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In this paper I shall make a typological comparison between the Biblical Hebrew ‘consecutive’ forms we qaṭal and wa yyiqiṭol and verbal forms expressing discourse dependency in Neo-Semitic and various non-Semitic languages. In particular I shall be concerned with the insights these typological parallels may give us into the possible historical background and development of the Hebrew forms. It is becoming increasingly recognised that language typology is an important tool for assessing and enlightening the study of historical linguistic change (Shields 2010; Pat-El 2020).

The paper is organised as follows. §1.0 presents the comparative data, with a particular focus on discourse dependent verbal forms in Neo-Aramaic. In §2.0 and §3.0 I examine the Biblical Hebrew consecutive we qaṭal and wa yyiqiṭol, respectively, in the
light of these parallels. This is followed by a concluding discussion concerning the coding of discourse dependency.¹

1.0. Discourse Dependency in Neo-Semitic

In some Neo-Semitic languages certain forms of verb are used to signal that the predicate of the clause they occur in continues in some way the preceding discourse. This continuation is typically either temporal sequence or some kind of elaboration, and is referred to here by the generic term ‘discourse dependency’.

In this section I shall focus in particular on verbal forms expressing discourse dependency in Neo-Aramaic dialects. I have presented a detailed study of this phenomenon in Neo-Aramaic in a recent paper (Khan 2021) and here I shall give only a brief overview.

1.1. Future and Discourse Dependent in Neo-Aramaic

In many North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA) dialects future events are expressed by a construction with the form baṭ-qatāl. This consists of a preverbal element baṭ, which is a grammaticalised and phonetically reduced volitional verb ‘he wants to’, followed by a verb form that is historically an active participle but now functions as a subjunctive. In normal fast speech the baṭ-element generally undergoes further phonetic reduction. In addition to expressing the future in main clauses, both a deontic fu-
ture expressing intention (e.g., ‘I shall go’) and an epistemic predictive future (e.g., ‘he will go’), the form is used in the apodosis of conditional constructions, e.g.,

(1) ʾən-kpîn-ni, | t-axlôn-ne.

if-hunger.Pfv-1s fut-eat.sbjv.1ms-3ms

‘If I am hungry, I shall eat.’ (A23:5)

In conditional constructions such as (1), the apodosis with the bêt-qatêl form is dependent syntactically on the preceding protasis. The bêt-qatêl form is sometimes used outside of conditional constructions in clauses that are more loosely dependent on the preceding discourse. Various types of such discourse dependency are attested. In some cases the form expresses events that are temporally sequential to what precedes (2). In many cases, however, the form does not express temporal sequentiality, but only some kind of relevance to a preceding clause, typically elaboration (3):

(2) báθwér ʾéda ʾgôra | ... ṭ̄enha | ṭ̄ēdôt ʾsulāqa.

after festival big there.is festival.of ascension

xārdâl | t-áθe | xáʾeḍa ʾxréna zôra, | afterwards fut-come.sbjv.3ms one-festival other small

y-amrîle ṭ̄ēdôt ʾmusarâde.

hab-say.ipfv festival.of musarde

‘After the Great Festival … the festival of Ascension takes place. … Afterwards comes a small festival, which is called musarde.’ (B6:5–8)

(3) báwθwê Ninwàyê ʾáp-ʾày ʾîtwâ.

petition.of Ninevites also-it.3ps there.was
The Rogation of the Ninevites was also observed (in our community). They would fast during it. **They would say** (concerning this) “The cocks and the chickens, and also the small lowly creatures (should observe the fast).” (B16:15)

When the *bət-qətal* form has this discourse dependency function, it generally expresses habitual events, as is the case in the examples above. The construction, however, is sporadically used in narratives, where it refers to specific events that are dependent on, and typically sequential to, what precedes, e.g.,

(4) ʾárbe máxe l-ḡḍāde, | ṭ-ázi
sheep strike.sbjv.3ms to.each other fut-go.sbjv.3pl  
xa-fatra | ʾal-salīqā zōrna,l máxe zōrna
a-while on-tune.of pipe strike.sbjv.3ms pipe  
xa-salīqa xēnā,l ʾárbe b-dēri,l b-ganēy,l
one-tune other sheep fut-return.sbjv.3pl by-themselves  
‘He gathered the sheep together **and they went off** for a while according to the tune of the pipe. He played another tune on the pipe **and the sheep returned** by themselves.’ (A25:27)

Following the temporal analysis proposed by Reichenbach (1947), we should be careful to distinguish event time (E), speech time (S), and the temporal reference time (R). Reichenbach’s
original system has undergone various modifications in more recent research, but the ‘neo-Reichenbachian’ approaches still distinguish these three components of analysis. The reference time (R), sometimes referred to as the ‘evaluation time’ (Hatav 2012), is the contextual temporal anchor to which the future verb form relates. One may say that the future form is temporally ‘bound’ to this anchor (Hatav 2012). According to a Reichenbachian system of temporal analysis, in future constructions in main clauses and in apodoses the event time (E) is posterior to the reference time (R), which can be represented R—E. In the case of the future function, the reference time overlaps with speech time (S), i.e., the contextual temporal anchor is the speech situation. This can be represented R,S—E. For the בַּת-קָטַּל form in the apodosis of conditional constructions, however, the reference time is that of the eventuality expressed in the protasis clause. In such cases the בַּת-קָטַּל form expresses an eventuality that is posterior to this reference time, but this reference time does not necessarily overlap with speech time. It is important to note that the reference time in these various constructions has different locations. In the future constructions the reference time is internal, i.e., it coincides with the utterance of the clause. The reference time of the verb of the apodosis, however, is external to the clause and is located in the preceding protasis clause.

I have argued (Khan 2021) that the discourse dependency habitual function of בַּת-קָטַּל developed by extension of its use in apodosis clauses. The habitual meaning of the discourse dependent בַּת-קָטַּל form most likely arises from a retention of the contingent semantics of a conditional apodosis.
1.2. Narrative Subjunctive in Neo-Aramaic

In some NENA dialects the subjunctive form of the verb is used in narratives as a perfective sequential form. It typically continues an event or events that are expressed by a narrative past verbal form, e.g.,

C. Barwar

(5) ꞌáp ꞌaw-léle xéna qìmla,₁ sá’et ṭáth a
also that-night other rise.pfv.3fs hour.of three
b-lèl e,₁ šáry a bănúd a diy a,₁ ꞌu-’áz a
at-night untie.sbjv.3fs bands.her of.her and-go.sbjv.3fs
ẖála xá-brona xéna ꞌu-dér a,₁
eat.sbjv.3fs one-son other and-return.sbjv.3fs
dám x a,₁ páθ xa tār a,₁ dám x a
sleep.sbjv.3fs open.sbjv.3fs door sleep.sbjv.3fs
gu-duḍi y a,₁
in-cradle

‘Also the next night she got up, at three o’clock in the morning, untied her bands, went and ate another child, then returned and went to sleep. She opened the door and went to sleep in the cradle.’ (A18:5–6)

This construction is predominantly used to express perfective events in narrative, but sporadically the subjunctive form is used as a sequential habitual:

C. Barwar

(6) ꞌu-máxa xa-mósxa gu-be-’àné diye₁
and-put.sbjv.3pl one-oil in-place.of-eyes.his of.him
ʾoðí-le rūšma ʾax-šliwa.1
do.sbjv.3pl-3ms sign like-cross
‘And they put some oil on his forehead and make the sign of the cross.’ (B6:36)

I argued (Khan 2021) that the narrative subjunctive qatṭal form is a modal subjunctive, which has been extended from its use in subordinate clauses, in particular, purpose clauses. Constructions that are used to express purpose are also used as result clauses, i.e., they express the result of a preceding action. Such result clauses appear to have developed from the common implicature of purpose clauses that the event took place, especially after verbs of movement, e.g., I went to buy some bread has the implicature that I did in fact buy bread (Schmidtke-Bode 2009, 178). This conventionalisation of an implicature as the expression of a real event that is reflected in result clauses is likely to have been the pathway of development also of dependent narrative subjunctive forms.

