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0. Introduction

The present-day variation in commentaries, grammars and Bible translations regarding their rendering and interpretation of the verbal forms attested in Biblical Hebrew’s poetic texts suggests that the use of the Hebrew verb in biblical poetry is not regulated by any system, but is completely determined by a poet’s rhetorical and stylistic preferences. It has become a tendency in the discipline of Old Testament Studies to consider the poetic passages as artistic and beautiful, but static pieces of art. But is this indeed all that can be said about the products of the biblical poets? Is it reasonable, or even acceptable, to assume that these authors were able to meaningfully communicate with their audiences without having to adhere to any rules of Biblical Hebrew’s grammatical system? Or could it be that they made use of a yet unidentified set of linguistic rules?

0.1 Hypotheses and Methodology

The central aim in this dissertation is to prove that indeed the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry cannot be seen as completely unbound to any grammatical rules. Our search for a system in the functioning of poetry’s verbal forms may be considered rather pretentious, since it has already been carried out unsuccessfully for so many centuries. However, instead of providing just another distribution of different functional nuances to each of the verbal forms, we will start our project with the introduction of a paradigm shift in order to create room for new perspectives on the verbal functions. Thus, instead of adopting the general tendency in Old Testament Studies to analyze the poetic texts merely from a literary-rhetorical perspective, our work is a plea for a restored balance between the methods of linguistic analysis and literary-rhetorical interpretation in terms of their relative order of priority. More specifically, it is assumed that only by starting the study of Hebrew poetic texts with an analysis of their linguistic (morphological and syntactic) features, justice can be done to the texts’ ability to speak for themselves. In this way, a more solid basis is created for subsequent literary and theological interpretations of the textual contents.

The central research hypothesis guiding our search for a systematic interpretation of poetry’s verbal forms’ functions is the assumption that Hebrew prose and Hebrew poetry make use of a single linguistic system determining the use of verbal forms. This assumption is based on research conducted by scholars in the discipline of General Linguistics which has revealed that it is a universal characteristic of all human languages that in all genres of a language the same grammatical system is operating. From the perspective of General Linguistics the idea that poetic language can or should not be analyzed in terms of a language’s grammar, is unacceptable.¹ In

accordance with this view, we assert that Biblical Hebrew poetry makes use of the grammatical categories and linguistic devices characterizing Biblical Hebrew grammar in general. One of the main arguments in the present dissertation is that the study of the Hebrew verbal system should not be restricted to analyses of the individual verbal forms, but should take into account observations of syntactic patterns attested at higher textual levels. More concretely, it will be shown that the functions of Biblical Hebrew’s verbal forms are strongly influenced by the specific verbal patterns in which they are included. By thus focusing on linguistic units greater than that of the sentence, we position our research in the discipline of Text Linguistics, which concentrates on the grammatical analysis of the texts and the identification of communication processes in them by studying not only those grammatical phenomena that are attested within the domain of the individual sentence, but also those that have a function in larger textual units. From the different approaches taken by text-linguists, which will be introduced in this dissertation’s third chapter, we give preference to, and so will adopt, the formalist-distributionalist one, in which the linguistic data and their distribution in linguistic patterns attested in the texts are taken as the starting point for the intended analyses. This entails that instead of imposing preconceived views or functional models on the textual data, we propose to start with a synchronic analysis of the linguistic forms and patterns attested in the texts. Though we do recognize the fact that the language used in different books or passages may reflect diachronic developments in the classical Hebrew language and that the development of Biblical Hebrew’s linguistic system did not take place in complete isolation but was influenced by cognate Semitic languages, we do not follow the tendency attested in many 20th-century and contemporary studies to make these diachronic considerations of primary importance in our research. Instead, we take the linguistic forms, constructions and patterns in the Masoretic Text as we now have it (in the form of the Codex Leningradensis) as the starting point for our analyses. By taking this position, we link up with the claim of leading linguists, like Thomas Payne, that ‘real’ linguistic analysis starts from the empirical linguistic data and tries to look for grammatical patterns that occur in all texts (of all genres) produced in a given language. The intention to let the texts speak for themselves instead of imposing a preconceived model or interpretation on them requires a degree of objectivity and consistency which can hardly (if not impossibly) be reached by the human analyst. We have been able to overcome this difficulty, however, by taking the computer as our central research instrument. Thus, many insights presented in this thesis have been gained by the execution of queries on the data stored in the

---

2 Of course, we acknowledge that not only the Hebrew language, but also the Masoretic text (MT) represents the final stage of a long history of transmission. However, the goal of this dissertation is not to perform historical-linguistic analysis, but to analyze the linguistic system present in the MT. The vocalization is regarded as being part of this system and will therefore be taken into account in our linguistic analyses. We are aware of the fact that the vocalization marks are a late addition to the text of the Hebrew Bible. We also recognize that in cases in which the older consonantal text left open several ways to interpret specific (verbal) forms, for example by its use of defective spelling (cf. Barr, J., The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989)), the Masoretic vocalization is not only an additional tool to help us correctly reading the text, but also represents the Masoretic interpretation of the text. However, since the object of our research is not the development of the text of the Hebrew Bible, but the verbal system present in the text as we now have it, these diachronic considerations will be of secondary importance in our synchronic analyses.

linguistic database of the *Eep Talstra Centre for Bible and Computer (ETCBC)*,\(^4\) which since the late 1970s has been developed and maintained by Eep Talstra and his colleagues. In addition, we have ourselves created a Java program which helped us to systematically retrieve and test the grammatical rules regulating the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry. The task of this program has been threefold:

- Identifying linguistic patterns at text-level.
- Identifying parameters influencing the distribution of verbal functions in linguistic patterns and using these parameters for the calculation of the verbal functions.
- Providing a translation of the Hebrew text, in particular of its verbal forms, in which the verbal functions that have been identified are accounted for.

### 0.2 Outline

The dissertation consists of two major parts. The first part (chapters 1–3) provides a description of the current state of affairs in the research on Biblical Hebrew’s verbal forms and more elaborately introduces the type of approach we have been using. In the first chapter, we present the results of our investigation of the attitude adopted in commentaries, Bible translations and grammars towards the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry. We reveal the remarkable lack of consistency in their renderings of verbal forms and offer an explanation for this situation by pointing to some general tendencies in the discipline of Old Testament Studies regarding its approach to poetry’s use of the verb.

In the second chapter, we give an overview of the theories on the Biblical Hebrew verbal system that have been developed by Hebraists in the past centuries and also pay attention to the role of poetic texts in the respective contributions.

In the third chapter, we introduce the origins and the basic principles of the approach of text linguistics. We then review a series of text-linguistic studies on Biblical Hebrew’s verbal system and concentrate on the rare contributions in which an attempt has been undertaken to understand part of how Hebrew poetry deals with verbal forms. After that, we describe in greater detail the methods and approach used in the second part of the dissertation.

In the second part (chapters 4–6), we introduce an innovative description of Biblical Hebrew’s verbal system that can account for the use of verbal forms both in the prosaic and the poetic texts of the Hebrew Bible. Syntax plays a central role in this description. In the fourth chapter, we show how the position of the *yiqtol* form within its clause is decisive for the default function in terms of volitivity that should be assigned to it. We argue that, initially, verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses should be ascribed a volitive meaning, while *yiqtol* clauses in which the predicate does not take initial position attain a non-volitive meaning. This view can account for a great deal of the *yiqtol* clauses attested in our corpus, but, particularly in poetry, we are left with quite some *yiqtol* clauses for which the assignment of (non)volitive functionality on the basis of the clause-internal position of a verbal form alone is rather problematic.

In the fifth chapter, we explain that it is indeed not sufficient to pay attention only to the individual clause. Instead, one has to take into account higher-level syntactic patterns of mother and daughter clauses. In this chapter, we show that the default function of a *yiqtol* clause in terms of the expression of (non)volitivity may be overruled by functionality or modifying

---

\(^4\) Formerly known as: *Werkgroep Informatica Vrije Universiteit (WIVU).*
elements inherited from a mother clause or may otherwise be blocked, for example by so-called multiple-duty modifiers.

Finally, in the sixth chapter, we claim that the higher-level syntactic patterns also help us to identify another type of functionality that can be ascribed to verbal forms and their clauses. We agree with most text linguists that the verbal forms function to structure discourse by marking the type, the level and the perspective of communication. Sequences of verbal forms frequently involve a shift in one or more of these three dimensions. In the final chapter, we investigate which concrete discourse functions can consistently be ascribed to specific relations between verbal forms and clauses.

By thus assigning a more significant role to (low- and high-level) syntax than has until now been done in the study of the Hebrew verb, we will be able to come up with a verbal system which can systematically account for the functioning of verbal forms both in the prose and in the poetry of the Hebrew Bible.

0.3 Text Corpus

As our research starts from the assumption that Biblical Hebrew poetry in its use of the verbal system shows many analogies with discursive prose, our text corpus comprises both poetic and direct speech prose texts. These texts have been selected from many different books in order to avoid the impression that our theories are only applicable to specific books of the Hebrew Bible.

The queries and analyses supporting the findings presented in chapters 4 and 5 have been applied to the direct speech prose sections attested in the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, I-II Samuel, I-II Kings, and I-II Chronicles, and to poetic passages taken from the Psalms, Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40–55), the Pentateuch (Gen 49, Exod 15, Deut 32–33), Judges (Judg 5), I and II Samuel (1 Sam 2, 2 Sam 1, 22 and 23), Proverbs (Prov 13–31), and Job (Job 10–20). For the theories presented in chapter 6, which required the analysis of complete texts at the highest level of discourse, we have restricted ourselves to the 150 Psalms, which have been elaborately investigated with the help of the Java program we created.

0.4 Website

The results presented in this thesis are the fruit of extensive experiments in which the computer has played a central role. Since this dissertation is not meant to be a detailed account of the exact experiments we have been conducting, but rather presents the theoretical insights gained by them, the readers may sometimes feel the need for an environment in which they have easy access to all of the experimental data on which we have built our assumptions.

As a response to this need, we have created a companion website on which we present the results of the computational analyses performed by our Java program. The website consists of 150 web pages containing the analyses and translations of each of the 150 Psalms as they have been made by the computer program. In addition, the visitors are provided with a sorted and annotated list of all verbal patterns attested in the Psalms, which enables them to easily compare multiple occurrences of the same pattern. Finally, several other web pages can be consulted for brief descriptions of our theoretical views. The companion website can be found via the following URL:

The website is meant to be complementary to the dissertation. It accounts for the experimental basis of the theories presented in the dissertation as it provides access to our analyses of all Psalms. Besides, it also serves a more practical function in that it may enable the readers to get a clear picture of how Hebrew grammar works at the level of discourse. While the sample texts provided in the dissertation do, of course, illustrate the discourse-level grammatical rules, the actual working of these rules becomes most obvious if the context of the whole Psalm is taken into account and this is exactly what the website allows its visitors to do.

0.5 Text Samples

We conclude this introductory part with a brief note on the form and contents of the numerous quotations we have included in the dissertation in order to illustrate our theoretical views. Each quotation starts with the Hebrew consonantal text, which has been derived from the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Since, as will become clear in the following chapters, the type of the clause in which a verbal form stands has a strong influence on the functionality of that verbal form, we have also included in our quotations the clause type labels as they are used in the ETCBC database.

The type of a clause depends, firstly, on the presence of a verbal form in the clause. If such a verbal form is absent, but the clause does contain a predicate, the clause is of a nominal kind and can be either a simple nominal clause (if the predicate is a noun phrase) - NmCl - or an adjective clause (if the predicate is an adjective phrase) - AjCl. If a clause does not contain a predicate, it has one of the following types:
- vocative clause – Voct
- ellipsis – Ellp
- macrosyntactic signal – MSyn
- casus pendens (topicalized element with resumption in main clause) – CPen
- extraposition (topicalized element without resumption in main clause) – XPos

The clause types of verbal clauses containing a non-finite predicate reflect just the tense of the verbal form:
- participle – Ptcp
- infinitive absolute – InfA
- infinitive construct – InfC

The clause type of verbal clauses containing a finite predicate is determined by four factors:
- the presence or absence of the coordinate conjunction \( \vee \)
- the presence or absence of constituents that precede the predicate (indicated by capital \( X \) for subjects, small \( x \) for non-subject constituents, and \( Z \) for no \( \) zero \( \) preverbal constituents)
- the verbal tense of the predicate, which can be either imperative, imperfect (\( yiqtol \)), or perfect (\( qatal \))
- the presence or absence of an explicit subject following the predicate (indicated by capital \( X \) respectively \( 0 \))
As an example, the label ZYqX refers to a clause containing an imperfect form, which takes initial position in the clause (Zero elements preceding it) and is followed by an explicit subject (X). In the main text of the thesis, we have made use of non-abbreviated (and sometimes simplified) designations of the clause types, such as 0-yiqtol and w-x-yiqtol.

The English translations of our sample texts have largely been based on the Revised Standard Version (1951). The rendering of the verbal forms attested in these texts, however, has not been adopted from any existing Bible translation, but always reflects our own analysis of the verbal functions.

Both the Hebrew text and the English translation in a sample text are present in a hierarchical format. The indentations enable the reader to identify the relations between mother and daughter clauses that are present in a given text. This is considered to be of utmost importance, since many of our translational choices can only be accounted for by referring to the theory of clause relations presented in this dissertation. As a preliminary example, we present Ps 2.1–2:

Why have the nations been conspiring, and/or (why) do the peoples plot in vain?

As our presentation of these verses shows, the verb-initial 0-yiqtol (ZYqX) clause in vs.2a has the x-qatal (xQtX) clause in vs.1a as its mother. For reasons to be explained in chapter 5, this specific connection between an interrogative mother clause and an asyndetic verb-initial yiqtol daughter clause often brings along an implicit transfer of the interrogative modifier from the mother to the daughter clause. As our translation suggests, this is indeed exactly what happens in these verses. By reflecting the hierarchical clause relations in our sample texts, we aim to help the reader understand how the anchoring of one clause into another may determine the functionality of those clauses.

5 For a complete overview of all clause type labels attested in our data, we refer the reader to the webpage on clause type labels at our website.
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1.1 Introduction

This introductory chapter will serve to situate the research problem that has motivated the research conducted for this dissertation. It will be our aim to make clear that the lack of knowledge regarding the functions of the Hebrew verbal forms both originates in and is maintained by the tendency within the discipline of Old Testament Studies to concentrate on semantic analyses and literary-rhetorical interpretations of the Hebrew poetic texts and to avoid any type of independent linguistic analysis of them. This tendency will be revealed in a fourfold manner. In the chapter’s first section, we will discuss some of the key studies about Biblical Hebrew poetry published since the work of Robert Lowth (1710–1787). In order to show that the methodological conditions forming the ‘breeding ground’ for our research problem are still very relevant, we will focus on books and articles that were produced in the past five decades. In this way we will be able to determine to which extent contemporary work on the poetic passages of the Hebrew Bible differs from the initial studies made by Lowth. This approach will also help us to identify important tendencies in Old Testament scholars’ approach to these poetic texts. It will become clear that, despite several minor developments, nowadays still no room is created for an independent analysis of the linguistic features and syntactic patterns in Hebrew poetry.

The second, third and fourth sections of the chapter serve to illustrate the consequences this tendency has for the study of Hebrew poetry’s verbal forms. In the second section, we will examine a collection of commentaries by focusing, first, on their general approach to the poetic texts they discuss, and, second, on the manner in which they deal with the use of verbal forms in these texts. We will investigate the explicit remarks made in these commentaries about the functions of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry and compare their translations of some passages selected from the first ten Psalms. Thus, again several tendencies will become clear with respect to the scholarly approach to Old Testament poetry.

In the third section, a large selection of Bible translations will be examined. By comparing their renderings of verbal forms in several passages, we aim to reveal the lack of uniformity and consistency in the manner in which these translations deal with the alternation of verbal forms in their poetic Hebrew source texts, thereby showing that the tendency to avoid a linguistic analysis of Hebrew poetry and of its use of verbal forms not only prevents Old Testament scholars and Bible translators, but also modern readers of the Bible, from an adequate understanding of the Biblical poetic texts.

In the final section, some Hebrew grammars will be analyzed with respect to their explicit and implicit attitudes towards Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms. We will discuss explicit statements made by the grammars about this topic and, after that, try to identify the role of the poetic texts in the grammars’ analyses of the Hebrew verbal system by investigating to which extent the grammarians refer to examples taken from poetic passages to illustrate their conclusions about the functions of the Hebrew verbal forms.

The aim of the approach outlined here is to reveal both the historical roots and the present significance of our research problem, and, with that, to point to the need for the exploration of new directions in this area of research.
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1.2 Studies of Biblical Hebrew Poetry

1.2.1 Robert Lowth

The systematic analysis of Biblical Hebrew poetry started about two and a half centuries ago with the lectures delivered by Robert Lowth, who was Professor of Poetry at the University of Oxford between 1741 and 1752. Before being consecrated bishop of St David’s, Oxford (both 1766) and London (1777), Lowth published his lectures in a volume titled *De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones Academicae* (1753). This collection of lectures has functioned as a basis for the majority of studies about Hebrew poetry in the centuries after him. Thus, it is not uncommon for Old Testament scholars to refer to this groundbreaking work by Lowth in the introductions to their publications. Indeed, Lowth can well be identified as the one who provided the study of Hebrew poetry with a ‘Standard Description’ that has generally been accepted from the 18th century onwards and continues to have its influence in recent works.

On the one hand, Lowth obviously linked up with other 18th century writings in asserting that Biblical Hebrew poetry was an art being ‘not so much the offspring of human genius, as an emanation from heaven’ (Lect.II; p.46), an ‘art, consecrated by the authority of God himself’ (Lect.II; p.49). Lowth, in his studies, repeatedly stresses the beauty of the poetic texts and their language, identifying them, for example, as ‘great and remarkable beauties of composition’ (Lect.IV; p.101). However, Lowth’s lectures differed strongly from the studies by his contemporaries in that he did not subscribe to the common opinion that the divine origin of the poetic texts prevented them from being ‘conformable to the principles of science’ (Lect.II; p.44). Instead, according to Lowth, one can only appreciate the beauty of Hebrew poetry, and its power to influence the human mind, if one has a clear insight into the ‘rules of art’, the instruments, used by the Biblical poets (Lect.II: pp.44–46). Moreover, Lowth not only was the first to advocate systematic research into Hebrew poetry, but also stimulated others to conduct it on the whole range of Biblical poetic texts. Thus, Lowth himself did not only analyze the Psalms, but also devoted lectures to the poetic nature and features of the prophetic books (see, for example, Lect.XIX).

Lowth distinguished between three points of attention that should play a central role in critical examinations of Hebrew poetry. As we will see, these three areas, together forming the ‘Standard Description’, have dominated the study of Hebrew poetry for centuries. According to Lowth, one should, first of all, investigate the argument or matter presented in a poem and the way in which it is treated. Lowth thus promotes a *rhetorical analysis* of the poem. Second, the elocution and the style of a poem should be discussed, focusing on ‘sentiments, splendour and perspicuity of arrangement, beauty and variety of imagery, and strength and elegance of diction’ (Lect.II; p.52). In taking this perspective, Lowth again puts focus on the central role of *rhetorical analysis*, but obviously also stresses the importance of *literary analysis*. Third, Lowth argues that


7 Examples of this can be found in the work of many of the scholars mentioned below (Gray, Kosmala, O’Connor, Cloete, Alonso-Schökel) and in several commentaries on the Psalms (Briggs, Kraus, Craigie).

8 We have borrowed this designation from O’Connor: O’Connor, M., *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1980), p.29.
every person studying Hebrew poetry has to consider the ‘harmony of the verse or numbers’ (Lect.II; p.52).

Lowth’s most important contribution to the discipline of Old Testament studies can be found in his description of this third area. The ‘harmony of the verse or numbers’ is clearly visible in the metrical and parallel sentences of Biblical Hebrew, according to Lowth (Lect.IV; p.96). In asserting so, he identifies, for the first time, Hebrew poetry’s two basic properties of parallelism and metre, referring to them with the term ‘sententious style’, which he defines as ‘the primary characteristic of the Hebrew poetry’ (Lect.IV; pp.98, 101).

In his Preliminary Discussion to Isaiah (1778), Lowth explains that the term ‘parallelism’ indicates the ‘correspondence of one verse, or line, with another’. A more elaborate discussion of the phenomenon of parallelism can be found in his nineteenth lecture, which deals with the sententious style of prophetic poetry. In this lecture, Lowth argues that the ‘parallel style’ of Hebrew poetry has its origin in the fact that the songs were composed for the purpose of being chanted by alternate choirs, one singing the first part of a distich (bicolon) and the other responding by singing the second part of it (Lect.XIX; p.24–32).

Of greater significance, however, is Lowth’s distinction between three different types of parallelism (cf. Lect.I; p.100). The first type of parallelism, which is the most frequently occurring one, Lowth calls ‘synonymous parallelism’. The term refers to a combination of lines or verses in which the same sentiment is repeated in different, but equivalent terms. There is a large amount of variety within the group of parallelisms belonging to this type. Thus, the repetition of the first member of this type of parallelism can be either complete, as in Ps 129.1–2:

1 “Sorely have they afflicted me from my youth,”
– says now Israel –
“Sorely have they afflicted me from my youth,
yet they have not prevailed against me.”

or partial, as in Ps 94.3:

How long shall the wicked,
YHWH,
how long shall the wicked exult?
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In addition, in many cases, the second member of the parallelism constitutes an incomplete sentence which implicitly presupposes the repetition of a word or group of words of the first member (Lect.XIX; pp.35–45), as is the case in Ps 105.20:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Su]} & \text{מלך} \quad \text{[Pr]} \text{משל} \quad 20 \quad \text{Qg0} \\
\text{[PO]} & \text{ зуб} \quad \text{[Cj]} -1 \quad \text{Way0} \\
\text{[Su]} & \text{עמי} \quad \text{Ellp}
\end{align*}
\]

20 The king sent
    and released him,
    the ruler of the peoples.

The second type of parallelism is called ‘antithetic parallelism’, which is used ‘when a thing is illustrated by its contrary being opposed to it’. Lowth distinguishes between different forms of antithetic parallelism on the basis of the types of entities that are opposed to each other: ‘sentiments are opposed to sentiments, words to words’ (Lect.XIX; p.45). Among the examples he provides are Prov 27.6:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Su]} & \text{ כתע} \quad \text{[PC]} \text{านדות} \quad 6 \quad \text{AjCl} \\
\text{[Su]} & \text{עיקות} \quad \text{[PC]} \text{>Action} \quad \text{AjCl}
\end{align*}
\]

6 Faithful are the wounds of a friend,
    but profuse are the kisses of an enemy.

and Isa 65.13:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Pr]} & \text{עמד} \quad \text{[Su]} \text{הנה} \quad 13 \quad \text{XYq} \\
\text{[Pr]} & \text{مريض} \quad \text{[Su]} \text{הנה} \quad \text{XYq} \\
\text{[Pr]} & \text{מר桉} \quad \text{[Su]} \text{הנה} \quad \text{XYq} \\
\text{[Pr]} & \text{מר桉} \quad \text{[Su]} \text{הנה} \quad \text{XYq}
\end{align*}
\]

13 Behold, my servants eat,
    but you are hungry;
    behold, my servants drink,
    but you are thirsty;
    behold, my servants rejoice,
    but you are put to shame.

The final type of parallelism identified by Lowth is that of ‘synthetic or constructive parallelism’, in which the sentences are not linked with each other on the basis of the repetition or the opposition of entities, but ‘merely by the form of construction’ (Lect.XIX; p.48–49). This third type of parallelism differs from the other two in that it identifies sentences as parallel to each other on the basis of their identical structures instead of their contents. All the parallelisms that cannot be categorized as being of the first or second type belong to this third class. Again, there is much variety in the form of this type of parallelism, as the ‘degrees of resemblance are almost infinite’ (Lect.XIX; p.53). Take, for instance, Ps 46.7:
The other basic property of Hebrew poetry discerned by Lowth, its metre, raises more questions. Not only Lowth himself encountered many difficulties in treating the Hebrew metre, but, as we will see, the phenomenon also became a hotly debated issue in a considerable number of studies published in the centuries after him. According to Lowth, however, one ‘may with safety affirm that Hebrew poetry was metrical’ (Lect.III; p.62). He even defines it as an absolute necessity to ‘demonstrate, that those parts at least of the Hebrew writing which we term poetic, are in metrical form, and to inquire whether anything be certainly known concerning the nature and principles of this versification or not’ (Lect.III; p.56). At the same time, Lowth acknowledges that it seems hardly possible to ‘restore the true and genuine Hebrew versification’ (Lect.III; p.67).

Although traces of a metrical system can be found in nearly every poetic text (for example in the shortening or lengthening of words by omitting or adding a syllable for metrical purposes), the exact system remains obscure. Lowth himself tries to solve this issue by creating a link between the two basic properties of Hebrew poetry and by arguing that a considerable part of the metre consists in the parallelism of sentences (Lect.XIX; p.53), not denouncing the possibility that some attention was paid to the numbers and the feet (i.e. the alternation of accented and unaccented syllables), too. Though Lowth emphasizes that we possess too little information about these numbers and feet to determine their respective roles in the Hebrew metre, he makes his audience aware of the work of the Jewish rabbi and scholar Azariah de Rossi (1513/14–1578), according to whom the metre in Hebrew poetry consisted of ‘the number of things, and of the parts of things; that is, the subject and the predicate, and their adjuncts, in every sentence and proposition’ (Lect.XIX; p.54–55). Lowth himself is not very optimistic about De Rossi’s ideas and concludes that the Hebrew metre has been irrecoverably lost. However, by introducing several possible criteria on which this metre may have been based (parallelism, feet [accentual approach] and numbers [numerical approach]), he does provide in his lectures a clear starting point for the century-long debate about the metre of Hebrew verse.

A final important characteristic of Lowth’s studies, which has heavily influenced the ‘Standard Description’, is the emphasis on the difference between poetic language and other (prosaic) forms of language: ‘as it is the nature of all poetry, so it is particularly of the Hebrew, to be totally different from common language’ (Lect.IV; p.75). In general, poetry has ‘a peculiar and more exquisite mode of expression’ (Lect.IV; p.75), which reveals itself both in the choice of words and in the structures. By stating this, Lowth lays a foundation for the tendency in the discipline of Old Testament studies – which has lasted until the final decades of the 20th century and, to a certain extent, even until today – to avoid any independent linguistic analysis of the Hebrew poetic texts: poetic language does not obey the rules of Hebrew grammar, but is creatively used by artistic poets with great rhetorical skills.

As already indicated, Lowth’s work constituted the basis for most of the publications on Hebrew poetry in the 18th-20th centuries. The work of Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament exegesis George B. Gray (1865–1922), *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (1915), is a nice example of this. Gray explicitly stresses the enormous contributions Lowth has made to the critical study of the Old...
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Testament and to Hebrew poetry in particular. In his work, he focuses on the identification and the examination of Hebrew poetry’s two main forms – parallelism and metre. Admitting that there is much discussion about these forms, Gray decides to devote a large part of his book to the study of parallelism and metre. Thus, he presents his definition of ‘parallelism’ as a restatement of the insights offered by Lowth, mainly trying to remove the obscurity characterizing Lowth’s category of the ‘synthetic or constructive parallelism’ by introducing the concept of incomplete parallelism and the possibility of a deliberate search for variety in the use of parallelism in order to avoid monotonous repetition. Moreover, Gray follows Lowth in emphasizing that there definitively is a certain rhythm in Hebrew poetry and that this rhythm is often based on parallelism. However, Gray also explains that rhythm is not always the result of parallelism, but in many cases points to a more independent rhythmical principle. In the end, he concludes that in Hebrew poetry indeed a loosely accentual system can be detected, which regulates the length of lines, but leaves room for much variety in the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables. Another interesting feature of Gray’s work is that he adds to Hebrew poetry’s two basic forms a third form, the strophe, which he considers to be of ‘less, but still of considerable importance’.

1.2.2 Turn to Syntax

It is only in the 1960s that we encounter a change in the general approach to Hebrew poetry, which is worthwhile mentioning here. In the search for different levels of measurement, which emerged from the ongoing debate about the Hebrew metre and the question about the delimitation of verse lines that was linked to it, several scholars turned away from the traditional ‘accent count’ approaches that focused on the number of stressed syllables per colon (akzentuierendes System) or the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables (alternierendes System), and started to pay attention in these years to quantities of non-phonological linguistic elements, with that continuing the approach defended by the already mentioned Jewish rabbi Azariah de Rossi. Thus, Freedman (1980, 1987) rejects the idea of a metre based on phonological restrictions and instead introduces a quantitative approach stating that the metrical patterns in Hebrew poetry

11 Gray, Forms of Hebrew Poetry, pp.58, 72.
14 See, for example, the studies of Sievers, Albright, Hrushovski and Ridderbos.
15 See, for example, the studies of Hare, Mowinckel and Böhl.
16 Freedman’s article ‘Another Look at Biblical Hebrew Poetry’ was published in Follis, E.R. (ed.), Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987). This volume contains sixteen essays, most of which are written by professors of Old Testament or Biblical Studies. In the preface to the volume, it is suggested that these essays are indicative ‘of the directions in which the study of biblical Hebrew poetry is presently being pursued’ (p.7). The essays are characterized as being of an interdisciplinary character. In general, they focus on the field of literary criticism, but the authors have also referred to insights from other areas like music, drama, classics, philosophy and the social sciences. By including such a variety of approaches, the editor has tried to give an overview of the richness of the study of Hebrew poetry. It is, however, illustrative for the study of Biblical Hebrew poetry, in general, that the discipline of linguistics is not mentioned in this preface,
can best be described by means of a ‘syllable-counting system’.

Freedman admits that it is not very likely that the Hebrew poets always counted the syllables in their compositions. Instead, he argues that we should reckon with a fundamental control system deeply rooted in the consciousness of all poets: ‘The result was a format at once regular and flexible, within whose fixed but not consciously recognized limits (sic) the poet was free to practice his art and express his individuality.’

Another scholar searching for regularities on the linguistic, or more specifically, the syntactic level, was Kosmala (1964). He argues that the basic element of Biblical Hebrew poetry is not the verse line or colon, but the word- or thought-unit and that there is a strong regularity in the number of these units per verse line (between five and eight). Not only verse lines together forming a parallelism consist of an equal number of thought-units, but the same is often true for the verse lines constituting a stanza: the lines within a stanza frequently are all of the same length in terms of the number of thought-units they contain.

The role of linguistics in these studies, however, remains very limited. Both scholars restrict themselves to merely counting linguistic units in order to find some regularity within the verse line that cannot be described by a phonological (accentual) metrical system. It is illustrative to see how both Kosmala and Freedman are firmly positioning themselves within the traditional ‘Standard Description’ approach by repeatedly referring to the beauty of Hebrew poetic art and the literary skills of the Hebrew poets. On the other hand, these scholars did create room for another, more significant trend arising in the late 1970s.

In three works published in those years, Old Testament scholars Collins, O’Connor and Cloete advocated the use of a more profound syntactic analysis. The influence of studies like those of Freedman and, in particular, Kosmala on these works is obvious: counting linguistic elements continues to play an important role. However, the three works were innovative in that they pleaded for the introduction of a whole new grammatical approach within the literary study of

neither does linguistic analysis play a serious role in any of the essays of the volume. Only in the articles of Freedman and O’Connor (‘The Pseudosorites: A Type of Paradox in Hebrew Verse’) is some attention paid to linguistic elements, but this is done merely within the framework of literary interpretation. We do not find a single trace of an independent linguistic analysis in this volume which claims to be representative of the ‘current’ (late 1980s) developments in the study of Hebrew poetry.

Freedman also investigated the usability of a ‘word-counting system’. He does not seem to be very consistent in his judgement about such a word-count approach. In *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, 1980), he explicitly identifies his attempts to find regularity in the number of words per line as ‘a waste of time’, while in ‘Another Look at Biblical Hebrew Poetry’ (1987) he suggests that the counting of words could well be as useful as the counting of the number of syllables.


Thus, Kosmala explains how the intimate relationship between form and meaning resulted in ‘the peculiar charm and outstanding beauty of ancient Hebrew poetic art’ (‘Form and Structure’, p.434), while Freedman is of the opinion that ‘we have given insufficient credit to the poet for subtleties and intricacies in his artistic creation’ and – expressing his idea that within the total configuration that can be measured by syllable counts, there was plenty of room for much variation – states the following about the structure of an individual poem: ‘The whole is a product of his genius, and many of the details are distinctive of this poet’ (*Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy*, p.11).
Hebrew poetry.21 The study of syntax was assigned a key function in these studies, which is why we will refer to these works as ‘the syntactic studies’.

