms is found in וַנֹּ֛שֶׁב נָשִָ֥ים נָכְרִיָ֖וֹת ‘We have married foreign women’ (Ezra 10.2). This example occurs in direct speech that belongs to Ezra’s third-person narrative and can perhaps be attributed to a different author or redaction than the first-person narrative. Wright (2004, 248–57), for example, suggests that Ezra 10 is the work of a later hand and that it is a secondary expansion of the first-person account. Pakkala (2004, 83–89), on the other hand, assumes that Ezra 10.2 belongs to an original third-person narrative and that the first-person accounts in Ezra 7.27–9.15 are later additions. Whatever the case may be, the use of defective spelling in hifʿil וַנֹּ֛שֶׁב is itself exceptional in LBH, since the hifʿil first-person imperfect consecutive has full consonantal orthography in 17 of 19 examples in Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles (Hornkohl 2014, 160–61). The only exceptions are וַנֹּ֛שֶׁב (Ezra 10.2) and וָׁאַגִָ֣ד ‘and I said’ (1 Chron. 17.10), which is itself distinctive (see below).

The other unlengthened imperfect consecutive is found in the first-person narrative: וַנֹּ֛בָ֖וֹא יְרוּשָׁלֶָּׁם וַנֵּ֥שֶׁב שָָׁ֖ם יָׁמִָ֥ים שְלֹשִָֽׁה ‘We came to Jerusalem and we dwelled there for three days’ (Ezra 8.32). Since Ezra 8.32 is similar to וָׁאָׁבָ֖וֹא אֶל־יְרוּשָׁלֶָּׁם וָׁאֱהִי־שָָׁ֖ם יָׁמִָ֥ים שְלֹשִָֽׁה ‘I came to Jerusalem and I was there for three days’ (Neh. 2.11), it

---

9 For III-ʾ verbs, see Ezra 8.17 (ketiv), 21, and 32. For III-w/y verbs, see Ezra 8.15. For the imperfect consecutive with a pronominal suffix, see Ezra 8.15.
is possible that the verse in Ezra was added at a later stage, during a redactional process in which the texts of Ezra and Nehemiah were combined.

It is also possible that the application of paragogic heh was inhibited by the penultimate stress pattern in והשב (Ezra 8.32) (and יהשב Ezra 10.2) and that it was written without paragogic heh by force of habit. On this assumption, יהשב was not generated by the author or the scribe at the time of writing, but memorised from previous encounters and prefabricated in the lexicon, perhaps on analogy with יהשב ‘and he sat, dwelled’, which occurs more than a hundred times in the Hebrew Bible.

4.0. Nehemiah

The book of Nehemiah is known to have an almost even number of lengthened and unlengthened verb forms (Talshir 1988, 172). However, the verb forms are not distributed evenly in the book; see Table 2.10

10 The counts in the table exclude two instances of qere יהשל for ketiv יהשב in Neh. 5.9 and 7.3. For lengthened verb forms in Neh. 1–4, including a III-ʾ verb, see Neh. 1.4; 2.1, 6, 9, 13. For III-ʾ verbs without paragogic heh, see Neh. 2.1, 2, 9, 11, 15; 4:8. For III-w/y verbs, see Neh. 1.4 (2x); 2.11, 13, 15 (2x); 3.38. For unlengthened verb forms of other roots, see Neh. 1.5; 2.3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 14, 15 (2x), 17, 18, 20 (2x); 4.3 (2x), 7 (2x), 8 (2x), 9, 13. For III-ʾ and III-w/y verbs in Neh. 5.1–7.5 and 12.27–47, see Neh. 5.12; 7.2, 5 (2x); 12.31. For unlengthened verb forms of other roots, see Neh. 5.7; 6.4; 7.1. For lengthened verb forms, see Neh. 5.7 (2x), 8, 13; 6.3, 8, 11, 12; 7.5; 12.31. For III-ʾ and III-w/y verbs in Neh. 13, see Neh. 13.7, 25. For unlengthened verb forms of other roots, see Neh. 13.15, 25. For lengthened verb forms, see Neh.
Table 2: First-person imperfect consecutive in Nehemiah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>‘Strong’</th>
<th>III-w/y</th>
<th>III-_suffixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+h] [-h]</td>
<td>[+h] [-h]</td>
<td>[+h] [-h]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1–7.5; 12.27–47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Williamson (1985), it is generally assumed that the Nehemiah Memoir (Neh. 1.1–7.5; 12.27–13.31) combines at least two different genres.\(^{11}\) One part of the memoir consists of a narrative that relates how Nehemiah repaired the walls of Jerusalem, and has variously been described as a building report (Hurowitz 1992, 118–24) and a court tale (Burt 2014, 120–25). There is some disagreement about which material belongs to this part, but a number of scholars conclude that at least the narrative in Neh. 1–4 belongs here.\(^ {12}\) Notably, these chapters also have the highest