1.3. Elsewhere in Semitic and Beyond

Within Semitic one can find some parallels to the discourse dependent forms of NENA. Owens (2018) argues that the preverbal particle b- that is found in a variety of Arabic dialects originates in the deontic verb bağa ‘to want’ (cognate with Aramaic ba’e). What is of interest is that, although it has retained its deontic or modal sense in some dialects of the Gulf, in other dialects it has developed into an indicative (e.g., Levant). The missing link, Owens claims, is its use in Nigerian Arabic to express what he calls
‘propositional adjacency’, which corresponds to what I call here discourse dependency.

The indicative preverbal particle *ka-* in Moroccan Arabic appears to have its origin in the modal use of the auxiliary verb *kân* in conditional clauses (Corriente 1977, 140–41; Stewart 1998, 111–12; Hanitsch 2019, 256–58). This also, therefore, may have followed a similar pathway of development as NENA *bat-qatâl*.

Tsukanova (2008) has identified the use of dependent subjunctive forms containing the modal auxiliary *čân* in Gulf Arabic as a continuative form in narratives.

Parallels to such discourse dependent verbal forms have been documented in a variety of languages outside of Semitic. Numerous languages of Africa have special verbal forms for the expression of continuity in discourse. These are used, for example, for the chaining of clauses in narratives and descriptions of habitual procedures. This continuity may be temporal sequence or elaboration. Such forms are often identical to forms that express modal subordination in subordinate clauses and so have been referred to as narrative subjunctives (R. Carlson 1992; Seidel 2015, 180). In some African languages the consecutive forms can be used independently of preceding discourse as a future or modal form denoting an unrealised action (e.g., Seidel 2015, 186). Historical reconstructions of Oceanic languages have

---

2 Verbal forms of this type in numerous African languages are discussed in the papers of the volume edited by Payne and Shirts (2015). See also Palmer (1986, 204–7), Longacre (1990), and Persohn (2017, §7.1).
revealed connections between narrative continuity devices and future verbal forms (Lichtenberk 2014).

English habitual constructions containing the auxiliary would also furnish a possible typological parallel. It has been observed that such habituals have a similar dependency on situations established in the context (by a preceding clause or time adverbial), e.g., Carlson and Spejewski (1997) and Boneh and Doron (2013), who refer to this as ‘modal subordination’. A habitual sentence used to, on the other hand, has no such dependency. In a description of habitual events used to may be employed in the first clause, whereas would is felicitous only in subsequent clauses, e.g., My grandmother used to make delicious apple pies. She would go to the orchard to pick the apples herself (adapted from Carlson and Spejewski 1997, 102).

2.0. Biblical Hebrew Consecutive weqaṭal

The historical development and function of the consecutive weqaṭal of Biblical Hebrew appears to parallel very closely that of the NENA bêt-qaṭal form. It has already been proposed by several scholars that the construction had its historical origins in Northwest Semitic conditional constructions (Smith 2009, 6–15). In the El-Amarna documents the suffix conjugation with future meaning is mostly restricted to conditional constructions. It is attested in the apodosis, which is normally preceded by the connective u (Rainey 1996, II:358–62; Baranowski 2016b, 173–78). According to Moran (1961, 64–65) this represents the closest semantic and syntactic antecedent to Biblical Hebrew future weqaṭal. The same applies to Ugaritic, where clear cases of w +
the suffix conjugation with a future meaning are restricted to the apodosis of conditional clauses or semantically related contexts (Sivan 1998, 92; Tropper 2000, 716–17). Similarly, future uses of the suffix conjugation in contexts of a conditional type are found also in Phoenician and Punic (Krahmalkov 1986). Elsewhere in Central Semitic one may compare this to the use of the qatala form in Arabic in conditional constructions, e.g., ʾin faʿalta dālika halakta ‘If you do that, you will perish’ (W. Wright 1898, 15).

In Biblical Hebrew weqāṭal with a future meaning is frequently used in the apodosis of conditional constructions:

(7) אֲמִרֵיהַ לְעַמִּים בְּבֵית יְהוָה בּוֹעֵשׁ לְעַמִּים היא אֲשֶׁר הָעָם הַזֶּה להָעָם הַזֶּה אָלַמְרוּ בֵּין מִלְּךָ יְהוּדָּה וַיהֲרָג יְהוָה וְשָבוּ אֶל־רְחַבְעָם מֵלךְ יְהוּדָּה׃

‘If this people go up to offer sacrifices in the house of the LORD at Jerusalem, then the heart of this people will turn again to their lord, to Rehoboam king of Judah, and they will kill me and will return to Rehoboam king of Judah.’ (1 Kgs 12.27)

The use of a past form to denote possible future events in conditional constructions in other Northwest Semitic languages and Arabic expresses contingent possibility rather than past time reference. The apodosis is modal. The modality has various parameters. It can be identified as including epistemic modality, in

---

3 The topic–comment type of constructions cited by Krahmalkov as examples of future we-qatal are semantically close to conditional constructions; cf. Haiman (1978) and Ebert et al. (2014).
that it involves judgement about the factual status of the proposition (Palmer 2001, 8). The contingency and dependence of the apodosis can be referred to as ‘contingent modality’.  

The two main meanings of the Biblical Hebrew consecutive weqatal outside of conditional constructions are dependent/serial future (8)–(11) and habitual (12)–(15):

(8) וְכִֽי־י רְאֵ֥ת תָּךְׂ֙֙֙ הַמִּצְרִּ֣ים וְאָמְרָ֖וּ אֶת־כָּל־אֲדָמָֽה...  
‘When the Egyptians see you, they will say “This is his wife,” and they will kill me...’ (Gen. 12.12)

(9) וַי ִ֤אמֶר דָּוִ֙ד֙ ל־שָאִַ֔וּל אַל־י פָּלֵ֔ל עָלָָ֑יו עַבְדְךָ֣יֵלִֵַ֔ךְ וְנַ לְחַָ֖ם עָם־הַפְל שְֽ֔יָה׃  
‘And David said to Saul, “Let no man’s heart fail on account of him; your servant will go and will fight with this Philistine.”’ (1 Sam. 17.32)

(10) רַַ֚ק אֵין־י רְאֶַ֣ת אֱלֹה ִַ֔ים בַּמָ֔קָוֹם הַז ָ֑ה וַהֲרָגָ֖וּנ י֙ עַל־דְבַָ֥ר א שְתִֽי׃  
‘But there is no fear of God in this place and they will kill me because of my wife.’ (Gen. 20.11)

(11) וְהָנ  שְאָר ֶ֣ים בָּכ ִַ֔ם וְהֵבִֵ֤את י֙ מֵעַרְכָ֛ה ב לְבָבִַָ֔ם בְאַרְצ ָ֖ת א יְבֵיה ָ֑ם...  
‘As for those of you who may be left, I will bring weakness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies...’ (Lev. 26.36)

(12) וְאֵָ֖ד יִַֽעֲלֵה מַן־הָאָָ֑רּוֹנ וְה שְׁקָָ֖ה א ת־כָל־פְנִֵֽי־הִָֽאֲדָמִָֽה׃  
‘A mist used to go up from the earth and would water the whole face of the ground.’ (Gen. 2.6)

4 This is the term used by Cook (2012, 250) and Robar (2015, 146) to refer to the modality of conditional constructions.
'And all the flocks would gather there, and they would roll the stone from the mouth of the well, and they would water the sheep, and they put back the stone in its place on the mouth of the well.' (Gen. 29.3)

'Seraphim stood above Him, each having six wings; with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew. And one would call out to another and would say “Holy, Holy, Holy, is the LORD of hosts. The whole earth is full of His glory.”’ (Isa. 6.2–3)

‘Do you steal, murder, and commit adultery,… then you come and stand before Me in this house...?’ (Jer. 7.9–10)

Although there has been recognition of the historical origin of consecutive weqatal in conditional constructions, as far as I am aware, no model that satisfactorily explains such a historical development has been proposed. I shall argue here that the development could be explained using the model of construction grammar, whereby linguistic change takes place through cognitive schematisation of constructions (e.g., Langacker 1987; Fillmore, Kay, and O’Connor 1988; Goldberg 1995, 2006; Bybee 2010). Such change involves extensions of components of a particular construction with a particular linear structure by a process of substituting items with a semantic resemblance or association, thereby making the slots of the components more schematic, i.e., abstract. Another feature of the extension of constructions is their
incorporation of pragmatic associations and implicatures into their meaning (Bybee 2010, 48). An example of this process of extension of constructions that is often cited (e.g., Bybee 2010, 55; 2015, 124) is the development of future constructions consisting of movement verbs, e.g., English *he is going to eat*. This originated as a construction that expressed real physical movement of an animate agentive subject, but it became schematised as `subject + be + going to + verb`, whereby any subject or verb could fill the subject or infinitive slots adjacent to the substantive core `going to`. Moreover, when used in the third person, although it originally expressed an intention, it implied that the predicate would be carried out. This implicature became conventionalised in the construction and so its meaning was extended to include prediction, e.g., *The branch is going to fall*.