Thus, Collins aims at a fruitful combination of linguistics and literary criticism. He explicitly criticizes traditional approaches that have, since the time of Lowth, concentrated too much on semantic relationships and parallelism, and asks for a shift from semantic to syntactic analysis. In the description of his theory of grammar, Collins proves himself to be innovative too. Instead of assuming the existence of a gap between ‘common language’ and poetic language, he states that this theory of grammar ‘must be one which operates in the language as a whole, not a special grammar for poetic texts. At the same time it must be capable of adaptation to enable it to describe any special features which occur only in poetry.’22 In his book Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry, Collins presents a classification of all types of lines occurring in Hebrew poetry. On the basis of the presence and order of three different types of constituents – subject/object (NP), verb (V) and modifier (M) – Collins distinguishes between four basic line-forms. These are grouped into four ‘General line-types’ – 1) lines containing only one of the four basic line-forms (e.g.: NP V M), 2) lines consisting of twice the same line-form with all of the constituents of the first line-form repeated in the second line-form (e.g.: NP V M – NP V M), 3) lines consisting of twice the same line-form but not repeating all of the first line-form’s constituents in the second line-form (e.g.: NP V – NP), and 4) lines consisting of two different line-forms (e.g.: NP V – NP V NP) – which, in turn, are further classified into ‘Specific line-types’ on the basis of the exact basic line-form(s) used in them.

Although Collins’ plea for giving room to syntactic analysis is very valuable, his grammatical approach in the end merely functions as an instrument for identifying ‘well-formed lines’, which, in turn, form the starting point for literary interpretation. As Collins himself puts it: ‘grammatical analysis can help us identify specific stylistic features of particular writers.’24 In summarizing the goals of his work, Collins explicitly stresses the secondary function of syntax in relation to literary interpretation: ‘Thus, one of the main results of this study will be to show that in Hebrew poetry syntax is ‘poetic’ in the strictest sense of the word, since it contributes to the aesthetic pleasure of appreciating a well-formed line which satisfies instinctive expectations already set up through familiarity with the same pattern in other known lines.’25 This quotation gives the impression that Collins falls back here again into the traditional pitfall of assuming the existence of a gap between ‘common language’ and poetic language.

In his big volume Hebrew Verse Structure, O’Connor takes a step further in the direction of giving syntactic analysis a more independent character. He blames Old Testament scholars for having ignored any grammatical analysis in their literary analyses of poetic texts and for having

---

21 In earlier work, a grammatical analysis of poetic texts had generally been ignored, except in diachronic studies like that of Robertson, who tried to distinguish between Early Hebrew poetry and Standard Hebrew poetry by categorizing the grammatical features of both. In such studies, however, no attention is paid to the contribution of linguistic analysis to the literary interpretation of poetic texts. We will come back to Robertson’s book in the next chapter, as he argued that it was one of the distinctive grammatical features of Early Hebrew poetry that it could use both qatal and yiqtol as a ‘past narrative’.
23 Collins, Line-Forms, p.44.
25 Collins, Line-Forms, p.16.
suggested time and again that a grammatical approach to a Hebrew poem would not yield any fruitful results. O’Connor notices the tension that has arisen between grammatical studies and the examination of Hebrew poetry and that has its origin in the claim that grammar cannot cope with the ungrammaticality in poetic texts. According to O’Connor, however, one should argue just the other way around: only when a grammatical description of structures and other elements in poetic texts is provided, can one trace ‘ungrammatical’ deviations in these texts. O’Connor rejects the ‘Standard Description’ which has made Hebrew poetic structure even more mysterious with its emphasis on parallelism and metre. Instead, O’Connor expresses his admiration for the studies of Kosmala and others, who have searched for regularities on the syntactic (instead of phonological) level. He suggests that the formation of lines is, indeed, bound to a number of syntactic constraints that operate on three linguistic levels, namely that of clause predicators (0–3 per line), constituents (1–4 per line) and units (2–5 per line).

Although O’Connor repeatedly stresses that his approach is of a syntactic nature, in the end, his study suffers from the same weakness as that of Collins. The syntactic analysis is not fully independent, but instead functions as an instrument to correctly delimit literary poetic units (cola). O’Connor rightly questions many of the frailties of earlier studies, but himself does not take the necessary step of conducting an independent (non-instrumental) linguistic analysis of poetic texts. Instead, in his work, the study of syntax remains located within the study of poetic units.

Unfortunately, the same is true for the final one of the three syntactic studies of the 1980s, which is the volume Versification and Syntax in Jeremiah 2–25: Syntactical Constraints in Hebrew Colometry published by Cloete. Thus, Cloete states explicitly that his study aims to respond to the uncertainty among Old Testament scholars about the position of the colon boundaries by concentrating on the syntactic nature of the colometric system. Again, the syntactic approach functions to serve a colometric analysis. After having elaborately discussed and criticized the syntactic studies of Collins and O’Connor, Cloete arrives at the conclusion that the work of O’Connor is superior to all other attempts to delineate the cola in Hebrew verse. For that reason, he decides to adopt O’Connor’s matrix of syntactic constraints, at the same time changing it slightly by adding a fourth level of measurement to it: that of main stresses (1–4 per colon). While O’Connor regarded his syntactic approach as an alternative to the traditional phonological approaches, Cloete tries to combine the two by asserting that both syntactic and accentual aspects are playing a role in the Hebrew colometric system. By doing so, Cloete in fact blocks the development towards a more independent syntactic approach which seemed to emerge in the studies of Collins and, in particular, O’Connor. Instead of promoting a study of syntax outside the domain of the search for the boundaries of poetic units, Cloete both firmly places the method of syntactic analysis within the area of colon delineation and further limits its instrumental role by taking up again the phonological, accentual analysis that was dismissed in the other two studies. Thus, syntax loses its function as being the only base of the Hebrew versification system: Cloete emphasizes that the Hebrew metre in itself is a ‘pure tonic metre’ which is characterized by an alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables. Although the number of stressed and unstressed syllables per colon is quite random and therefore can and should not be used as the only criterion

26 O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, p.10.
27 O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, p.33.
for determining colon boundaries, one certainly has to take into account this phonological base in the colometric analysis of Hebrew poetry. Another ‘step back’ in Cloete’s study, which we also discerned in the work of Collins, is his conviction that there are ‘marked differences between the syntax of Hebrew prose and that of Hebrew verse’. Cloete follows Hartman and other scholars in asserting that there is a strong dichotomy between verse and prose.

Cloete’s study reveals two main weaknesses of the work of those scholars who in the 1980s advocated the use of a syntactic approach in the analysis of Hebrew poetry: by assuming the existence of a gap between prosaic and poetic syntax (thus mirroring the traditional idea that poetic language and ‘common language’ were totally different from each other) and by assigning to the study of syntax only an instrumental function (that becomes even more limited in Cloete’s book), these studies have blocked any profound grammatical analysis of the poetic texts and have enabled the literary-rhetorical and semantic analyses to continue playing their dominant roles in the study of Hebrew poetry.

This situation did not change in the decades after the publication of these syntactic studies. In fact, many new studies followed Cloete in further restricting and, in the end, even ignoring the role of syntactic or, more generally speaking, linguistic analysis and merely paying attention to the beauty of the poetic language, its literary structures and the rhetorical skills of the Hebrew poets that became apparent in their use of multiple poetic techniques.

1.2.3 Present State of Affairs: Turning Back to Literary-Rhetorical Analysis

In recent years, only a small number of scholars has tried to take into account some of the results of the syntactic studies and revealed a certain ‘syntactic or linguistic consciousness’. Thus, Wilfred Watson repeatedly refers to these studies in the theoretical introduction to his volume Classical Hebrew Poetry in which he intends to combine the two disciplines of literary criticism and linguistics in order to arrive at ‘an approach to literature which attempts to show specifically how elements of a linguistic text combine to create messages, how, in other words, pieces of

---

29 Cloete, Versification, p.5.
30 One of the very few other examples of studies directly comparable to the three syntactic studies concerning its focus on the study of syntax as a help to identify the poetic lines is: Niccacci, A., ‘Analysing Biblical Hebrew Poetry’ (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 74 (1997)), pp.77–93. In this article, Niccacci starts by stressing the strong communicative and linguistic differences between prose and poetry (pp.77–80) and then continues by assigning to grammatical or syntactic analysis the instrumental function of being the only valid criterion for identifying verse lines, in particular in sequences of two parallel lines with corresponding grammatical units (pp.81–91). The study suffers from the same weaknesses as those of Collins, O’Connor and Cloete: it leaves no room for independent grammatical analysis and it points to several ‘remarkable areas of disagreement between prose and poetry’ (p.91), many of them being of syntactic nature: the apparently free use of verbal forms, the non-rigid word order (suggestively labelled as ‘joy of disorder’) and the use of the phenomenon of ellipsis (pp.91–92).

In a later contribution – Niccacci, A., ‘The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in Hebrew Poetry’, in: S.E. Fassberg & A. Hurvitz, Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting; Typological and Historical Perspectives (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2006), pp.247–268 –, Niccacci puts aside this rather ‘desperate’ attitude and raises the hypothesis that, contrary to what he argued initially, Hebrew poetry, for example in its use of verbal forms, does obey the rules of a linguistic system which it shares with Hebrew prose.
literary writing function as a form of communication. However, in the practical application of his methods in the main part of his book, Watson hardly leaves any room for linguistic analysis and instead focuses strongly on a semantic, literary-rhetorical approach. Thus, Watson makes explicit that ‘the chief interest’ of his study ‘will be the style of Hebrew verse’ and, in line with the subtitle of his volume – ‘A Guide to its Techniques’ –, devotes the longest chapter of his study to a discussion of the poetic devices and rhetorical techniques used by the Hebrew poets. Moreover, Watson proposes a general outline for the analysis of the Hebrew poems which is based merely on the insights provided by literary criticism, leaving any form of linguistic or syntactic analysis out of consideration. Finally, Watson links up with the traditional approach (the ‘Standard Description’) in paying much attention to Hebrew poetry’s basic features of parallelism, metre and strophic division. Interestingly, the gap between theory and practical application becomes very obvious in his discussion of these three topics. Thus, Watson argues that grammatical analysis should always constitute the basis for the description of parallelism and, although very briefly and with a certain reservation, points to the relationship between metre or numerical regularity in verse lines and syntactic analysis as advocated in the studies of Collins and O’Connor. However, in his own description of parallelism Watson concentrates on the use of semantic analyses to identify parallel constructions and on the literary and rhetorical functions fulfilled by parallelism, while he defines the Hebrew metre in terms of accents and argues that the metre is ‘a measure of the poet’s skill’ which ‘disautomatises language’. In this regard, Watson also states that the Hebrew poet in his search for language that suited the metre had to break away from ‘everyday vocabulary and normal syntax’, thus underlining the traditional idea of a gap between poetic and ‘common’ language. Other scholars have made mention of the syntactic studies of Collins, O’Connor and Cloete, too, but did so only to explicitly reject their importance for the study of poetic language. This was the approach of Jan Fokkelman, for example, who can be seen as one of the most important present-day advocates of the assumption that poetic language is so much unlike ‘normal’ language that grammatical or syntactic analysis can never do justice to its exceptional and uncommon nature, in other words: to the poetic licence. It is because of this peculiar character of

32 Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry, p.3.
33 For an example of the application of the type of analysis proposed by Watson, see pp.379–383.
35 Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry, p.112.
36 Compare also the work of Robert Alter, The Art of Biblical Poetry (New York: Basic Books, 1985). Alter characterizes the system of ‘syntactic constraints’ as proposed by O’Connor and Cloete as ‘bewilderingly elaborate’ and ‘arbitrary’ in its ‘chopping up of poetic lines into units that will confirm the proposed pattern’ (p.3). In a note (p.215n2) Alter defines the work of Collins as an ‘equally unconvincing (…) attempt to make syntax the governing principle’ of the Hebrew verse line. Alter himself opts for a literary approach and aims to find and illustrate the principles of poetics that operate in the Hebrew Bible. A central point of attention in his study is the semantic nature of the Hebrew parallelism. According to Alter, a general characteristic of all different subtypes of semantic parallelism is that the first part of the parallelism contains a general term while the second part refers to a more specific instance of the general category referred to in the first part (p.19). All in all, Alter clearly takes a traditional position as he focuses on a literary-rhetorical interpretation of the poetic art in the Hebrew Bible.
poetry that Fokkelman in his four volumes about the *Major Poems in the Hebrew Bible* adopts an attitude of ‘fundamental reservation’ towards the usefulness of syntactic studies for the interpretation of poetry. He states that ‘linguistics or the analysis of sentence structure are not the obvious disciplines to do justice to the unicity of poetry. For this we need poetics, i.e. that discipline which starts from the recognition that its object is an object *sui generis*’ and adds that ‘poetic licence, and its surprising forms of expression, are matters that do not conform easily to the grids of logic and linguistics, and sometimes spill over the limits of grammatical and syntactic analysis.’\(^{37}\) Instead of applying a system of syntactic constraints, Fokkelman stresses the unicity and individuality of every poem, which can only be adequately described by a prosodic analysis which accepts the high degree of flexibility in the construction of cola and poetic lines.

According to Fokkelman, for the correct delimitation of cola one has to combine semantic and literary analysis of the cola, and their context, with the technique of ‘syllable counting’. Not surprisingly, Fokkelman here makes mention of the work of Freedman, pointing, however, to an important difference between Freedman’s studies and his own. For Fokkelman, counting syllables does not just serve to determine the length of verse lines, but is part of a much broader approach which aims to identify the structures within a specific poem: the colometric analysis is embedded in the larger framework of a literary structural analysis, which is supported by numerical considerations, not only on colon level, but also on the level of strophes and stanza’s. Most modern Old Testament scholars, however, ignore, or at least do not systematically apply, the results of the syntactic studies in their work. Some of them occasionally create room for linguistic or syntactic considerations, but most scholars merely analyze the poetic texts from a semantic and literary-rhetorical perspective. The volume *The Structure of Classical Hebrew Poetry* of Marjo Korpel and Johannes de Moor is one of the very few examples belonging to the first category. In their search for objective arguments to evaluate traditions regarding textual divisions, Korpel and De Moor, for all textual levels (cola, verse line, strophe, canticle, cantos) introduce separating and binding forces which operate on that specific level. On each of the levels the Masoretic accents constitute the primary source for the delimitation of textual units. Parallelism and (absence of) thematic unity are two other important factors. However, on the level of verse lines and strophes, syntax seems to play a (minor) role too, according to Korpel and De Moor. Thus, ellipsis – the omission of one or more words in a parallel colon – is an important binding force on the level of verse line, as it is impossible to understand the phenomenon without taking into account a neighbouring colon. Moreover, sometimes, a sentence started in the first colon is continued in the second. In both such cases, ‘the cola appear to be bound by syntax’.\(^{38}\) Furthermore, the use of emphatic syntactic constructions, especially the deliberate changing of the default (prosaic) syntactic word order, functions as a separating force on the level of strophes. Again, however, the role of syntax is merely instrumental. As was true for the ‘syntactic’ studies of the 1980s, the study of syntax in the volume of Korpel and De Moor just functions to support the delimitation of poetic units, as becomes clear in the remark that ‘in poetry the changing of word-order often has no other function than to mark the boundaries of strophes.’\(^{39}\)

---

As we have already said, most modern studies do not take their starting point in the study of syntax or any other form of linguistic analysis. Illustrative examples in this regard are the writings of Alter, Alonso-Schökel, Landy and, quite recently, Van der Lugt. Alonso-Schökel, in his book *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, expresses his admiration for the studies of Watson and Alter and decides to imitate them by concentrating on poetic techniques like assonance and alliteration, synonymy, repetition, imagery and figures of speech, and on the two ‘pillars’ of Hebrew poetry as identified by Lowth: parallelism and (tonal) metre. For our purposes, it is interesting to note that Alonso-Schökel does not pay any attention to Watson’s theoretical remarks about the advantages of the study of syntax. Quite innovating is Alonso-Schökel’s insistence that it is impossible to make rigid distinctions between poetry and, especially artistic, prose. However, he admits that poetry enables language to be used in new ways, thus implicitly questioning the applicability of a grammatical approach to poetic texts.\(^{40}\)

Most recent studies link up with the tendencies noted above. Thus, Landy, like Alonso-Schökel, shows much respect for the work of scholars like Alter. In his volume *Beauty and the Enigma*, which consists of a collection of several essays mainly about poetic books and chapters and all containing some reflections on ‘poetry and poetic experience’,\(^{41}\) he criticizes others for having placed too much focus on the technical aspects of metre and structural patterns and, in doing so, overlooking the ‘poetical aspects’ in poetry. As this remark already suggests, Landy decides to concentrate on those features which separate poetic passages from prose, thereby stressing the beauty of the Hebrew poetry. Although asserting that poetry and prose represent the ends of a continuum, Landy mentions several important differences between the two genres. Thus, poetry is ‘timeless’, more personal and more emotional, making use of metaphorical expressions and parallelism, which Landy defines as poetry’s simplest trick. Furthermore, poetry is characterized by ‘the intricacy of imagery, the freedom with which convention is used, the interplay between creativity and tradition’.\(^{42}\) This all makes clear that Landy agrees with the traditional tendency to emphasize the differences between poetic language and ‘common language’. His quotation of the work of Alter is a good illustration of this: ‘Poetry, working through a system of complex linkages of sound, image, word, rhythm, syntax, theme, idea, is an instrument for conveying densely patterned meanings, and sometimes contradictory meanings, that are not readily conveyable through other kinds of discourse... poetry is a way of using language strongly oriented toward the creation of minute, multiple, heterogeneous, and semantically fruitful interconnections.’

A final study which may well be considered as representative of the current state of affairs in the study of Hebrew poetry is the book *Cantos and Strophes in Biblical Hebrew Poetry* of Pieter van der Lugt. In his elaborate outline, Van der Lugt discusses all relevant studies about the strophic structures in Hebrew poetry published since the 19th century, but does not mention a single study making use of linguistic or syntactic analysis to detect the structures in poetic texts. Van der Lugt himself links up with this tendency to avoid linguistic and syntactic considerations in the structural analysis of Hebrew poetry. He argues that, in order to arrive at an adequate analysis of the structures in poetic texts, five mutually complementary lines should be combined: 1) paying attention to the development of the ‘thought contents’ (cf. Kosmala) in a thematical analysis, 2)

---


\(^{42}\) Landy, *Beauty and the Enigma*, p.21.
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registering ‘transition markers’ (like specific particles, key words and certain verbal forms), 3) observing ‘verbal repetitions’, 4) investigating structural divisions proposed by others, and 5) describing quantitative structural aspects found by a numerical approach. Together these lines constitute the method for the rhetorical inquiry Van der Lugt intends to undertake. It is this methodology which will enable him to reach his goal: a systematic description of ‘the rhetorical aspects of the overall design of Hebrew poetry’.

1.2.4 Conclusions

Now that we have presented a brief historical survey of the developments in the study of Biblical Hebrew poetry, which conclusions can be drawn? First of all, it appears to be the case that, in the end, the approach toward the Hebrew poetic texts has not significantly changed since the first critical examination of these texts by Lowth. In the two and a half centuries that have passed since he published his lectures, his findings have continued to form the basis for most of the writings about Hebrew poetry. Despite two interesting developments – the promotion of the search for numerical regularity in the 1960s and 1970s and the growing attention for syntactic analysis in the late 1970s and the 1980s – recent publications like those of Landy and Van der Lugt show that these developments have not so much altered the approach introduced by Lowth (defined above as ‘Standard Description’), but have rather added some new elements to it, leaving its basis intact. Thus, most present-day studies link up with the traditional tendency to merely analyze the texts from a literary-rhetorical point of view, thereby focusing on the rhetorical skills of the Hebrew poet and the beauty of the poetic language as they manifest themselves in the use of poetic devices, the creation of beautiful literary structures, and the presence of wonderful numerical regularities. In sum, the poetic texts are mainly considered to be artistic and beautiful, but static pieces of art. By thus either completely avoiding any form of linguistic analysis or locating linguistic and syntactic analyses within the framework of literary interpretation, the study of Hebrew poetry suffers from a strong methodological weakness. The gap between Linguistics and poetry continues to be preserved, which is reflected by the common idea that regularity in the Hebrew poetic texts can and should not be described in terms of a grammatical system. In suggesting or even explicitly stressing that poetic language differs so strongly from ‘common’ prosaic language that grammatical and syntactic analyses of poetic texts will not yield any fruitful results, the discipline of Old Testament not only violates the linguistic universal that every genre makes use of the one and single grammar of its own language, but also provides a methodological
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43 Van der Lugt here refers to the work of Labuschagne and decides to (partially) adopt his approach by counting all cola and strophes and the number of words on different textual levels in order to find the central cola, strophes and words that often contain or refer to the core information in the poem. By including this search for numerical regularity, Van der Lugt links up with the studies of Freedman and, especially, Kosmala that preceded the three syntactic studies of the 1980s, and with the work of Fokkelman, who also embedded his system of counting linguistic units (syllables) into the larger framework of structural analysis.


framework that forms the breeding ground for our research problem: the lack of knowledge about the exact functions of the verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry.

The century-long dominance of the methods of semantic, literary and rhetorical analysis in the discipline of Old Testament Studies until today has blocked any systematic, linguistic analysis of the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry. This will become clear in the next sections of this chapter, in which we will discuss how commentaries, Bible translations and grammars have dealt with the verbal forms occurring in poetic texts.

1.3 Commentaries

The tendency to ignore any form of independent linguistic analysis in the study of Hebrew poetry has had several consequences for the interpretation and translation of the verbal forms used in the Hebrew poetic texts. However, before we illustrate these consequences by comparing the interpretations and translations of verbal forms presented in a selection of commentaries on the Psalms, we will first briefly investigate to what extent these commentaries follow the tendencies identified in the first section in order to strengthen our point that the focus on literary-rhetorical analyses of the texts indeed dominates the study of Hebrew poetry.

1.3.1 Analyses of Poetic Texts in Commentaries

For this part of our study, we have examined explicit and implicit remarks made about the nature and structure of poetic texts in seven commentaries covering a time span of roughly one hundred years. First of all, let us take a look at the most important tendencies in these commentaries’ analyses of the poetic texts.

A first remarkable fact is that most of the commentaries emphasize that they will not focus on linguistic analysis, but rather on the literary structures of the poetic texts and the rhetorical skills of the Hebrew poets. Thus, Beaucamp states: ‘C’est sur l’analyse littéraire de chaque pièce que portera l’essentiel de notre commentaire (…) Il ne s’agit pas là à strictement parler d’une analyse structurale mais d’une analyse de la structure littéraire.’ Craigie stresses that the ‘detailed literary analysis (…) (or, for those who prefer it, in terms of “rhetorical criticism”), must be undertaken first’, while Dahood in his introduction to the third volume of his commentary on the Psalms pays much attention to the description of ‘poetic techniques’, which form an expression of the poet’s ‘literary skills’, and explains that he will focus on a literary-theological
interpretation of the texts. Terrien adopts this focus on literary and rhetorical structures in his commentary and makes the theological interpretation of the texts his central point of interest. The commentaries not only link up with the tendency to concentrate on literary analysis, but also follow the trend to ‘create’ a gap between poetic language and ‘common language’ by repeatedly stressing the beauty and artistry of the Hebrew poetry. A nice example of this we find in the commentary of Craigie, who characterizes poetic language as ‘a special kind of language (... an attempt to transcend the limitations of normal (prosaic) human language and to give expression to something not easily expressed in words’ and, with other commentators like Dahood, refers to Hebrew poetry as ‘highly sophisticated, subtle, full of nuances’, thereby seeming to assume the existence of a separate, highly inconceivable grammar of Hebrew poetry.

When we examine the analyses of the individual Psalms in the commentaries, we find clear traces of the traditional tendencies identified in §1.2. Thus, most commentaries focus on the three topics that dominated the study of Hebrew poetry – parallelism, metre and strophic structure – and adopt traditional views when doing so. In their description of parallelism, for example, most commentators agree with Lowth’s distinction of three types of parallelism (BR, CR, KR, SE), while three of them identify parallelism as Hebrew poetry’s dominant feature (DA, KR, SE). The debate about the Hebrew metre also plays a role in the commentaries, though most of them follow the traditional view of a metre consisting of an alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables (accentual system). Craigie forms an exception to this as he decides to follow the approach of those scholars who defined the Hebrew metre in terms of the number of units per verse line, though he explicitly states that the idea of a rigid regularity or system should be rejected. None of the commentaries, however, pays attention to the study of syntax as a possible help to find regularities in the (length of) verse lines. It is interesting to note that several commentaries emphasize that metrical patterns have been damaged by changes made in the Hebrew texts during its history of transmission. Some commentators even deem it possible to restore the original text on the basis of metrical considerations (KR, BE). With regard to the analysis of strophic structures, the commentaries show more variation. Still, most of them follow the tendency to make the detection of strophic structures into an important part of the analysis of Hebrew poetry. Two commentaries propose to delimit strophes on the basis of ‘lines of thought’ in the text (BR, BE), but most commentators avoid an elaborate discussion of the criteria that can be used to find the boundaries of strophes, which sometimes makes their strophic divisions appear quite random.

Next to these three central topics the commentaries also mention lots of poetic devices and techniques that were used by the poets when they composed their poems. Thus, attention is paid to sound patterns (rhyme, assonance, alliteration), verbal repetitions, literary structures like chiasm and inclusion, word plays, and acrostics.

We can conclude, then, that the tendencies characterizing the studies of Hebrew poetry discussed in the first section also dominate the analyses of poetic texts in commentaries on poetic books like the Psalms. None of the commentaries creates room for grammatical analyses.
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49 Dahood, Psalms 1–50, pp.xxv-xxx, xxxvii-xli.
50 Craigie, Psalms 1–50, p.36.
51 Cf. Dahood, Psalms 1–50, p.xxxv.
52 Cf. Terrien, who states that ‘The Hebrew metre is not a system of rigorous regularity: A style of emphasis or of restraint, due to the poet’s emotion or reflective pause, might explain rhythmic variations’ (Psalms 1–50, p.37).
and we hardly find evidence of any influence of the three syntactic studies in the more recent commentaries, that, instead, seem to simply ignore the growing attention for the study of syntax in the 1980s and take their position among the present-day studies like those of Landy and Van der Lugt, in which Hebrew poetry is merely examined from a literary-rhetorical perspective. Let us now illustrate how this attitude towards the Hebrew poetic texts effects the interpretation and translation of verbal forms occurring in it.

1.3.2 Interpretation of Verbal Forms in Commentaries

For our analysis of the interpretation of verbal forms in commentaries on poetic books, we have made use of the seven commentaries on the Psalms mentioned in the previous subsection (see note 46) and have added two other commentaries to them: Ridderbos (1955) and Jacquet (1975). Before we present the interpretational and translational tendencies we discovered in these commentaries, let us first draw a framework for this presentation by summarizing the commentaries’ explicit assertions about the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry.

1.3.2.1 Explicit Comments on Hebrew Poetry’s Use of Verbal Forms

A first important observation in this regard is that most commentators do not make a single remark about the ‘problem’ of the functioning of verbal forms in the poetic texts. Of course, this does not mean the problem is not there, as we will see below. Three commentaries, however, do provide a certain theory about Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms. Interestingly, they all work from a different perspective. Thus, Craigie supports the aspectual theory, claiming that the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry indicate whether an action is completed (perfect) or incomplete (imperfect). Dahood, instead, opts for a historical-comparative approach and argues that the problematic alternation of qatal and yiqtol forms in Hebrew poetry can be explained by taking into account the influence of the Ugaritic language which often used the yiqtol form to refer to a simple action in the past and regularly contained a ‘balanced’ sequence of qtl and yiqtol forms (fulfilling the same function) in its poetic passages. Briggs does not devote much space to a description of the functions of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry, but repeatedly emphasizes in his translational notes that he tries to apply the verbal aspectual theory of the recent editions of Gesenius’ grammar in his translation of the verbal forms in the Psalms. Though these three commentaries support different theories, they resemble each other in that they all (explicitly) admit or (implicitly) show that their respective theories cannot be consistently applied to all verbal forms occurring in the poetic texts. Thus, Craigie questions the usability of
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53 The commentary of Terrien is illustrative in this regard. The psalms are characterized as forms of ‘poetic art’ and the psalmists are called ‘versifying craftsmen’. The commentator concentrates on literary structures and thematical developments in the text, adopts both the division into three types of parallelism of Lowth and the traditional, accentual metrical system, and considers the expression of elegance to be the most important (literary) purpose of the strophic structures in Hebrew poetry.


the aspect theory, which he characterizes as ‘tentative’, by admitting that ‘we are working partially in the dark with respect to the translation of Hebrew verbs in poetry’, that ‘the poet had relative freedom to use the most appropriate form’ and that, for that reason, ‘in practice, the context is the principal guide to determining the most appropriate translation’.\(^{57}\) Dahood’s approach in itself raises many questions. Contrary to his statement that in Hebrew poetry ‘yiqtol often is paired with qatal, with both expressing past actions’, Dahood is, as we will see below, not at all systematic in his rendering of the many sequences of qatal and yiqtol he identifies. In the third volume of his commentary, for example, Dahood classifies the verbal patterns consisting of a sequence of qatal and yiqtol in four groups on the basis of his rendering of the forms: 1) some of them are translated with past tense, 2) others with present tense, 3) again others with future tense, and 4) there is even an instance in which Dahood translates a qatal and a yiqtol form both as optatives. Nowhere in his commentary do we find any criteria on which Dahood bases this apparently unsystematic rendering of the verbal forms. In the end, the translation of the verbal forms seems to be determined by Dahood’s own literary interpretation of the verse and its context. Finally, Briggs, who aims to undertake the attempt to account for poetry’s use of verbal forms in terms of the verbal functions described by recent editions of Gesenius’ grammar, suffers from the problem that, in order to do so, he needs to somehow invent a very large amount of diverging functions for each of the verbal forms. Unfortunately, this undermines the degree of consistency in Briggs’ translation of the forms.

1.3.2.2 Translational tendencies

Although, based on the observations presented above, a consistent application of one of the theories mentioned does not seem to be possible, we consider it worthwhile to investigate to what extent the commentaries in general are able (and trying) to systematically translate the verbal forms occurring in Hebrew poetry. In doing so, we aim to discover some tendencies in the interpretations and renderings of Hebrew poetry’s verbal forms in traditional and present-day commentaries.

1.3.2.1 Lack of Internal Consistency

We have compared the commentaries’ translations of nine passages taken from the first ten Psalms: Ps 1.1–3; 2.1–2; 3.5–7; 4.4; 6.7–9, 10; 7.13–16; 8.5–7; 9.7–11; 10.2–3. These passages have mainly been selected because of the remarkable alternation of qatal and yiqtol forms they contain. All in all, we have examined 27 verses containing 59 verbal forms, which we divided into different categories including those of 1) qatal forms (26 attestations), 2) yiqtol forms (22 attestations, excluding those belonging to a wayyiqtol clause), and 3) wayyiqtol forms (6 attestations). For each of these three types of forms we investigated to what extent they were translated consistently. We did so by distinguishing between four types of translation on the basis of tense and aspect – past tense/perfect, present tense, future tense – and on the basis of ‘mood’ – contrasting the three types of indicative renderings just mentioned with the type of modal renderings.\(^{58}\) For each of the three formal categories (qatal, yiqtol, wayyiqtol) we
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\(^{57}\) Craigie, Psalms 1–50, p.111–113.

\(^{58}\) To keep our analysis as simple as possible, further functional nuances were avoided. Thus, we decided not to distinguish between past tense and perfective aspect renderings, but rather to place them in a single category. In the end, it was not our purpose to describe as accurately as possible how each of the verbal...
investigated how often the four types of translation (past, present, future, modal) were provided by a specific commentary.

The results of our analysis can be found in the scheme in fig. 1.1.59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Qatal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Yiqtol</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Wayyiqtol</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Fut</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Fut</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridderbos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahood</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaucamp</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigie</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seybold</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrien</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47,9</td>
<td>48,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>71,7</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>5,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.1 Translation by commentaries of qatal, yiqtol and wayyiqtol forms in nine passages from Ps 1-10

The results presented in the scheme evoke a number of interesting observations. First of all, there is a remarkable balance in the number of past tense renderings and present tense renderings of the qatal forms. Three exceptions should be mentioned in this regard. First, in the two French commentaries (Jacquet, Beaucamp) there is an obvious preference for a present tense translation of the qatal form. Second, the commentary of Craigie shows an opposite inclination as it renders nearly all qatal forms with a past tense. Third, the commentary of Dahood is extremely unsystematic in its translation of the qatal forms, as it provides twice a future tense rendering and five times a modal or volitive interpretation.