13.7, 8, 9 (2x), 10, 11 (2x), 13, 17 (2x), 19 (2x), 21 (2x), 22, 30. For verbs with pronominal suffixes in the Nehemiah Memoir, see Neh. 1.2; 5.12; 13.11 (2x), 25 (3x), 28.

\(^{11}\) See already Mowinckel (1964, 68–74), who characterised significant portions of the book of Nehemiah as enumeration (*Aufzählung*), but noted that Neh. 1–2 separates itself as an introductory narrative (*Erzählung*).

\(^{12}\) On the basis of Northwest Semitic building inscriptions, Hurowitz (1992, 118–24) classifies the following parts as Nehemiah’s building report: (a) Neh. 1.1–2.8 (the decision to build), (b) Neh. 2.9–20 (preparations), (c) Neh. 3 (description of the building), and (d) Neh. 7.1–5a; 11.1–2; 12.27–43 (dedication rites). Burt (2014, 137) characterises Neh. 1–4 as a foreign court narrative in which the action is propelled by the conflicts among courtiers. Indeed, a number of important events
concentration of the unlengthened imperfect consecutive. Furthermore, Neh. 1–4 is characterised by certain archaic or archaising features, such as the frequent use of יָהִי before time determinations (Neh. 1.1, 4; 2.1; 3.33; 4.1, 6, 9, 10) and the use of the short form in the first-person imperfect consecutive of III-w/y verbs (Neh. 1.4; 2.11, 13, 15 [2x]; Neh. 4.8). Indeed, among 25 examples of the first-person imperfect consecutive of III-w/y verbs in Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, the short form is only found here and in Dan. 10.5 (see above, §2.0).

The other part is not immediately concerned with the building project and is characterised by the occurrences of so-called remembrance formulae, e.g., זָכְרַהּ לְאֵלֹהִי ‘Remember me, my God’ (Neh. 5.19) and זָכְרָּה לָהֶם אֱלֹהֵם ‘Remember them, my God’ (Neh. 13.29), which express Nehemiah’s concern for how he or his enemies should be remembered by God; see also Neh. 6.14; 

in Neh. 1–4 are initiated by the reaction of Sanballat and other enemies (Neh. 2.10, 19; 3.33; 4.1, 9). As Nehemiah becomes governor in chapter 5, however, the story leaves the genre of the court tale and turns into an official memoir (Burt 2014, 125). Neh. 6, in turn, comes back to the genre of the court tale and combines it with features of the memoir (Burt 2014, 135).

13 Introductory יָהִי is also found in Neh. 6.1, 16; 7.1; 13.3, 19. At the same time, it is notably not used before time determinations on four occasions in Neh. 13 (vv. 1, 6, 15, 21).
The remembrance formula has parallels in commemorative votive inscriptions in Aramaic, Akkadian, Egyptian, and Persian and, on the basis of these parallels, it has been suggested that at least Neh. 5 and 13 belong to a genre of Ancient Near Eastern memorial texts (Von Rad 1964; Burt 2014, 108–11).