The distribution of *weqaṭal* reflects a variety of schematisation.

In a context such as (8), in which the *weqaṭal* form follows a subordinate temporal clause, we may say that the construction of the conditional apodosis has been extended to verbs expressing events that are presupposed to take place, while retaining the reference time of the verb in the preceding clause and so expressing temporal sequentiality. In example (9) the *weqaṭal* expresses an event that is future relative to that expressed by the verb in the preceding clause. Here too, therefore, its reference time is in the preceding clause.

In a context such as (10) the temporal reference point of the apodosis that was in the preceding protasis clause has been schematised to being a more abstract cognitive reference point,
referring to the general situation rather than specifically to a point in time. The weqatal predication, therefore, is cognitively, but not necessarily temporally, bound to this preceding point. It is linked to it through discourse coherence analogous to a topic-comment relationship. This does not mean that the topical situation itself may not have a reference time, but rather the weqatal form no longer expresses temporal posteriority to this reference time, but rather communicative posteriority to the more abstract topical situation, i.e., topical reference point-comment. This is seen clearly in a context such as (11), in which the weqatal clause is a comment on a preceding topical entity rather than on a situation expressed by a proposition. In (10) and (11) the weqatal form has a future time reference, and so the event time is posterior to the reference time (R—E), but its reference point is internal to the clause and is not situated in the preceding clause as in a conditional construction or in a construction such as (8). This distinction is referred to by Hatav (2012) as local versus long distance temporal binding of tenses. As with contexts such as (8) and (9), so in (10) and (11), the contingent element of the conditional apodosis has been lost. Examples such as (10)–(11), therefore, have retained the future of the apodosis, but lost the long distance temporal binding and the contingency of the apodosis.

The habitual use of weqatal seen in (12)–(15), which prima facie may seem furthest from the original function of the qatal form in a conditional apodosis, can also be explained as having arisen by schematisation of the conditional construction. As we have seen, there is a typological parallel for this in the habitual
discourse dependent \textit{bət-qəṭal} form of NENA. In such cases the contingent feature of the verb of the apodosis has been retained, whereas the future time reference has been lost.

The habitual meaning of the discourse dependent \textit{weqəṭal} form arises from this retention of the contingent semantics of a conditional apodosis. Verbs expressing habituality present an event as a characterising property of an individual, which occurs on the majority of occasions during a particular time interval (\textit{he usually visits us every week}). Habitual predicators are not completely “lawlike” (Dahl 1985, 97) and are contingent on circumstances (\textit{he usually visits us every week, but he did not come last week because he was ill}).\(^5\) A habitual predicate is imperfective in aspect since it includes the reference time within it and is only partially viewed from within (G. Carlson 2012, 835). Habituality should be distinguished from iterativity. Verbs expressing iterativity assert the occurrence of the event on multiple occasions, typically specified by an adverbial (\textit{he visited us three times; he visited us every day}). Such predicates are perfective and express repeated temporally bounded events that are not contingent on circumstances (Dahl 1985, 97; G. Carlson 2012, 835). Iterative uses attributed by some scholars to \textit{weqəṭal} are best interpreted as habitual, especially if they are translated with English \textit{used to} or \textit{would}, which are incompatible with the iterative, e.g.,\(^6\)

\begin{equation}
\text{וְעָלָה הָאָ֡ישׁ הַהֹ֣וּא מִֵֽעַ יָמִּ֔ים לְהַשְׁתַּכְוִֹׁ֧ת וְלַזְבָּ֛ח לְהוָָ֥ה צְבָאָ֖וֹת בְּשִׁלְׁחָ֣ה (16)}
\end{equation}

\(^5\) Cf. the remarks of Joosten (1992), who sees a connection between the non-indicative modality of \textit{weqəṭal} and habitual aspect.

\(^6\) Contra, e.g., Joosten (1992; 2012, 305), who uses the term ‘iterative’.
‘And this man used to go up from his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice to the LORD of Hosts in Shiloh.’ (1 Sam. 1.3)

In some cases, habitual consecutive weqataš forms are temporally sequential to what precedes, e.g., (13). In such cases the temporal structure of the verb would include the reference point of the preceding clause, as a verb does in an apodosis, as well as a local reference point coinciding with the event. This can be represented $R_1—R_2,E$, i.e., the event is located at reference time $R_2$ in relation to reference time $R_1$.\(^7\) In examples such as (14), in which the habitual weqataš is not temporally sequential to what precedes, the long distance temporal reference point of the original apodosis has been schematised to a cognitive topical reference point. Most cases of habitual weqataš have past time reference, but some examples are attested of weqataš expressing present habituals (GKC, §112m), e.g., (15). It appears that the time reference of habitual verbs was relative rather than absolute, i.e., it was determined by the context and not a component of its meaning. In this respect it would correspond to the relative time reference of habitual yiqtol.

The various schematisations of the conditional construction can be represented thus ($R =$ reference time, $E =$ event time, $T =$ topic):

\(^7\) For the possibility of a verb having two reference points see Comrie (1985, 128).
Table 1

| What precedes  |  
| weqāṭal  |
|---|---|
| conditional | R—E (future, contingent) | Example (7) |
| future (1) | R—E (future) | Examples (8), (9) |
| future (2) | T—R—E (future) | Example (10), (11) |
| habitual (1) | R₁—R₂,E (contingent) | Examples (12), (13), (15) |
| habitual (2) | T—R,E (contingent) | Example (14) |

As can be seen, all schematisations retain some specific semantic element of the weqāṭal in the apodosis of the conditional construction.⁸

As for why the discourse dependent qaṭal occurs only after waw, this can be explained also within the framework of construction grammar. The conditional construction that forms the basis of the schematisation was specifically protasis + waw + qaṭal. This had the advantage of containing a connective waw, which made the apodosis suitable for reanalysis as a consecutive clause in discourse. Moreover, it was by far the most frequent ordering of these elements in conditional constructions containing such waw of apodosis, as was the case also in the predecessors of the construction in earlier Northwest Semitic languages. The

⁸ The discourse dependence of weqāṭal can also be represented in the dependency framework of mental spaces proposed by Fauconnier (1994) and Dinsmore (1991). According to this model, knowledge can be represented in a network of mental spaces. These spaces are constructed by the listener/reader, interpreting grammatical or lexical cues. Spaces contain information belonging to distinct times, locations, or realities. For mental spaces in Biblical Hebrew discourse see Robar (2015, 31–33).
string *waw* + *qaṭal* remained the substantive core of the construction. This core underwent semantic but not syntactic schematisation, analogously to the phrase *going to* in the future construction in English (see above). It was the substantive invariable ‘chunk’ that had become consolidated and ‘en-trenched’ in the construction, facilitated by frequent repetition (Bybee 2010, 34–37). The NENA parallel construction with *ḥet qaṭal* did not include a connective. The explanation is likely to be that in NENA discourse connectives between clauses in discourse are far less regular than in Biblical Hebrew.