Another important observation is that the overwhelming majority of the yiqtol forms is rendered by a present tense. Again, three remarks can be made. First, there are only two commentaries (Ridderbos and Craigie) in which no past tense rendering of a yiqtol form is found. In most commentaries, three or more yiqtol forms are interpreted as referring to a past situation. Second, a future tense translation is given quite rarely, but Craigie (again) forms an exception to this tendency in providing a future tense rendering for no less than half of the yiqtol forms. Third, Dahood again appears to be very unsystematic in his interpretation of the verbal forms; he makes forms was translated. Instead, we aimed just to give a general impression of the strong mutual differences between commentaries in their translation of the verbal forms and, more importantly, of the high degree of inconsistency in the commentaries themselves regarding their manners of translating the verbal forms.

59 In our analyses, we encountered several difficulties, especially with regard to the classification of the renderings of the qatal forms in Ps 6.8 and 9.7. In addition, a wayyiqtol form was twice reinterpreted as a wayyiqtol form (by Kraus and by Craigie). We have marked these two instances by an asterisk (*). However, even if we would leave these questionable forms out of consideration, this would not affect the general impressions given by the scheme.
use of all four categories of translation to render the different yiqtol forms, as he also did for the qatal forms.

Finally, most wayyiqtol forms are interpreted as indicating past tense, though the number of present tense translations is still remarkably high.

All in all, the results of our analysis seem to point to a tendency in the commentaries to ignore the formal differences between verbal forms by repeatedly offering a neutral, weak, flat present tense translation. The numbers are significant: almost half of the qatal forms (48.3%) and the far majority of the yiqtol forms (71.7%) is rendered by a present tense. In addition, more than a third of the wayyiqtol forms (37%) is assigned a present tense translation.

However, the scheme does not only show us that the commentaries are generally very inconsistent in their interpretation of the verbal forms, but it also gives some insight into the mutual differences between the commentaries in the way they deal with the verbal forms. Thus, the two French commentaries seem to be the most important representatives of the tendency to translate the verbal forms in a neutral, flat manner (with present tense), while the commentary of Dahood, despite its theoretical considerations described above, appears to be very unsystematic in its interpretation of the verbal forms. The commentary of Craigie, on the other hand, is far more consistent in its rendering of the verbal forms than any of the other commentaries.

1.3.2.2 Lack of Agreement between Commentaries

To make clear that commentaries indeed differ strongly in their interpretation of specific verbal forms, let us take a closer look at one of the passages that we selected for our analyses: Ps 7.13–17.60 We propose to focus a bit more on these verses because we have discovered that the interpretations of these verses, and their verbal forms, by the commentaries show great mutual differences. Below, we present the Hebrew text of the five verses together with a rough translation. Instead of providing a specific, and therefore suggestive, translation of the verbal forms, we have noted down only the rendering of the stem of the verbs concerned.

60 We left vs.17 out of consideration in the first part of our analyses, because the use of verbal forms in this verse did not seem to cause real problems in the commentaries. However, we have decided to include vs.17 in our next discussion of the passage, because all of the commentaries consider the verse to be inextricably bound up with vs.13–16.
1. The Research Problem

If he [repent] not, he [whet] his sword, he [bend] his bow, and [string] it, and he [prepare] for him his deadly weapons, he [make] his arrows fiery shafts.

Behold, the wicked man [conceive] evil, and [be pregnant] with mischief, and [bring forth] lies.

He [make] a pit, and he [dig] it, and he [fall] into the hole, which he [make].

His mischief [return] upon his own head, and on his own pate his violence [descend].

The first clause in vs.13a raises many questions in the commentaries: it should be omitted according to some and is very differently translated by others. The final *yiqtol* form in vs.16 seems to constitute a dependent relative clause. Both clauses and their verbal *forms have been left out of consideration in the discussion below.

To present the results of our analysis as clearly as possible, we will again make use of a scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>BR</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>KR</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>TE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>mod</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>fut</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.2 Translation of verbal forms in Ps 7.13-17 by commentaries

---

61 The commentaries all give a past tense rendering for this *yiqtol* form (with the exception of Briggs, who provides a present tense rendering).
1. The Research Problem

In fig. 1.2, we have noted for each of the thirteen verbal forms in Ps 7.13–17 in which manner it is translated by the commentaries, thereby using the same four translation types as in the previous section (past/perfect, present, future, modal).

On the basis of the data presented in the scheme, we propose to divide the commentaries into three categories. The largest category is that of commentaries providing a flat, neutral present tense translation for most of the forms. The best example of a commentary following this tendency is that of Terrien, which renders all verbal forms with a present tense. It is interesting to see that most commentaries have partially acted in line with the tendency by giving a neutral rendering for most forms in the first verses. Thus, with the exception of Dahood and Jacquet, only Craigie differs from all other commentaries in not providing a present tense translation for the three different verbal forms in vs.13. In the other verses, the inclination to use a flat present tense rendering is most clearly visible in the commentaries of Ridderbos (who offers a present tense rendering for all forms in vs.13–15 and 17), Briggs (present tense rendering for all forms in vs.13–15) and Jacquet (present tense rendering for nearly all forms in vs.14–17).

The second category consists of commentaries trying to be systematic in their rendering of the verbal forms. As could be expected on the basis of the results presented in the first scheme, the best example of commentaries belonging to this category is the commentary of Craigie, who consistently renders qatal and wayyiqtol forms with past tense and yiqtol and weqatal forms with present tense (or future tense). Some other commentaries can to a certain extent be regarded as systematic too. Thus, the commentaries of Kraus and Seybold are quite consistent in vs.14–17, as they offer past tense translations for the qatal and wayyiqtol forms and present tense translations for the yiqtol forms.

The third category contains those commentaries in which the alternation of different forms seems to be ignored and in which the translation of the verbal forms is completely inconsistent. As we already suggested above, the best example of a commentary of this category is that of Dahood, who offers a modal, deliberative interpretation (‘would...’) of all five forms in the first two verses and is the only one translating both yiqtols in vs.17 with a past tense (even though they are not ‘balanced’ by a past qatal form). Another example of a commentary in which the interpretation of verbal forms is not systematic at all, is that of Beaucamp, which renders all forms in vs.13–14 with a present tense, then gives a past tense rendering for the first weqatal in vs.15 and a future tense rendering for the second weqatal, and also seems to inconsistently interpret the first wayyiqtol in vs.16 as referring to a past situation and the second wayyiqtol as denoting a future event.

There are, however, a number of instances in which the commentaries belonging to the other categories break away from their translational tendencies and, with that, allow themselves to be inconsistent and non-systematic, too. Thus, Jacquet provides a modal interpretation for the three verbal forms in vs.13 and, contrary to its inclination to use the flat present tense, translates the first weqatal in vs.15 with a past tense. Similarly, Briggs and Ridderbos offer a past tense rendering for the first wayyiqtol in vs.16, but translate the second one, respectively, with a future and a present tense. Even the most systematic commentary, that of Craigie, appears to allow a

---

62 If in a commentary a Hebrew verbal form was not directly rendered by a verbal form of the target language, we wrote down between square brackets the function the commentary implicitly (e.g.: in its rendering of the surrounding verbal forms) assigned to that verbal form. We were required to do so twice.

63 Kraus’ rendering of the yiqtol form in vs.14 with a past tense is an exception to this.
certain degree of variety as it translates the *yiqtol* in vs.14 with a future tense, while it gives a present tense rendering for all other *yiqtol* forms. All in all, it does not seem to be uncommon for commentaries to forget their translational tendencies and to make room for inconsistent translational choices. But what are their reasons for doing so? In other words, considering the strong mutual differences between the commentaries and the internal lack of consistency in nearly all of them, what exactly determines their translation of a verbal form?

1.3.2.3 Relation between Literary Interpretation and Translation of Verbal Forms

In our examination of nine passages selected from Ps 1–10, we found several instances in which the literary interpretation of a text by the commentator influenced the way he dealt with the verbal forms in that text. Thus, in Ps 9.7–11, Kraus, on the basis of his interpretation of the text, proposes to alter the vocalization of no less than three verbal forms. Interestingly, all of the changes are meant to improve the ‘Textzusammenhang’, which suggests that Kraus’ interpretation of the literary contents of the text clearly overrules a systematic interpretation of the verbal forms in the text itself. In Ps 2.1–2 the twofold alternation of *qatal* and *yiqtol* appears to be ignored by the commentators, as they all give a present tense rendering for the text’s four verbal forms. Craigie, who, as we saw, is usually quite systematic in translations, probably feels compelled to explain his ‘flat’ rendering of the forms and does so by stating that the alternation of verbal forms functions to highlight the chiastic structures in these verses. In Ps 6.10, Terrien, who normally tends to ignore formal differences between the verbal forms and to use mainly a neutral present tense, suddenly provides a very ‘systematic’ rendering of the *qatal* form (perfect tense) and *yiqtol* (future) form in this verse. Terrien’s interpretation of the verses’ contents seems to have influenced this sudden change in translation style: ‘...an astounding transformation has taken place in the mind of the psalmist: God has heard his sobbings and will answer his supplications. The verb in the perfect tense makes room for an “imperfected”’. On the other hand, we do not always find such an obvious link between the interpretation of a verse and the manner in which the verbal forms are translated. Thus, commentators sometimes provide an interpretation of the text which is not in line with their rendering of the verbal forms. Terrien, for example, renders the *yiqtol* form and the *wayyiqtol* form in Ps 3.5 both with a past tense (‘With my voice I *cried* aloud to the Lord, and he *heard* me out of his holy hill’), while, in fact, he interprets the *yiqtol* form as referring to a future situation by offering the following explanation: ‘The distressed man announces that he *will cry* out (...); at the moment, however, he restrains his emotion, for having been heard and answered in the past, he will again be listened to in the near future.’

---

64 Thus, he reanalyzes the *yiqtol* form in vs.8 as a *qatal* form and suggests to vocalize the *weyiqtol* forms in vs.10–11 as *wayyiqtol* forms.
66 Compare also Dahood’s comments about the ‘chiastic parallelism’ in these verses; Dahood, *Psalms 1–50*, p.7.
68 Terrien, *The Psalms*, p.92. Compare Ridderbos (De *Psalmen vertaald en verklaard*, p.32), who offers a present tense translation for both verbal forms in Ps 3.5, but in his commentary interprets the *wayyiqtol* as referring to a future event: ‘Nu wordt de door David van Jahwe ontvangen hulp nader beschreven als een verhoring van zijn gebed: Jahwe zal hem op zijn hulpgeschrei horen.’
1. The Research Problem

All in all, we find two major tendencies with regard to the relation between the commentaries’ interpretations of these verses and their renderings of the verbal forms in them. A first group of commentaries appears to regard the literary interpretation of the verses and the translation of the verbal forms occurring in them as two completely separated domains as they both ignore their translation of the verbal forms when providing their interpretation of the text (compare our example of Terrien’s translation and interpretation of Ps 3.5 above) and propose a translation of the verbal forms without taking into account their literary interpretation of the text’s contents. A second group of commentaries assumes a ‘one-way relationship’ between the two domains: the translation of the verbal forms obviously depends on the literary interpretation of the verses’ contents, while formal differences between the verbal forms are ignored in the textual interpretation.

Interestingly, both tendencies point to an absolute dominancy of the method of literary analysis and to a lack of linguistic analysis and systematic interpretation of the functions of verbal forms. Both groups of commentaries in their interpretations of the text simply ignore formal differences between the verbal forms, even if they tried to account for them in the translation of the verses. Now, there are interesting links between the two groups of commentaries just distinguished and the styles of translating identified earlier. Thus, commentaries exhibiting a ‘systematic’ style of translating generally show the tendency to ignore their translation of the verbal forms in their interpretation of the textual contents, even regularly proposing interpretations of the verses which are not supported by their rendering of the verbal forms. Several commentaries, for example, interpret Ps 7.16 as referring to a general situation, although they have systematically rendered the qatal and wayyiqtol forms of the verse with a past tense, thus suggesting that the verse describes a specific situation in the past. Next to these ‘systematic’ commentaries, a number of commentaries using a ‘flat’ present-tense translation style also adopt the tendency to ignore their translation of the verbal forms in their interpretation of the text. Interestingly, in these commentaries we observe an opposite trend. Instead of providing a more general interpretation of the text than the translation of verbal forms seems to support, these commentators offer a more specific explanation of the text’s contents than their ‘flat’ present-tense translation of the verbal forms appears to allow for. Thus, Ridderbos’ interpretation of Ps 7.13–14 shows much more ‘temporal relief’ than is reflected in his present-tense rendering of the verbal forms: the psalmist is presented as finding himself in the midst of a chronologically ordered series of actions, some of which have already happened and some of which still have to take place: ‘het zwaard wordt eerst gewet; de boog wordt gespannen, straks worden de pijlen gericht, en de dichter geeft op sobere wijze de afloop aan door te zeggen, dat het dodelijke schichten zijn en dat God ze brandend maakt.’

However, most commentaries belonging to the category of those giving a ‘flat’ present-tense rendering of most of the verbal forms, follow the second tendency of letting their translation of the verbal forms be influenced by or conform to their interpretation of the text. Thus, Jacquet, Beaucamp and Terrien all emphasize the general nature of Ps 7.13–17 by suggesting that they

---

69 Craigie (*Psalms* 1–50, pp.102–103), earlier identified as being the best example of a commentary providing systematic translations of the verbal forms, interprets vs.15–16 as a general portrayal of ‘the sinner’ and his fate: each sinner falls in the pitfall he has dug himself. According to Kraus (*Psalmen* 1–59, p.200), vs.15–16 draw two general pictures in order to explain how evil attacks the evildoer himself. Seybold (*Die Psalmen*, pp.47–48) even interprets vs.15 as a ‘Sprichwort’ indicating that it has always been like this.

70 Ridderbos, *De Psalmen vertaald en verklaard*, p.67.
present general impressions and principles. Beaucamp’s commentary is illustrative in that it excludes any concrete or individual meaning of the text. Thus, Beaucamp argues that Ps 7.13–14 was spoken by a priest telling someone that YHWH always has his weapons prepared for the sinners. Furthermore, he highlights the general character of the contents of the verses by making the singular enemy into a plural in vs.15: ‘Ce sont des gens...’. These people, representing the general category of ‘the sinners’, are pregnant with mischief and will give birth to misfortune. This second tendency is, however, most clearly visible in those commentaries exhibiting the third style of ‘completely non-systematic’ translation. In these commentaries, the literary interpretation obviously influences the manner in which verbal forms are rendered. Thus, Dahood, being the most important example of commentaries belonging to this category, explains that in vs.13–14 the psalmist refers to ‘primeval times when God destroyed his foes’ and, on the basis of that knowledge, expresses his wish that YHWH acts correspondingly in the present situation.71 This interpretation has obviously determined Dahood’s rendering of all qatal, yiqtol and wayyiqtol forms in vs.13–14 with a deliberative form (‘would...’).

1.3.2.4 Conclusions
What conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the presented findings? Some commentaries take into account the formal differences between the verbal forms in their translation, while others do not. All commentaries acknowledging the formal differences in their translation subsequently completely ignore this translation in their interpretation of the text. Some of the commentaries overlooking the formal differences between the verbal forms in their translation do the same and also fully separate their rendering of the verbal forms from their interpretation of the text. Other commentaries ignoring the formal differences between the verbal forms in their translation, however, obviously let their rendering of the verbal forms be determined by their interpretation of the text’s contents. Schematically, we can present these different types of relations between the translation of verbal forms and the interpretation of the text as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translational tendency</th>
<th>Translation reflected in interpretation</th>
<th>Translation not reflected in interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random / neutral</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.3 Relation between translation and interpretation in commentaries

What do the three groups of commentaries have in common? Well, they all point to a dominant focus on the method of literary interpretation and to a complete lack of attention for the question of how systematic, linguistic analyses of the poetic texts and their use of verbal forms may benefit our understanding of the literary contents of the text. Literary analysis and systematic, linguistic analysis are made into two fully separated worlds of which the second one is usually avoided.

The enormous differences between and inconsistencies within commentaries in their renderings of the verbal forms, which create the picture that the commentator is totally free in his decision of how to render a specific verbal form, point to the actuality of our research problem. The need for more insight into Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms is strong, but remains unanswered.

71 Dahood, Psalms 1–50, p.46.
1. The Research Problem

because of the tendencies described in the first two sections of this chapter. In the next section, we will investigate how this situation influences the actual practice of Bible translation by comparing a number of Bible translations. Are the tendencies detected above also attested in these translations that, instead of providing (like the commentaries) personal interpretations of the texts, should aim to adequately and more objectively communicate the message of the Hebrew text to the modern reader?

1.4 Bible Translations

In order to give an adequate overview of the tendencies regarding the rendering of poetry’s verbal forms in Bible translations, we have studied thirty translations from four different languages (English, Dutch, German and French). Most of these translations were published in the 20th century, though we have also included in our survey the Geneva Bible (1599), the King James Version (1611), the Jongbloed edition of the Dutch Statenvertaling (1888) and the Darby Translation (1890). The texts we analyzed have been taken from ten passages in Ps 1–10, most of which were also studied in the commentaries: Ps 1.1–3; 2.1–2; 3.5–7; 4.4; 5.6–7; 6.7–9,10; 7.13–16; 8.5–7; 9.7–11; 10.2–3.

We have applied two types of analysis to the data attested in the Bible translations. The first one may be called ‘vertical analysis’ as it aims to show the strong differences between the Bible translations in their rendering of the individual verbal forms by studying the translations ‘vertically’, i.e.: by concentrating on the correspondences and differences between the thirty Bible translations in their rendering of each individual verbal form. The second type of analysis could instead be called ‘horizontal analysis’ as it concentrates on the degree of consistency within one single Bible translation and the extent to which that translation pays attention to the alternation of different verbal forms in the Hebrew text. This can be measured by studying the translations ‘horizontally’, i.e.: by comparing the renderings of all verbal forms in one single Bible translation.

1.4.1 Horizontal Analysis: Are the Translations Internally Consistent?

Let us start with the results gained by the second form of analysis. In the scheme presented in fig. 1.4 we have noted how the Bible translations rendered the verbal forms in each of the passages we studied. As can be seen, we decided to split some of the passages into two smaller parts as this helped us to present more accurately the translations’ way of dealing with the verbal forms, which sometimes seemed to change from verse to verse. Consequently, fig. 1.4 contains the

---

72 This twofold approach may suggest that we advocate an analysis of the Hebrew verbal system in which a one-to-one relationship between forms and specific functions or meanings is assumed. However, as we will make clear from chapter 3 onwards, we hold that, instead of assigning functions to the individual verbal forms, a verbal form’s meaning is strongly affected by its relation with surrounding verbal forms. Nevertheless, the study of renderings of individual forms in Bible translations does provide us with a helpful context for measuring the degree of consistency exhibited by them.

73 The following passages were divided into two smaller parts: Ps 3.5–7 (vs.5–6 (3A) and vs.7 (3B)); Ps 6.7–10 (vs.7 (6A) and vs.9b–10 (6B)); Ps 7.13–17 (vs.13–14 (7A) and vs.15–17 (7B)); Ps 10.2–3 (vs.2 (10A) and vs.3 (10B)).
results of our examinations of each of the resulting fourteen passages. When a translation in its rendering of the verbal forms in a specific passage did account for the formal differences between those verbal forms, we noted a $Y$ (‘Yes’). When a translation, however, followed the tendency to render all forms in a passage with a ‘flat’ present tense, we noted a $P$ (‘Present’). When it ignored the formal differences by providing a past tense, future tense or perfective rendering of all forms, we indicated that by the symbols $PA$, $FU$ and $PE$, respectively. Finally, we used the symbol $R$ to indicate that the rendering of the verbal forms did not show any sign of regularity, but seemed to be completely random (‘Random’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3A</th>
<th>3B</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6A</th>
<th>6B</th>
<th>7A</th>
<th>7B</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10A</th>
<th>10b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statenvertaling Jongbloed (1888)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$PA$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leidsche vertaling (1914)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG’S1 (1951)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herziene Statenvertaling (2011)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$PA$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Bible (1959)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$PA$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$PE$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King James Version (1611)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$PA$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$PE$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darby Bible (1890)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$PE$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (1901)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (1951)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Segond (1910)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traduction Œcuménique (1976)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Colombe (1978)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buber (1935)</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menge-Bibel (1939)</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einheitsübersetzung (1980 [1974])</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthervertaling (1984 [1945])</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$PE$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlachter-Bibel (2000 [1905])</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürcher Bibel (2011 [1931])</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.4 Translational tendencies in thirty Bible translations

74 The verbal patterns attested in the fourteen passages are the following:

1. The Research Problem

On the basis of the findings presented in the scheme, we propose to categorize the Bible translations into three groups. This categorization corresponds to the classification of commentaries we made in the previous section on the basis of their translation styles. The first category of Bible translations is made up by those translations that, in the majority of the selected passages, do account for the differences between the verbal forms in their renderings of the texts. We consider a Bible translation to belong to this category when it provides a systematic rendering of the verbal forms (with different renderings for different forms) in more than half of the passages studied (i.e.: 8 passages or more). Taking this criterion as a guideline, the following Bible translations may be identified as more or less ‘systematic’ (between brackets we have put the number of passages in which the translation has provided a systematic rendering of the verbal forms): Leidsche Vertaling (10), American Standard Version (10), Statenvertaling (9), Naardense Bijbel (9), Darby Bible (9), World English Bible (9), Geneva Bible (8), King James Version (8), and the Revised Standard Version (8). Interestingly, seven out of these nine Bible translations were produced more than 50 years ago. This may point to a development of a ‘looser’ or less systematical attitude towards the interpretation and rendering of poetry’s verbal forms in the second half of the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century. The Naardense Bijbel and the World English Bible form interesting exceptions to this. We will come back to this at the end of this section. Another important observation is that this first category does not contain any French or German Bible translations. This may indicate that Bible translations generally are inclined to follow the tendencies exhibited by previous translations produced in the same language. We will return to this assumption in our discussion of the next category of translations. Another argument for the supposition that Bible translations in their renderings of the verbal forms are regularly influenced by the tendencies attested in other translations is our observation that for some texts – e.g.: Ps 4.4 or Ps 6.9b-10 – translators have almost unanimously provided a systematic rendering of the verbal forms.

Translations that deviate from the general tendency to systematically translate the verbal forms in these texts by instead offering a ‘flat’ present tense translation of them (e.g.: Groot Nieuws Bijbel, Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling, Bible en français courant, Parole de Vie and the Lutherübersetzung) can well be regarded as serious representatives of the second category of Bible translations, consisting of those translations generally ignoring the alternation of verbal forms in the Hebrew text and providing ‘neutral’ present tense renderings. When a Bible translation offers a ‘flat’ present tense rendering of all verbal forms in at least half of the passages we studied, we regard it as belonging to this category. On the basis of the data presented in the scheme in fig. 1.4, we may conclude that the majority of the Bible translations (16) belongs to this category (we have again noted the number of passages in which a translation offers a ‘flat’ present tense rendering of all verbal forms between brackets): Groot Nieuws Bijbel (11), Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling (11), Louis Segond (11), Bible en français courant (11), Parole de Vie (11), Nouvelle Bible Segond (10), Lutherbibel (10), Gute Nachrichte (10), Willibrordvertaling (9), La Colombe (9), Einheitsübersetzung (9), NBG’51 (8), Good News (8), Buber’s Verdeutschung (8), New International Version (7), and the Menge-bibel (7). We already hinted at the overwhelming presence of German and French translations in this second category. Thus, in no less than half of the passages all of the French translations offer a ‘flat’ present tense rendering of all verbal forms, while the Dutch, English and German translations, at least in some of these texts (Ps 5.6, 7.13–14 and 7.15–17), show a higher degree of diversity. Next to that, it is interesting to note that in some texts the Bible translations almost unanimously offer a present tense translation of
all verbal forms, e.g. in Ps 1.1–2, 2.1–2, 6.7 and 10.3. Some of the translations offering a divergent, non-present tense rendering of verbal forms in these verses can well be identified as important representatives of yet a third category. Before we continue with the discussion of this third category we should notice that some Bible translations seem to fall in between the first two categories as the number of passages in which a more or less systematic rendering of the verbal forms is offered is equal to the number of passages in which the translators have chosen to ignore the formal differences and to offer a present tense (or, more rarely, a perfective) rendering of all forms. This is the case in the Herziene Statenvertaling (both ways of translating are attested in six passages), Traduction Œcumenique de la Bible (both seven), Schlachter-Bibel (both seven) and the Zürcher Bibel (both seven).

The third category consists of those translations in which the renderings of verbal forms seem to be completely random, neither bound to a search for regularity nor exhibiting the inclination to avoid systematic considerations by offering a neutral present tense rendering. Although several translations provide a rather unsystematic, extremely free and inconsistent interpretation of the verbal forms in single instances, the Contemporary English Version is, by far, the most important representative of this category, as it offers a completely random rendering of the verbal forms in no less than four instances. In Ps 1.1, for example, it renders the first qatal form with a present tense and the two subsequent qatal forms with a future tense. Furthermore, it provides a present tense translation for both the qatal forms and one yiqtol form in Ps 2.1–2, while it renders the other yiqtol form with a perfect. All in all, the translators of the Contemporary English Version (like Dahood and Beaucamp who, in their commentaries, provided very inconsistent renderings of the verbal forms in these same passages) appear to have repeatedly based their renderings of the verbal forms on their own interpretation of the contents of the texts, thereby ignoring the formal differences between the verbal forms in their Hebrew source texts.

1.4.2 **Vertical Analysis: Correspondences and Differences between Translations**

The above-mentioned observations and conclusions do not only point to tendencies within the individual Bible translations, but are also an indication of strong differences between those translations. Let us focus a little bit more on the relations between the Bible translations. We have already made the reader aware of the translations’ inclination to conform to the tendencies attested in the other translations produced in the same language. Thus, we noticed that the French translations in general tend to ignore the formal differences between the verbal forms and to render them all in a flat present tense.

Another good example of this kind of ‘grouping’ of translations of the same language area over against translations belonging to other language areas can be found in Ps 8.6–7, where all German translations (except for Buber’s Verdeutschung) render each of the four verbal forms with a perfect, while the translations in the other languages show much more mutual diversity as some of them try to pay more attention to the alternation of different verbal forms and others follow the tendency of the German translations and render all forms as perfects or with a past tense. Ps 9.11 should also be mentioned here. The qatal form

---

75 It is interesting to note that the two French commentaries we referred to in §1.3 (Jacquet and Beaucamp) also showed a strong inclination to render the verbal forms with a flat present tense. Thus, they translated more qatal forms with a present tense than any of the other commentaries.
1. The Research Problem

In this verse is translated as a present tense by all French (six out of six) and almost all German translations (six out of seven) and the formal difference between the yiqtol and the qatal form in this verse is simply ignored or is made visible by ascribing to the yiqtol form a volitive meaning and to the qatal form a ‘normal’ indicative meaning. Most English (six out of nine) and Dutch (five out of eight) Bible translations, however, render the qatal form with a perfect, thus distinguishing it from the yiqtol form that is generally translated as a present tense.

In order to make the mutual differences between the Bible translations more visible, we have compared the thirty renderings of each of the verbal forms occurring in the fourteen passages we studied. We would like to illustrate the results gained by this type of analysis by concentrating again, like we did in the §1.3.2.2.2, on Ps 7.13b-17, which we have now divided into two smaller units of analysis: vs.13b-14 and vs.15–17.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[<Pr> הָרֹב] [<Ob> לָצַש] xYq0} \\
&\text{[<Pr> כָּשַׁת] [<Ob> רֶדֶךְ] xQt1} \\
&\text{[<PO> קָנְנֶה] [<Cj> -ו] Way0} \\
&\text{[<Ob> לִמְלֹת] [<Pr> אֵצִים] [<Cj> -ו] WxQt} \\
&\text{[<Pr> יַפְעַל] [<Co> לַדְלְקֵי] [<Ob> צֵיו] xYqt}
\end{align*}
\]

13 He [whet] his sword, he [bend] his bow, and [string] it, and he [prepare] for him his deadly weapons, he [make] his arrows fiery shafts.

A first observation to be made with regard to vs.13b-14 is that the majority of the Bible translations, among them all French translations, in their renderings of the verses do not account for the variation of verbal forms in the Hebrew source text as they simply translate all forms with a present tense, thus presenting the situation as a general principle: if wicked people do not repent, YHWH prepares himself to punish them. Only eleven translations try to account for the alternation of verbal forms. Seven of them render the first yiqtol form with a future tense and continue with a perfective rendering of the following qatal and wayyiqtol forms. These translations differ in their interpretation of the final yiqtol form as four of them opt for a ‘neutral’ present tense rendering, two offer a perfective rendering – with that showing the inclination to ignore formal differences and to translate all forms in the same (perfective) manner – and only one (Statenvertaling) provides a future tense rendering, thus exhibiting consistency with regard to its translation of the first yiqtol form. By offering these renderings, the translations appear to present the situation described in these verses as a more concrete one, creating some suspense by stressing that YHWH has already made some preparations and only has to make one or two others before he will execute the punishment. Some translations deviate only slightly from these seven Bible translations; the Leidsche vertaling, for example, renders both yiqtol forms with a

\[76\] Some translations consider the sinner to be the subject of all verbal forms in these verses. The Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling, for example, translates: “Maar de vijand scherpt opnieuw zijn zwaard, hij spant zijn boog en legt aan, hij richt zijn wapens om te doden.” The translation seems to present the verses as revealing a general truth, a principle that is applicable to all situations in which one is, in a similar way, confronted with the threat of an enemy. Compare: Bible en français courant, Buber’s Verdeutschung and the Einheitsübersetzung.
present tense and translates the other forms as perfects. Other translations seem to behave conform the third category of translations identified above in that they provide a very inconsistent rendering of the verbal forms. Thus, the Herziene Statenvertaling and the New International Version both translate not only the first yiqtol form, but also the first qatal form and the wayyiqtol form following it with a future tense.

}\text{Behold, the wicked man [conceive] evil, and [be pregnant] with mischief, and [bring forth] lies.}\]
\text{He [make] a pit, and he [dig] it, and he [fall] into the hole, which he [make].}\]
\text{His mischief [return] upon his own head, and on his own pate his violence [descend].}\]

In vs.15–17, the diversity between the translations is enormous too. Leaving the relative yiqtol clause in vs.16d out of consideration, we observe that, again, many translations (fourteen) simply ignore the interesting alternation of the eight verbal forms in these verses and render them all with a flat present tense. Again, all French Bible translations belong to this group. Three other translations slightly deviate from these fourteen Bible translations in that they render (only) one verbal form with another tense. Thus, the NBG’51 renders the first yiqtol form with a past tense, while the Groot Nieuws Bijbel and the Willibrordvertaling translate, respectively, the first and the second weqatal with a future tense. In general, these translations again seem to present the sequence of actions in these verses as a kind of principle, a general truth. Some of them even explicitly support such an interpretation. Thus, Good News and the Contemporary English Version respectively add the explicit subjects ‘wicked people’ (plural) and ‘an evil person’ (general term). The thirteen other Bible translations all appear to take into account the alternation of verbal forms in the Hebrew source text, thereby evoking a wholly different interpretation of the text, again suggesting that the psalmist is referring to a specific enemy here and to some concrete events in the past. On the basis of their analysis of the two weqatal forms, these translations can be divided into two subcategories. Six translations provide a present or future tense rendering of the yiqtol and the weqatal forms, while they render the qatal and wayyiqtol forms with a past tense or as perfective forms. The Menge-Bibel, only deviating in having a present tense rendering of the second wayyiqtol, may also be counted among these translations. Five other translations relate the weqatal forms to the qatal and wayyiqtol forms.
1. The Research Problem

and render them all with past tense or as perfective forms, while they translate only the yiqtol forms with a present or future tense. An exceptional rendering of the weqatal forms is provided by the Geneva Bible, which offers a perfective translation of the first and a future tense translation of the second.