Now, the remembrance formula in Nehemiah occurs as a retrospective conclusion of shorter episodic units, and it is precisely in these narrative units that most of the examples of the lengthened imperfect consecutive are found. In other words, these units are composed in a style in which the lengthened imperfect consecutive was used as a rule. It is less clear whether the distribution of the lengthened forms can be explained as a function of genre or whether they should be attributed to a different author or redaction. For its part, Neh. 13, in which most

---

14 As shown by Shulman (1996, 65–84) and Fassberg (1999), the so-called lengthened imperative is used when the action of the verb is directed towards the speaker or for the benefit thereof. However, such a meaning does not appear to be present in the lengthened imperative in Neh. 13.29. It rather looks like the verb form is used in imitation of Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH); see Joosten (1999, 156–57).

15 Notably, many of the LBH features discussed by Polzin (1976, 73) are found only in Neh. 5 and 13, such as the plural form עִתִים ‘times’ (Neh. 13.31), reduplication with syndeton for plurality (Neh. 13.24), and the appositional order ‘weighed or measured + weight or measure (+ number)’ (Neh. 5.15).

16 Zahn (2017, 197–99) has argued for the influence of genre on the morphology and orthography in texts found at Qumran, noting that many parabiblical or apocryphal texts are written with the kind of spelling associated with Ezekiel and Jeremiah, rather than according to the so-called Qumran Scribal Practice; see also Tigchelaar (2010, 204).
examples of the remembrance formula are found, may belong to a different author or redaction altogether.\(^\text{17}\) Indeed, Corwin (1909, 47–48) noted long ago, even without referring to the use of the lengthened imperfect consecutive, that Neh. 13 and Neh. 1–7.5 differ on a number of syntactical points.\(^\text{18}\)

Thus, most examples of the lengthened imperfect consecutive are found in coherent units concluded by the remembrance formula, and may belong to an author or redaction different from that of Neh. 1–4.

\(^\text{17}\) Williamson (1985, xxvii–xxviii), for example, suggests that the memoir can be divided into two layers: Nehemiah first wrote a building report in connection to the construction of the wall, and later updated it by adding various paragraphs in a different style. Wright (2004, 323–78) agrees that at least Neh. 13.4–14 is more recent than the rest of the memoir. Pakkala (2004, 212–24), in turn, assumes that all of Neh. 13.4–22 is later.

\(^\text{18}\) One finds, for instance, narrative *qatal* with conjunctive *we-* twice in chapter 13 (vv. 1, 30), but never in chapters 1–7. Likewise, *wayyiqtol* is twice used as an object clause after *אָמַר* ‘say, order’ in chapter 13 (vv. 9, 19), but never in Neh. 1–7. Finally, *liqtol* is used in a circumstantial clause on four occasions in chapter 13 (vv. 7, 13, 27 [2x]), but never in chapters 1–7. Notably, the same modes of expression are common in Chronicles. Chapter 5, in turn, shares with Neh. 13 the use of partitive *מُן* (Neh. 5.5; 13.19, 25, 28) and adverbs of time formed with *לֹ* (Neh. 5.18; 13.6) against the rest of the memoir. Corwin (1909, 50) suggests that these features in Neh. 5 may belong to the Chronicler’s redaction, and also notes that the construction *ad sensum* with a plural verb form before *בֵּיתוֹ* ‘assembly’ (Neh. 5.13b), as well as the use of *לְהָרְבֵה* (Neh. 5.18), are distinctive characteristics of Chronicles; see, e.g., 1 Chron. 29.20; 2 Chron. 29.31 and 2 Chron. 11.12; 16.8, respectively.
In Chronicles there are ten examples of the first-person imperfect consecutive. However, all of these examples occur in passages that have parallels in Samuel and Kings.

The first-person imperfect consecutive of verbs III-\(w/y\) has the full form in both Chronicles and the parallel texts, see וִֽׁאֶהְיֶֹ֛ה ‘and I have been’ (1 Chron. 17.5 || 2 Sam. 7.6), וְאָּׁ֝בְּנֶָּ֣ה ‘and I have built’ (2 Chron. 6.10 || 1 Kgs 8.20). The first-person imperfect consecutive in qal verbs II-\(w/y\), in turn, is spelled with vowel letters in two examples, even when the parallel text in MT Kings has defective spelling; see וָׁאָּק֡וּם ‘and I have arisen’ (2 Chron. 6.10 || וָׁקֵֽם 1 Kgs 8.20) and וָׁאָּשִָ֥ים ‘and I have placed’ (2 Chron. 6.11 || וָׁשֵּׂים 1 Kgs 8.21). This is in accordance with LBH orthographical practice (Hornkohl 2014, 160–61).