On a number of occasions *weqaṭal* is used as a narrative past perfect. This is found not only in Late Biblical Hebrew (Cohen 2013, 84–86), but also in earlier books. In some cases the *weqaṭal* may be regarded as a later insertion on text-critical grounds (e.g., 1 Kgs 20.27, where the *weqaṭal* verb is not represented in the LXX). Several cases, however, are consecutive in function and on text-critical grounds do not appear to be later insertions, e.g.,

(17) יִשָּׂ֣מָּהוּ מֵאֶֽשֶרֶּ֑מְיֹם מַהְיִֽהְיוּ לֵֽיוֹרְשֵׁלֶֽםְ בְּשֵׁמֵֽהּ קֹדֶֽהוּ וּבֵֽית־אֶֽל׃

‘And the king **commanded** (*wayyiqtol*) Hilkiah, the high priest, and the priests of the second order, and the keepers of the threshold, to bring out of the temple of the **LORD** all the vessels made for Baal, for Asherah, and for all the host

---

9 The habitual function of *weqaṭal* is only sporadically attested in Late Biblical Hebrew (Cohen 2013, 203–7).
of heaven; and **he burned them** *(wayyiqtol)* outside Jerusalem in the fields of the Kidron, and **he carried** *(weqatal)* their ashes to Bethel.’ (2 Kgs 23.4)

Such *weqatal* forms have been interpreted as past perfective uses of the construction that unexpectedly break a chain of *wayyiqtol* narrative forms in order to express climactic events (Longacre 1994; van der Merwe 1994, 28; Robar 2015, 152–59). The range of functions of the NENA parallel form *bot-qatal*, however, could open our mind to another possible interpretation of some such uses of *weqatal*. As has been indicated above, the NENA discourse dependent *bot-qatal* form is attested occasionally in narratives, e.g., (4), repeated below as (18), within a past perfective context. The clauses with *bot-qatal* forms cohere together with the immediately preceding clauses. Each pair of cohering clauses express subevents of the same overall event:

(18) ʾérbe máxe l-góðåðe,| t-ázi
sheep strike.sbjv.3ms to-each.other fut-go.sbjv.3pl

xa-fatraʾ al-saliqə zòrna.| máxe zòrna
a-while on-tune.of pipe strike.sbjv.3ms pipe

xa-salíqa xèna,| ʾérbe b-dèri,| b-ganëy.| one-tune other sheep fut-return.sbjv.3pl by-themselves

‘He gathered the sheep together and they went off for a while according to the tune of the pipe. He played another tune on the pipe and the sheep returned by themselves.’ (A25:27)

Such *bot-qatal* forms mark the closure and climax of the preceding event and disrupt the flow of the narrative. It is, therefore,
a strategy to signal discontinuity.\textsuperscript{10} The form is an imperfective habitual, but is used in a perfective context in narrative. Its lack of temporal boundaries is exploited to disrupt the chain of perfective temporally bounded events. This strategy of using imperfectives in narratives has been identified in various other languages, e.g., the ‘narrative imperfect’ of French (Carruthers 2012, 312–15) or narrative habituals in African languages (Schaefer and Egboh 2015, 310). In this light, weqātāl forms in contexts such as (17) in Classical Biblical Hebrew could be identified as consecutive habitual weqātāl forms rather than instances of perfective weqātāl forms. As is the case with narrative habitual bēqaṭāl forms in NENA, these habitual weqātāl forms disrupt the flow of narrative by removing temporal boundaries in order to signal closure and climax of discourse segments. This can have the effect of marking an event as a subevent cohering with what precedes, embedded in the higher-level narrative chain.\textsuperscript{11} The act of burning and the act of carrying the ashes cohere together as two subevents of the same overall event, the closure of which is marked by the weqātāl form. Further support for this argument can be adduced from the fact that the yiqtol form is sometimes used with the same function in narrative contexts when the verb is preceded by a clause argument, e.g.

\textsuperscript{10} For discontinuity strategies in Biblical Hebrew see Robar (2015, 148–49). For possible imperfective interpretations of narrative weqātāl see Hornkohl (2013, 261, 288).

\textsuperscript{11} For embedding of units in the narrative chain see Robar (2015, 74–75).
He rose and struck down the Philistines until his hand was weary, and his hand clung to the sword. And the Lord brought about a great victory that day, and the men returned (yiqtol) after him only to strip the slain.’ (2 Sam. 23.10)

3.0. Biblical Hebrew Consecutive wayyiqtol

The consecutive wayyiqtol form is normally thought to be a vestige of an old past yaq tul form, which can be found in earlier forms of Northwest Semitic, such as the Tell Amarna Canaanite texts and Ugaritic, and in East Semitic. Some possible examples of this use of an old past yaq tul without waw have, moreover, been identified in early poetic layers of Biblical Hebrew, e.g. יָצֵב ‘he fixed’ (Deut. 32.8) (Notarius 2013, 78). In this paper I do not want to engage with the question of the identity and status of this past yaqt ul form in ancient Northwest Semitic and beyond, but rather I shall focus on the consecutive wayyiqt ol form as it appears in the Masoretic Text and the form of the construction that has been transmitted in the Tiberian vocalisation tradition.

For references to the literature see the survey in Robar (2015, 78–79).

Different views have been expressed in the literature as to whether there were originally two distinct yaqt ul forms expressing past and jussive, distinguished, according to some, by stress position (e.g., Hetzron 1969; Rainey 1986), or whether there was only one morpheme expressing both functions (Huehnergard 1988).
I shall argue that although the scholarly consensus is undoubtedly correct that its roots go back to an old past *yaqtul* form, in Classical Biblical Hebrew prose it came to be reanalysed as a schematised extension of a dependent jussive form.\(^{14}\) The typological parallel to the consecutive *wayyiqtol* in NENA is the NENA narrative subjunctive (see §1.2), which was a subordinate verbal form used to express discourse coherence. As we have seen, the NENA narrative subjunctive was an extension of the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses, in particular purpose clauses. The Hebrew *wayyiqtol* form results from the reanalysis of the old Semitic past *yaqtul* as a jussive specifically in discourse dependent contexts. This was facilitated by its formal similarity to jussives and the syntactic similarity of such discourse dependent contexts to constructions with jussives in dependent purpose clauses. This similarity of form, construction, and dependent function led to the distinction between jussives and *yiqtol* past

\(^{14}\) Robar (2013; 2015, 78–112) is one scholar who has found the notion that *wayyiqtol* is past perfective problematic. She insightfully adduces arguments against the view that it has a past perfective core meaning. Her thesis is that it is a narrative present form that takes its time reference from the context. She has drawn attention to parallels in the Neo-Aramaic narrative *qatal* form in the Barwar dialect, which I interpreted as a narrative present in my grammar (Khan 2008), and also to parallels in several African languages that have narrative forms without specified tense. My interpretation of the Barwar narrative *qatal* has since, however, shifted and I now consider it to be a narrative subjunctive in the light of my work on other dialects. The relevant parallels in African languages for me are now those languages that use modal subjunctive forms as narrative forms (R. Carlson 1992).
becoming opaque and to the reanalysis of the *yiqtol* past in this context as a schematised extension of a jussive.

The reanalysis followed the common pattern of linguistic change whereby it took place in a context where it was least obtrusive due to structural ambiguity in particular contexts (de Smet 2012, 608). It was ‘coerced’ by the construction (Noël 2007).

As Baranowski (2016a) has shown, *u + yaqtul* was the most common pattern of past *yaqtul* constructions in narrative sequences in the Canaanite reflected by the Amarna letters. This archaic narrative structural pattern was preserved in Biblical Hebrew by reanalysis in a context that resembled contexts in which jussives were used to express dependent events, i.e., *waw + yiqtol*. By the period of Classical Biblical Hebrew, the *qatal* form had extended its functional territory to include that of the perfective past, which would have pushed the old *yiqtol* perfective past out of the system.\(^\text{15}\) The old narrative construction of *waw + past perfective yiqtol* expressing chains of events was preserved by a process in which it was reanalysed as an extension of a different, but structurally similar, construction, viz. *waw + jussive yiqtol*. One may say that the conservative nature of the literary tradition with the old narrative construction was a motivating factor for the reanalysis.

Some scholars have, indeed, already expressed the view that there was a convergence between the *wayyiqtol* form and the

\(^{15}\) In Archaic Biblical Hebrew the *qatal* had not yet completely superseded the old past perfective *yiqtol* (Notarius 2013).
modal system during the period of Late Biblical Hebrew.\textsuperscript{16} I would like to argue that this had taken place already in Classical Biblical Hebrew. Furthermore, I wish to propose a model to explain how this came about.