1.4.3 Conclusions

All in all, the lack of uniformity among Bible translations in their renderings of the verbal forms is obvious. Our analyses have revealed the presence of considerable differences between the Bible translations, but have also pointed to the lack of consistency within translations themselves by making clear that most translations tend to ignore the alternation of verbal forms in the poetic Hebrew source texts and translate all forms with the same tense, but, at the same time, in particular passages suddenly decide to offer a more ‘systematic’ rendering of the verbal forms. Our findings demonstrate the need for a deeper understanding of the functioning of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry. As long as Hebraists and Bible translators continue to assume that there is no system regulating the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry, the observed ‘chaos’ in Bible translations, which expresses itself in a lack of mutual and internal consistency, will be preserved. As a result, in their interpretations of the poetic texts modern readers of the Bible will not only be influenced by inconsistent (and therefore inadequate) renderings of the verbal forms in the modern Bible translations, but will also be confused when they are confronted with the diverging renderings of the verbal forms presented in the different Bible translations which they make use of.

Therefore, the search for regularity in Biblical Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms obviously remains of the utmost importance. However, as we will see in the next section, the traditional tendency to avoid any independent linguistic analysis of Biblical Hebrew poetry has hindered grammarians from conducting this search even until today.

1.5 Grammars

In our examination of a selection of ten Hebrew grammars covering a time span of roughly one century, we decided to make use of a two-level approach in order to get a clear picture of how the grammars deal with the often apparently non-systematic use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry.

First, we investigated what the grammars assert *explicitly* about the functioning of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry. Since most grammars abstain from such explicit remarks we decided to further examine their attitude towards poetry’s use of verbal forms on another, *implicit* level. This was done by investigating whether and, if so, to what extent the grammars make use of examples taken from poetic texts to illustrate their theories about the Hebrew verbal system.

1.5.1 **Explicit Comments on Hebrew Poetry’s Use of Verbal Forms**

In our investigation of grammars’ explicit remarks on the verbal functions we have discovered a number of tendencies. Several grammarians indeed explicitly acknowledge that the use of verbal forms in poetry raises many questions and seems to lack any underlying regularity. Probably the best example of a grammar taking this position is that of Bergsträsser, who in his remarks appears to summarize the general impressions (outlined in the previous sections) translators and commentators have with regard to poetry’s use of verbal forms. Thus, Bergsträsser notices the increasing use in poetry of *qatal* to indicate present and future tense and concludes that this development has resulted in a ‘völligen Verwischung der Bedeutungsunterschiede der Tempora und einem regellosen Promiscuegebrauch sämtlicher Tempusbezeichnungen im Sinne der Gegenwart und Zukunft.’ The Hebrew tempora seem to express present and future tense ‘ohne ersichtlichen Grund’, which makes it extremely difficult to determine which time axis was originally intended and to which extent the text has been delivered to us in its original form. Bergsträsser also points to the mixing up (‘regelloses Durcheinander’) of tempora indicating repetition (*yiqtol* and *weqatal*) and tempora indicating simple past (*qatal* and *wayyiqtol*), explaining that even a bare *yiqtol* can denote simple past in poetry. On the basis of this observation, he argues that ‘Perf. und Imperf. ebenso unterschiedslos für die Vergangenheit gebraucht werden, wie für Gegenwart und Zukunft.’ This makes him conclude that in Hebrew poetry, in general, ‘die genaue Feststellung der beabsichtigten Tempusbedeutung und auch der Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse zu grosse Schwierigkeiten macht und z.T. nicht einmal die Vergangenheitsbedeutung feststeht.’ He even states: ‘Bei den jüngeren Stücken wird schon den Verfassern selbst keine bestimmte Tempusbedeutung vorgeschwebt haben.’ Other grammars take a less ‘desperate’ position with regard to poetry’s use of verbal forms, though they still refer to the apparent lack of consistency in it. Joüon-Muraoka, for example, argues that it is often very difficult or even impossible to find a satisfying explanation for the use of a specific verbal form in a poetic passage, which is contrary to what is generally the case in ‘good narrative prose’. To this they add that the choice for a specific verbal form in poetry quite frequently does not depend on grammatical considerations, but can also be determined, for example, by ‘metrical necessity’.

1.5.2 **Use of Poetic Texts in Grammatical Descriptions of the Hebrew Verbal System**

Most grammars do not make explicit comments on the use of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry. Therefore, we need to find out how they deal with poetic texts *implicitly*, that is: how, if at all, are

79 Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, p.34.
80 Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, p.35.
poetic texts used in the grammars’ discussions of the verbal system? When observing the grammars from this perspective, they appear to break up into two opposing camps.

Some grammars (Brockelmann, Blau, Lettinga, Meyer, Van der Merwe-Naudé-Kroeze) avoid any reference to poetic passages when discussing ‘normal’ uses of a verbal form. These grammars tend to use examples from poetry only when they describe a verbal function which rarely occurs in prose. By thus leaving poetry out of consideration in the main part of their analyses of the Hebrew verbal system, these grammars implicitly seem to subscribe to the conclusion drawn by Bergsträsser that the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry is, to a certain degree, inscrutable.

Other grammars (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Waltke-O’Connor, Joüon-Muraoka), however, do not make a difference between prose and poetry and take their examples to illustrate the verbal functions both from prosaic and from poetic texts. By doing so, these grammars create room for a systematic, linguistic analysis of poetry’s use of verbal forms and try to include the functions fulfilled by the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry into the general Hebrew verbal system.

The contrast between the two camps of grammars is clearly visible in their different way of dealing with those functions of verbal forms that do not seem to be attested in Hebrew prose. The first group of grammars tends to characterize these functions as exceptional or even unexplainable, while the other group attempts to link those functions as much as possible to the ‘default’ function(s) which a verbal form usually fulfills in the prosaic texts, thus trying to include those ‘divergent’ functions into the Hebrew verbal system. Unfortunately, the dividing line between the two groups is not always that rigid. Some grammars show characteristics of both approaches. Thus, with regard to its description of each of the verbal functions Joüon-Muraoka belongs to the second camp in that it uses both prosaic and poetic texts to illustrate these functions, while, as we saw above, the grammar at the same time joins the first camp in explicitly arguing that in many instances poetry’s use of verbal forms is very difficult, if not impossible, to explain.

Therefore, we deem it desirable to specify a little bit more how exactly the grammars deal with poetry’s verbal forms. We have discovered that each of the ten grammars detects some usages of verbal forms that are not directly explicable in terms of the verbal system they present. Interestingly, the grammars show a certain agreement when it comes to the exact usages they (explicitly or implicitly) characterize as ‘poetic’. As was the case in the commentaries and the Bible translations, the grammars too have many difficulties in trying to account for the alternation of qatal and yiqtol forms in Hebrew poetry. However, not only the apparently irregular use of qatal and yiqtol, but also the usage of the wayyiqtol form frequently raises questions in the grammars.

The grammars can be divided into two categories on the basis of the explanations they offer for such difficult or divergent uses of the verbal forms in poetic texts. The first category of grammars tries to account for these complicated uses by referring to factors that do not involve a synchronic analysis of the Biblical Hebrew linguistic system. These factors can be further subdivided into three subcategories. First, some grammars agree with the commentary of Dahood in making use of a ‘historical-comparative approach’. Bergsträsser and Lettinga, for example, defend poetry’s use of yiqtol as a ‘punctual preterite’ characterizing it as being ‘archaic’. Similarly, Joüon-Muraoka argues that the perfect consecutive is used to indicate past tense in the oldest (archaic) pieces of Hebrew poetry. Next to this, Bergsträsser regularly points
out that the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry may be determined by Aramaic or dialectical influences. A second subcategory of non-synchronic explanations has to do with the transmission of the text. Thus, Bergsträsser, Joüon-Muraoka and Meyer assert that the use of wayyiqtol as a present or future tense can be explained by assuming that the Masoretic vocalisation is incorrect in many instances and that, accordingly, many wayyiqtols should be reinterpreted as weyiqtols. In a similar way, Bergsträsser also regards weqatal as having a past tense meaning as having resulted from incorrect textual transmission and proposes to reinterpret them as qatal (thus contradicting Joüon-Muraoka’s interpretation of the use of weqatal as past tense as archaic), while, on the same grounds, he reanalyzes qatal with a present tense meaning as weqatal. A final category of explanations for divergent usages of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry that are not based on a synchronic type of linguistic analysis consists of metrical and stylistic considerations. Schneider, for example, concludes for specific cases in poetic texts: ‘Hier scheinen oft stilistische oder metrische Gründe für die Tempuswahl massgebend gewesen zu sein.’84 Similarly, Lettinga argues that poetry often prefers the use of a waw copulative over that of a waw consecutive for reasons of style and parallelism.85 Finally, as we saw above, Joüon and Muraoka stress that the choice for a specific verbal form in poetry, in many cases, is determined by ‘metrical necessity’.86 Together, these subcategories of explanations are indicative of the tendency to avoid synchronic grammatical analyses of the difficult usages of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry. However, most grammars do attempt to assign grammatical functions to at least some of the verbal forms that seem to be used in a divergent way in poetry. Unfortunately, in some cases, the explanations given by these grammars are not purely grammatical, but seem to be influenced either by the grammarian’s literary interpretations of the sample texts or by one of the other non-synchronic considerations mentioned above. Let us illustrate this by taking a look at how the grammars deal with several usages of verbal forms that appear to occur merely in poetic texts.

First of all, nearly all grammars pay attention to the above-mentioned use of yiqtol as a ‘punctual preterite’. As we saw, some of them characterize it as ‘archaic’, while others identify those instances in which yiqtol seems to fulfill this function as ‘problem cases’.87 Interestingly, none of the grammars tries to relate this divergent use of the yiqtol to (one of) the default or main function(s) they identified for this form, which supports the impression that the main reason for assigning this function to a yiqtol form is the common or grammarian’s literary interpretation of the text’s contents.

The same applies to another ‘poetic’ usage of the yiqtol form. Thus, Gesenius-Kautzsch and Brockelmann argue that in some cases the yiqtol form is used for ‘vivid poetic description’. Both grammars try to include this use of yiqtol into Biblical Hebrew’s verbal system, but at the same time appear to narrowly relate this grammatical analysis to their literary interpretation of the sample texts they provide. Thus, Gesenius-Kautzsch explains how the yiqtol for ‘vivid poetic description’ divides unique and momentary actions into their ‘component parts’ and in that way portrays these actions ‘as gradually completing themselves’. He offers two examples from the Pentateuchal poetry (Exod 15.12 and Num 23.7) to illustrate how the single yiqtol form indicates the different stages of an action. Brockelmann also links this merely poetic use of yiqtol (‘lebhaft vergegenwärtigen’) to the ‘einmalige Handlungen der Vergangenheit’. In both grammars, the

84 Schneider, Grammatik, p.188n7.
85 Lettinga, Grammatica, §77i, p.156.
86 Joüon-Muraoka, Grammar, p.353.
87 Van der Merwe, Naudé, Kroeze, Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar, p.149.
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illustration of the function by means of sample texts looks quite artificial, which makes this ‘poetic’ function of yiqtol as dubious as the first function of ‘punctual preterite’.

The grammars also identify several usages of the qatal form as ‘poetical’, like those of ‘precative perfect’ (Bergsträsser, Waltke-O’Connor, Van der Merwe-Naudé-Kroeze), ‘prophetical perfect’ (characterized as a ‘rhetorical means’ by Joüon-Muraoka and Van der Merwe-Naudé-Kroeze) and ‘gnomic perfect’ (i.e.: the use of qatal for general expressions). Although the grammars provide different analyses of these uses of qatal, it is clear that these functions are mainly, or even merely, attested in Hebrew poetry. Some grammars (Brockelmann, Van der Merwe-Naudé-Kroeze) implicitly support this assertion by breaking away from their tendency to ignore poetic passages in their illustrations of verbal functions and selecting only poetic texts to illustrate these usages of the qatal form. Other grammars explicitly subscribe to the conclusion that the use of qatal for the utterance of general expressions and empirical truths is a ‘poetic one’. Thus, Gesenius-Kautzsch explains that in many instances qatal forms playing these functions have the same meaning as a yiqtol form, especially in ‘dichterischen oder prophetischen Parallellismus’.  

Grammarians do not always make such a strong distinction between divergent and default functions of qatal. Joüon-Muraoka, for example, relativizes its identification of the non-default usages of qatal, such as that of the ‘gnomic perfect’, by arguing that in some instances the poet might still have been thinking of a more concrete situation in the past. However, even though grammars do try to relate, in this way, the non-default functions of qatal to its other functions, they not only encounter serious difficulties in doing so, but also have great problems in determining which specific functions are fulfilled by the qatal forms at all.

We conclude this brief overview of how the grammars deal with the apparently divergent functions of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry by summarizing their remarks about the use of wayyiqtol to denote present and future tense. This usage is marked as ‘poetic’ by many grammars. Thus, Bergsträsser identifies the alternation of wayyiqtol and yiqtol both indicating present tense or future tense as ‘ein poetisches Phänomen’ and, together with some other grammarians (Meyer, Joüon-Muraoka) argues that many of the exceptional usages of the wayyiqtol can only be understood as mistakes made during the transmission of the poetic texts (see above). However, he also acknowledges that not all of the present tense or future tense meanings of wayyiqtol can be explained in this way: ‘Vielleicht handelt es sich hier nicht um blosse Textfehler, sondern um wirklichen poetischen Sprachgebrauch’. Other grammars implicitly support the statement that the use of wayyiqtol to express present or future tense is ‘poetic’ by presenting only poetic sample texts to illustrate this use of wayyiqtol (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Joüon-Muraoka, Lettinga, Van der Merwe-Naudé-Kroeze).

All in all, most grammars try to account for many of the seemingly divergent usages of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry by inventing several ‘poetic’ verbal functions. Taking into account the many differences between the grammars with regard to the functions they identify and the
sample texts they mention, the apparent arbitrariness in grammars in their interpretation of the verbal forms occurring in sample texts (see the differences between the German and the English version of the grammar of Gesenius-Kautzsch), and the lack of clarity resulting from the tendency to invent a new function for each usage of a verbal form that appears to be divergent (see especially Waltke-O’Connor), we conclude that the attempt to provide a grammatical description of the use of the Biblical Hebrew verb in poetic texts by proposing new verbal functions that are only attested in poetic texts cannot be the solution to our research problem. Though the attempt itself is praiseworthy, the invention of so many new verbal functions in the end merely supports the idea that in Hebrew poetry each verbal form can mean anything.

1.5.3 Conclusions

So, does this mean that we have to accept that the use of verbal forms in the poetic passages of the Hebrew Bible is an expression of poetical freedom and not bound to any grammatical rules? The answer to this question is negative. A first step towards a possible solution for our research problem can be taken when we concentrate on another tendency that revealed itself in our study of the grammars. A profound examination of the sample texts referred to by the grammars in their illustration of the verbal functions results in the observation that some of the verbal forms (qatal and wayyiqtol) and their verbal functions appear to be dominant in narrative prosaic texts, while other verbal forms and functions are attested mainly in prosaic direct speech sections and poetic texts (yiqtol and weqatal). Implicitly, most grammars thus appear to suggest that the function of a verbal form is dependent upon the question in which text type (narrative prose or discursive prose/poetry) the form occurs. It could therefore be valuable to compare the use of verbal forms in poetry with that in the prosaic direct speech sections. As we will see in the next chapter, this is indeed what is explicitly asserted in the grammars of Schneider and Van der Merwe-Naudé-Kroeze.

Especially in the grammars using both prosaic and poetic texts in their illustrations of different verbal functions, but also in the grammars almost only referring to poetic passages in cases of functions not attested in narrative prose, we regularly find a combination of discursive prose texts and poetic texts to illustrate specific usages of verbal forms. This is, for example, the case in the grammars’ discussion of qatal forms expressing physical or mental conditions (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Brockelmann, Bergsträsser, Joüon-Muraoka, Lettinga), weqatals expressing future tense (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Meyer, Waltke-O’Connor, Joüon-Muraoka), and yiqtols and other volitive forms expressing volition (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Schneider, Bergsträsser, Waltke-O’Connor, Joüon-Muraoka). On the other hand, the above-mentioned observation of a dividing line between narrative and discursive/prosaic forms and functions is also supported by the absence of poetic sample texts in the grammars’ illustrations of the verbal functions that are strongly represented in narrative texts. Probably, the grammars do not deliberately avoid the use of poetic texts in the illustration of these specific functions, but simply are not compelled to refer to poetic texts because the ‘narrative’ verbal functions occur much less frequently in them than in narrative prose.

Such observations on clusterings of poetic and discursive prosaic sample texts are promising as they open new possibilities for a fruitful, systematic linguistic analysis of the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry. The above-mentioned grammars’ tendencies 1) to search for non-synchronic explanations of the divergent usages of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry or 2) to
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‘invent’ long series of new verbal functions in order to explain poetry’s use of verbal forms do not take away the uncertainty of Hebrew scholars and Bible translators about the functions of the verbal forms in poetry, which we illustrated in the previous sections, but instead strengthen it, and should therefore be rejected. Instead, the observation of the many correspondences between discursive prose’s and poetry’s use of verbal forms should be taken as a new starting point in the search for more clarity concerning the verbal functions in Hebrew poetry.

1.6 Summary and General Conclusions

In this chapter, we have made clear that the common ignorance among Old Testament scholars with regard to the functions of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry results from the century-long dominance of the method of literary interpretation within the discipline of Old Testament Studies. In the first section, we concluded that the approach of Hebrew poetry has not undergone any significant changes since Lowth, in the 1750s, introduced his ideas, which we referred to as the ‘Standard Description’. It is true that we detected some interesting developments in the second half of the 20th century, when a growing number of scholars started to pay attention to numerical and syntactic regularities. However, in the end, this study of poetry’s linguistic elements and its syntax remained subordinate to the examination of the texts’ literary and rhetorical structures and the poetic devices used in it. Linguistic and syntactic analysis was merely given an instrumental function: it served to delimit literary, poetic units. We pointed out that this lack of any form of independent linguistic analysis and the emphasis on the artistic and divergent nature of poetic language constituted a real methodological weakness in that it contradicted the linguistic universal that every genre makes use of one and the same grammar of that language. By focusing merely on semantic, literary and rhetorical methods of analysis, the discipline of Old Testament Studies has created the methodological breeding ground for our research problem: instead of trying to explain the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry by taking into account the rules of Hebrew grammar, commentators, translators and grammarians offer literary explanations for divergent uses of the verbal forms in poetic texts (referring to literary structures or rhetorical functions) or simply neglect the alternation of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry.91

The commentaries generally ignore the formal differences between the verbal forms in their interpretation of the texts. Some commentaries decide to account for the formal differences in

91 Of great interest, in this regard, are Lowth’s remarks about the incapability of commentators and grammarians to do justice to the frequent alternation of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry which, according to Lowth, strongly deviates from the use of verbal forms in ‘common language’ (Lectures on the Sacred Poesie of the Hebrews, Lect.XV, p.330). Lowth himself already points to the lack of attention for grammatical analysis in attempts to explain poetry’s use of verbal forms. This further supports our conclusion that the study of Hebrew poetry (and its use of verbal forms) has hardly changed since the time of Lowth, who states: ‘If we resort to the Translators and Commentators, so far are they from affording any solution, that they do not so much as notice it, accommodating as much as possible the form of the tenses to the subject and context, and explaining it rather according to their own opinion, than according to the rules of Grammar, or any fixed and established principles. If again we apply to the Grammarians, we shall still find ourselves no less at a loss: they, indeed, remark the circumstance, but they neither explain the reason of it, nor yet are candid enough to make a fair confession of their own ignorance (...) they attempt to evade a closer inquiry; as if the change were made by accident, and from no principle or motive.’ (p.337)
their translation of the poetic passage, thus creating a gap between their translation and their interpretation of a text, but most of them neglect the formal differences in their rendering of the verbal forms, either ‘flatly’ rendering the verbal forms in present tense or letting their rendering of the verbal forms be completely determined by their literary interpretation of the text. As such, they all make the literary interpretation of the text and the systematic grammatical analysis of verbal forms into two separate, unrelated worlds, following the tendency in the discipline of Old Testament Studies to concentrate on the first domain (literary-rhetorical analysis) and leaving out of consideration the second (grammatical analysis). As a result, one observes strong differences between and numerous inconsistencies within the translations of the verbal forms offered by the commentaries, which seem to suggest that Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms is not bound to any (grammatical) rules, but forms an expression of the poetic freedom and the rhetorical skills of the Hebrew poet.

The same is valid for the Bible translations we examined. They did not render the verbal forms occurring in the passages we studied in corresponding ways, but instead showed many mutual differences. Even those Bible translations following the tendency to account for the formal differences in their renderings of the verbal forms did not hesitate to break away from it now and then and to ignore the formal differences by providing a neutral, flat present tense translation of all forms or being even more ‘unsystematic’ or inconsistent by giving unexpected and wholly different renderings of verbal forms of a similar type. Besides, on the basis of the observation that most translations following the tendency to be systematic in the interpretation of the verbal forms were produced more than fifty years ago, it may be suggested that recent translations, by creating much more room for free (and inconsistent) or flat renderings, more explicitly underline the fact that the functioning of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry is doomed to remain obscure. The number of translations trying to be consequent in the translation of poetry’s verbal forms has decreased radically in the past decades. Translators generally seem to resign to the idea that the alternation of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry is not regulated by grammatical rules and that, for this reason, their own intuition and interpretation of the text forms the only criterion on which the rendering of verbal forms is to be based.92 This has important consequences for the modern reader of the Bible, who, without doubt, will feel confused when he compares the strongly differing translations he has at his disposal. We have to conclude that the present-day chaos in Bible translations’ renderings of the verbal forms prevents the modern Bible reader from adequately interpreting the poetic Old Testament texts by burdening him with the question of which of all those widely varying renderings and interpretations he has to accept.

The grammars link up with the tendencies exhibited by the commentaries and the Bible translations in that most of them implicitly characterize poetry’s use of verbal forms as random,

92 The tendency of Bible translators (and other Hebraists) to ignore, in their rendering and interpretation of a text, the linguistic forms attested in it, is also observed by Talstra, who argues that in translations and exegetical studies ‘occasionally a broader, theological view of the overall textual composition simply overrules the primary linguistic signals presented by Hebrew morphology or syntax’ and points to the need of reconsidering the methodological order of language and theology in this regard; see Talstra, E., ‘Text, Tradition, Theology. The Example of the Book of Joel’, in: E. Van der Borght & P. van Geest (eds.), Strangers and Pilgrims on Earth. Essays in Honour of Abraham van de Beek (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp.311–312, 319. Translations take too much liberty in applying all kinds of translational options in their renderings of the verbal forms in poetic texts, thereby suggesting that “grammar allows for any interpretation one might ‘need’” (p.320).
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non-systematic or divergent by either avoiding the use of poetic sample texts to illustrate the verbal functions they detect or ‘inventing’ many new verbal functions in order to be able to include the otherwise unexplainable usages of verbal forms in poetic texts into the Hebrew verbal system. Though we reject the tendency to invent new verbal functions, we share the desire to search for one verbal system underlying the use of verbal forms in all genres of Biblical Hebrew. Another tendency observed in the grammars may be of great help in this search for a linguistic system behind Biblical Hebrew’s use of verbal forms. The majority of the grammars implicitly supports the assumption that many correspondences exist between the use of verbal forms in prosaic direct speech sections and poetic texts by showing the tendency to illustrate some verbal functions only by examples taken from narrative texts and others by selecting examples from discursive and poetic passages. It is this observation that forms the starting point of our research, in which we will concentrate on the search for one verbal system that underlies the use of verbal forms both in prosaic direct speech sections and in poetic texts, and, with that, in Biblical Hebrew in general.

The main point of criticism to be expressed on the basis of our findings in this chapter concerns the unbalanced relationship between linguistic and literary analysis. As we will argue in the following chapters, the order of relative priority of the two disciplines should be changed. Instead of interpreting the meaning of a verbal form by taking its literary context as a starting point, which sometimes even requires the invention of new functionalities, more attention is to be paid to the syntactic context in which a verbal form is embedded. It will be shown that a more systematic analysis of Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms can be realized if higher-level syntactic patterns are taken into account. In other words, the solution for the puzzle of the Biblical Hebrew verb should be sought not in the area of literary analysis, but in that of text grammar.

Before further specifying our theoretical framework, we will first provide in the next chapter a brief historical overview of the research into the Hebrew verbal system that has been done until now. As we will see, some recent publications support the observation of the many correspondences between discursive prose and poetry in their use of verbal forms. However, at this moment hardly any research has been done into what this means for the exact functions fulfilled by these verbal forms.
2. **Traditional Approaches to the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System**

In this chapter, we will present a historical overview of the studies on the Biblical Hebrew verbal system that have been conducted in the 16th-21st centuries. The chapter consists of three parts. In the first part, we will outline the most significant theories and developments in the study of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system up to the first half of the 20th century. In the second part, attention will be paid to the present state of affairs in the study of the Hebrew tempora. As will become clear, there is much diversity both in traditional and in recent investigations into Biblical Hebrew’s use of verbal forms. However, most of them tend to ignore poetic texts in their examinations of textual data from the Hebrew Bible. In the final part, the reader is provided with a summary and an evaluation of those rare studies conducted by Hebraists that do focus on the functions of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry.

### 2.1 The Study of the Hebrew Verbal System: 16th century - 1950s

The study of the Hebrew verbal system in the period ranging from the 16th century up to the first half of the 20th century can be divided into three stages, which will be discussed in three subsections below. Each of these stages is characterized by a single dominant theory reflecting the central areas of interest in the respective periods. At a more abstract level, one can identify, first of all, a gradual shift from a focus on translational challenges – i.e.: how to account for the verbal forms in the translation of God’s Word? – to a more specific attention to processes at work in the Hebrew source texts themselves. A second shift implies a transition from the concentration on these translational and textual considerations to an increasing attention for cultural differences and the unique characteristics of the classical (in particular, Semitic) cultures. In our subsequent historical overview of studies on the Hebrew verbal system, these contextual frameworks should be kept in mind, as they help us understand theoretical views that may, at first sight, seem to lack any persuasive power and to be rather far-fetched. Our thesis does not so much offer yet a new view on the meaning of Hebrew’s verbal forms, but rather proposes to initially postpone historical and cultural (i.e.: diachronic) types of analysis, however important they may be, and start the study of Hebrew’s use of the verb by concentrating on the linguistic patterns and processes attested in the texts themselves. This synchronic approach and its practical implementation will be further introduced in the next chapter.

#### 2.1.1 16th century – 1827: Tense Theories

In the first stage, roughly lasting from the 16th until the 18th century, the ‘tense theories’ played a central role. The broader contextual background of these studies was constituted by the central

---
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desire to translate the Word of God in the native languages of European Christians and by the theoretical consensus on a direct relationship between verbal forms and the expression of time, as it was attested in most Indo-European languages.

Indeed, all studies published in these centuries assumed the main function of Hebrew’s verbal forms to be that of expressing tense. Imitating their Jewish predecessors, the first Christian Hebraists adopted in their commentaries, grammars and other writings the tendency to render the qatal form with a past tense, the qotel form with a present tense and the yiqtol form with a future tense. Though all theories presented in these centuries shared this threefold assignment of temporal functions to Hebrew’s main verbal forms, we can make a more precise distinction between three types of tense theories.

The oldest type of tense theory is the waw-conversive theory, which was defended by the Jewish medieval grammarians (12th-16th centuries) and accepted by most of their earliest Christian successors in the 16th, 17th, 18th and even the first part of the 19th century. According to this theory, the waw has a ‘conversive’ effect on the verbal form, which means that it converts the yiqtol into a qatal and the qotel into a yiqtol. Thus, the wayyiqtol is considered to express past tense (like the qatal), while the weqatal is assigned the function of denoting future tense (like the yiqtol). Because the theory seemed to solve most of the translational problems and because it was promoted by the Jewish grammarians themselves, who were considered to be far more familiar with the Hebrew language than the Christian, European hebraists were, the theory prevailed until the 1820s, as can be seen, for example, in the work of Gesenius, who continued to support the theory in all editions of the famous Gesenius grammar that were of his own hand.

However, the theory obviously had to face serious problems, since it was based not so much on a thorough linguistic analysis of the Biblical Hebrew texts themselves, but rather on the efforts to solve the problems encountered when one tries to translate the Hebrew verbal forms in the European languages. It is, therefore, not surprising that the waw conversive theory does not have a parallel in any other language. Like the other tense theories, the waw conversive theory represents an attempt to somehow superimpose the Indo-European tense system on Hebrew’s use of verbal forms. The fact that, in practice, most of the verbal forms seem to require multiple tenses to be adequately rendered in different contexts makes clear that such attempts are indefensible.

In 1766, N.W. Schroeder for the first time introduced an alternative to the waw conversive theory. Though adopting the basic threefold designation of qatal as past tense, qotel as present tense and yiqtol as future tense, he rejected the analysis of the waw as a waw conversive and instead developed the relative tense theory, according to which the Hebrew verbal forms do not only express absolute, but also relative tense. Thus, the yiqtol and wayyiqtol form in many cases express relative future, denoting an action being future to a viewpoint in the past (though possibly past from the absolute present viewpoint), while the qatal and weqatal form serve to

---

94 See, for example, the grammars of Abraham ben Meïr ibn Ezra (1092–1167) and David Kimhi (1160–1235). Kimhi’s grammar, published under the title Mikhlol, would dominate Jewish grammatical studies for the next 600 years. In their remarks about the Hebrew verbal system both scholars linked up with the ideas presented in earlier works produced by Jewish grammarians, stating that the waw before a verbal form often functioned as a waw conversive, which converted the tense expressed by a verbal form from future to past tense or from past to future tense; McFall, Enigma, pp.6–9.

95 McFall, Enigma, pp.17–18; Waltke-O’Connor, Introduction, p.459.

96 McFall, Enigma, pp.18–21, 176–177.
express relative past, indicating that an action is past seen from a viewpoint in the future (though possibly future from an absolute perspective). 97 Though Schroeder’s theory proved to be much more consistent in its ascription of functions to the verbal forms, it had some weaknesses. Thus, the idea that the Hebrew writers could use their verbal forms for expressing both relative and absolute tense is quite problematic: how then could the reader determine whether the author had written his text from an absolute standpoint – i.e.: from the time in which he was living – or from a relative standpoint – i.e.: from the time about which he was writing? Furthermore, Schroeder’s definition of the verbal forms in terms of tense ((way)yiqtol as future tense and (we)qatal as past tense) still raises multiple problems. How, for instance, can the prospective weqatal clauses in predictive discourse in direct speech sections and prophetic books be accounted for in this theory? 98 On the other hand, Schroeder’s work was quite innovative in that it assumed a gap between the Indo-European verbal systems with their absolute tense values and the Biblical Hebrew one with its waw forms expressing relative tense. As a matter of fact, Schroeder’s study marked the starting point of a gradual move from a central focus on the rendering of the Hebrew forms in the target languages to a more specific attention for the linguistic features of the source texts.

A final tense theory was proposed in 1818 by Philip Gell. His waw inductive theory focused again on the peculiar usage of the waw conjunction and argued that this waw communicates the temporal power of the previous verbal form to the verbal form to which it is attached. In other words, the waw inducts into a verbal form the tense of the ‘governing verb’ preceding it. Each verbal form retains its proper temporal (or modal) power at a subordinate level, but the inducted power prevails. Gell, however, relativizes these remarks by asserting that a weqatal form always completely loses its own (subordinate) power and only retains the temporal power inducted into it. Gell paid much attention to the idea of ‘genre-effect’ on the use of verbal forms, arguing that a literary system within a genre (a historical narrative, for example) always starts with a verbal form which places the text in the right temporal stage and is continued by a series of ‘subordinate’ verbal forms to which the temporal power of that first governing verb is inducted by means of the ‘waw inductive’. Thus, a historical narrative frequently starts with a qatal form that is continued by wayyiqtol forms adopting the qatal form’s past tense value and retaining their subordinate own future tense value in that they present actions following (not preceding) the previous ones. In the end, Gell seemed to combine the two other tense theories by assuming that the waw forms (especially the wayyiqtols) adopt the absolute tense of the governing verbs (which often ‘converts’ their meaning: wayyiqtol expresses past tense), but at the same time retain their proper tense value subordinately by expressing relative tense (wayyiqtol denotes an action which is future from the viewpoint of the situation expressed by the previous verbal form). 99 An interesting aspect of Gell’s views is his innovative argument that for an adequate assignment of functionalities to verbal forms one is required to pay attention to the verbal patterns in which these forms occur. The relation between verbal forms indeed seems to affect the distribution of functions to them. However, though Gell’s theory is really a pragmatic one, it combines several of the weaknesses of the other tense theories and can even be regarded as no more than a ‘semantic refinement’ of the waw conversive theory. Furthermore, it looks quite random to state that wayyiqtol forms retain their proper tense subordinately, while weqatal

97 McFall, Enigma, pp.21–23; Waltke-O’Connor, Introduction, §29.2.
98 McFall, Enigma, pp.23–24, 177–179.
forms completely lose it and one may raise the question which function a wayyiqtol form fulfills in those instances in which it is not preceded by a governing verb.\textsuperscript{100} Despite the ‘bewilderment over the tenses in Hebrew’\textsuperscript{101} dominating the studies on the Hebrew verbal system in these centuries, expressing itself in a broad range of revisions of the above-mentioned tense theories, it was only in the 1820s that Hebraists began to admit that the search for a tense system underlying Biblical Hebrew’s use of verbal forms had proved to be unsuccessful. When some scholars, like Von Herder and Sperber, desperately concluded that the Hebrew verbal system had to be regarded as a ‘universal tense system’, arguing that qatal and yiqtol identically functioned as a kind of aorists and thus were both able to express all sorts of temporal nuances,\textsuperscript{102} it became clear that the category of ‘tense’ could no longer be seen as a central principle in the Hebrew verbal system.