At one point, \(wa’eqtol\) in Chronicles corresponds to \(weqatal\) in the parallel verse in MT Samuel: וִֽׁאָּׁ֝קְד ‘and I hereby tell’ (1 Chron. 17.10 || וְהִגִֵ֤יד ‘and he tells’ 2 Sam. 7.11). At present it seems impossible to know whether the reading in Chronicles belongs to the Chronicler’s own creativity, or whether it represents the faithful transmission of an otherwise unknown source text.

---

19 Since there is no evidence for first-person imperfect consecutive of roots III-\(w/y\) in the Chronicler’s independent composition, nothing can be said with certainty about his own usage at this point (Japhet 1968, 335, n. 1). It is significant, however, that the Chronicler shortens the imperfect consecutive of verbs III-\(w/y\) in the second and third person (Japhet 1968, 335–36), e.g., qere וַיִתְאָָ֥֑ו ketiv וַיִתְאַו ‘and (David) yearned’ (1 Chron. 11.17 || וַיִתְאַו 2 Sam. 23.15).
However, the defective spelling of וָׁאַגִָּד points in the latter direction, since the first-person imperfect consecutive in hif‘il has full orthography in 17 out of 19 examples in Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles (Hornkohl 2014, 160–61). The only exceptions are וָׁאַגִָּד (1 Chron. 17.10) and וָׁאַגִָּד (Ezra 10.2; see above, §3.0).

Another example of wa’eqtol occurs in a text that has no parallel in other MT books, but for which the Chronicler’s source can be reconstructed based on other witnesses. Compare:

(2a) וָׁאֶבְחַָּ֣ר בִּירָּ֣וּשָׁלִִַ֔ם לִהְיָ֥וֹת שְמִָ֖ם וָׁאֶבְחַָּ֣ר בְדָׁוִִ֔יד לִהְיָ֖וֹת עַל־עַמִָ֥י יִשְרָּאִֵֽל׃

‘I chose Jerusalem for my Name to be there and I chose David to be over my people, Israel.’ (2 Chron. 6.6)

(2b) וָׁאֶבְחַָּ֣ר בְדָׁוִִ֔יד לִִֽהְיָ֖וֹת עַל־עַמִָ֥י יִשְרָּאִֵֽל׃

‘...and I chose David to be over my people, Israel.’ (1 Kgs 18.6b)

While 1 Kgs 8.16b corresponds to 2 Chron. 6.6b, there is no corresponding material to 2 Chron. 6.6a in the MT of 1 Kings. However, the Old Greek version of 1 Kgs 8.16 and the column width of 4QKgs f7 (DJD 14, 177) presuppose the text of the Chronicler’s transmission. Thus, the absence of the text corresponding to 2 Chron. 6.6a in MT 1 Kgs 8.16 presumably results from homeoteleuton with 1 Kgs 8.16b. In other words, the use of וָׁאֶבְחַָּ֣ר in 2 Chron. 6.6 cannot be ascribed to the Chronicler’s own composition.

At another point, an unlengthened verb form in Chronicles corresponds to a lengthened verb form in the synoptic verse according to the MT; compare וָׁאַכְרִָ֥ית ‘and I have cut off’ (1 Chron. 17.8) and וָׁאַכְרִָ֥תָּׁה (2 Sam. 7.9). It is not impossible, however, that
the Chronicler’s source was different from MT Samuel, so that the difference is merely coincidental. To be sure, disagreement over paragogic heh is found in other synoptic verses in the MT.\textsuperscript{20} Thus, the absence of paragogic heh in וָׁאַכְרִָ֥ית (1 Chron. 17.8), despite its presence in וָׁאַכְרִָ֥תָׁה (2 Sam. 7.9), is not conclusive evidence of the Chronicler’s own perceived rule of language-usage prescription.