In the Tiberian Masoretic corpus of Biblical Hebrew jussives are used with a subordinate purposive sense after imperatives (20) or expressions that function pragmatically as imperatives, such as (21):\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{equation}
(20)
\text{וּהַעְתֶ֣יר אֶל־יְהוִַָ֔ה שָׁמְרָ֔דָּהּ מִמִּ֥נֶֽי}
\end{equation}

‘Entreat the LORD \textit{in order that He remove} the frogs from me and from my people.’ (Exod. 8.8)

\begin{equation}
(21)
\text{מִי יִתְּחַה אַתָּה־יָהָ֣בֶּל הַ֣יֶּלְּהִ֑בָּר בְּרָמַ֧ת גָּלָ֣ילָ֜א}
\end{equation}

‘Who will entice Ahab \textit{in order that he go up and fall} at Ramoth-gilead?’ (1 Kgs 22.20)

When the verb of the purpose clause is first person singular, the cohortative jussive is often used, e.g.,\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{equation}
(22)
\text{וַעֲשֵׁה־לָ֥֖י מַטְעַמֶּֽים כַּאֲשֶׁ֣ר אָהֶ֣בֶת יִֽשָּׁר לָֽ֖י וְאַכֵּֽלָֽה בָּ֣֖טֶרֶם אֵֽֽמוֹת׃}
\end{equation}

‘and prepare for me savoury food, as I love, and bring it to me \textit{that I may eat} before I die.’ (Gen. 27.4)

This corresponds to the distribution of the modal \textit{yaqtul} and \textit{yaqtula} forms, the ancestors of the Hebrew jussive and cohortative.

\textsuperscript{16} E.g., Bergsträsser (1918–1929, II:§5d) and Talshir (1986).

\textsuperscript{17} For other functions of sequences with jussive verbs see Dallaire (2014, 102–3).

\textsuperscript{18} For other functions of the cohortative after \textit{waw} in sequences see Dallaire (2014, 118).
tive, respectively, in purpose clauses in the Canaanite of the Amarna letters, in that they occur with this function specifically after volitive expressions. Moran (1960, 6–9) called this ‘modal congruence’.\textsuperscript{19} In cross-linguistic studies of the moods of subordinate clauses it has been observed that subordinate moods often originate as moods that are in harmony with the mood of the main clause, but that these can become extended to subordinate clauses in other syntactic contexts (Palmer 1986, 132; Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994, 218–19). I shall argue that such a process of extension took place with jussives.

The Hebrew jussive expresses a directive with speaker-oriented modality (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994, 179), whereby the speaker imposes his/her will or permission on the addressee or third person subject of a clause.\textsuperscript{20} Sequences of directives such as (20) and (21) had the implicature of purpose constructions with the second event future in relationship to the first event, i.e., the second event is intended by the subject of the first event or by the speaker. This implicature was subsequently conventionalised. As a consequence, the second event became

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{19} It was Moran (1961, 64) who first proposed the Canaanite \textit{yaqtula} as the ancestor of the Hebrew cohortative. This has been accepted by some scholars. Others prefer to seek its origins in the Canaanite energetic form \textit{yaqtulanna}. See Dallaire (2014, 108–11) for a survey of the literature. In Classical Arabic an analogous construction has a subjunctive verb (\textit{yaqtula}) after an imperative and the conjunction \textit{fa}-, e.g., \textit{ʾiġfir lī yā rabī fa-ʾadkhula ʾal-janna} ‘Pardon me, oh my Lord, so that I may enter paradise’ (Wright 1898, 31).

\textsuperscript{20} For the various nuances of commands expressed by the jussive and other verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew see Dallaire (2014, 89).
\end{flushright}
temporally and semantically integrated with the first and had its temporal reference point in the first event.

In some attested cases this construction could be interpreted as having made a further shift to express result, e.g., in the prophetic pronouncement of Elisha:

(23) הָלֹּֽא וְרָחַּ֙צ בָּ֣שַׂעְיָ֔הּ שִׁבַּ֖עַ פְּעָמִֽים בָּ֣יְרָֽדָן וְיָשֶֽׁב בְּשָרְךָ לְךָ֖

‘Go and wash in the Jordan seven times, and (as a result) your flesh shall be restored’ (LXX ἐπιστρέψεις future’) (2 Kgs 5.10)

As we have seen, the NENA narrative subjunctive appears to have developed through the pathway of purpose clause > result clause > discourse dependent. Result clauses developed from the common implicature of purpose clauses that the event took place (see above §1.2 and Schmidtke-Bode 2009, 178). When the main clause has future time reference, the shift from purpose to result clause entails a shift from a desired event to a predicted event.

The cohortative form expresses the desire of the speaker to perform the event. This can be analysed as agent-oriented modality in the sense of the term that is described by Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994, 178), i.e., it consists of internal or external conditions on an agent with respect to the completion of the action. Since it is first person, however, it overlaps with their category of speaker-oriented modality, since it imposes the desire of the speaker on the performance of the action. It could, therefore, be used in a sequence with imperatives and other directives with the implicature of purpose, as in (22) above.
The temporal structure of purpose clauses (weyiqṭol), result clauses (weyiqṭol), and consecutive wayyiqṭol clauses can be represented as follows.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Purpose clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R₁, E</td>
<td>waw + yiqṭol (R₁—E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Result clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R₁, E</td>
<td>waw + yiqṭol (R₁—R₂,E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Consecutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R₁, E</td>
<td>waw + yiqṭol (R₁—R₂,E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the purpose clause construction the jussive verb is irrealis and takes as its reference time, i.e., its contextual anchor, that of the main clause (represented by the repeated R₁ in (a) in Table 2). It is viewed from the perspective of the main clause. The event time of the purpose clause, therefore, is posterior to its reference time. In (b) and (c) the jussive clause has been reanalysed as an asserted event. This involves the acquisition of a reference time coinciding with the event (R₂). It is proposed that the clause retains the R₁ reference time, to which it is posterior. This reflects its reanalysis as an asserted event that is sequential to what precedes, i.e., the event is located at reference time R₂ in relation to reference time R₁.²¹ The representation in the table

²¹ This temporal analysis differs from that of Hatav (1997; 2004; 2006), who argues that a wayyiqṭol form “introduces a new R-time [i.e., reference time] into the discourse” (Hatav 2006, 748). This analysis is followed by Cohen (2013, 95–96). According to such a model, sequential is an inference from the succession of R-times with each wayyiqṭol. Cf.
above does not include speech time, which differs in relation to R₁ according to whether the main clause is future (S—R₁) or past (R₁—S).¹² In the attested corpus of Biblical Hebrew, as we have seen, purpose and result clauses with jussives have future main clauses, whereas past wayyiqtol is generally preceded by a past clause. The reanalysis of the discourse dependent past yiqtol as a jussive, therefore, would have involved a schematisation of the temporal structure of the construction of purpose and result clauses whereby the speech time is no longer specified. The common denominator of the construction across all three variants can be identified as:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 1</th>
<th>Clause 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R₁,E</td>
<td>waw + yiqtol (R₁—E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the weqatal construction, consecutive wayyiqtol developed by schematisation of a specific construction with the string waw + yiqtol as its substantive core, which is the norm for

also Cook (2004; 2012), who argues that temporal succession is the default interpretation of a series of temporally bounded perfectives. In my proposal the wayyiqtol form explicitly encodes dependency on the preceding discourse by having two reference points (R₁—R₂,E), which is a legacy of its historical origin in a purpose clause.

²² In some Neo-Reichenbach approaches (e.g., Johnson 1981; Dinsmore 1982; Verkuyl 2012), rather than consisting of a single triple system, the analysis should consist of two pairs of components, namely S and R, on the one hand, and E and R, on the one hand. The relationship between S and R would correspond to tense, whereas the relationship between E and R would be one of posteriority or anteriority, independent of tense.
purpose and result clauses with jussive verbs. For that reason, the conversive *yiqtol* only developed when the *yiqtol* was immediately preceded by *waw*.

As is the case with the NENA narrative subjunctive, the discourse dependent *wayyiqtol* form came to be far more frequent than the subordinate use of the *waw + yiqtol* construction.

Reanalysis involves a change in the structure of an expression without any immediate modification of its surface manifestation. It typically takes place when there is an overlap in surface form between two underlying structures and some analogical relationship between their functions. The actualisation of the reanalysis may then be manifested by changes in surface structure or function of some exponents of the reanalysed form from those of the form before the reanalysis.²³

The reanalysis of the narrative *yiqtol* as a schematised extension of a jussive and also the process of change described above are manifested in a number of features.