2.1.2 1827 – 1910: Aspectual Theories

It was Ewald who in 1827, with the introduction of his aspectual theory, started the second phase in the study of the Hebrew verbal system and ‘freed the study of the Biblical Hebrew verb from its time straightjacket’.\textsuperscript{103} In the first decades of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, Hebrew scholars, like their contemporaries, paid increasing attention to differences between classical cultures – tendentiously regarded as ‘primitive’ – and their own modern culture. In addition, the historical roots of cultures and languages became a central point of interest, which explains why Ewald and many of his successors did not only try to identify the verbal functions of the Biblical Hebrew verbal forms, but also wanted to reveal the historical development of both the forms and their functions. Indeed, Ewald distinguished between three stages in the development of the Hebrew verbal system. The simple forms qatal and yiqtol and their functions have their origins in the first stage in which the language’s speaker made a difference between completed, finished actions and non-completed, unfinished, non-existent actions. In the second stage, the consecutive forms appeared and in the final stage, starting only in the end of the Old Testament period, the simple forms weyiqtol and weqatal, expressing future and past tense respectively, emerged and replaced the consecutive forms. In his work, Ewald focuses on the first two stages and argues that qatal, irrespective of the temporal sphere in which it is used, always denotes an action as (actually or imaginatively) completed, while the yiqtol form functions to describe an incomplete action or situation, which does not yet exist or is still continuing to exist (in which case the yiqtol form expresses durativity). The yiqtol form is only used in a past context when the author focuses more on the action itself than on the time in which it took place. The use of yiqtol then results in a graphic representation of past events. Ewald’s analysis of the consecutive forms, however, is less straightforward. He asserts that the waw in these verbal forms functions as a ‘relative waw’ which makes the ‘bare’ verbal forms into progressive, connective and therefore relative forms. Thus, Ewald identifies the wayyiqtol form as a relatively-progressive imperfect and the weqatal as a relatively-progressive perfect. He reanalyzes the wayyiqtol form as a combination of the

\textsuperscript{100} For further criticism, see: McFall, Enigma, pp.26, 179–180.
\textsuperscript{101} McFall, Enigma, p.15.
\textsuperscript{102} McFall, Enigma, p.14; Waltke-O’Connor, Introduction, §29.3.
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conjunction ו, the adverb ז and the short (jussive) form of the imperfect. The 'heavy waw' throws the action expressed by the yiqtol form back into the past and attaches it there to the preceding action. As a 'relatively-progressive imperfect', the wayyiqtol is always preceded by an explicit or assumed qatal form. Ewald considers the wayyiqtol form to be identical to the Greek aorist and finally concludes that a wayyiqtol has the same meaning as a qatal form, which means that it denotes past and finished actions. It is not progressive in the same sense as the 'bare' yiqtol form, which expresses incomplete, unfolding actions, but it is progressive in that it indicates that there is a sequence of actions starting in the past and moving forward in the direction of the present. According to Ewald, the weqatal form is in every respect the antithesis to the wayyiqtol. It has the same meaning as the simple imperfect and is used to express those actions that are regarded as being already as good as accomplished.104

Like the tense theories, Ewald’s theory is not free from weaknesses. Not only is his assertion that ‘primitive’ man regarded everything as either complete and finished or incomplete and non-existing difficult to prove, his identification of incomplete with non-existing has rightly been criticized too. However, it is in particular his analysis of the consecutive forms that raises many questions. His morphological analysis of the wayyiqtol form as consisting of three components is not convincing and his decision to assign to the wayyiqtol form the function of expressing simple past tense is quite problematic and even seems to contradict his aspectual theory: if the wayyiqtol’s function is indeed that of expressing tense, can it still be seen as an imperfective form, as Ewald does? Finally, Ewald’s use of the terms ‘relative’ and ‘progressive’ remains obscure as they appear to have different meanings for the different waw consecutive forms. It is not surprising that especially Ewald’s discussion of the wayyiqtol already in his own time evoked much criticism. Nevertheless, Ewald’s aspectual theory with its emphasis on the distinction between qatal for completed actions and yiqtol for non-completed actions became extremely popular and dominated the study of the Hebrew verbal system in the 19th century. We may again point to the grammar of Gesenius in this respect and notice that Rödiger in his 19th-century revisions of this grammar consistently replaced Gesenius’ own analysis of the Hebrew verbal system as tense system by a discussion of the verbal forms in terms of aspects, stating that the qatal form expressed completed situations, while the yiqtol forms presented situations as happening, as being in the process of completion. The two consecutive forms adopt these aspectual values from their ‘bare’ equivalents but add to that the notion of temporal or logical consequence. These ideas dominated the study of Hebrew grammar during the whole 19th century.105

An interesting study elaborating on the ideas of Ewald was published by S.R. Driver in 1874. Driver adopted the idea that the Hebrew verbal forms indicated aspect, but he differed from Ewald in his characterization of yiqtol as expressing ‘nascent’ (i.e.: ‘becoming’) or incipient action, which, according to Ewald, was only one of the secondary meanings of yiqtol. Driver argued that the most important difference between qatal and yiqtol is the ‘kind of time’ they express, the yiqtol emphasizing the moment at which an action begins, and the qatal characterizing an action as ‘being completed’. Thus, the verbal forms do not say anything about the exact date of an action – they can both be used in all time spheres and it is the context which is decisive for determining the exact tense –, but they represent actions either as beginning to exist and being
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in a process of development (yiqtol) or as being accomplished (qatal). The yiqtol can also be used to denote repetition of an action in the past because this function is strongly related to that of expressing an action’s gradual realization. The wayyiqtol form connects an incomplete activity to a point already reached and so represents an action as a continuation or development of the events expressed by the previous verbs. It can do so in all time spheres, though wayyiqtol is used predominantly in past time where it seems to have lost its original aspectual value and has adopted the function of simply connecting together a series of completed past events. Like Ewald, Driver regards the weqatal as the direct antithesis of the wayyiqtol. Contrary to the wayyiqtol the weqatal has never obtained an independent function. Instead, its meaning is always determined by the preceding verb. Thus, the action expressed by a weqatal can only be considered as completed when this is permitted by the preceding verbal form. However, because the preceding verbal form usually is the yiqtol form, the weqatal has adopted many of the (incipient, nascent) functions of this form and in many contexts continues to exhibit them even without being directly preceded by such a yiqtol form (or another dominant verb). The most significant problems in Driver’s theory are his inclination to follow Ewald in assigning the function of expressing (past) tense to the wayyiqtol form, thereby easily leaving aside his aspectual theory, and his very strict definition of the yiqtol form. In some instances a yiqtol form without doubt has to be interpreted as expressing a complete action instead of only its nascence. This is especially the case when the yiqtol refers to frequentative actions, which consist of a series of complete events. On the other hand, by pointing to the strong functional differences between the nascent yiqtol form and the wayyiqtol form, for which the idea of nascence has completely been disguised, Driver rightly creates room for a type of analysis in which the wayyiqtol form is approached not as a simple derivative of the yiqtol form, but rather as a more independent verbal form.

In addition to the aspectual theory of Ewald and Driver, William Turner in 1876 formulated a more philosophical one, which, without changing the dominant position of the aspectual theory, has inspired many other grammarians in their examination of the Hebrew verbal system and still continues to do so nowadays. According to Turner, whose ideas are often referred to as the ‘Factual-Descriptive theory’, the qatal form expresses an action or state as being an attribute of the person or thing spoken of, while the yiqtol form represents an action as being the product of the power and energy of the subject. In other words, the qatal presents an action or state as an independent thing, as a static fact, while the yiqtol describes an action or state as a dynamic process, a personal activity taking place before our eyes. The qatal form focuses on the act itself, the yiqtol form concentrates on the actor who is actively making the action or state coming into existence and evolving itself. One of the main strengths of Turner’s theory is that it enables him to consistently interpret each of the verbal forms, irrespective of the time phase in which they are used. By using the qatal an author focuses on historical facts or future results, while by means of the yiqtol he indicates that he is interested in the manner in which these facts and results were or will be reached. Another advantage of Turner’s theory over against the other theories is that it accepts a considerable gap between the Indo-European verbal systems and the Hebrew one and so helps avoid the impression that, instead of letting Hebrew’s use of verbal forms speak for itself, a preconceived functional model is rigidly imposed on them. In contrast

---

106 McFall, Enigma, pp.60–69; Waltke-O’Connor, Introduction, §29.3.
107 McFall, Enigma, pp.70–77, 180–181.
108 McFall, Enigma, pp.77–82; Waltke-O’Connor, Introduction, §29.3.
2. Traditional Approaches to the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System

with his predecessors, Turner does not point to ‘primitive’ layers in the functionalities of the Hebrew verbal forms, but instead approaches Hebrew’s verbal system as a self-contained object of analysis. Yet, his philosophical views on language remain quite complicated and seem to be based more on assumptions regarding the functioning of the human mind than on a careful linguistic analysis of the Hebrew texts themselves. Thus, though Turner’s innovative ideas allow him to reject the tendency of the aspectual theories to propose non-systematic (i.e.: non-aspectual) functions for the consecutive form of the wayyiqtol, which, instead, should simply be ascribed the same ‘descriptive’ meaning as the ‘bare’ yiqtol, Turner does not provide examples of how he would himself render the wayyiqtol constructions, but restricts himself to making some abstract remarks in this regard.109

2.1.3 1910 – 1950s: Comparative-historical Theories

The third stage in the study of the Hebrew verbal system emerged in the first decades of the 20th century. After the discovery of the Assyrian/Akkadian language around 1850, more and more scholars started to pay attention to the historical development of the Semitic verbal system. In 1910, the focus on the historical roots of the Hebrew verbal forms and the embeddedness of the Hebrew culture and language in its broader Semitic context, which, as we noted, already began to emerge in the time of Ewald, reached its peak. In that year, Hans Bauer published his dissertation110 in which he identified no less than eight stages in the development of the Proto-Semitic verbal system. His work brought the period of the dominancy of the aspectual theory of Ewald to an end and opened a new era in which comparative-historical theories would play a central role. The first verbal form to arise, according to Bauer, was the yáqtul form which resulted from a combination of the personal pronoun ya- and the verb stem qtul (1st stage). This form had a ‘timeless’ character in that it functioned as a ‘universal’ tense. After the development of the suffix personal pronouns (2nd stage), these pronouns were used to create the new qataltá form, which functioned as a present participle (3rd stage). This qatal-participle put an end to the timeless meaning of the yáqtul form and forced it to adopt the verbal function that was left over after the introduction of the present participle: the yáqtul now became a past participle. After this, the East Semitic verbal system separated from the Proto-Semitic one and its present participle, the suffix form qataltá, developed itself into a new prefix form (4th phase). While the old prefix form (yáqtul) expressed past and completed action both in the East and the West Semitic verbal system, the new East Semitic prefix form (ikasad) represented present or incomplete actions and durative or habitual actions in past, present and future. The development of the old suffix form into a new prefix form at the same time created room for the emergence of new suffix forms (qatila and qatula) in the East Semitic system that were created on the basis of adjectives and functioned as permansive or stative forms. Subsequently, there also emerged a new verbal form (qatalta) in the West Semitic system which started to function as a past participle (5th phase). As a result, the old yáqtul in this West Semitic system (again) lost the narrative function it had obtained and was forced to adopt the functions of the present participle (qataltá). In the end, this new yaqtúl (note the shift in accent) was assigned a non-perfective function (6th phase) and the West Semitic system had to distinguish
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between the archaic, universal yáqtul and the new, non-perfective yaqtûl. This all resulted in an interesting shift of functions (7th phase): not only did the new yaqtûl form adopt the non-perfective function of the old present participle qataltá, but the new past participle qaţalta, in turn, also took over the narrative function of the archaic yáqtul. The archaic forms, however, did not fully disappear. According to Bauer, they constitute the basis for the consecutive forms, the wayyiqtol having the same meaning as the archaic narrative yáqtul and the weqatal fulfilling the same function as the old present participle qataltá. On the basis of the developments described above, Bauer argues that these consecutive forms are interchangeable with the bare qatal and yiqtol that were formed on the basis of, respectively, the younger narrative qaţalta and the non-perfective yaqtûl. Thus, the Hebrew forms qatal and wayyiqtol mirror the West Semitic qaţalta and yáqtul in fulfilling the same past, narrative function, while the Hebrew forms yiqtol and weqatal correspond to the West Semitic yaqtul and qatal in both having a non-perfective meaning. In the final stage, when the younger forms were well established, the Semites, among them the Hebrews, ceased to make a distinction between the archaic and younger forms by means of the accentual patterns (8th stage), which helps us to explain why we sometimes find in the Hebrew Bible isolated yiqtol and qatal forms obviously fulfilling the functions of the corresponding archaic forms of which they are remnants.

Bauer concludes his historical overview by arguing that Biblical Hebrew’s verbal system essentially represents a combination of the East and West Semitic verbal systems. From the East Semitic system it adopted the preterite meaning of the old yáqtul form (in the wayyiqtol and in some usages of yiqtol) and the present tense meaning of the permansive/stative qaţila and qatula (in the qatal forms expressing a present or future tense). From the West Semitic system it adopted the perfective meaning of the past participle qaţalta (in the active qatal forms functioning as perfects) and the present-future meaning of the new yaqtûl form (in most yiqtol forms). Thus, in the end, Bauer, although using an innovative approach, arrived at the same analysis of the functions of the Hebrew verbal forms as the medieval Jewish grammarians. Bauer aimed to give their conversive theory a better foundation by explaining both the ‘inverse’ meanings of the wayyiqtol and the qatal and the apparently exceptional usages of the bare yiqtol (for simple past tense) and qatal forms (for present or future tense) on the basis of diachronic developments in the Semitic and Hebrew verbal system.111

The main problem in Bauer’s theory is constituted by the very complicated nature of many of the transitions Bauer presupposes in the development from the Proto-Semitic simple verbal forms into the complex system of Hebrew’s verbal forms and functions. Especially his assertion that the prefix and suffix forms in the West Semitic system adopted each other’s functions and broke away from their own, raises serious questions. Yet, Bauer’s work was regarded as groundbreaking by many of his contemporaries and influenced most of the 20th-century studies of the Hebrew verbal system.112

One of the most influential successors of Bauer was G.R. Driver,113 who radically differed from Bauer’s view in that he identified not the yaqtul form, but the qatal form as the oldest Semitic verbal form. Driver distinguished between six stages in the development of the Semitic verbal system. Initially, the qatal had a stative meaning and functioned to describe ‘pure states’, i.e.: completed states in the past and lasting states in the present and future (1st stage).
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Subsequently, the first new verbal form to develop was the *i-qatal* form that functioned as a present-future tense with an active meaning (2nd stage). After this, in the East Semitic system the *yáqtil* form emerged and fulfilled the function of a preterite as it described single, momentary actions in the past (3rd stage). The Hebrew *wayyiqtol* is identified by Driver as a remnant of this *yáqtil* form. After the development of an imperative form (4th stage), and, on the basis of this imperative form, jussive and cohortative forms (5th stage), the West Semitic system separated from the East Semitic by making the universal *qatal* form into a form describing completed actions in the past, which resulted in the emergence of a *yaqtul* form (different from East Semitic *yáqtil*) for the expression of incomplete situations. Driver follows Bauer in asserting that Hebrew combined elements from both the East Semitic and the West Semitic system and explains how Hebrew adopted both East Semitic’s ‘universal’ (past, present and future) *qatil* and preterite *yáqtil* and West Semitic’s past *qatal* and imperfective *yaqtul*. The East Semitic functions are most clearly distinguishable in the consecutive forms, while the West Semitic functions can be found in the copulative forms. Though proposing a different order of stages in the development of the Semitic verbal system, Driver in the end agrees with Bauer in assuming that the contradictory functions exhibited by the different Hebrew verbal forms could be accounted for by relating them to separate Semitic forms. Unfortunately, Driver’s theory, like Bauer’s, invokes the impression of being of a highly speculative nature. In the end, Bauer and Driver are not able to provide us with a systematic analysis of the functioning of the Hebrew verbal forms, but instead offer an extremely complex, and therefore not so convincing, description of a rather incoherent development of the Semitic verb into an inconsistent constellation of forms and functions they think to observe in Biblical Hebrew. Besides, Driver follows Bauer in assigning (though maybe less rigorously) tense values to Hebrew’s verbal forms and linking them to certain aspects. The *yiqtol* form, for instance, in its expression of present and future events is viewed as referring to incomplete actions. As a result, Driver’s theory has to face the same types of criticism as the tense and aspectual theories discussed in the previous sections.

2.2 The Study of the Hebrew Verbal System: 20th and 21st century

The present-day situation in the study of Hebrew’s verbal system has not yet received much attention in summaries of the theories regarding the use of verbal forms in Hebrew. Thus, McFall discusses only the theories developed before 1954 (the year in which Thacker, using the same comparative-historical approach as Bauer and Driver, published his study) and explicitly states that ‘it is a fact that no fundamentally new solution to the HVS [Hebrew Verbal System, GK] has appeared since 1954 that has received significant support from Hebraists and Semitists’. Waltke & O’Connor (1990) in their historical overview of theories on the Hebrew verb leave recent publications out of consideration, too.

A careful examination of the books and articles about the Hebrew verbal system produced since the 1950s indeed shows that, as McFall suggests, most Hebraists and grammarians tend to take up again the traditional theories, often slightly reinterpreting and somehow combining them. It is interesting to note that, since the work of Bauer and G.R. Driver, the comparative-historical
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diachronic approach has continued to play a central role in most studies and grammars. However, scholars using this approach have not all arrived at the same conclusions. Below, we categorize and briefly summarize the theories presented in works published in the past decades.

2.2.1 Tense Theories in Recent Times

Let us start with the tense theories. The medieval *waw-conversive* theory has continued to influence Hebraists even in the second half of the 20th century. Thus, Frank Blake, arguing that the aspectual theories have brought about much confusion and obscurity and generally lack any consistency, aims at ‘a resurvey based in general on the tense theory advanced by Bauer’. 117

After a brief description of the historical development of the Semitic verbal system, in which Blake for the most part agrees with Bauer, Blake concludes that *yiqtol* still functions as a kind of ‘omnitemporal’ form as it is used to express ordinary present, general present, progressive past, simple past (preterite), future and even modality. Stative *qatal* in most instances carries the original present tense meaning of the proto-Semitic perfect, while active *qatal* mostly has a past tense meaning. All in all, Blake follows Bauer by assigning tense meanings to Hebrew’s verbal forms. Illustrative is his remark about the *w-conversive*: “It is a curious fact that the conjunction υ, when immediately preceding an imperfect or a perfect form, has the power, at least apparently, of giving an imperfect a past meaning and of changing the meaning of the perfect to any one of the numerous meanings of the imperfect (present-future).” 118 Blake adds that the converted forms function as independent tense forms and are, therefore, also able to exhibit their converted meaning if they are not preceded by another verbal form.

Another, more recent, supporter of the *waw-conversive* theory is Joshua Blau, who in his grammar 119 expresses his view that, in classical prose at least, *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* refer to the past, while *yiqtol* and *weqatal* refer to the present or the future. When the syntactic environment enables or requires the use of the *waw* conjunction, Hebrew (prose) switches to the opposite tense with consecutive *waw*. In other words, by adding the *waw* to a verbal form, it is made to adopt the tense value of the opposite tempus.

The ‘relative tense theory’ of Schroeder has also received renewed attention in the past decades. In his study of 1982, Rüdiger Bartelmus, like Blake above, criticizes the aspectual theories, stating that the Biblical Hebrew verbal system, having four basic forms, can hardly be analyzed as an aspectual system, which usually possesses two basic verbal forms. Bartelmus argues, instead, that Hebrew has an ‘einfache Zeitlagessystem’ in which the point of reference does not necessarily have to be the present. 120 In such a system, the verbal forms express three temporal layers – ‘Vorzeitigkeit’ (VZ), ‘Gleichzeitigkeit’ (GZ) and ‘Nachzeitigkeit’ (NZ) – relative to a point of reference that has just been set. The VZ- and NZ-form express punctuality, because they focus, respectively, on the starting point (retrospective) and the end point (prospective) of a situation. Next to that, the VZ-form denotes perfectivity, while the NZ-form indicates imperfectivity. Both forms, however, can also express durative aspect. The GZ-form, on the other hand, always indicates incompleteness (imperfectivity) and durativity and cannot be used to express
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punctuality. Bartelmus applies all this to Hebrew by asserting that *qatal* functions as a VZ-form, *qotel* as a GZ-form and *yiqtol* as a NZ-form. However, while *qatal* and *qotel* indeed fulfill all functions of, respectively, the VZ- and the GZ-form, the *yiqtol* according to many scholars does not express prospectivity and punctuality (as the NZ-form should do), but contemporaneity and durativity. Bartelmus rejects such an analysis of *yiqtol* and stresses that all functions of *yiqtol* can be reduced to the common denominator of expressing prospectivity. *Yiqtol* functions as a kind of *ingressive* form, implying that the situation it describes as just having emerged, will continue (note the correspondences with S.R. Driver’s analysis of *yiqtol* as a ‘nascent form’). Though Bartelmus obviously creates room for aspectual notions, he emphasizes that the expression of relative tense domains is the main function of the three verbal forms. The consecutive forms enable the Hebrew language to be more precise in its expression of time relations. Thus, *wayyiqtol* functions as a VZ-form and adds to the features of that form the notion of progression (which the *qatal* form cannot express). The *weqatal* form does the same with the NZ-form. However, because *yiqtol* itself is already capable of expressing progression, the formation of the *weqatal* is probably influenced more by the desire to have a ‘NZ-equivalent’ of the *wayyiqtol* form than by the need for another NZ-form.

### 2.2.2 Aspectual Theories in Recent Times

Taking into account both Blake’s and Bartelmus’ strong criticisms on the aspectual theories and their inclination to include aspectual notions in their analysis of the Hebrew verbal system, one may deduce that these aspectual theories continued to play a dominant role in much of the 20th-century studies, even though Bauer and G.R. Driver redirected their readers’ attention to the tense theories.

Indeed, many 20th-century grammars support (though often in a slightly more cautious way) the traditional view that the main function of Hebrew’s verbal forms is that of expressing aspect. Brockelmann, for instance, starts his analysis of the Hebrew verbal system by examining the comparative-historical theories of Bauer and G.R. Driver, and in the end, by slightly modifying them, arrives at the conclusion that the Hebrew verbal system is not a tense system, but an aspectual one. 121 Brockelmann’s analysis of the aspectual functions of the Hebrew verbal forms is rather straightforward. He places more weight on the communicative purposes of the speaker or author by arguing that the verbal forms express ‘subjektiven Aspekte’ with which a situation is presented either as an event that has simply happened or as something in progress. Thus, the *qatal* denotes perfective aspect, while the *yiqtol* indicates imperfective, progressive or *kursiv* aspect.

Roughly three decades later, Waltke and O’Connor, after having presented an elaborate historical overview of theories on the Hebrew verbal system, arrive at the same conclusion that the basic structure of the Hebrew verbal system is aspectual. Basing themselves on the work of the linguist Comrie and on comparative-historical considerations, they characterize the *qatal* form as perfective and the *yiqtol* form as non-perfective. While the *qatal* form focuses on a situation as a whole and ‘views it globally’, the *yiqtol* concentrates on ‘internal distinctions of various separate phases together making up the situation’. Waltke and O’Connor stress that ‘perfective aspect’
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does not present a situation as finished, as completed, but as ‘complete’, and in that way avoid many of the problems of earlier aspeclual theories. The non-perfective יִקְטֹל has two basic values: it may indicate an imperfective situation in the past or in the present and it may express a ‘dependent situation’, i.e.: a situation which is dependent on speaker and subject (in which case the יִקְטֹל expresses modality or volition) or on another situation. The וּיִקְטֹל and weqatal share the values of, respectively, qatal and yiqtol and represent a situation that is, as a (con)sequence or as an explanation, subordinate to that referred to by the preceding clause. Other recent works in which the aspectual approach dominates are, for example, the elaborate cross-linguistic study of Moomo, who shows himself to be an advocator of the approach of S.R. Driver, the book of Eskhult, who treats the Hebrew verbal system in terms of aspectual contrasts, and the small grammar of Seow, who considers qatal to present actions that are completed or are viewed as such and analyzes yiqtol as denoting non-completed actions or states.

2.2.3 Combination of Tense and Aspeclual Theories in Recent Times

Other modern grammars tend to combine the tense and aspeclual theories. Thus, in his grammar first published in 1923 (and in later times revised by T. Muraoka) P. Joüon asserts that qatal is used for present tense of stative verbs and, in most instances, for past tense of active verbs, in which case it denotes unique and momentary actions. The grammar’s attention for both tense and aspect is most clearly visible in its discussion of the yiqtol form. It is argued that the yiqtol expresses future tense in case of stative verbs but fulfills different functions in case of active verbs: if the yiqtol is used for future situations, it merely has a (future) tense value; if yiqtol is used for present situations, the form indicates both (present) tense and (durative/iterative) aspect; if yiqtol is used for past situations, the form only denotes (durative/iterative) aspect. Wayyiqtol and weqatal are regarded as ‘inverted tenses’ by Joüon. The forms have the same values as, respectively, qatal and yiqtol and add to those values the notion of succession. The discussion of the Hebrew verbal forms in the grammar of P. Joüon and its recent revisions by Muraoka is remarkably similar to the discussion of the Hebrew verbal system presented in the later editions of the grammar of Lettinga-Muraoka. In these recent editions, the
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authors/revisers combine the categories of tense and aspect by stating that qatal expresses unique and momentary actions mostly in the past, but sometimes (in case of stative verbs) in the present, while yiqtol may denote mere future tense (in which case it is neutral for aspect), but can also be used, with active verbs, to indicate durative or iterative aspect in combination with past or present tense, then having both a temporal and an aspectual meaning. Furthermore, the authors agree with Joüon in analyzing the waw in the consecutive forms as a waw converusive.\footnote{The first edition of the grammar, which has become the ‘standard grammar’ of Biblical Hebrew for the Dutch-speaking audiences, was written by J. Nat and was published in 1936 under the title of ‘Hebreeuwsche Grammatica’ (‘Hebrew Grammar’). In this edition Nat explicitly states that he has based his views on the work of Bauer, G.R. Driver and Brockelmann. As a result, Nat’s focus is on a historical-comparative analysis of the Hebrew grammatical phenomena. This focus is continued in the third and subsequent revisions of the grammar made by J.J. Koopmans. However, in the sixth edition, a revision of the grammar made by Lettinga, some of the weaknesses of the historical-comparative approach are pointed out and an approach that is less dependent on the work of Bauer and Driver is promoted. Yet, the need for an analysis of the historical developments in the Hebrew language itself is still stressed. This becomes clear, for example, in the adoption in later revisions by Lettinga (e.g. 8th edition of 1976) of numerous views on the history of the Hebrew language presented in the grammar of Meyer (see below). Consequently, much attention is paid to the study of non-masoretic Hebrew texts like the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the tenth edition, a revision of the hand of Muraoka, the straightforward claims of the historical approach are criticized by arguing that the development of the Hebrew language was not as unidirectional and linear as was supposed by the advocates of this approach. Instead, the grammar aims to do more justice to the masoretic text of the Old Testament itself. Thus, the authors appear to favour a more synchronic approach. These developments are clearly reflected in the grammar’s discussion of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system, which is the grammar’s part that has undergone the most thorough modifications in subsequent editions. In the first editions, Nat introduces a ‘purely’ aspectual approach by distinguishing between qatal’s function to mark actions or situations as ‘completed’ and yiqtol’s function to characterize actions and situations as ‘non-completed’ or ‘durative’. In the revision of Lettinga (6th edition, 1962), the verbal functions are analyzed in terms of subjective aspects (reflecting the attitude of the speaker with respect to the action described) and objective ‘Aktionsarten’ (referring to the nature of the action itself). According to Lettinga, in the verbal system emerging in West Semitic languages subjective aspects (konstativ vs. kursiv; cf. Brockelmann and in particular Meyer) have replaced the original objective ‘Aktionsarten’ (punctual vs. durative). In Muraoka’s revision of the grammar (10th edition, 1996) and in subsequent editions, the Hebrew verbal system is no longer analyzed only in terms of aspect (momentary-durative, unique-iterative), but also in terms of tense (see main text). The main cause for this change can be found in the transition to a new grammatical approach in which more room is created for insights from General Linguistics and the drawbacks of the historical-comparative approaches, bringing forth the view that the Hebrew verbal system is purely aspectual, are recognized. As such, the history of the grammar of Nat, Lettinga and Muraoka nicely mirrors different stages in the overall history of the 20th-century study of the Hebrew verb. For a more elaborate summary of the grammar’s different editions and their characteristics, see: Van Peursen, W.Th., ‘Nat – Koopmans – Lettinga – Muraoka; Ontwikkelingen in de Hebraïstiek van 1936 tot 1996’ (Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift 51 (1997)), pp.194–207.\footnote{One may feel tempted to explain this by the fact that the revisions of the two grammars were made by the same person, namely T. Muraoka. However, for the grammar of Joüon it is clear that it was Joüon himself who in the original French 1923 edition of his Grammaire de l’Hébreu Biblique introduces the theory that Hebrew’s verbal functions are to be defined in terms of both tense and aspect (see esp. §112–113, pp.294–307). We do not find radical changes in the discussion of the Hebrew verbal system in Muraoka’s revision of this grammar.} One may feel tempted to explain this by the fact that the revisions of the two grammars were made by the same person, namely T. Muraoka. However, for the grammar of Joüon it is clear that it was Joüon himself who in the original French 1923 edition of his Grammaire de l’Hébreu Biblique introduces the theory that Hebrew’s verbal functions are to be defined in terms of both tense and aspect (see esp. §112–113, pp.294–307). We do not find radical changes in the discussion of the Hebrew verbal system in Muraoka’s revision of this grammar.\footnote{Lettinga, J.P., Grammatica van het Bijbels Hebreeuws. Twaalfde, herziene editie door M.F.J. Baasten & W.Th. van Peursen (Leiden: Brill, 2012), §43, pp.82–85; §77, pp.149–158.}
The grammar of Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze also points to the ‘interwovenness of tense and aspect’ in the Hebrew verbal system. They analyze qatal as a form expressing completed actions in the past and yiqtol as a form denoting non-complete actions in a non-past (mostly future) setting. Further temporal distinctions within the categories of past and non-past can only be made on the basis of context and the lexical meaning of the verb. Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze emphasize that the Biblical authors had the choice to describe either the aspect or the time of an action. Next to that, they seem to create room for the notion of relative tense by stating that the Hebrews were free to present an action either from the perspective of the author himself or from the perspective of one of the text’s characters, which implies, that there was no fixed point of time reference in the use of the Hebrew tenses. In agreement with Lettinga and Joüon-Muraoka, Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze distinguish between two ‘inverted pairs’, arguing that wayyiqtol expresses temporal or logical progress in the temporal and aspectual spheres of the qatal form, while the weqatal does the same in the temporal and aspectual spheres of the yiqtol form.