6.0. The Non-Past Prefix Conjugation

It was noted in the introduction that the short form of the imperfect consecutive is normally used when it obtains in the third-person singular and second masculine singular. Now, Qimron (1986–1987) has shown that when the prefix conjugation refers to the non-past in LBH, the short form is also frequently used after \textit{wə-}, even when indicative mood is expected, and where \textit{weqatal} would be used in CBH, e.g., וָּאָכְרִָ֥ית מַלְכוּתִ֔וֹ וְתֵחָׁ֕ץ לְאַרְבַָ֖ע רוּחָּ֣וֹת הַשָׁמֶָּׁ֑יִם... ‘As he rises, his kingdom will be broken and divided to the four winds of heaven...’ (Dan. 11.4a). As noted by Joosten (1999, 158) in connection with this example, the verb form וָּאָכְרִָ֥ית may have the same function here as מַלְכוּתִ֔וֹ, and so the use of a short verb form instead of imperfective תִשָׁבֵָּ֣ר should be understood as a pseudo-classicism, i.e., an expression known from classical usage that demonstrates a reanalysis on part of the post-classical author: “The authors of post-classical texts appear to have noted that CBH tends to use the short form following \textit{wəw}, without paying attention to the distinct function expressed by the

\textsuperscript{20} Note, for example, Isa. 37.24 || 2 Kgs 19.23; Ps. 18.24 || 2 Sam. 22.24; Ps. 18.38 || 2 Sam. 22.38; 1 Chron. 21.13 || 2 Sam. 24.14; 2 Sam. 22.50 || Ps. 18.50; 2 Sam. 10.12 || 1 Chron. 19.13.
form." The generalised use of such pseudo-classicisms presupposes a literary standard rather than the idiosyncratic use of an individual author, and shows that pseudo-rules were taught in a school setting to those who became the authors of post-classical literature (Joosten 1999, 156).

A similar case can be made for the distribution of the prefix conjugation referring to the non-past in the first person. The book of Nehemiah includes 16 examples of such verb forms that are not followed by a pronominal suffix and in which the final radical is not ʾ or w/y.21 All verb forms that are non-initial are unlengthened (Neh. 1.8; 2.20; 4.4; 5.12; 6.3; 13.21) and all verb forms that are syndetic with wə- are lengthened (Neh. 5.2 [2x], 3; 6.2, 7, 10). This distribution is in agreement with CBH, where the cohortative and imperfective as a rule are used in initial and non-initial position, respectively.22 Notably, however, there are three

---

21 For III-ʾ verbs, see Neh. 2.7, 8; 4.5; 6.11, 13; 10.38. For III-w/y verbs, excluding two examples with pronominal suffixes, see Neh. 2.17 (2x); 5.2, 12; 6.13. For verb forms with pronominal suffixes, see Neh. 1.9; 2.5; 6.3. In the book of Ezra, there are six examples of the prefix conjugation referring to the non-past in the first person. Two examples involve III-w/y verbs and both are full, in initial (Ezra 4.2) as well as non-initial (Ezra 4.3) position. In another four examples, the verb form is non-initial and unlengthened (Ezra 4.2; 9.10, 14; 10.3). There are six examples of the prefix conjugation referring to the non-past in the first person in Daniel. Two verb forms are syndetic and lengthened/full (Dan. 1.12 [2x]). The other verb forms are non-initial and unlengthened (Dan. 10.20, 21; 11.2; 12.8).