The most obvious structural manifestation is the occurrence of the cohortative jussive form of first person in *wayyiqtol* forms. These become particularly frequent in Late Biblical Hebrew (Cohen 2013, 121–23),²⁴ but are found sporadically already in the Pentateuch in Classical Biblical Hebrew, e.g.,

(24) יְנַחֲלֹתָה אֶת-הַלְוִים נִתְנֶה לְאַהֲרֹן לְבָנֵיהֶם 'And I have given the Levites as a gift to Aaron and his sons.' (Num. 8.19)

²³ For the process of reanalysis see Madariaga (2017).

²⁴ For more details regarding their distribution in Late Biblical Hebrew see Sjörs (this volume).
‘and when we came to the lodging place, we opened our sacks.’ (Gen. 43.21).

Sjörs (2021) argues that such consecutive forms retain the speaker-benefactive meaning of the cohortative. This can be interpreted as a legacy of the volitive meaning of first person cohortatives in purpose constructions such as (22).

Some wayyiqtol forms occur in clauses that can be interpreted as result clauses, which, as discussed above, was the immediate extension of a purposive use of jussive yiqtol, e.g.,

‘Why did you say “She is my sister,” so that I took her for my wife?’ (Gen. 12.19)

Occasionally a wayyiqtol form expresses a discourse dependent imperfective habitual, e.g.,

‘Why then look with greedy eye at my sacrifices and my offerings which I commanded, and (habitually) honour your sons above me by fattening yourselves upon the choicest parts of every offering of my people Israel?’ (1 Sam. 2.29)

There are fifteen cases of wayyiqtol cohortative in the Pentateuch and Early Prophets (Talshir 1986, 590).

Robar (2015, 85–86) draws attention to this fact in her argument against interpreting the wayyiqtol form as a preterite. See also her paper in this volume.
‘The LORD kills and he brings to life; he brings down to Sheol and he raises up.’ (1 Sam. 2.6).

'[29] הָמַַ֣כְלַּֽים לַמֶָ֣ו ת וְאֵינָ֑נוּ וִַֽ֜יַחְפְּרוּ מַמְטוֹנֵֽים׃

‘those who long for death, but it comes not, and dig for it more than for hid treasures.’ (Job 3.21)

Such functions are incompatible with the old past perfective yiqtol, but would not be problematic if the form is a schematised jussive, which does not have a specified aspect. The purposive construction waw + yiqtol typically expresses a perfective event and this is likely to be why the wayyiqtol form, likewise, is typically perfective in its function. As we have seen, however, the NENA discourse dependent subjunctive qatal can sometimes be habitual (6).

As discussed, the substantive structural core of the construction that was schematised was waw + yiqtol (jussive). This explains why the narrative yiqtol form is restricted to yiqtol immediately preceded by waw. Such restricted distribution would be difficult to explain if the form was still being analysed as the old past yiqtol.

---

27 An alternative way of understanding the wayyiqtol forms in (27)–(29) would be to interpret them as existential perfects (‘you have honoured on unspecified occasions’, etc.). This would be a strategy for expressing a habitual characteristic of the subject that is equivalent to a ‘gnomic’ qatal.

28 There are some cases where a short yiqtol is preceded by waw without a dagesh in the prefix and the form is generally interpreted as a future, e.g., Num. 24.19, 1 Sam. 10.5, 1 Kgs 14.5, Dan. 11.4, or habitual, e.g., Job 10.17.
It is also relevant to note that negative purpose clauses do not have a jussive form, e.g.,

(30)

וְלָֽא יֵרְבּ הֵוָֽיָּם לָהַֽוֶּם וְלָֽא יָסָֽוְרִֽיוֹ לְבָֽבָוֹ

‘and he shall not multiply wives for himself lest his heart turn away.’ (Deut. 17.17)

If consecutive wayyiqtol came about through reanalysis of a jussive through schematisation of a subordinate jussive construction, then how is the dagesh in the prefix to be explained? I have argued elsewhere that the gemination should be regarded as a late addition to the reading tradition in the Second Temple Period to express a semantic distinction between jussive and indicative meanings of the construction (Khan 1991, 241; 2013, 43), and further arguments for this have recently been adduced by Kantor (2020, 104–16). The phenomenon of introducing gemination (reflected by dagesh in the medieval vocalisation systems) to express distinctions in the meaning of an originally unitary form is found in various places in the Tiberian vocalisation tradition (Khan 2020, I:524–30) and there are many additional cases in the Babylonian tradition (Yeivin 1985, 357, 909–10). The fact that dagesh in the wayyiqtol form and also the other cases of dagesh for distinguishing meaning that occur in the Tiberian tradition also occur in the Babylonian tradition suggests that it developed in the Second Temple Period in the proto-Masoretic reading traditions before its Tiberian and Babylonian transmissions became geographically divided. This reflects a general Second Temple development in the proto-Masoretic reading tradition involving the introduction of strategies to increase care in pronun-
ciation and clarity of interpretation (Khan 2020, I:73–85). Reading traditions that were not direct heirs to the proto-Masoretic reading also exhibited such strategies, but they did not always coincide with the proto-Masoretic tradition. With regard to the dagesh of wayyiqtol, it is significant to note that the Samaritan reading tradition does not reflect this. In the Samaritan tradition, where possible, i.e., in qal I-y verbs, a different strategy was adopted for distinguishing waw + yiqtol with a past consecutive meaning, namely the mapping of the qatal vocalic pattern onto the verbal form, e.g., wtèrd ‘and she went down’ (Tiberian וַתֵּרֶד), by analogy with the pattern qåṭal, versus térad ‘she goes down’ (non-past, Tiberian תֵּרֶד, תֵּרֶד). Similarly, in the Samaritan tradition the vocalic pattern of yiqtol is mapped onto weqatal, e.g., wyèlèdu ‘and they (habitually) give birth’ (Tiberian והַלֶּדֶעַ, דָּעַ). 29 In the Greek transcription of the Hexapla, moreover, the dagesh of wayyiqtol is reflected to a far lesser extent than in the Tiberian and Babylonian traditions (Kantor 2020). Moreover, there are sporadic examples in the Babylonian tradition of constructions where a form that is we-yiqtol jussive in Tiberian is read as wayyiqtol, suggesting that the gemination of the prefix was a matter of interpretation of tradition, rather than an original feature of the form, e.g.,

(31) יָשְׁמִעַ wayyašmiʿu ‘and they made hear’ (Jer. 23.22, Yeivin 1985, 1063–68 || BHS ישִׁמְעֵהו ‘and let them make heard’)

29 See Florentin (1996). A possible parallel to this in the Hexapla is ιεδάλ (BHS יָדָל ‘and it/one ceases/will cease’ Ps. 49.9). Data supplied by Ben Kantor.
The dagesh was introduced into the cases of waw + yiqtol that expressed asserted realis events. In the vast majority of cases, of course, these were perfective events in narrative. Occasionally, however, the dagesh was introduced in a yiqtol form in the received text when the asserted event was interpreted as habitual to ensure that it was not interpreted as an irrealis form, as we have seen in (27)–(29). Another case of adaptation of the reading tradition in the Second Temple Period to express grammatical distinctions for the sake of clarity is the change of the reading of qal transitive verbs to piʿel and the change of the reading of qal intransitive verbs to nifʿal (Khan 2020, I:58–59).

Finally, the /a/ vowel in the form wayyiqtol can be explained by the fact that the default pronunciation of the shewa of the Tiberian tradition was [a]. So the /a/ would have been the result of the closing of the syllable with a vocalic shewa.  