A final example of a study in which different traditional approaches are combined is that of Ronald Hendel, who tried to describe the Biblical Hebrew verbal system by means of the three categories of tense, aspect and mood. To these categories, Hendel adds a fourth notion which he terms ‘situation’. This notion concerns the nature of the verb, which can be either stative or dynamic. The distinction between these two types of nature correlates, according to Hendel, with a functional distinction in the present time frame. Thus, Hebrew in general uses the qatal to express the present tense of stative verbs, while the yiqtol is used to express a dynamic verb’s present tense. As for the category of tense, Hendel notes that Biblical Hebrew’s tense operations can be regarded as indicative of a relative tense system. Though the point of reference is often simply the present time of the speaker, in some cases it proves itself to be the time of the situation expressed by the previous verb. In those instances, qatal expresses relative past and yiqtol relative future. More specifically, Hendel argues that qatal denotes relative non-future for stative verbs and relative past for dynamic verbs, while the yiqtol indicates relative future for stative verbs and relative non-past for dynamic verbs. With regard to the category of aspect, Hendel claims that qatal presents a situation as a bound whole (compare Waltke-O’Connor’s analysis of qatal as expressing complete events), with that denoting perfective aspect, while yiqtol portrays a situation as an unbound process. Finally, with regard to the category of mood, Hendel stresses that the yiqtol, frequently referring to a future event or action, is used to express all kinds of modality, while the qatal form only rarely fulfills such a modal function. By combining these three categories, the Biblical Hebrew verbal system can reach a maximal number of semantic contrasts with only a minimal number of distinctive forms. It is interesting to note that Hendel treats the wayyiqtol and the weqatal forms in a very traditional way as ‘conversive forms’ adopting the semantic categories of the ‘bare’ form of the opposite tempus.

2.2.4 **Comparative-historical Theories in Recent Times**

In many works mentioned in the previous subsections the comparative-historical approach functions as a kind of framework for the analysis of the Hebrew verbal system. The historical development of the Semitic verbal system as outlined by Bauer and others has enabled scholars to find explanations for the broad range of functions the verbal forms in Hebrew seem to fulfill. Thus, many of them distinguish between the normal or *Langform yiqtol* functioning as an imperfect and the short form *yiqtol* that can be traced in the *wayyiqtol* and the jussive form. Though most studies assign an instrumental function to this kind of comparative-historical considerations, some scholars make the diachronic and comparative analysis their central point of attention.

Andersen, for example, considers a diachronic analysis of the Hebrew verbal forms to be more helpful than a synchronic one and, for that reason, elaborately discusses the historical background of Hebrew's verbal conjugations. His identification of stages in the development of the Proto-Semitic verbal system slightly differs from that of Bauer. Andersen argues that the *yáqtul* form never functioned as a timeless form, but immediately adopted a past perfective meaning (1st stage). It is this form that can be traced back in the *wayyiqtol* form and in archaic uses of preterite *yiqtols*. The second form to arise was the *yaqtulu* form that adopted an imperfective function and as such served as a basis for the Hebrew imperfect *yiqtol* (2nd stage). After that, the *qatala* form was introduced in the Proto-Semitic verbal system (3rd stage). According to Andersen, this form started as an imperfective form, but in later times attained a perfective meaning. The oldest imperfective meaning has been preserved in the Hebrew *weqatal* form and in the use of *qatal* as a present continuative imperfective of stative verbs. The perfective meaning of *qatal* can probably be linked to the development of the Proto-Semitic *qatala* into a perfective form for transitive and resultative verbs. In this way, Andersen tries to explain the semantic split between the different usages of *qatal* (and *weqatal*). The imperfective meaning of *qatala* was connected to the present and future temporal axes, while its perfective meaning was related to the past temporal axis and thus mirrored that of the old past-perfective *yaqtul* form. To summarize, the Hebrew verbal forms *wayyiqtol*, *qatal* and *weqatalti* attained a preterite meaning, while the *yiqtol* and *weqatal* forms adopted an imperfective and future meaning, as did the *qatal* form for stative verbs (4th stage). Additionally, the *qatal* and *weqatalti* forms also functioned as perfects. In this way, Andersen uses a profound diachronic analysis to arrive at the conclusion, drawn by others (Lettinga, Joüon-Muraoka) mainly on the basis of a synchronic analysis, that the Hebrew verbal system is one that combines the categories of aspect and tense.

Another interesting comparative-historical analysis of the Hebrew verbal forms is that of Siedl, who distinguishes himself from earlier studies like those of Bauer and G.R. Driver in ignoring the Proto-Semitic system and focusing merely on a comparison between the Hebrew verbal system and the (East Semitic) Akkadian one. In his article, Siedl concentrates on the broad range of functions that can be fulfilled by the prefix conjugation. After having identified the Akkadian equivalents of the Hebrew *yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* form, Siedl raises the hypothesis that Hebrew
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originally made a morphological distinction between a durative present-future *yiqtol* form and a punctual preterite *yiqtol* form, like Akkadian did. Though the morphological marking of this distinction has disappeared in Hebrew, the distinction can still be traced in the difference of the vocalization of the *waw* in the (durative present-future) *wayiqtol* forms and the (punctual preterite) *wayyiqtol* forms and in the difference in syntactic positioning between the (durative present-future) *yiqtol*, which is often preceded by another linguistic element in the clause, and the (punctual preterite) *wayyiqtol*, which always occurs at the beginning of a sentence. Siedl defends this diachronic analysis of two original contrasting prefix forms by arguing that the formation of the Hebrew verbal system was not only influenced by the Akkadian one (though he stresses that the Akkadian language indeed functioned as a kind of basic layer for the later classical Hebrew language), but indirectly also by the Sumerian language which directly affected the development of the Akkadian verbal system. For that reason, Siedl deems it possible to apply the Sumerian terms *hamtu* (durative *Vollform*) and *maru* (punctual *Kurzform*), which indicate the type of action (aspect) and its temporal axis, to the Hebrew verbal conjugations, with that supporting and further specifying his distinction of a *durative/iterative* present-future prefix form and a *punctual* preterite prefix form within the Hebrew verbal system.

Another Hebraist making use of a strongly diachronic approach was Bergsträsser, who wrote his grammar in the decade after Bauer revealed his theories. Bergsträsser elaborately refers to the theory of Bauer, but rejects his idea that the Hebrew verbal system forms the result of a mixing-up of the East and West Semitic systems. Instead, he identifies the imperative and the jussive ‘*Kurzimperfectum*’, which was also used to express past actions, as the oldest Semitic verbal forms and stresses that the same ambiguity in the meanings of the ‘*Kurzimperfectum*’ can be found in Hebrew that distinguishes between jussive *yiqtol* and past *wayyiqtol*. In a second stage the suffix conjugation, having a present tense meaning, was formed on the basis of the adjetival forms *qatil* and *qatul*. After that, a present-future form developed from the jussive-preterite ‘*Kurzimperfectum*’. Subsequently, the function of the suffix conjugation changed from that of expressing present tense to that of denoting ‘*vergangener Ereignisse ohne Rücksicht auf aus ihnen hervorgehende Zustände*’, thus making the *qatal* into a ‘*Vergangenheitstempus*’. This resulted in the polar scheme *qatal-wayyiqtol* (*Vergangenheitstempus – Präriterumjussiv expressing progress*), which, in turn, stimulated the formation of the other polar scheme *yiqtol-weqatal*. On the basis of these diachronic considerations, Bergsträsser, more than half a century earlier than Bartelmus, analyzes the Hebrew verbal system as a relative tense system in which *qatal* expresses *Vorzeitigkeit* and *yiqtol* denotes *Gleichzeitigkeit/Nachzeitigkeit*. Though his identification of the polar schemes may suggest that Bergsträsser regarded the *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* forms as converive forms, he seems to relativize this view by emphasizing that both forms always (in case of *wayyiqtol*) or often (in case of *weqatal*) adopt the tense value of the preceding verbal form, which does not necessarily have to be the form to which they are related in the polar scheme.

A more recent example of a contribution focusing on the historical development of the Hebrew verbal system is the grammar of Meyer, who by following the approach of Bauer arrives at the

---

conclusion that the Hebrew verbal system is (not a tense system, but) an aspectual system in which the qatal form indicates punctual (‘konstativen’) aspect, while yiqtol denotes durative (‘kursiven’) aspect. In line with the aspectual theories of Ewald and S.R. Driver, Meyer concludes that only the wayyiqtol expresses (past) tense. Meyer accounts for exceptional uses of the verbal forms by asserting that the Hebrew conjugations contain remnants of the verbal functions that were attested in the old West Semitic verbal system. Thus, while as a durative form yiqtol usually expresses the relative ‘Zeitstufen’ of Gleichzeitigkeit and Nachzeitigkeit, it can also present durative or even punctual actions in the past, which can be explained by referring to the old West Semitic preterite-jussive prefix form. Similarly, qatal has preserved the stativfunktion of the old West Semitic suffix conjugation and, as such, often expresses, in present tense, a certain state or feature. In agreement with the development of the function of the West Semitic suffix conjugation from a stative one into a punctual one, the Hebrew qatal also was increasingly used as a narrative tense with a punctual meaning. The wayyiqtol emerged from the old West Semitic preterite-jussive form and became a narrative tense. The weqatal frequently adopts the values of the preceding clause, but may also function independently as an imperfective form in some instances.

2.2.5 Conclusions

Our overview of 20th-century theories concerning the Hebrew verbal system makes clear that there is still no agreement on the functions of Hebrew verbal forms. Even scholars using the same approach arrive at wholly different conclusions about the meanings the verbal forms seem to fulfill. Thus, Hebraists favouring a comparative-historical method not only show strong mutual differences in the stages of development they identify, but also come up with verbal functions that are as different from each other as those that the synchronic studies discussed in the first part of this section proposed. It is not only interesting, but also quite alarming to note that almost all of the theories developed in the 16th-19th centuries appear to have had their advocates in the past decades, which suggests that a consistent interpretation of the functions of Hebrew’s verbal forms in the present may well be as unreachable as it was in previous centuries.

Based on the fact that a consistent interpretation of the functions of Hebrew’s verbal forms is still not provided and that we even find recent attempts, like that of Zuber, to offer a wholly new
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137 Zuber, B., Das Tempussystem des biblischen Hebräisch (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986), pp.19–30, 69–71, 136–142. Zuber, dissociating himself from all theories presented above, hypothesizes that new insights into Hebrew’s use of verbal forms can be gained by comparing the Hebrew texts with their translation in the Septuagint and the Vulgate. He argues ‘dass es eigentlich möglich sein müsste, anhand systematischer Beobachtungen, wie Septuaginta und Vulgata die einzelnen hebräischen Verbformen übersetzen, recht nahe an das Verständnis heranzukommen, das die pharisäischen Traditionsträger zur Zeit Qumrans selbst von der Funktion der einzelnen hebräischen Verbformen gehabt haben’. On the basis of his comparative analyses, Zuber concludes that the main function of the Hebrew verbal forms is that of indicating mode. After having identified wayyiqtol and weqatal as ‘conversiv-Formen’, Zuber divides Hebrew’s verbal forms into two categories. First, he analyzes qatal and wayyiqtol as recto forms and assigns to them an indicative meaning. Second, yiqtol and weqatal are termed obliquo forms and considered as expressing modality and future tense. In other words, decisive for the use of recto forms is ‘der direkte Bezug zur angesprochenen Realität’, while the obliquo form is used in all instances where ‘modifiziert über Ereignisse und Handlungen gesprochen wird’. Arguing that the categories of ‘tempus’ and ‘modus’ should be related to each other,
analysis of the Hebrew verbal system, we conclude that the search for a better understanding of the functioning of the Hebrew verbal forms has to be continued until, in the words of McFall, ‘a more objective and scientific solution is found’. With our present knowledge of the Hebrew verbal system, the Biblical texts still cannot be fully understood. None of the theories and their revisions and combinations outlined above is able to provide us with a satisfying and encompassing explanation for Biblical Hebrew’s use of verbal forms.

Before addressing the question if and how this situation can be changed, we conclude this chapter by a brief survey of the research into the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry that has been conducted in recent decades.

2.3 The Study of the Use of Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Poetry

As we noted in the first chapter and in the previous sections, grammars and studies on the Hebrew verbal system tend to concentrate on an analysis of prosaic texts, while a serious discussion of the use of verbal forms in poetic texts is mostly avoided. Thus, most grammars, even the ones that were published recently, link up with the tendencies shown by commentaries and Bible translations to regard poetry’s use of verbal forms as random, non-systematic or divergent. They do so by avoiding the use of illustrative examples taken from poetic passages or by ‘inventing’ lots of new verbal functions in order to be able to include in their verbal theories those usages of verbal forms in poetic texts that cannot be explained by referring to the functions they assigned to the verbal forms used in prosaic texts.

From all 20th-century scholars studying Hebrew’s verbal system only very few have advocated a rather systematic analysis of the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry. Interestingly, these scholars indeed seem to follow the just-mentioned tendencies as they provide an analysis of the use of verbal forms in poetry without paying attention to a specific theory about the verbal forms’ functions in prose. This is particularly the case in the dissertation Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen published by the German Hebraist Diethelm Michel. In this dissertation, Michel explicitly criticizes earlier attempts to examine the functions of the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry, because these attempts were influenced too much by theories concerning the use of verbal forms in Hebrew prose. Michel himself, on the contrary, aims to investigate the verbal forms’ functions as if their respective meanings are yet completely unknown. This incites him to use an approach which is ‘purely inductive’. He concludes that in

Zuber asserts that, while the obliquo forms express future tense (one cannot speak about future events in a non-modal way), the recto forms frequently refer to past events and actions.

138 McFall, Enigma, p.185.

139 Illustrative in this regard is Hatav’s explanation of her decision to leave poetic texts out of consideration. Hatav, G., The Semantics of Aspect and Modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1997), p.24: ‘Gesenius (1909), Ben-Hayyim (1977), Qimron (1981) and others claim that the language in the poetry texts differs in many respects from the prose discourse (...). The verb forms function differently in prose as opposed to poetry. I have chosen in this study to examine narrative texts since (...) poetry often violates otherwise valid linguistic norms for poetic effect, often harking back to archaic styles, etc. (...) Gesenius (1909), Bergsträsser (1972) and others show that prophetic texts in the Bible behave like poetry, and hence they, too, are excluded from the corpus of this study.’

the Psalms the verbal forms do not indicate ‘Zeitstufe’.\textsuperscript{141} Instead, the perfect (\textit{qatal}) is used to express an independent and self-evident (‘selbstgewichtig’) action. The \textit{qatal} usually denotes a fact or a series of facts.\textsuperscript{142} The imperfect (\textit{yiqtol}), however, expresses a dependent action, an action which is not ‘selbstgewichtig’, i.e.: an action which acquires its meaning from something else.\textsuperscript{143} Thus, the action expressed by a wayyiqtol always represents an effect which is closely related to an earlier action. The action, however, can also result from ‘das Wesen’ of its subject, in which case the action is modal, or from ‘das Begehren’ of a person, in which case \textit{yiqtol} has a volitive function.\textsuperscript{144}

Though Michel’s work has some interesting features and may be appreciated for avoiding the assignment of temporal meanings to poetry’s verbal forms, its main supposition that there exists a gap between, on the one hand, the functioning of verbal forms in prose and, on the other hand, the use of verbal forms in poetry violates the general linguistic universal that in every language one system regulates the use of verbal forms in all genres.\textsuperscript{145} Besides, Michel’s approach is not purely linguistic. Instead, in his analysis of the verbal forms Michel obviously allows himself to be guided by the German renderings of the forms, concluding that, because German translations need verbal forms referring to all different time axes in order to adequately render Hebrew’s verbal forms, the verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry cannot function to indicate tense, but have to denote other ‘inhaltlichen Merkmalen’. After having determined the ‘inhaltliche Unterschiede’ between the verbal forms, mainly on the basis of his (sometimes questionable)\textsuperscript{146} literary interpretation of some texts, Michel goes on to apply these hypothesized functions to all verbal forms in the poetic texts he examines. Instead of using an inductive approach and trying to detect the verbal functions by letting the texts ‘speak for themselves’, Michel in fact imposes a functional model of semantic oppositions on the use of verbal forms in the texts he quotes.\textsuperscript{147} In the end, then, Michel’s work links up with traditional studies in presupposing a gap between prose and poetry, in preferring a literary-semantic approach over a profound linguistic analysis, in basing himself on the renderings of the verbal forms in the Bible translations of his own language.

\textsuperscript{141} Michel, \textit{Tempora und Satzstellung}, p.254.
\textsuperscript{142} Michel, \textit{Tempora und Satzstellung}, pp.98–99, 254.
\textsuperscript{143} Michel’s theory about the verbal functions in the Psalms appears to be strongly influenced by the ‘Factual-Descriptive theory’ of William Turner (see §2.1.2).
\textsuperscript{144} Michel, \textit{Tempora und Satzstellung}, pp.110, 176, 254–255.
\textsuperscript{146} Gross, for example, refers to Michel’s subjective (i.e.: based on his personal interpretation of the text) rendering of the $x$-$qatal$ clause in Ps 31.11 (Michel, \textit{Tempora und Satzstellung}, p.53) with a present tense (while, according to Gross, a past tense would also be very well acceptable) and his subsequent argumentation that, apparently, the \textit{qatal} denotes ‘nicht nur vergangene Handlungen, sondern auch gegenwärtige’, which means that the criterion for the use of \textit{qatal} cannot be the time axis of the action presented. See: Gross, W., \textit{Verbform und Funktion: wayyiqtol für die Gegenwart? Ein Beitrag zur Syntax poetischer althebräischer Texte} (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1976), p.46n99.
It is clear, then, that Michel’s approach is a function-to-form approach: he first offers his interpretation of the text’s contents and, only after that, continues to examine which forms are used to express the text’s meaning. Compare also the dominancy of a semantic-literary analysis over a linguistic analysis in Michel’s discussion of several other Psalms (pp.215–245).
\textsuperscript{147} Compare the criticism on Michel provided by Gross; Gross, \textit{Verbform und Funktion}, pp.44–54.
and in superimposing his model of semantic distinctions on the Hebrew data without inductively designing a theory on the basis of the linguistic data present in the texts themselves.

In 1976, Walter Gross published his dissertation *Verbform und Funktion. Wayyiqtol für die Gegenwart? Ein Beitrag zur Syntax poetischer althebräischer Texte*. His approach somehow differs from that of Michel as he partially bases his views on the numerous discussions he had with the formalist text linguist Wolfgang Richter, which can, inter alia, be seen in Gross’ attention to syntactic patterns. After having focused on the use of the wayyiqtol form for ‘angebliche oder wirkliche individuelle oder generelle Gegenwart’, which is almost exclusively attested in poetic texts, Gross concludes that the function of the wayyiqtol form, just like that of the suffix conjugation, should be stated in terms of aspect: as wayyiqtol can be used both to express individual past situations, which, in most cases, are progressive with regard to a preceding situation, and to express a non-progressive past situation, namely in case the use of a qatal-clause is impossible (for stylistic reasons, for example), the form in itself is not merely a past tense form, but, like the qatal, functions as a verbal form indicating perfective aspect. Though Gross does not explicitly relate his analysis of the wayyiqtol in ‘fast ausschliesslich poetischen Belege’ to a broader examination of wayyiqtol in (prosaic and poetic) Hebrew in general, his work is certainly innovative. Gross namely builds his work on the core assumption that the functions assigned to the verbal forms in poetry should be regarded as a sort of Nebenfunktionen in which the basic opposition between the verbal forms that is attested in prosaic texts, is still visible. Gross indeed stresses that insights concerning syntactic features and patterns figuring in prosaic texts should not be neglected in the analyses of poetic passages. 

This plea for a systematic analysis of poetry’s use of verbal forms in which insights into the functioning of verbal forms in prosaic texts is taken into consideration is shared by Rüdiger Bartelmus, who explicitly criticizes the work of Michel, stating that his theory ‘sich (…) nicht mit den Sachverhalten vereinbaren last, die uns aus der Syntax der Prosatexte bekannt sind, in denen die Kategorie “Zeit” eine wichtige Rolle spielt’. Instead, Bartelmus proposes to turn back to the grammatical categories that are identified in prosaic texts, though at the same time he admits that when doing so, one has to take into account that the poetic texts have emerged in a period of about 1000 years, which means that they do not all exhibit the same ‘Sprachgebrauch’. ‘Systemfremde Texte’, therefore, have to be examined with the help of diachronic analyses. In this respect Bartelms refers to the work of Robertson, who tried to distinguish between ‘early Hebrew poetry’ (13th-10th century BC) and ‘standard Hebrew poetry’ by linking divergent grammatical features of Hebrew poetry to the features of Ugaritic poetry and the Amarna text, thus identifying them as being of an early date.
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148 Gross, W., *Verbform und Funktion*, pp.163–166.
149 Gross, *Verbform und Function*, pp.162.
150 Gross, *Verbform und Function*, pp.10–11; see also his note 22.

After having traced morphological and syntactical differences between early and standard Hebrew poetry, Robertson takes these differences as criteria in his attempt to date Hebrew’s poetic texts. According to Robertson, one of the important linguistic features of early Hebrew poetry, clearly attested in the Ugaritic
Like Gross, Bartelmus bases his analyses of poetic texts to a large extent on the work of the text linguist Richter, arguing that one should, first of all, start with the examination of the individual forms and their (contextual) functions. Only after having inductively described the internal linguistic structure of a poem and, with that, having clarified the author’s communicative intentions, one can continue with a literary-rhetorical analysis of the text.\footnote{The advantage of...}
such a form-to-function approach is that it has the ‘textinternen Gegebenheiten’ as its starting point instead of ‘abendländischen Vorstellungen über orientalische Poesie’. 154 After having himself conducted a structural analysis of 1 Sam 2.1–10, Bartelmus points to ‘sorgfältige Umgang des Autors mit den Verbformen bzw. Satzarten’. 155 Instead of falling back on metrical and other stylistic considerations in the search for an explanation of the verbal forms’ functions, as is done in many traditional studies and commentaries (see chapter 1), Bartelmus argues that a form-to-function approach makes clear that the poetic text in 1 Sam 2 has to be treated as a direct speech text in which the present situation of the speaker is the point of reference for the ‘relativen Tempora’ (cf. our discussion of Bartelmus’ theory in §2.2.1). Bartelmus concludes that the poet uses ‘das Dreizeitenschema Vorzeitigkeit (qatal) – Gegenwart (qotel and simple nominal clause) – Nachzeitigkeit (yiqtol)’ as ‘Strukturprinzip zur Organisation seines Textes’. 156 The only serious problem for this interpretation of the verbal forms used in Hebrew poetry as indicating relative tense is constituted by the wayyiqtol forms. However, Bartelmus accepts Gross’ theory that wayyiqtol, when following a participle, can denote a general, perfective or present situation and explains that such an interpretation of the wayyiqtol form does not contradict his ‘Strukturtheorie’, but merely points to some variation in the surface text-level realization of an underlying scheme, or, as Bartelmus himself puts it, ‘nur eine Störung an der Textoberfläche’. 157 Bartelmus finishes his discussion of the use of the Hebrew verbal forms in poetic texts by stating that there is no reason to assume that poetry makes use of another system than the ‘Dreizeitenschema’ regulating the use of verbal forms in prose. Deviations from this scheme are to be explained by other solutions than those involving a change within this system. Thus, according to Bartelmus, the divergent use of weyiqtol, instead of weqatal, as an expression of future progression in 1 Sam 2.10b raises questions about the ‘sprachliche Kompetenz’ of the text’s author, who here suddenly seems to leave aside the classical linguistic system determining his use of verbal forms in the previous verses of the poem. 158 Though such attempts to account for divergent use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry are rather questionable, we appreciate and, as we will make clear in the next chapter, share Bartelmus’ conviction that one single linguistic system underlies the use of verbal forms in both prosaic and poetic texts. We also praise the form-to-function approach favoured by Bartelmus and acknowledge that his ‘Strukturtheorie’ can indeed explain a major part of Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms. However, as Bartelmus’ discussion of the small poem in 1 Sam 2 shows, his focus on isolated verbal forms and clause-level grammatical categories forces him to interpret a certain number of forms as ‘Störungen’. The explanations he offers for these ‘Störungen’ are not of linguistic nature, but seem to be quite speculative and not always that convincing. His conclusion, for example, that the poet lacks ‘sprachliche Kompetenz’ when he uses the weyiqtol for future progression in 1 Sam 2.10b is not very convincing and appears to be based merely on the attempt to keep his theory unchanged. The same is true for the ‘non-relative tense’ interpretation of some wayyiqtols as denoting perfectivity is only ‘eine Variante auf der Ausdrucksebene, nicht aber eine inhaltliche Störung’, such and other ‘Störungen’ invoke serious questions about the plausibility of Bartelmus’ views.

Nevertheless, Bartelmus’ theory, with its focus on a form-to-function approach and its attempt to offer a single explanation for the use of verbal forms in both prose and poetry, opens promising perspectives for future research.

### 2.4 Summary and General Conclusions

It has been observed in this chapter that the difficulties in the search for a systematic description of the Hebrew verbal system do not only entail the use of verbal forms in poetic texts. A consistent analysis of the verbal functions in Hebrew prose is not yet provided either, as is pointed out by the different views held by present-day grammarians and Hebraists and by the long lists of ‘exceptional’ uses of verbal forms presented in studies on this topic. We have seen that most studies reflected the more general areas of interest and attention taking central place in their respective time periods. Thus, the initial (and recurring) focus on the challenge to render the Hebrew texts in the target languages with their own restrictions can well be seen as one of the motives for the inclination shared by many Hebraists to define the Biblical Hebrew verbal system in terms of the verbal categories (tense, aspect, mood) present in the native (often Indo-European) language of the scholars themselves. Furthermore, the increasing interest in historical and cultural matters in the 18th and 19th century caused many Hebraists to de-emphasize the need and possibility to offer a comprehensive description (and translation) of Biblical Hebrew’s verbal forms and functions and instead made them prioritize the identification of the historical roots of the Hebrew verbal system and the effects of surrounding languages on the development of Hebrew’s verbal forms and functions.

A more general problem concerns the tendency to identify fixed one-to-one relations between specific forms and functions. As we will show in what follows, the solution to the enigma of the Hebrew verbal system is to be found not in the continued ascription of subtly different meanings and nuances to individual forms, but rather in the view that the verbal functions are largely determined by the syntactic context in which the verbal forms occur.

Though many of the discussed theories do generally work for the rather straightforward narrative Hebrew texts often forming the core (or even the whole) of the text corpora selected by the researchers, serious problems arise when poetry is taken into consideration. Indeed, the absolute lack of attention for and belief in any type of search for linguistic rules guiding the use of verbal forms in poetry is alarming. Most scholars follow the tendency outlined in the previous chapter to consider the alternation of verbal forms in poetic texts as an expression of the poet’s rhetorical skills. The number of serious attempts to systematically account for poetry’s use of verbal forms is remarkably low. Besides, these scholars tend to concentrate on specific verbal forms only rather than providing a comprehensive description of the functioning of all verbal forms. By taking as a starting point for their analyses only those usages of verbal forms that are hard to explain in terms of the tense or aspectual categories defined in studies on prosaic texts, they further strengthen the general supposition that the usage of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry indeed is not regulated by a comprehensive linguistic system. In any case, the focus on such ‘exceptional’ usages of verbal forms often forces scholars to invent new verbal functions for Hebrew poetry’s verbal forms that are not attested in prosaic texts and to assume that Hebrew poetry does not make use of the verbal system regulating the distribution of verbal functions in prosaic texts.
2. Traditional Approaches to the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System

A different picture might emerge, however, when, instead of focusing on isolated problematic verbal forms, room would be created for a more comprehensive and systematic analysis of the functioning of Hebrew’s verbal forms in poetic texts. In the next chapter we will outline the methodological changes that are required for such an innovation in the approach to Biblical Hebrew poetry’s deployment of the verbal forms.
3. Methodological Approach and Research Hypotheses

3.1 Paradigm Shift

In this chapter, we will outline the theoretical assumptions and methodological aspects guiding our search for a systematic description of the usage of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry. In the previous chapters, we have explained how the inability of commentators, grammarians, translators and other scholars to systematically account for Biblical Hebrew poetry’s usage of verbal forms has resulted from the questionable tendency to prioritize the literary and theological interpretation of the Hebrew text over a systematic analysis of its linguistic features. Therefore, as our conclusions drawn in these chapters (§1.6, §2.4) suggest, what is needed in the study of the verbal functions in Biblical Hebrew in general and in its poetic texts in particular, is a reconsideration of its methodological basis.

As we have stated in the Introduction of this thesis, this reconsideration of methodology implies a paradigm shift. Indeed, the methodological basis of our analyses will radically differ from that underlying the studies described in the previous chapters. Our point of departure is the central assumption that a language’s grammatical system is not restricted to specific genres, but operates in all texts composed (orally and written) in that language. For our study of the usage of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry, this means that we will have to search for a single verbal system regulating the functioning of verbal forms in both prosaic and poetic texts.

In line with our remarks made in earlier chapters, we argue that a more fruitful investigation of the verbal functions in poetry is only possible if one starts with a synchronic linguistic analysis of the linguistic forms and patterns that are present in the text, instead of ignoring these linguistic signals or letting them be overruled by one’s interpretation of the textual contents based on literary-rhetorical analyses or theological views. Indeed, the linguistic data are to be taken as the starting point.

The paradigm shift proposed here is not completely new. It has already been applied by Hebraists advocating the approach of Text Linguistics. Text-linguistic studies are characterized by an emphasis on the primacy of linguistic analysis over literary-rhetorical interpretations and on the importance of conducting a synchronic type of analysis in which linguistic data and patterns in the texts themselves constitute the central point of interest. As these two issues form the methodological base of our research, the next part of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of this innovative approach. Before concentrating on the potential of this approach to offer new insights in the Hebrew verbal system, we will first introduce its origins and its theoretical foundations.

3.2 Text Linguistics

Since the emergence of Text Linguistics within the discipline of Old Testament Studies in the 1970s, there has been a tendency among its advocates (and its opponents) to be inconsistent and ambiguous in the use of the terms ‘Text Grammar’, ‘Text Linguistics’ and ‘Discourse Analysis’. All terms identify an approach which implies that texts have a grammar that is comparable to that of sentences and that an adequate interpretation of these texts requires, in the first place, a profound analysis of the linguistic signs they contain. According to Van der Merwe, the
designations ‘Text Linguistics’ and ‘Discourse Analysis’ function as synonyms and both tend to be used, in a non-technical manner, to refer to the study of linguistic phenomena on textual levels higher than that of the sentence. The first term is generally preferred by European Hebraists, while the American scholars most often opt for the second one.¹⁵⁹ Talstra, however, emphasizes that the random use of the terms ‘Text Linguistics’ and ‘Discourse Analysis’ to refer to the same approach is to be rejected as it results in much confusion. He makes a distinction between ‘Text Grammar’ — which studies practices of linguistic encoding in texts, especially the encoding used to establish clause connections — ‘Text Linguistics’ — which aims to go further than merely registering the linguistic encoding and searches for the actual communication process that lies beyond it by adding ‘pragmatics’ to the set of analytical instruments and by focusing on the communicative functions of linguistic phenomena — and ‘Discourse Analysis’ — which, though often being incorrectly considered equivalent to the notion of ‘Text Linguistics’, in fact, is a more abstract approach concentrating on the lines of argumentation present both (explicitly) in the texts themselves and (implicitly) in the communication between writer and reader.¹⁶⁰ In general, however, the term ‘Text Linguistics’ is used, and will be used as such in this dissertation, to refer to the art of decoding texts and determining the communication processes at work in them by studying not only the grammatical phenomena occurring within the domain of the sentence, but also those playing a role in larger textual units.¹⁶¹

The text-linguistic approach to Biblical Hebrew emerged as a result of an increasing dissatisfaction with the traditional ‘sentence-based’ approach among many Hebraists. This dissatisfaction with the traditional approach, which rendered an adequate linguistic explanation of many grammatical constructions impossible, in turn, resulted from three major developments.¹⁶²

1) First of all, Hebraists were influenced by new insights from General Linguistics, which went through three paradigm shifts in the 20th century.

a) The first shift concerns the emergence of structuralism, which related the meaning of an expression to the syntactic and pragmatic relationships in which it occurred and thus shifted the focus to formal patterns attested in the texts.

b) The second shift provided an answer to the need among linguists to explain the formal patterns found in the texts: why did these (and no other) patterns occur? It found its expression in the emergence of Functional Grammar, which tried to relate certain formal patterns to specific functions. These developments had some important consequences. Thus, linguistic research increasingly concentrated on the study of syntax, especially on the level of clauses, and on a more accurate definition of linguistic categories and the levels of description.