22 See Shulman (1996, 248) regarding the distribution of the cohortative in clause-initial position.
verb forms that are asyndetic but clause-initial, and they are unlengthened, e.g., וַיְאֵמַר נִוָּׁעֵד אֶל־בִֵׂ֨ית הָׁאֱלֹהִִ֜ים אֶל־תָּ֣וֹך הַהֵיכִָׁ֗ל וְנִסְגְרָׁה דַלְתָּוֹת הַהֵיכִָׁ֔ל... ‘He said, Let us meet in the house of the Lord, in the midst of the temple, and let us shut the doors of the temple...’ (Neh. 6.10ba). To be sure, one also finds unlengthened verb forms in clause-initial position in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, e.g., אֶרְדָּפ אַשִָ֖יג ‘I shall pursue, I shall overtake’ (Exod. 15.9), where the full form of אַשִָ֖יג here indicates that such unlengthened verb forms should be parsed as imperfective. It cannot be ruled out that the imperfective is intended in נוּשֵׁה, too, but it is also possible that it is volitive in meaning and coordinated with וְנִסְגְרָה, compare לְכָָׁ֞ה וְנִִִֽֽוָּׁעֲדָָׁ֥ה ‘Come and let us meet’ (Neh. 6.2). Thus, this distribution may reflect a literary standard in which unlengthened verb forms were used in asyndetic position, whether volitive or imperfective, while lengthened verb forms were used after "וַּ-

---

23 See also Neh. 2.18 and 5.12. In fact, the only lengthened clause-initial verb form is followed by -nā, which never occurs after unlengthened verb forms in the first person when the final radical is not ʾ or w/y.

24 See also Gen. 30.31, 32; Deut. 32.41, 42. To be sure, there are very few examples of non-past ʾeqṭḥl that also display the morphology of the short prefix conjugation (Bergsträsser 1929, 21). In qal II-w/y and hifʿil verbs, for example, ʾeqṭḥl regularly displays the morphology of the imperfective even in clause-initial position. In other words, it appears that there is no contrastive opposition between ʾeqṭḥlā and volitive ʾeqṭḥl < āqṭul, but between ʾeqṭḥlā and imperfective ʾeqṭḥl < āqṭulu.
7.0. Conclusions

The literary language of LBH compositions reflects a standard in which the first-person imperfect consecutive is lengthened.

Daniel and Ezra use the lengthened imperfect consecutive as a rule. A few examples of the unlengthened form in Daniel can be explained as the result of assimilation processes after ‘ayin and ḥet. Other times it appears that the author or a scribe resorts to the unlengthened verb form when writing formulaic language (Dan. 8.27a and 10.5). In וַנֵָ֥שֶב ‘and we remained’ (Ezra 8.32) and וַנֵּ֣שֶׂב ‘and we have married’ (Ezra 10.2), in turn, it seems that the author or a scribe falls back on the unlengthened form when stress falls on the penultimate syllable. All these verb forms may have been retrieved whole from the lexicon at the time of writing rather than being subjected to analysis in accordance with the prescriptions of language-usage grammar.

In the Nehemiah Memoir, most lengthened verb forms are found in those memorial texts that conclude with the so-called remembrance formula in chapters 5–6 and 13. The court narrative in Neh. 1–4, in turn, is characterised by the use of unlengthened verb forms. In light of the short forms of III-w/y verbs in these chapters, this may be viewed as a successful imitation of the use in pre-exilic Biblical Hebrew when handling the morphology of the first-person imperfect consecutive. It is less clear whether the distribution of lengthened/full and unlengthened/short verb forms can be explained as a function of different genres or whether they should be attributed to different authors or redactions.
The absence of the lengthened imperfect consecutive from Chronicles cannot be used as evidence for the use of unlengthened verb forms in original LBH literary compositions, because all examples of the imperfect consecutive occur in passages that have parallels in MT Samuel and Kings, and only one example, 1 Chron. 17.8, corresponds to a lengthened imperfect consecutive in the parallel MT text, i.e., 2 Sam. 7.9. Nevertheless, since other synoptic verses in the MT sometimes disagree on the use of paragogic *heh*, it cannot be ruled out that the Chronicler had an unlengthened verb form in his source text.

According to one explanation, the use of the lengthened verb form in the first-person imperfect consecutive in LBH is formed on analogy with the use of one and the same verb form in the imperfect consecutive and the jussive in other grammatical persons. Alternatively, lengthening may have been introduced in order to maintain a distinction between the syndetic imperfective and imperfect consecutive, which presumably had coincided in their pronunciation. Such a formation does not, however, result from a natural development in spoken language. On the contrary, the use of the lengthened imperfect consecutive may reflect a generalised pseudo-classicism of a literary standard that developed in the Second Temple Period.
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