In wayyiqtol verbal forms that have a penultimate open syllable the stress typically occurs on the penultima, e.g., וַיִּקְם ‘and he arose’ (Gen. 4.8). This represents the original position of the stress. In jussive forms, by contrast, the stress frequently shifted to the final syllable when it is closed, e.g., יָשַׁב ‘let him return’

30 In the Tiberian tradition in the Middle Ages a vocalic shewa was, in fact, assimilated to a following semi-vowel /y/, so that וְיַקְטִל would have been pronounced [vijiqṭoːol]. Before other prefixes the default [a] appeared, e.g., וְנַקְטִל [vaniqṭoːol]. This assimilation before /y/ could have been a later development or perhaps the /a/ in the third person forms arose by analogy with other persons.
(Judg. 7.3). There are, however, some jussive forms with this syllable structure that preserve the penultimate stress, e.g., אַל תָָּשֶם ‘do not put’ (1 Sam. 9.20). The stress shift in the jussive outside of wayyiqtol constructions seems to have been by analogy with the stress position in the long yiqtol, e.g., קָם ‘[a people] arises’ (Num. 23.24).\(^{31}\) A motivation for this stress shift may have been to distinguish between the realis wayyiqtol and the irrealis jussives. The same applies to the advancing of the stress to the suffix in the weqatal construction, e.g., שָׁמַעְתָ ‘and you will listen’ (Deut. 6.3). The fact that this does not entail pre-protonic reduction indicates that it is late. It is possible that this stress shift reflects the imposition on weqatal of a stress position that was characteristic of yiqtol, where the stress is on the ultima in most inflections, e.g., אכַַ֖ל ‘you will eat’ (Gen. 3.14); cf. אֲכַַ֖ל ‘and you will eat’ (Gen. 3.18). It is possible, moreover, that the retention of penultimate stress in wayyiqtol forms such as והִיה ‘you arose’ (2 Sam. 12.21).\(^{32}\) This is analogous to the imposition of the vocalic pattern of qatal on wayyiqtol and of the vocalic pattern of yiqtol on weqatal where possible in the Samaritan tradition.\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{31}\) For these developments in stress position see Blau (1978, 100).

\(^{32}\) For the lateness of the stress shifts see Revell (1984).

\(^{33}\) An analogous phenomenon can be found in the Yemenite reading tradition of Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic. In this oral reading tradition the plural active participle retains its historical vocalism in the first syllable when it has present tense reference, viz. [qɔːːtːəː] with a qamesh, but when it is interpreted as referring to the past it has the form [qatːəː]
The jussive form, of course, merged with the form of the indicative *yiqtol* in many verbal roots. In the form of the Masoretic text that has been transmitted to us by the Tiberian vocalisation, which is likely to reflect essentially the proto-Masoretic reading tradition of the Second Temple Period, it is only formally distinguished from the indicative *yiqtol* in certain weak roots and in the *hif'il*. This reflects a merger in progress. In some of the biblical texts from Qumran this merger is more advanced, in particular in the Isaiah scroll 1QIsa\(^3\), where short forms in the MT are often long, e.g., יעשה ‘and it made’ (Isa. 5.2 = MT יעש) (Kutscher 1979, 328).\(^3\)

In the Samaritan oral tradition the jussive and indicative *yiqtol* have merged in form completely, e.g.,

(33) *w-lā yēmot* ‘and will not die’ (Exod. 9.4; Ben-Ḥayyim 1977 וְלָא יֶּמִּוט || BHS והלא יموت)

(34) *w-al yēmot* ‘and may he not die’ (Deut. 33.6; Ben-Ḥayyim ואל ימות || BHS ואל יموت)

with a *pataḥ*. The latter form is based on the analogy of the past *qatal* verb, which has the base *qaṭal* in most persons (Morag 1988, 133–34).

\(^{34}\) This merger in some cases resulted in the original jussive morphological form being extended to the functions of the indicative. An example of this is the normal inflection of 3mpl and 2mpl indicative *yiqtol* with final -ū. This represents the levelling of the original jussive inflection and the original indicative inflection -ūn, which has survived as an archaism in indicative contexts (Hoftijzer 1985). Moreover, there are sporadic cases of short *yiqtol* forms (according to orthography and vocalisation) being used as indicatives, e.g. תָמוּת בָנוֹרָע נַפְשָם ‘their soul dies [habitual] in youth’ (Job 36.14), ירעם אלה ‘God thunders [habitual]’ (Job 37.5). For further examples preceded by *waw* see n.28.
Analogy to the merger in other verbal forms in the reading tradition (i.e., strong verbs that were not *hif'il*) no doubt played a role in this complete merger. Also, the Aramaic verbal system, which was in the process of losing the jussive in the Second Temple Period, is likely to have had an impact. The Rabbinic Hebrew verbal system, of course, converged even more closely with Aramaic and lost the jussive. With the loss of the jussive form the *waw* + jussive *yiqtol* construction was lost and this would have entailed the loss of the consecutive *wayyiqtol*, which was replaced by simple *we-qatal*. This, in turn, would have eliminated the consecutive *weqatal* from the system. Embryonic signs of this are found already in Late Biblical Hebrew and also in the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in which *we-qatal* is frequently used with a perfective past sense (Qimron 2018, 370).

The morphological merger of the Biblical Hebrew jussive *yiqtol* with the indicative *yiqtol* was particularly advanced in the first person. This was due, it appears, to the fact that the distribution of the cohortative form was extended and began to overlap with the functions of the first person jussive (i.e., short *yiqtol*), including the consecutive *wayyiqtol* forms, which, as remarked, were sometimes expressed by cohortative forms in the first person. The original occurrence of *waw* + first person jussive in a purpose clause and consequently also in a *wayyiqtol* clause rather than the cohortative may have been a vestige of verb sequences in earlier Canaanite. Baranowski (2016b, 166–68) has argued that in the Canaanite of the Amarna letters modal *yaqtul* (the ancestor of the Hebrew jussive) and modal *yaqtula* (the ancestor of the Hebrew cohortative) have different distributions. The *yaqtul*
form is what he calls a ‘sequential modal’, in that it occurs in clauses expressing the purpose or result of a volitive expression, whereas the yaqtula occurs in a volitive phrase that precedes the purposive yaqtul.\textsuperscript{35} Against this background, the spread of the Hebrew cohortative into purpose and wayyiqtol clauses can be seen as an innovative extension of its function. This gradual replacement of the first person jussive by the cohortative was due to the functional relatedness of the cohortative in this construction and also to the general extension of the functions of the cohortative. Originally a volitive expressing the desire of the speaker, the cohortative came to be used as a future expressing the intention of the speaker. These developments are conspicuous in the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls, where the cohortative becomes particularly frequent in wayyiqtol constructions and in intentional future constructions. In the Isaiah scroll 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}, for example, the cohortative often occurs with these functions where the MT does not have a cohortative (Kutscher 1979, 327).\textsuperscript{36} This extension of the cohortative is also found in the Samaritan Pentateuch (Sjörs 2021). As Dahl (1985, 106) has observed, a future expressing intention typically implies that the speaker predicts that the event will take place.

\textsuperscript{35} This is contrary to previous studies, which interpreted the yaqtula form as expressing purpose after volitive expressions, e.g., Moran (1960), Dallaire (2014, 131–32).

\textsuperscript{36} According to Qimron (2018, 371) the occurrence of the cohortative in the Dead Sea Scrolls is conditioned by position, in that it occurs predominantly in clause-initial position after waw. The same has been observed in the language of Ben Sira by van Peursen (2004, 83–87).
Such developments led to the merging in function of the cohortative with the long *yiqtol* form. This would explain the regular use, with only a few exceptions, of the long *yiqtol* in first person *wayyiqtol* forms in Late Biblical Hebrew, e.g., ‘and I rose’ (Neh. 4.8), ‘and I put’ (2 Chron. 6.11), ‘and I have built’ (2 Chron. 6.10), ‘and I stationed’ (Neh. 4.7), ‘and we stationed’ (Neh. 4.3), ‘and we built’ (Neh. 3.38), ‘and we camped’ (Ezra 8.15) (Talshir 1986, 586–87).

As is generally the case with linguistic change, this process was gradual and there was variation in the first person between the new *wayyiqtol* cohortatives, e.g., ‘and I saved’ (Judg. 10.12), the new long *wayyiqtol* forms, e.g., ‘and I saved’ (1 Sam. 10.18, ‘and I wept’ (2 Sam. 12.22), and the old short *wayyiqtol* forms, e.g., ‘and I made go’ (Lev. 26.13), ‘and I cause to go up’ (Num. 23.4). First person jussive short *yiqtol* forms are occasionally attested outside of *wayyiqtol*, though they are rare, e.g., ‘let me not hear again’ (Deut. 18.16),37 ‘and let us not leave’ (1 Sam. 14.36).38 The Classical Biblical Hebrew representation of the long *yiqtol* in the *wayyiqtol* is, however, restricted to the orthography of the Early Prophets. The orthography of the Pentateuch reflects the regular use of short forms for the first person jussive and *wayyiqtol* (Talshir 1986).