¹⁶¹ Or, to quote Schneider, one of the first Hebraists applying the insights of Text Linguistics to the study of Biblical Hebrew texts: Text Linguistics entails ‘Eine grammatische Beschreibung der Sprache, die über die Satzgrenzen hinausgeht und die Konstitution und die Abgrenzung von Texten zu erfassen sucht’; Schneider, W., Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch. Ein Lehrbuch (München: Claudius Verlag, 1974), p.231n1.

c) A final paradigm shift moved the focus of linguistic studies from theoretical grammar to pragmatics and cognitive linguistics and, with that, encouraged linguists to pay more attention to the use of language in communicative processes and to contextual concepts.\textsuperscript{163} These tendencies in General Linguistics, after some time, started to influence scholars studying the Biblical Hebrew language. Thus, in the 1970s, Schneider and Richter tried to apply insights from structuralism in their description of Biblical Hebrew by focusing on the actual distribution of formal data and patterns in the Hebrew texts. Schneider’s grammar, for example, links up with the European structuralist theories in that it defines the text, not the sentence, as the largest unit of grammatical description, stating that it is not sufficient to study only the paradigmatic features of words, but that one also has to take into account syntagmatic relationships between clauses and sentences. The study of the formal, syntactic structure of texts is considered to be an indispensable step in an adequate textual analysis. Schneider defines syntax as the description of linguistic forms that guide the communication process and maintains that only after having detected the linguistic forms and their distributional formal patterns in the texts can one continue assigning (communicative) functions to them.\textsuperscript{164} Richter identifies ‘language’ as ‘ein System von Zeichen, bei dem sich mit Ausdruckselementen Inhalte verbinden.’\textsuperscript{165} He explicitly adopts the insights gained by structural linguistics in asserting that a language has two sides: ‘eine Ausdrucksseite’ and ‘eine Inhaltsseite’.\textsuperscript{166} Richter proposes to start any type of textual analysis with a description of the first side, the ‘Ausdrucksseite’. Such a description will result in a ‘differenzierten Eingrenzung der Inhaltsseite und damit des Inhalts’. In other words, the contents of a text can only be grasped and analyzed by first concentrating on the text’s formal structure: ‘Nur über die Analyse der formalen Seite der Sprache last sich ein Zugang zum Inhalt finden.’\textsuperscript{167} This also means that phenomena in one language cannot and should not just be explained by referring to possibly corresponding phenomena of other languages. Interestingly, Richter points in this respect to the enigma of the Hebrew verbal system and stresses that the functions of the verbal forms and their usage within the sentence are not to be analyzed in terms of the verbal functions and usages in Latin or in other Indo-Germanic languages\textsuperscript{168} (cf. §2.1). Richter applies all this to the discipline of Old Testament exegesis and advocates an approach in which exegetes take the analysis of the formal structure of a Hebrew text as the starting point in their research, thereby doing justice to the peculiar ‘Ausdruckselemente’ of the Biblical Hebrew language instead of isolating the text’s contents from these formal elements or linguistic signs by which it is expressed and uncritically rendering the textual contents in their own language.\textsuperscript{169} Only by starting with an analysis of the linguistic forms is it possible to avoid a textual analysis...


\textsuperscript{166} Richter, \textit{Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft}, pp.29–30.


\textsuperscript{168} Richter, \textit{Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft}, p.42n42.

\textsuperscript{169} Richter, \textit{Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft}, p.43.
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guided by subjective presuppositions. Thus, an analysis of the formal structures in a text is ‘methodisch notwendig’ in order to arrive at an adequate ‘inhaltliche Interpretation’. Like Schneider, Richter, too, defines the sentence as only the smallest unit of analysis and makes the ‘Text’, the larger ‘Komposition’, into the central study object, which, however, can only adequately be described if one starts from the bottom, i.e.: with a formal analysis of the individual sentences.

Although this attempt to identify formal categories by means of distributional criteria and to assign functional labels to them, proved to be not entirely sufficient for an adequate description of Biblical Hebrew, because semantic and pragmatic considerations required more attention, the work of Schneider and Richter has had a decisive impact on the linguistic study of Biblical Hebrew.

2) Along with the paradigm shifts taking place within the discipline of General Linguistics, a tendency in the field of Bible translation ‘to translate the sense rather than the words of an utterance’ emerged as a major development that contributed to a growing dissatisfaction among Hebraists. This movement from an approach based on ‘formal equivalence’ to one emphasizing ‘functional equivalence’ revealed the need to identify and understand the use of linguistic constructions and rules operating at levels higher than that of the individual sentence.

3) A final major change concerned the discipline of Old Testament Studies itself, as many exegetes started to criticize traditional exegetical methods and explicitly expressed the need for new analytical methods by means of which they could interpret the texts. In the traditional exegetical approach, any form of linguistic analysis was restricted to the categories of lexical semantics and clause level syntax, while text-level analysis was left to the discipline of literary and stylistic interpretation. Text Linguistics, however, instead of regarding a text merely as resulting from the freedom of literary design, reclaims part of the text-level analysis for the study of the linguistic system, thereby concentrating on ‘the art of reading and linguistic decoding of texts, rather than reconstructing their literary development’, with that trying to be ‘less dependent on literary interpretation than traditional grammar usually has been’. The analysis of textual structures is no longer seen as a matter of stylistic and rhetorical skills only, but room is created for grammatical analyses on text-level.
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173 Van der Merwe, ‘Discourse Linguistics’, p.15.
176 Talstra, E., ‘A Hierarchy of Clauses in Biblical Hebrew Narrative’, in: E. van Wolde (Ed.), *Narrative Syntax & the Hebrew Bible*. *Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p.104; see also: Lowery, K.E., *Toward a Discourse Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1985), p.323: ‘Traditionally, grammar is divided into phonology, morphology and syntax. Grammar must be extended to include a fourth dimension – discourse. The literary critic must take into account the fact that languages have ways of organizing the text which may be different from their own understanding. Thus, the grammar of discourse places limits on the interpretation of those discourses.’
In the discipline of Text Linguistics, the dialogue between distributionalist, formal grammar and functional grammar that, as we mentioned, dominated the discipline of General Linguistics in the 20th century, plays a significant role. Indeed, the distinction between formalist and functionalist approaches is a helpful criterion in the attempt to categorize the text-linguistic studies on the Biblical Hebrew texts.

Text-linguists using the formal approach (formalists) in their analyses start with observing the specific linguistic forms and their distribution (in formal patterns) in the texts. Subsequently, they attempt to derive a functional model from these formal observations. This approach, which is already attested in the work of Hebraists like Wolfgang Richter and Jacob Hoftijzer, and, within the discipline of Text Linguistics, is defended mainly by European scholars like Wolfgang Schneider and, more recently, Alviero Niccacci, Eep Talstra and Walter Gross, can be characterized as a ‘form-to-function’ approach. Its advocates aim to re-evaluate existing grammatical theories by analyzing the Biblical Hebrew data within a new framework, namely that of Text Linguistics. Most often, this analysis is not restricted to certain levels of description, but is conducted on all linguistic levels ranging from that of morphemes to that of whole texts.

In order to be able to do this, formalists sometimes make use of computerized linguistic databases. This is true for both Richter and Talstra, who have adopted a similar bottom-up approach in which they work up from the lowest level of description – that of morphemes – to the higher levels of phrases and clauses. While Richter has spent most of his life on the study of Biblical Hebrew morphology, phonology and clause-level syntax and, in fact, has never reached beyond the level of the sentence, Talstra’s database contains analyses at all successive levels in the grammatical hierarchy including that of the whole text.

Text-linguists using the functional approach (functionalists) work the other way around. They first introduce and describe a certain universal linguistic model and, afterwards, use this model to explain the formal data occurring in the texts, in particular problematic phenomena. Important advocates of this approach are Robert Longacre, Francis Andersen, Michael Rosenbaum, Christo van der Merwe and Nicolai Winther-Nielsen. Within the functional approach, one can again distinguish between two models. Some functionalists work ‘bottom-up’, which means that they focus on lower levels of description, in most cases that of
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183 Interestingly, the functionalist approach has been supported most strongly by American scholars. Winther-Nielsen, being himself a propagator of a function-to-form approach, even defines this approach as ‘American Discourse Analysis’. Winther-Nielsen, *Functional Discourse Grammar*, p.11.
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clauses, and with their universal model about the functions of these smaller textual units try to solve grammatical problems occurring at the higher levels of the text. A famous functionalist using this approach is Andersen, who in his often quoted book *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew* investigates interclausal relationships and shows much respect for the Biblical Hebrew data, but at the same time defines both sentence types and the relations between them in terms of their functions rather than their formal characteristics. Other functionalists utilize a ‘top-down’ approach, which means that they concentrate on higher levels of description, for example the types of discourse, in order to explain problematic grammatical phenomena attested at lower levels. A good example of a scholar using this approach is Longacre, who tries to test his functional hypotheses about discourse types by experimenting with them in a substantial amount of Biblical Hebrew data. Functionalists like Winther-Nielsen and Rosenbaum share the opinion that the limits of an exclusively formal analysis of texts can be surpassed by making use of Functional Grammar, claiming that linguistic forms cannot be studied without taking into account their functions and their pragmatic use and arguing that one should try to determine how a specific language like Classical Hebrew makes use of universal linguistic patterns and categories. Thus, Winther-Nielsen first introduces some universal characteristics of the verbal systems in human languages and, subsequently, uses these universal features, like the assumption that every inflectional system always has tense, aspect and mood categories, to solve the difficulties in Hebrew’s use of the verbal forms. Similarly, Rosenbaum starts his contribution by presenting a series of universal tendencies with respect to patterns of word order and, after that, both investigates how Biblical Hebrew uses universal models of clause types and word order patterns and tries to explain instances in which Hebrew deviates from its functional basic pattern in verbal sentences (VSO) by pointing to pragmatic functions, like the expression of ‘topic’ and ‘focus’.

Despite the many differences between the formal and the functional approach, we can identify some basic assumptions that are shared by all text-linguists. The core assumption, constituting the starting point of all text-linguistic publications, is that language is a system of communication. Every text, whether belonging to the genre of prose or to that of poetry, should first of all be studied as a form of linguistic communication exhibiting certain linguistic patterns.
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184 Andersen, F.I., *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), pp.186–191. Andersen distinguishes between, for example, sequential, circumstantial, chiastic and contrastive sentence types and defines these sentence types as ‘surface realizations’ of deep-structure consecutive, simultaneous, concomitant and opposite relationships, respectively. To this he adds that such a functional relationship does not always have to be expressed by the same linguistic form – i.e.: the same sentence type. See also: Talstra, E., ‘Text Grammar and Biblical Hebrew’, p.283-284.


At the same time, in most text-linguistic studies of Biblical Hebrew, it is acknowledged that Biblical Hebrew has different genres, or registers, containing their own characteristic grammatical constructions and exhibiting their own communicative functions. The most important genre distinction is, of course, that between prose and poetry. However, text linguists usually make a second general genre distinction between narrative and discursive (direct speech) material. Next to that, some text-linguists, most of them being advocates of the functionalist approach, propose a so-called ‘discourse-modular grammar’ in which the category of direct speech discourse is further subdivided into different discourse types that are assigned their own characterizing formal patterns and communicative functions. Finally, text linguists generally pay much attention to the levels of communication occurring in a text, thereby separating the ‘mainline of communication’ from ‘secondary or subsidiary lines of communication’.

Although text-linguistic approaches have been applied to Biblical Hebrew texts for nearly forty years now, many of their advocates admit that text-linguistic analysis of Hebrew texts is, to a certain extent, still ‘in its infancy’. Much research has yet to be done, especially with regard to poetic and prophetic texts. Only very little attention has yet been paid to text-linguistic analyses of Biblical Hebrew poetry. In this regard, the text-linguistic approach obviously links up with the general tendency in the study of Biblical Hebrew to (initially) focus on the analysis of the ‘straightforward’ prosaic, in particular narrative, text, and to avoid the analysis of the complex poetic passages.

### 3.3 Text-Linguistic Studies on the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System

In the previous chapters, we introduced the primacy of literary-rhetorical interpretation and the imposition on Biblical Hebrew of verbal categories from other (non-)Semitic languages as significant causes, among several others, of the absence of consistent analyses of the functions of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry. As we showed in the previous section, the emergence of Text Linguistics in the discipline of Old Testament Studies is, in fact, a critical response to these dubious tendencies and, as such, may create room for a more satisfying description of the Hebrew verbal system.

Harald Weinrich, the German founder of a text-linguistic approach to verbal forms and functions, explicitly states that one should avoid the tendency to impose grammatical categories of a known language (like ‘tense’ and ‘aspect’) to an unknown language, as this often results in long lists of
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functions for each of the verbal forms (cf. our critical remarks in §1.5 and §2.3). In this section we will show that verbal theories presented by text linguists indeed open up new perspectives in the search for a consistent verbal system in (all genres of) Biblical Hebrew.

Text-linguistic studies on Biblical Hebrew’s verbal system share a number of characteristics. Thus, they are all guided by the appeal for a study of grammatical phenomena at work on all different linguistic levels in the texts including the higher levels of paragraph and discourse, and by the intention to reveal the communication processes present in these texts. In line with this, text linguists attempt to understand the functions of verbal forms not so much in terms of tense, aspect and mood, but rather in terms of their contributions to the textual coherence and the unfolding of the communication process, thus promoting a shift from clause-level to text-level analysis. Since, as we indicated, the origins of such an approach to the verb can be traced back to the work of Harald Weinrich, we will start this section with a brief discussion of the work of this German linguist.

### 3.3.1 Harald Weinrich – A New Perspective on the Functions of Verbal Forms

A first attempt to conduct a text-linguistic analysis of verbal forms was undertaken in the volume *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt* written by Harald Weinrich, who made use of distributionalist, structuralist techniques of language description in his analyses of modern European languages. According to Weinrich, each verbal form has a paradigmatic position in the language’s tense system and a syntagmatic position in the context, i.e.: with respect to the other verbal forms and constituents in the text. Weinrich repeats several times that one should not inadequately identify ‘Tempus’ (tense form) with ‘Zeit’ (time), and argues that the relationship between the two notions ‘Tempus’ and ‘Zeit’ is irrelevant for every ‘Tempussystem’. Instead, Weinrich proposes to categorize the verbal forms ‘nach anderen Gesichtspunkten’ than has been done until now: more attention should be paid to the syntagmatic dimension, i.e.: to the distribution of elements in a sentence and in a text. He claims that a verbal form exercises a certain ‘Strukturzwang’ over its neighbouring elements, especially on the other verbal forms in the context. This diminishes the degree of freedom in the choice for verbal forms, as a coherent text does not allow all possible sequences of verbal forms. On the basis of their syntagmatic position, Weinrich divides the verbal forms (of every language) into two categories that form a ‘Dichotomie’. After an extensive analysis of texts in several modern European languages (English, German, French, Italian and Spanish), Weinrich, referring to the work of the French structural linguist Benveniste, concludes that the two categories of verbal forms have to be linked to different *Sprechsituationen*, stating that there are ‘bestimmte Affinitäten zwischen den beiden
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In brief, Weinrich asserts that the verbal forms of one ‘Tempusgruppe’ dominate in ‘jeder Art von Erzählung’ (i.e.: in narrative texts), while the forms belonging to the other ‘Tempusgruppe’ dominate ‘im Dialog allgemein’. Therefore, he makes a distinction between ‘die Erzähltempora’ and ‘die besprechende Tempora’. While the verbal forms of the first category make clear that the information provided does not concern the world of the speaker/author and his audience and therefore allows the audience to relax a little bit (‘Du kannst jetzt etwas lässiger zuhören’), the second category of verbal forms urges the audience to listen with concentration as the information given is of direct relevance for them (‘Pass auf, das geht dich unmittelbar an!’). Weinrich notes, however, that the alternation of verbal forms does not always point to a transition from narrative to discursive texts or the other way around. He argues that in narrative texts the alternate use of different types of (narrative) verbal forms often functions to create Relief: some forms should be analyzed as ‘Tempora des Hintergrunds’, which are mainly attested in introductions and conclusions of stories, while others obviously serve as ‘Tempora des Vordergrunds’ dominating in the core of the narratives. In many languages, verbal forms seem to fulfill such a ‘relief function’ only in narrative texts, while in discursive texts foreground and background are distinguished with the help of gestures and deictic elements. Among the modern languages investigated by Weinrich, only English and Spanish appear to use different verbal forms in foreground statements and background descriptions in discursive texts.

A third notion introduced by Weinrich is that of ‘die Sprechperspektive’. By indicating the ‘Sprechperspektive’, the verbal forms help us to orientate ourselves within the narrative or the discursive world. Weinrich argues that in several modern European languages the ‘Tempora des Vordergrunds’ (the Haupttempora) can be characterized as ‘Tempora mit der Perspektive Null’: these verbal forms do not provide any ‘zeitliche Orientierung’, but merely mark a text as narrative or discursive. The other verbal forms, however, indicate a ‘Sprechperspektive relativ zum Null-Punkt der jeweiligen Tempusgruppe’. They express either ‘rückschauende Perspektiven’ or ‘vorausschauende Perspektiven’. Weinrich continues to emphasize that this third feature of denoting perspective should not be misinterpreted as an indication that the ‘Tempora’ are to be identified with ‘time’. Instead, the verbal forms only make clear whether the information provided should be seen as ‘old’ (prior to actual communication), ‘new’/‘introduced for the first time’ (simultaneous with actual communication), or ‘anticipated’ (posterior to the actual communication).

In his conclusions, Weinrich states that his theory, which assumes the existence of correspondences between the verbal system and the Sprechsituation, may also be of great help

197 Weinrich, Tempus, p.45.
200 Weinrich, Tempus, pp.70–76. Compare this definition of linguistic perspectives to the remarks of the linguist Talmy Givón about ‘the grounding of information’. According to Givon, many grammatical devices can be used by the speaker to ground his information in the existing knowledge of the hearer. One should distinguish in this regard between old information, i.e.: ‘assumed by the speaker to be accessible to the hearer’, and new information, i.e.: ‘assumed by the speaker to be inaccessible to the reader’. Coherent discourse is characterized by a balanced alternation of old and new information; Givon, T., Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction. Vol.II (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990), pp.896–897.
in languages ‘die wir häufig so schlecht beschreiben, weil wir sie so gut zu kennen glauben’. Is Biblical Hebrew one of these languages? Does the application of the type of analysis promoted by Weinrich, in which the functions of verbal forms are described according to their functioning in the whole text (text-linguistic functions), offer new insights into the nature of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system? Hebraists advocating a text-linguistic approach claim it does so indeed. The categorization of text-linguistic contributions on the basis of the two approaches outlined in the previous section (formalist versus functionalist) will serve as a structuring principle in this review section. We concluded §3.2 by mentioning the fact that in text-linguistic research, like in Old Testament Studies in general, focus is still placed on the linguistic analysis of prosaic texts, and especially texts containing narrative prose. Not surprisingly, then, dominancy of prosaic source data also characterizes most of the studies on the Hebrew verbal system that have been conducted by text linguists until now, while text-linguistic studies concentrating on poetic texts are relatively scarce. Interestingly, the only text-linguistic studies on the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry worth mentioning here have been conducted by two formalists, Niccacci and Talstra. However, we will start our review of text-linguistic studies on the Hebrew verbal system by summarizing and evaluating the views on the Hebrew verbal system maintained by two functionalists, Robert Longacre and David Dawson.

3.3.2 Functionalist Approaches

3.3.2.1 Robert Longacre

3.3.2.1.1 General Approach

Robert Longacre’s expertise encompasses a vast area of research. As an International Linguistics Consultant working for SIL and as a professor in General Linguistics at various universities in the United States, he has done research into many languages from all over the world. It was only in the late 1980s that Longacre started to pay attention to Biblical Hebrew, although his interest in discourse analysis emerged already before the 1970s. Longacre’s general linguistic background clearly influences his approach regarding Biblical Hebrew. Thus, contrary to text linguists advocating a formalist approach, Longacre tends to analyze the Hebrew texts within the framework of a universal linguistic theory, namely that of Tagmemics, thereby basing himself on his analyses of the grammars of other languages. This tagmemic approach, which emerged in the 1950s, has been developed ‘in the field’, i.e.: by analyzing language material of indigenous populations. Taking into account new discoveries in these ‘real language data’, tagmemics creates room for the description of the finer details of language use and, as such, constitutes a theoretical model that enables one to find basic patterns in any language, thereby advocating the comparison of these patterns attested in specific languages with ‘language universals’ discovered on the basis of earlier studies of vast amounts of languages. It is not surprising that Longacre, being one of the most important advocates of the tagmemic approach, pleads for the application of this method to the analysis of Biblical Hebrew discourse by assuming the existence of function-set correlations, which means that each discursive unit should be described by referring both to its functions, designated as ‘slots’ (such as ‘subject’ and ‘object’ on sentence level, or ‘text’ and
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3.3.2.1.2 Theory on the Hebrew Verb

In the second part of his analysis of the Joseph story in the volume *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence. A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39–48*, Longacre more clearly formulates the basic assumptions related to his proposal of a discourse-modular grammar and argues that these basic assumptions apply to all human languages. First, Longacre assumes that every language has a system of discourse types. His distinction of discourse types is not restricted to that between narrative and discursive (or: direct speech) discourse (though he considers it to be a good starting point), but goes further as he subdivides the category of direct speech discourse into a broad range of discourse or text types. Longacre’s second assumption is that each of these discourse types has its own characteristic constellation of verbal forms that occur within that type. Thus, for every language a discourse typology can be developed on the basis of the verbal forms playing a dominant role in each of the discourse types. Thirdly, Longacre assumes that the functions of these verbal forms are most adequately described when the specific discourse type is taken into account. He argues that the constellation of verbal forms occurring in a specific discourse type is structured in such a way that each discourse type has one or more forms which constitute its mainline or backbone, while the other verbal forms are used outside the domain of the mainline of the discourse. When one has determined the mainline and ‘offline’ (i.e.: non-mainline or secondary line) verbal forms of a specific discourse type, one can go on to more thoroughly analyze texts belonging to that discourse type by constructing a hierarchical structure of them in which the position of every sentence depends on the verbal forms used in that sentence.

Applying these assumptions to Biblical Hebrew, Longacre argues first of all that, in a text-linguistic analysis of Hebrew texts, one should distinguish between narrative, predictive/procedural, exhortatory and expository discourse and paragraph types. Within each of these discourse types, it is possible to make a hierarchical arrangement of the verbal forms and clause types used in it, thereby ordering them from ‘most relevant’ (mainline) in that discourse type to ‘least relevant’. In the whole process of verb ranking, the concept of paragraph plays a central role, according to Longacre. Thus, within each type of discourse, he distinguishes between nine different paragraph types (such as ‘sequence’, ‘reason’, ‘result’, ‘comment’, etc.), all containing their own combination of verbal forms (which determines the discourse type to which the paragraph belongs), clause types and slots to be filled (such as ‘text’, ‘setting’, ‘result’, etc.).

Longacre also stresses the importance of the phenomenon of ‘discourse recursion’ – the occurrence of one discourse type embedded in another type of discourse. Without this linguistic phenomenon, his theory of discourse types would be impossible, because he then would be required to constitute a distinct discourse type for every new instance of discourse embedding. An obvious type of embedding is that of reported speech in narrative texts, but many other forms of discourse embedding are attested in the Hebrew Bible, too.

In several of his works, Longacre provides ranking schemes of verbal forms for the different discourse types he identifies. In his article ‘A proposal for a discourse-modular grammar of Biblical Hebrew’, for example, Longacre determines the hierarchical ordering of the verbal forms in seven discourse types (narrative, predictive, procedural, instructional, exhortatory, explanatory/descriptive, juridical) and concludes that such a discourse-modular approach is of great help for the abstraction and generalization of the meanings and functions of the Hebrew verbal forms. A similar attempt to rank the verbal forms occurring in each of the discourse types is undertaken in his analysis of the Joseph story. Here, Longacre first identifies a verbal rank scheme for narrative discourse, in which the wayyiqtol, indicating the main story line, is positioned at the top and is followed, at the second highest level, by qatal forms indicating backgrounded actions. Semantically, these verbal forms are separated from each other in that wayyiqtol, as an action-oriented verbal form, presents sequential punctiliar happenings, while qatal, as a participant-oriented form, focuses on the participant who participates in an event.

In the text types of predictive discourse and procedural discourse, the weqatal should be regarded as the mainline verbal form, according to Longacre. On the next level, he places the yiqtol form, which denotes background predictions or procedures. Then, on the third level, background activities are indicated by the participle, which may be preceded by the interjection הנני or by a noun. Finally, on the lowest level, היהו, היהי, and the nominal clause are used to describe a discourse setting.

Because the text type of expository discourse hardly occurs in the Joseph story, Longacre refrains from presenting a full verb rank scheme for this discourse type. However, he assumes that one can define expository discourse as discourse in which, contrary to what is the case in narrative and predictive/procedural discourse, the highest ranking should be assigned to the most static

---

211 Longacre, *Joseph*, pp.60, 64.
212 Longacre, *Joseph*, pp.64–82.
clause types – i.e.: the nominal clauses and the clauses starting with יִהְיֶה וּלְךָ and, while finite verbal forms are to be ranked lowest.\textsuperscript{215}

Finally, Longacre tries to construct a verb rank scheme for the exhortatory discourse type, placing the ‘command forms’ (imperative, cohortative, jussive), which indicate the primary line of exhortation, at the top. The second level contains the modal יִקְּטֹל and its negation, both denoting the secondary line of exhortation. On the third level, motivation of the exhortation is expressed by weqatal, negated יִקְּטֹל and future qatal. The lowest level comprises past qatal, participles and nominal clauses, describing the background setting.\textsuperscript{216} When a higher person is exhorted to act, a more ‘deferential’ subtype of exhortatory discourse is used, in which imperatives are avoided and commands are expressed by means of the jussive. In some instances, one may also decide to use a ‘less objectionable’ type of discourse, like instructional discourse, in which the mainline is constituted by weqatal forms.\textsuperscript{217}

In these attempts to provide a ranking of the verbal forms for each of the discourse types, Longacre hardly pays attention to the exact functions fulfilled by the verbal forms. In yet another article,\textsuperscript{218} however, Longacre does not restrict himself to presenting a series of abstract ranking schemes, but investigates how a discourse-modular approach may help him to more precisely determine the functions of the weqatal form in Hebrew prose. He argues that weqatal forms function as backbone structures in predictive, procedural and instructional discourse.\textsuperscript{219} In these discourse types, weqatal forms occur in their own right and are not consecutive on other preceding verbal forms. As such, they can be regarded as the direct speech equivalent of narrative wayyiqtol.\textsuperscript{220} The weqatal mainline can be interrupted by a yiqtol clause, for example when the use of weqatal is made impossible by the fronting of a non-verbal element. In predictive discourse, weqatal forms and (secondary level) yiqtol forms together constitute a story told in advance of its happening. In procedural discourse, weqatal forms are used to describe the essential elements of rituals or procedures, while minor procedures are indicated by yiqtol forms.\textsuperscript{221} In instructional discourse, another interesting phenomenon occurs. In this type of discourse, weqatal is not only used as mainline verbal form, but can also, although less often, be a continuation form of an imperative or another command form. When such a continuation weqatal is associated with ‘switch reference’ (i.e.: a switch in the referent of its subject), it expresses result or, when there is a switch from a lower to a higher agent, promise.\textsuperscript{222}

Longacre attempts to account for the use of weqatal in narrative discourse by assuming the embedding of procedural discourse, stating that, whenever in Biblical Hebrew narrative a string

\begin{footnotesize}
\item[216] Longacre, \textit{Joseph}, pp.120–123.
\item[219] Longacre, ‘Weqatal forms’, pp.50–51, 95.
\item[222] Longacre seems to make a mistake here by arguing that weqatal expresses promise when the switch reference is from a higher to a lower agent. The example he mentions (Exod 25.8: “And they shall make me a sanctuary, and I will dwell among them.”) seems to indicate just the opposite: the weqatal form expresses a promise in case of a switch from a lower to a higher agent. See: Longacre, ‘\textit{Weqatal forms}’, p.55.
\end{footnotesize}
of weqatal forms is found, this indicates a ‘how-it-was-done’ procedural discourse. This theory, however, cannot account for the many isolated weqatal forms occurring within a narrative framework. Therefore, Longacre raises another hypothesis by arguing that these isolated weqatal forms mark climactic or pivotal events in a narrative. Although both theories are illustrated by means of many examples, Longacre’s argument remains quite unconvincing in this regard. Instead of analyzing the Biblical Hebrew data in order to verify or falsify his approach, Longacre sometimes seems to simply make his textual data fit in the framework of the functional model he advocates, which may now and then result in rather artificial interpretations of the functions of the weqatal forms.

3.3.2.1.3 Evaluation

Yet, Longacre provides us with a number of helpful observations that certainly benefit the study of the Hebrew verbal system from a text-linguistic perspective. Thus, Longacre – in line with Weinrich, though even stronger – points out, in a convincing manner, the importance of linking verbal forms and their functions to the type of discourse in which they occur. Furthermore, Longacre’s analyses clearly show that in Biblical Hebrew the verbal forms indeed serve to create ‘Relief’ in the texts. Even more important is Longacre’s observation that verbal forms do not only fulfill this ‘Relief’ function in narrative discourse (as verbal forms appeared to do in most other languages, according to Weinrich), but also in direct speech communication. Another helpful insight delivered by Longacre is his observation that the functions of verbal forms are related to the position of their clause or sentence in the hierarchical structure of the whole text. Longacre provides us with several examples in which a clause’s function is clearly influenced by its position with respect to other clauses. Besides, Longacre gives some significant clues that may help us to identify the linguistic factors that determine how exactly a clause’s function is influenced by preceding clauses. Thus, in sequences of imperative > weqatal, both continuation or discontinuation (‘switch reference’) of the same subject and relative statuses of speaker and addressee are considered to play a decisive role in the assignment of functionality to the weqatal clause.

Finally, Longacre’s contribution deserves attention since his expertise in General Linguistics may prevent fellow Hebraists from conducting their linguistic analyses in complete isolation, without taking into account insights gained and common knowledge shared by linguists studying other (families of) languages. At the same time, it is exactly at this point that we find a major weakness in the theory of Longacre, since his analyses are obviously guided by a preconceived theoretical framework, namely the model of a discourse-modular grammar. Longacre’s analyses more than once evoke the impression that he superimposes a certain model or pattern on the Hebrew texts without paying sufficient attention to the possible lack of support for such a model or pattern provided by the collection of data. In addition, the identification of so many discourse and paragraph types each having their own multi-layered (instead of simple mainline vs. secondary line) hierarchical constellation of verbal forms in the end results in quite a complicated picture of the structure of Hebrew texts, which, instead of providing Hebraists with a deeper understanding

of these texts and their usage of verbal forms, may well discourage from continuing the text-linguistic type of analysis of verbal forms themselves.225

Another disadvantage of Longacre’s focus on the interplay between discourse modules and the realization of specific verbal functions is that by taking this approach, he sometimes seems to mix up the two notions of communication and genre and, with that, in fact, keeps intact the priority of literary analysis. Longacre’s work also raises the both challenging and promising question whether it could be that a Hebrew verbal form, instead of fulfilling different (mutually unrelated) functions in different ‘modules’, is to be assigned an abstract default functionality which then has different concrete realizations in different communicative contexts. We will further elaborate on this in the next chapters.

All in all, Longacre’s functionalist approach to Hebrew’s verbal system is of considerable help in a number of respects, but in taking its starting point in a preconceived functional model (tagmemetics) sometimes presents a picture which is not only rather complicated and abstract, but also evokes the impression of being quite arbitrary and artificial as the model is not developed on the basis of a careful analysis of the Hebrew formal data themselves.

3.3.2.2 David Dawson

Another advocate of the functionalist approach is David Dawson. His book *Text Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* consists of two major parts. In the first part, Dawson discusses and evaluates a number of recent text-linguistic publications. In the second part, he conducts his own text-linguistic analysis, thereby focusing on the functions of different clause types in narrative and non-narrative text-types.