37 This form, however, may have originally been a *qal*, as is the case also with the jussive form יָסָף; cf. Huehnergard (2005, 467-8) [I am grateful to Aaron Hornkohl for drawing my attention to this].

38 First person jussives outside of Classical Biblical Hebrew prose, include Isa. 41.28; 42.6; Ezek. 5.16; Hos. 9.15; 11.4; Zeph. 1.2, 3; Job 23.9, 11.
On many occasions the orthography of Classical Biblical Hebrew reflects a short form in the first person wayyiqtol, but the qere reads it as a long form, e.g., יַשָּׁלֵם ‘and I threw’ (Deut. 9.21), ובָא ‘and I delivered’ (Josh. 24.10). This is the norm in middle weak verbs, e.g., יָשָׁב ‘and I rose’ (1 Kgs 3.21), יָבְשָׁנָה ‘and I put’ (Gen. 24.47). The same applies to jussives outside the wayyiqtol form, e.g., in a purpose clause: יהָא ‘that I may die’ (2 Sam. 19.38). In the Pentateuch this applies only to first person singular forms. First person plural forms are vocalised as short jussives, e.g., וַָֽנַחֲרֵּם ‘and we destroyed’ (Deut. 2.34), וַָֽנְַקְרִֵּ֞ב ‘and we have brought as an offering’ (Num. 31.50).\footnote{Talshir (1986, 586). For a detailed examination of this phenomenon, see Hornkohl (forthcoming).}

In later texts composed in the Second Temple Period the orthography of the ketiv reflects the long form, indicating that the jussive form had merged with the ‘long’ yiqtol in the first person at the time of composition (see examples above). The vocalisation of Classical Biblical Hebrew forms such as יָמֵשׁ reflects the state of the language in the Second Temple Period. It is not clear why this phenomenon of the qere is restricted to the first person singular. It may be connected to the greater frequency of occurrence of the first person singular than the first person plural. Within the Masoretic Text, for example, the statistics for 1s and 1pl wayyiqtol forms in the qal and hif’il are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1s qal: 355</th>
<th>1pl qal: 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4
This may be compared to the application of the innovation of stress shift to the suffixes of the 1s and 2ms forms of weqāṭal, but not to those of the 1pl forms. As suggested by Revell (1984, 440), this is likely to be connected with the fact that the 1s and 2ms forms occur more frequently than the 1pl forms. The statistics are as follows for 1s, 2ms, and 1pl weqāṭal forms:

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phenomenon would be different from the normal effect of frequency in vernacular language, in which changes that require analysis, e.g., reconfiguration of inflectional morphology, affect the least frequent words first (see Groen in this volume). The imposition of the aforementioned changes in the reading tradition were, by contrast, applied ‘top down’, i.e., to the most frequent items. These innovations are likely to have been internal to the reading tradition and do not reflect vernacular speech.

Returning now to the process of schematisation of the waw + jussive yiqtol construction, which, I argue, gave rise to the conversive wayyiqtol form, I would like to examine a further schematisation of the construction.

Scholars have drawn attention to the fact that the wayyiqtol form in some cases does not express temporal sequentiality but rather elaboration of what precedes, e.g.,
(35) וַיְנַשֵּׁק לְכָל־אֶחַיו וַיֵֶּבְךְ עֲלֵיהֵם

‘And he kissed all his brothers and wept on them.’ (Gen. 45.15)

(36) וַיְשָלָח יֹוָּאָב וַיָגֵ֣ד לְדָו ִַ֔ד א ת־כָל־ד בְרֵָ֖י הַמ לְחָמִָֽה׃֙

‘And Joab sent and reported to David all the events of the war. And he instructed the messenger, saying...’ (2 Sam. 11.18–19)

It was proposed above that a temporally sequential way-yiqtol reflected the following schematisation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Consecutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_1$,$E$</td>
<td>$waw$ yiqtol ($R_1$—$R_2$,$E$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the consecutive way-yiqtol is bound to the temporal reference point $R_1$ in the preceding clause. By a further schematisation, which was identified above also in the weqatal construction (§2.0), the temporal reference point of the first clause was generalised to a topical cognitive reference point, whereby the way-yiqtol form expresses relevance to what precedes, but not necessarily temporal sequentiality.

4.0. Concluding Remarks

In this paper I have argued that the discourse dependency of consecutive weqatal and way-yiqtol forms is encoded in their semantic structure and is not just an implicature of the context. This is a heritage of their historical origin in subordinate constructions with temporal integration between clauses. The historical development of consecutive weqatal and way-yiqtol that has been proposed above has typological parallels in NENA and involves the
extension through schematisation of constructions containing dependent clauses (apodosis and purpose clause, respectively). In terms of syntactic structure, these are not subordinate clauses. They have, however, semantic integration with the preceding clause, which is a feature of syntactic subordination (Cristofaro 2003).

The dependency of *weqatal* and *wayyiqtol* is encoded by a temporal anchor, i.e., a reference time, in the preceding context, so that the event is encoded as being temporally posterior to the reference time of the preceding context. In some cases this temporal anchor has become schematised to a cognitive topical anchor, so that the event is coded as being relevant to what precedes, but not necessarily temporally posterior.

In some languages discourse dependent verb forms have undergone a further schematisation, whereby the cognitive anchor in the preceding discourse has been extended to a general realis indicative denotation irrespective of context. This has occurred, for example, in one NENA dialect (Jewish Dobe, Khan 2021) and is the background of the realis indicative preverbal particles *ka-* of Moroccan Arabic and *bi-* of Eastern Arabic dialects. The question arises as to whether such a further schematisation could be posited for the Biblical Hebrew consecutive forms *weqatal* and *wayyiqtol*, i.e., are there contexts in which they have lost any coding of an anchor, temporal or cognitive, in the preceding context? A relevant factor when considering this question is the fact that, although *weqatal* and *wayyiqtol* are cognitive ‘chunks’ in constructions, they have not lost their compositional-
ity completely and the *waw* still functions as a clause-initial con-
nnective to the preceding discourse. This can be considered to co-
erce a discourse dependency interpretation for the construction. 
Some scholars have argued that the fact that the *wayyiqtol* form 
occurs at the beginning of several biblical books indicates that 
they do not always denote sequentiality or dependency (Bauer 
1910, 35–39; Hatav 1997, 36–88; Joüon and Muraoka 2011, 
§118c). Several scholars, however, regard the *waw* as reflecting 
connections between the literary units of other books. Moreover, 
*waw* sometimes begins a biblical book before a non-verbal form, 
e.g., וְאֵ֗לֶה שְׁמוֹת ‘And these are the names’ (Exod. 1.1).40

In NENA, by contrast, the substantive element in the con-
struction did not include a connective *waw*. In the Barwar NENA 
dialect discussed in §1.0 the discourse dependency must be en-
coded in the verbal form. Following this typological parallel, I 
have posited that the Hebrew constructions followed the same 
historical pathway and likewise involved coding of discourse de-
pendency. Unlike in NENA, and Arabic dialects, the presence of 
the *waw* in the substantive core of the Hebrew constructions was 
a constraint against the full bleaching of this discourse depend-
ency coding.

The schematisation of the constructions (apodosis and pur-
pose clauses) resulted in looser semantic integration with what 
precedes, which I have been referring to as discourse depend-

40 One should also take into account that connectives in some Semitic 
languages introduce the main body of texts after formulaic preliminar-
ies, e.g., *fa-* in Arabic and Epigraphic South Arabian (Nebes 1995).
ency. This development of linear elements, i.e., from greater integration to lesser integration, is the opposite to what is normally said to be the typical directionality of morphosyntactic change according to grammaticalisation models, i.e., main clauses > subordinate constructions. It has recently been recognised, however, that the opposite directionality may be more widespread in languages than has previously been thought. Evans (2007), in particular, has drawn attention across many languages to cases of syntactically subordinate constructions developing into main clauses. He refers to this process as ‘insubordination’. The insubordination process in the development of consecutive weqat al and wayyiqtol does not fit the normal model of grammaticalisation. I hope to have shown, however, that they can be explained using the model of construction grammar, whereby components of constructions become more generalised through the cognitive process of schematisation.
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