While characterizing formalist studies like Niccacci’s volume *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, which will be discussed below, as a ‘strong beginning’, Dawson’s preference for the functionalist approach becomes very clear in his elaborate appraisal of Longacre’s book *Joseph*, which he considers to belong to the two best examples of fruitful text-linguistic research, together with the volume *Studies in Semitic Syntax* written by Khan. Dawson praises Longacre for the rich potential of his theory and methodology and for the insights he offers into Biblical Hebrew’s text-level structures, but also for his depth of experience with and knowledge about the (universal) features of the world’s languages.226 He explicitly defines Longacre’s *Joseph* as ‘the most significant advancement in Hebrew text linguistics seen to date’.227 The verbal rank schemes, in which Longacre briefly summarizes the functions of the different clause types, are regarded by Dawson as the most immediately accessible and revolutionary contributions of the book.228

Dawson acknowledges that Longacre’s detailed discussion of different paragraph types makes his model more complex, and, with that, more difficult to understand. Indeed, he considers this complexity to be the only weakness of Longacre’s study. Because of this high level of complexity, the audience will need an ‘intermediate’ literature, a literature which intends to provide theory and methods in such a way that it does not overwhelm the Hebraist, but, instead, motivates him
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to use the text-linguistic approach himself. This type of easily accessible literature is what Dawson aims to offer in the final chapters of his book.  

After having introduced the theoretical foundations and basic concepts of the tagmemic approach, Dawson conducts his own text-linguistic analysis of narrative and non-narrative (in particular procedural/instructional and expository) text types by taking data samples from Exodus, Leviticus and Judges. On the basis of his findings, he raises six hypotheses. The first three hypotheses concern the division between mainline and offline (secondary line) clause types within the three text types. The views defended in these assumptions are largely equivalent to those presented in the verb rank schemes for these three text types offered by Longacre. However, contrary to Longacre, Dawson refrains from identifying a hierarchical ordering within the category of offline-clauses, as he deems his text corpus as too small a basis for drawing conclusions at this point.

The fourth hypothesis of Dawson’s concerns the idea that a shift from mainline clause types to offline clause types always indicates a break in the flow of the text. Such an interruption can have different functions: it may serve to introduce some background information, it may function to signal a change of scene, or it may indicate a peak event or a fact of central importance. Fifthly, Dawson agrees with Longacre in pointing to the recursive nature of linguistic and communicative structures. Thus, higher-level linguistic items, like an infinitive construct clause, can themselves function as lower-level items in larger constructions, for example as a constituent in the main clause. Finally, Dawson asserts that material of one text type can be embedded in another text type without losing its own ‘identity’, i.e.: its original text type.

Dawson applies these hypotheses in his text-linguistic analyses of the Jephtah story and the book of Ruth and, afterwards, presents his conclusions, in which he again stresses the importance of distinguishing between different text types each showing a preference for a particular clause type, which serves as the backbone of texts belonging to that text type. Mainline and offline clauses together, in combination with other features, provide insights into the hierarchical structure of the text. An important conclusion drawn by Dawson is that all text types occur both within reported speech sections and within non-reported speech sections (i.e.: narrative sections) and that their preference for a particular clause type as their mainline clause is not influenced by the question whether they belong to a narrative or to a direct speech section. With this final conclusion, Dawson may seem to reject the views of Weinrich, according to whom the distinction between ‘erzählende und besprechende Tempora’ is of central importance. However, a more significant aspect of this final conclusion is the underlying assumption that the use of verbal forms or clause types is not completely different in the two ‘genres’ of narrative and discursive communication. Instead, Dawson formulates his theory in such a way that it leaves room for a search for a single verbal system in Biblical Hebrew, or at least Hebrew prose, in general. Another interesting aspect of the work of Dawson is his attempt to define possible functions that can be assigned to transitions between mainline and offline forms and clauses. While Longacre only identified such concrete functions for the weqatal form, Dawson tries to make some more general observations arguing that interruptions of the communication as marked by shifts between mainline and offline clauses may serve diverging functions ranging
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229 Dawson, Text Linguistics, pp.68–69.  
230 Dawson, Text Linguistics, p.152.  
from marking peak events to just introducing background information. More specification is needed at this point, but Dawson provides us with a helpful first step. At the same time, for large parts of Dawson’s work the question arises what exactly is new about his analyses and to which extent the views presented are merely an adoption of Longacre’s views. This causes our criticism on the function-to-form approach utilized by Longacre to be valid as well for Dawson’s work. By making the universal model of discourse types (discourse-modular grammar) and the functionalist approach of tagmemics the starting point of his analyses, Dawson, too, cannot avoid the impression of imposing on the Biblical Hebrew textual data a preconceived model. Though Longacre and Dawson claim that their findings are in line with universal tendencies in the human languages of the world, it remains highly questionable whether indeed the Biblical Hebrew textual data force us to assume different ranking schemes for each individual text type and to accept the dubious view that the verbal forms fulfill different functions in these different text types. The examples provided by Longacre and Dawson are not very convincing in this regard. Besides, the identification of so many possible functions, resulting from the view that the function of a verbal form fully depends on the specific text type in which it occurs, not only saddles us with an extremely complex picture of the Hebrew verbal system, but also undermines the explanatory power of the ideas of Longacre and Dawson. The question arises whether indeed the assumption of the presence of such a high level of complexity is inevitable when one starts the textual analysis by ‘letting the texts speak for themselves’. It may well be that ‘discourse analysis could be more effective if it would concentrate first on the linguistic markers used in a specific language before comparing texts on the basis of universal types of human cognition and communication’. This is exactly the approach defended in the formalist, distributionalist strand of Text Linguistics, which draws its conclusions on the basis of analyses of the actual linguistic forms and distributional patterns in a text.

3.3.3 Formalist approaches

3.3.3.1 Wolfgang Schneider

Wolfgang Schneider was one of the first Hebraists directing the attention of Hebrew grammarians and Old Testament exegetes to the text-linguistic approach and its application in the analysis of Biblical Hebrew texts. In his grammar, Schneider explicitly refers to Weinrich’s text-linguistic views on the functions of the verb and decides to adopt both these views and the formalist approach promoted by Weinrich.

3.3.3.1.1 Theory on the Hebrew Verb

On the basis of statistical analyses regarding the number of occurrences of verbal forms in different types of texts, Schneider concludes that Biblical Hebrew’s two main verbal forms are not *yiqtol* and *qatal* (as has traditionally been assumed [see chapter 2]), but rather *yiqtol* and
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233 It should be noted that Dawson dedicates the whole third chapter (the largest chapter of his book, containing over sixty pages!) to the introduction of the functional model of text-analysis he aims to use.


wayyiqtol. In line with Weinrich’s views, Schneider assumes that the use of these and other verbal forms is not determined by temporal reference or verbal aspect, but by the speaker’s orientation in the text. Thus, wayyiqtol should be analyzed as an ‘erzählende Tempus’ (Schneider refers to the wayyiqtol with the term ‘Narrativ’) used in expressions that concern persons and activities not present in the actual communication situation, while yiqtol functions as a ‘besprechende Tempus’ (and may therefore be called the ‘Diskursiv’) and occurs in utterances referring to persons (speaker/listener) or activities that are present or actual in the current communication situation. In short, Schneider identifies a ‘basic opposition in the syntactic function’ of these two verbal forms which he relates to the attitude of the speaker.

Within narrative and discursive texts the alternate use of verbal forms reflects other systems of opposition. First of all, Schneider characterizes the wayyiqtol and the yiqtol as ‘Haupttempora’ that indicate the mainline of communication, and contrasts them with the other verbal forms that function as ‘Nebentempora’ denoting a secondary, or background, line of communication. Schneider distinguishes a tendency within Biblical Hebrew texts to use as much as possible one and the same verbal form, the Haupttempus, and to make use of a Nebentempus related to this Haupttempus only if this is required for differentiating between separate levels of communication. Thus, in narrative texts a series of mainline wayyiqtols may now and then be interrupted by a background qatal form.

Another system of opposition concerns the linguistic perspective expressed only by the background verbal forms. Instead of classifying these forms on the basis of further hierarchical levels of importance, like Longacre does, Schneider argues that each of the background forms has its own linguistic perspective, which can be ‘retrospective’, ‘neutral’ or ‘prospective’. A background qatal form in a narrative text, for example, has a retrospective function and, as such, presents a situation prior to the events narrated in the mainline of communication.

With these three systems of opposition – speaker’s orientation (narrative vs. discursive), grounding (foreground/mainline vs. background/secondary line) and linguistic perspective (retrospective, neutral and prospective) – Schneider attempts to provide a text-linguistic explanation for Biblical Hebrew’s use of verbal forms. His views are summarized by Talstra in a scheme, an adaptation of which can be found in fig. 3.1:236
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A brief note of explanation should suffice here. The dimensions of mode of communication and linguistic perspective are reflected in the different columns and rows, respectively, while the dimension of grounding is represented by colour (light-grey for foreground and dark-grey for background). In the left part of the scheme the narrative forms are assigned their positions. Wayyiqtol is a foreground form, which is, like the foreground verbal forms in general, neutral for perspective. In this narrative domain, w-\{(x-)qatal} and רט-יִתְּקַל are background constructions denoting, respectively, a retrospective and a prospective meaning. In discursive texts, yiqtol and imperative qetol (and qatal in ‘performatorischen Sprechen’)\(^{237}\) function as zero-perspective foreground verbal forms, while w-\{(x-)qatal} and weqatal respectively express a retrospective and a prospective meaning. As the colouring of the cells in the scheme suggests, Schneider stresses that in direct speech the verbal forms do not indicate whether the information they present belongs to the communication’s mainline or to a secondary line. Thus, Schneider advocates an analysis of Hebrew discursive prose’s use of verbal forms which lines up with Weinrich’s views on the use of verbal forms by the same text type in most modern languages, like French and German: in direct speech texts the language uses other elements than the verbal forms, such as particles, to distinguish between foreground and background.\(^{238}\)

In his grammar, Schneider devotes much attention to a discussion of ‘Tempus-Übergänge’\(^{239}\) in which he mainly concentrates on the transition of narrative forms to discursive forms and vice-versa, stating that these transitions sometimes imply a change in the Sprechhaltung of the author within the same narrative or discursive domain. Thus, the use of yiqtol forms after a chain of wayyiqtol forms does not always mark the opening of a direct speech section, but may also point to a change in the narrator’s orientation within the narrative domain of communication: the narrator no longer narrates about a situation outside the communicative domain shared by himself and his audience, but directly addresses that audience in order to discuss with them something which does not belong to the narrated world. The same transition can also be used by the narrator in order to make his way of narrating become more engaged and, in that way, to bring the narration nearer to his audience. Schneider characterizes this type of narration as ‘besprechendes erzählen’ or ‘engagierten erzählen’. When clauses belonging to a narrative text make use of a yiqtol form or another unexpected (discursive) verbal form, they are often foregrounded and sometimes even have a structural function, as several Biblical Hebrew authors tend to consistently use such clauses in the introduction or the conclusion of their narrative. Similarly, in discursive texts a chain of weqatal forms can be interrupted by a narrative sequence of qatal and one or more wayyiqtol form(s). One of the participants in the dialogue may use such forms
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\(^{237}\) Schneider, *Grammatik*, pp.204–205. The exceptional mainline function of the performative perfect is marked not by the verbal form itself, but rather by the context and other linguistic elements, like the adverb המ. According to Schneider, the performative perfect usually loses its perspectival function, though it may to some extent be preserved in the ‘Botenspruch’ המ והע.

\(^{238}\) The scheme that Talstra offers appears to ignore these explicit remarks of Schneider, as it clearly presents w-\{(x-)qatal}, qatal and weqatal as background forms or constructions. However, in his review of Schneider’s theory Talstra notes that determining the mainline in discursive texts, indeed, is much more difficult than in narrative texts and, with that, implicitly accounts for Schneider’s view that the verbal forms in discursive texts do not mark relief.

a cluster of narrative verbal forms to give a brief (historical) account – or, in Schneider’s terminology, *ein Sprosserzählung* – of past events.²⁴⁰

In two separate sections, Schneider more elaborately discusses the functions of the verbal forms in narrative and discursive texts. In narrative texts, *qatal* forms are not only used to interrupt the mainline expressed by a series of *wayyiqtols* and to present a background situation, but may also serve a macro-syntactic function by structuring the narrative. Thus, *qatal*s are often found at the beginning of narrative texts, where they provide the reader with some introductory material needed to understand the story.²⁴¹

In discursive texts, too, *qatal* functions as a *Nebentempus*, which means that the form does not show a real preference for either narrative or discursive texts. Therefore, *qatal* is not a real, independent Tempus according to Schneider: for each of its occurrences its meaning has to be determined on the basis of the context. When a ı is added before the *qatal* form, the form seems to lose its ‘perspektivische Funktion’. These *weqatal*s are often regarded as independent verbal forms, their function not being (directly) related to that of the ‘bare’ *qatal* form. Schneider, however, emphasizes that, although the original domain of use of the *weqatal* is that of the conditional sentence, more specifically that of the apodosis-clause (“wenn..., so...”), one still can prove the existence of a relationship between *qatal*s and *weqatal*s forms by assuming that the ‘perspektivische Funktion’ of the latter becomes prospective instead of retrospective. With its adoption of this perspectival function, the *weqatal* is often used to indicate an action or an event which forms the logical result of a situation described by the preceding verbal form. Next to that, a *weqatal* can also be used to continue a command expressed in a preceding imperative clause.

In direct speech texts the mainline *yiqtol* form has as its only function to characterize the ‘Sprechhaltung’ of a text as ‘auf die Sprechsituation bezogen’. In some cases, on the basis of the context, a *yiqtol* can be assigned a modal function or a future tense interpretation, but in general, the meaning of the *yiqtol* form can best be represented by the German (or English) present tense, according to Schneider.²⁴²

### Evaluation

Schneider’s theory distinguishes itself from the functionalist theories of Longacre and Dawson in that it aims for a systematic description of the *whole* verbal system of Biblical Hebrew. While Longacre and Dawson concentrated on the identification of discourse types and only subsequently tried to analyze the verbal forms used within those discourse types in terms of their relief function (distinguishing between mainline and offline forms), Schneider attempts to locate each of the forms in a single matrix by determining its default value in terms of type of communication, level of communication and perspective. The result of this approach is a rather clear description of a coherent system, which is much easier to work with than with the multiple verb ranking schemes of the two functionalists.

Another strong aspect of Schneider’s grammar is his quite elaborate discussion of ‘Tempus-Übergänge’. It is interesting to note that Schneider takes the distinction between narrative and discursive forms as the basis for this discussion. This enables him to provide a more systematic
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account of the tense shifts than his functionalist colleagues. Though Longacre and Dawson are certainly to be admired for their respective attempts to deal with transitions between mainline and offline clauses, their discussions are not as precise and coherent as the one that Schneider offers, which for each of the verbal forms makes clear how surrounding verbal forms may influence that specific form’s functions.

A significant methodological distinction underlies these differences between the outcomes of the analyses of Longacre and Dawson, on the one hand, and those of Schneider, on the other hand. While Longacre and Dawson started their analyses by applying a model of discourse types to the Hebrew texts, Schneider, though adopting the views of Weinrich as a theoretical foundation for his views, eventually takes the text itself as a starting point for analyses. Illustrative in this regard is the fact that Longacre and Dawson make use of a rather small corpus of texts (to which they apply their functional model), while Schneider’s description of the verbal functions contains numerous references to texts selected from different books.

In the end, Schneider’s approach evokes the impression of being both more verifiable and more objective than that of the functionalists. On the other hand, after having been confronted with Schneider’s views, we are left with several questions. If, for instance, the opposition between mainline and secondary line is no functional category in direct speech texts, what then exactly distinguishes a *qatal* without perspectival function from a mainline *yiqtol* form? Moreover, the view that verbal forms may serve to signal different lines of communication also in discursive texts, was quite convincingly defended by Longacre and Dawson. Though their analysis of multiple levels of ‘offline forms’ seems to render their theory unnecessarily complicated, their distinction between mainline and offline communication on the basis of the verbal forms is convincing and enables us to avoid the need to assign identical functions to different verbal forms.

Furthermore, Schneider’s analysis of such ‘present’ *qatal* forms as *Haupttempora* is not only confusing, but also reflects another, more basic, problem in his grammar (and the functionalist studies). By identifying these *qatal* forms as occurrences of the ‘poetisches Perfekt’, Schneider to a certain extent seems to continue the traditional tendency to consider the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry as ‘non-systematic’. Though Schneider’s contribution is, at first sight, quite innovative in that he argues: ‘In der Dichtung (...) ist diese Verteilung der Funktionen von Imperfekt und Perfekt (...) grundsätzlich gültig’, his subsequent remarks are illustrative, as he states that for multiple passages one cannot avoid the following impression: ‘Hier scheinen oft stilistische oder metrische Gründe für die Tempuswahl massgebend gewesen zu sein.’

Yet, Schneider’s theory is enriching in many respects and will be taken as a starting point in this dissertation. In the next sections we will see how Schneider’s views have strongly influenced the work of other text linguists favouring a formalist approach: Alviero Niccacci and Eep Talstra.

### 3.3.3.2 Alviero Niccacci

#### 3.3.3.2.1 General Approach

In the preface of his volume *Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, Alviero Niccacci explicitly states that Schneider’s *Grammatik*, in spite of being neglected by most Hebrew scholars at that moment, opens the way for an approach to the problem of the Biblical Hebrew verbal
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243 Schneider, *Hebraïsche Grammatik*, p.188n7.
system which he believes to be correct, namely an approach in which the verbal forms are not studied in isolation, but with regard to their actual use and functions in a text. Indeed, in several articles Niccacci emphasizes that the functions of the Hebrew verbal forms can only be correctly understood within the text as a whole.  

The text-linguistic approach, according to Niccacci, ‘promises to be more effective than the traditional approach.’ Most present-day theories concerning Hebrew’s use of verbal forms are at least partially based on historical-comparative analyses (cf. §2.2.4). Niccacci states, however, that such diachronic solutions to the problem of the Hebrew verbal system, even if acceptable to everyone, ‘cannot replace a synchronic analysis intended to check the appropriate functions of the verb forms in the text.’

Niccacci agrees with the views of Weinrich and Schneider in many ways. At a more general level, he follows them by making use of a ‘bottom-up approach’ in his analysis of the Hebrew verbal system, in which he starts with a grammatical analysis of the sentence, then continues by determining relationships between clauses, sentences and paragraphs, and finally concludes by performing a discourse analysis.

### 3.3.3.2.2 Theory on the Hebrew Verb

Niccacci’s view on the verbal functions is in line with that of Weinrich and Schneider, too, as he argues that the verbal forms constitute the ‘main clue for the author’s perspective in presenting his information’. They help us to identify the author’s strategy of communication, that is: his attitude with respect to the information he communicates. Niccacci distinguishes between two main linguistic attitudes: narrating (in narrative texts) and commenting (in direct speech). Both attitudes are expressed by a particular set of tenses with separate functions: narrative and discursive texts possess their own sets of verbal forms (wayyiqtol and yiqtol being the two basic ones), while forms occurring in both genres do not fulfill similar functions in them.

Niccacci also adopts the other ‘systems of opposition’ identified for the Biblical Hebrew verb by Schneider, i.e.: grounding and linguistic perspective. The first Niccacci refers to as the
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249 Niccacci’s view on the relationship between direct speech and (narrative) comment is somewhat confusing. In *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* Niccacci seems to make a distinction between ‘discourse’ (direct speech sections) and ‘comment’ (when a narrator reflects on the events narrated) and explains that the same verbal forms fulfill different functions in the two text types. In his article ‘On the Hebrew Verbal System’, however, Niccacci considers both direct speech and narrative comment to belong to the same category of discursive texts. We will come back to this inconsistency at the end of this subsection.

phenomenon of ‘foregrounding’ or ‘emphasis’ and concerns the alternate use of verbal forms to mark transitions between the mainline and secondary lines of communication. Contrary to what Schneider argued, Niccacci is of the opinion that the Hebrew verbal forms serve this ‘relief’ function both in narrative and in discursive texts. Indeed, he even argues that the higher degree of variation in the use of verbal forms in direct speech prose is a direct result from the fact that discursive prose is characterized by a more explicit identification of the different levels of communication. At the same time, Niccacci claims that in discursive texts not only *yiqtol* forms, but also (other) volitive forms, simple nominal clauses (SNC’s) and *qatal* can be used on the main level of communication.

With regard to the dimension of ‘linguistic perspective’, which regards the distinction between retrieved information, ‘degree zero’ (expressed by the mainline forms) and anticipated information, we again encounter significant differences between Niccacci and his predecessors, as he shows the inclination to reinterpret the criterion of ‘linguistic perspective’ in terms of the traditional verbal functionality of ‘indicating tense’. Indeed, in several of his later publications Niccacci introduces the assumption that the Biblical Hebrew verbal forms do have a temporal reference, more specifically stating that verbal forms signalling the mainline of communication, like *wayyiqtol* in narrative texts and *yiqtol* in discursive texts, have a fixed temporal reference, which means that they indicate absolute tense, while verbal forms representing secondary lines of communication, instead, have a relative temporal reference, indicating both relative tense and aspect.\(^{251}\)

A central innovative aspect of Niccacci’s work is his view that for an adequate description of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system, one needs to add to these three dimensions another ‘criterion’, namely that of *the position of a verbal form in the sentence*.\(^{252}\) Niccacci takes the criterion of the position of the verbal form within its sentence as the basis for a distinction between verbal clauses and nominal clauses and defines as ‘verbal clauses’ only those clauses in which the verbal form takes initial position in the sentence, which in Biblical Hebrew is the default position of the predicate. If a verbal form is preceded by a nominal element, this nominal element functions as the sentence’s predicate, according to Niccacci, and often bears emphasis. He claims that such a clause is to be identified as a grammatical construction or a complex nominal clause (CNC)\(^{253}\) and separates between the categories of syntactic predicate (i.e.: the element taking initial position in a sentence) and grammatical predicate (i.e.: the verb). Niccacci argues that in CNC’s the fronted
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\(^{251}\) Niccacci, ‘On the Hebrew Verbal System’, pp.128–130; Niccacci, ‘Essential Hebrew Syntax’, p.125; Niccacci, ‘Basic Facts and Theory’, p.197. Note that in his earliest work, *Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, Niccacci explicitly denies the existence of ‘aspect’ in the Biblical Hebrew verbal system and, instead, speaks of ‘mode of action’. In the end, however, Niccacci appears to refer to the same concept with these two different terms. In both contributions he identifies ‘repetitiveness’ as one of the characteristics of background clauses and ‘unicity’ as one of the features of foreground clauses. Besides, he rejects the relevancy of the category of ‘perfective-imperfective’ or ‘complete-incomplete’ for the Hebrew verbal system. See also: Niccacci, *Syntax*, p.166.


\(^{253}\) Niccacci, ‘Essential Hebrew Syntax’, p.111. Here, Niccacci identifies this assumption that clauses having a verbal form in second position constitute (complex) nominal clauses as one of the two general principles in his verbal theory. See also: Niccacci, ‘On the Hebrew verbal system’, p.121–122; *Syntax*; Niccacci, ‘Analysis of Biblical Narrative’, p.177; Niccacci, ‘Basic Facts and Theory’, p.178.
noun is the main element providing new information – that is: the syntactic predicate – while the verbal form represents the given information and, as such, functions as a syntactic subject.  

Schneider, in his grammar, made a similar distinction between ‘Verbalsätze mit einer finite Verbform in Spitzenstellung und Nominalsätze mit einem Nomen in Spitzenstellung’ and identified those sentences in which a finite verbal form took a non-initial position as Zusammengesetzter Nominalsätze. However, the innovative aspect of Niccacci’s dealing with these views lies in the fact that he applies them to his analysis of the Hebrew verbal system. More concretely, Niccacci relates his distinction between verbal and nominal clauses to the analysis of the levels of communication in a text and argues that the mainline of communication, both in narrative and in discursive texts, is constituted by verbal clauses that, in doing so, provide the text with a certain coherence, while (complex and simple) nominal clauses interrupt this mainline when an author desires to change his linguistic attitude and signal a subsidiary line of communication. According to Niccacci, it is of paramount importance to note that the ‘verb forms of interruption’, which indicate a secondary line of communication, always depend on independent ‘verb forms of the mainline of communication’. 

Niccacci not only uses the criterion of the position of the verbal form in its clause for the determination of levels of communication, but also relates this criterion to another function of the Biblical Hebrew verbal forms, namely that of expressing modality. According to Niccacci, a sentence-initial yiqtol (Q-yiqtol) is always jussive, while the indicative yiqtol is always preceded by another element (x-yiqtol). He acknowledges, however, that jussive x-yiqtol clauses do occur in Biblical Hebrew. It is at this point that Niccacci moves to the next level in his bottom-up approach: the grammatical analysis of a verbal form within its own sentence is now followed by a syntactic analysis of the relationships between the sentence concerned and surrounding sentences. Niccacci shows how patterns of verbal forms and sentences may influence a specific clause’s functioning. Thus, if an x-yiqtol clause continues a volitive verbal form or is itself continued by a volitive form, like weyiqtol, it has itself to be assigned a volitive meaning too. When, however, an x-yiqtol clause does not form a clause pattern with other volitive clauses, it always has an indicative meaning and may express ‘anticipated information’ or, only in narrative texts, a repeated past action. This also applies to the w-x-yiqtol construction, which only has a volitive meaning if it continues or is continued by a volitive clause. 

Niccacci offers a separate discussion of the functions of each of the verbal forms and grammatical constructions he identifies. When it comes to the analysis of the individual forms, the views presented by Niccacci are largely equivalent to those defended by Schneider. However, Niccacci’s analyses are innovative in that they repeatedly show that the exact function of a verbal form is regularly determined by the clause pattern in which it occurs. In these clause patterns we often find a transition from one clause type to another, a tense shift. According to Niccacci, these tense shifts are responsible for the progression of the text. Niccacci emphasizes that the number of tense shifts is remarkably lower than in the modern languages studied by Weinrich. Thus, he argues that in Biblical Hebrew, ‘temporal metaphors’ – tense shifts that concern a change on two or more of the three text-linguistic dimensions – are virtually unknown and can only be identified in cases in which there is a radical transition from a narrative text to a direct speech section, or

---

255 Schneider, Grammatik, p.160, §44.1.2.
257 Niccacci, Syntax, pp.75–81.
vice-versa. However, in most instances, tense shifts in Biblical Hebrew concern only one of the three text-linguistic levels. Thus, a sequence of wayyiqtol and w-x-yiqtol or weqatal in a narrative text frequently points to a change only in linguistic attitude: the author changes his attitude from that of narrating to that of commenting. According to Niccacci, similar shifts, concerning the speaker’s linguistic attitude, are absent in discursive texts.\(^{258}\)

On the level of ‘linguistic perspective’ tense shifts like qatal → wayyiqtol denote a transition from ‘antecedent information’ to ‘degree zero’. Niccacci characterizes the category of antecedent constructions as ‘quite varied and well differentiated’. Thus, a narrative-opening wayyiqtol can also be preceded by a w-x-yiqtol or weqatal expressing a repeated, antecedent action. Besides, it is not always that easy to determine the boundaries between the antecedent construction and the narrative itself. According to Niccacci, we often have to rely on stylistic and semantic criteria in this respect.\(^{259}\)

Tense shifts concerning the linguistic level of ‘grounding’ or ‘prominence’ receive most attention in the work of Niccacci, like they also did in the functionalist studies of Longacre and Dawson. Niccacci argues that shifts from mainline to secondary lines make an important contribution to the ordering of information into a structured whole,\(^{260}\) and he links the tense shifts expressing a transition from one line of communication to another to the syntactic notions of subordination and coordination, stating that a sequence of two verbal forms belonging to different levels of communication implies subordination, while coordination is expressed by a series of verbal forms denoting the same communication level. Referring back to his claim that the mainline of communication is usually denoted by verbal clauses, while (simple and complex) nominal clauses convey a secondary line of communication, Niccacci argues that, while verbal clauses usually signal coordination, the positioning of a verbal form in non-initial position (making the clause a complex nominal clause) may be regarded as a form of ‘syntactic subordination’.\(^{261}\) Most often, such CNC’s function as background constructions interrupting a chain of foreground constructions. Such interrupting background construction can serve several functions. Thus, a w-x-qatal interrupting a series of narrative wayyiqtols may express simultaneity, contrast, emphasis or an antecedent circumstance. Which of these functions is exactly fulfilled by a w-x-qatal clause can only be determined on the basis of context and meaning.\(^{262}\) In discursive texts, a similar transition from foreground to background is denoted by a sequence of mainline yiqtol forms or volitive forms and background constructions like the w-x-qatal or the simple nominal clause. Besides, a series of mainline weqatal can be interrupted by a background clause like the (w-)x-yiqtol.\(^{263}\)

\(^{258}\) Strangely enough, Niccacci thus implicitly rejects the existence of what Schneider calls ‘Sprosserzählungen’: short narratives embedded in a direct speech domain.

\(^{259}\) Niccacci, *Syntax*, pp.118–121; note that in both of the examples Niccacci provides here, the narrative itself starts with a wayyiqtol clause explicitly introducing a new group of participants. This seems to suggest that conducting an analysis of the participants entering and leaving the stage helps us to more precisely locate this type of discourse shifts in the texts. See also: Niccacci, ‘Analysis of Biblical Narrative’, p.179.


\(^{262}\) Niccacci, *Syntax*, pp.62–65, 188.
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3.3.3.2.3 Evaluation

With regard to his methodological approach, Niccacci’s work deserves appreciation. Not only does Niccacci continue the promising formalist way of reasoning of Weinrich and Schneider, he also creates room for a high degree of consistency in his analyses by advocating a ‘bottom-up’ approach which is clearly structured into subsequent analytical stages, starting at the level of individual sentences and concluding with the level of the whole discourse. As will become clear in the next part of this chapter, this type of ‘bottom-up’ analysis will also be advocated in this dissertation. Our practical implementation of the ‘bottom up’ approach, however, will strongly differ from the one made by Niccacci for reasons to be explained below.

Like his functionalist colleagues, Niccacci convincingly shows that the verbal forms serve to signal different lines of communication (and transitions between them) not only in narrative texts, but also in direct discourse. Niccacci’s analyses are even more convincing than those provided by the functionalists as he does not separate between multiple levels of ‘offline’ communication within the different discourse types, thus preventing himself from proposing a verbal system being of such a complex nature that it loses explanatory power. It should be noted, however, that Niccacci does agree with the functionalists in making the assignment of functions in terms of indicating mainline or secondary line dependent on the text type in which a form is used. Thus, while in narrative texts the qatal form denotes background, in discursive texts the same form is often used to convey mainline information. The same type of analysis is applicable to the simple nominal clause, according to Niccacci.

For the text type of direct speech this type of analysis appears to suggest that almost any form can be used to signal the mainline of communication, which raises the question whether, if that is true, the marking of levels of communication can still be considered a central function of Hebrew’s verbal forms. In addition, we may doubt, as we did in the previous sections, whether such an analysis, according to which a form’s function is determined to a large extent by the type of communication in which it occurs, is defendable in a search for a systematic description of the Hebrew verbal system. Can a verbal form’s functioning be text type dependent, while, at the same time, the marking of text type is itself a function of certain (mainline) verbal forms?

The most significant contribution made by Niccacci is his well-defended claim that the function of a verbal form can only be determined by means of syntactic analyses on two levels, namely that of the individual clause and that of the clause patterns. Though we do have our hesitations with regard to some conclusions drawn by Niccacci on the basis of his syntactic analyses, we consider his focus on the role of syntax in the function of the verbal form as a strong foundation for the analysis of the Hebrew verbal system.

At the level of inner-clause syntax, Niccacci’s use of the criterion of the position of the verbal form to determine verbal functions is promising, especially when it comes to the relation between the position of a yiqtol form within its clause and volitive or non-volitive meanings expressed by that clause. Indeed, the purpose of the next chapter of our thesis will be to prove that this criterion, at least to a certain extent, helps us, as Niccacci rightly claims, to identify volitive meanings of clauses. By pointing to the influence of the clause-internal position of a verbal form on the function of that form, Niccacci implicitly suggests that it may be more appropriate to talk about functions of clauses or clause types than about functions of individual verbal forms. This is at least true with respect to the ascription of volitive or non-volitive meanings. For the identification of verbal functions in terms of the three text-linguistic dimensions, it may be more questionable to determine whether indeed the criterion of the
position of the verbal form does play a decisive role. Thus, we regard Niccacci’s use of this criterion for the distinction between mainline and secondary line clauses as untenable, not only because Niccacci fails to provide his audience with convincing examples, but also because this standpoint forces Niccacci to allow for a certain inconsistency in his analyses. He has to assume, for instance, that the $x$-yiqtol clause can be used to denote both mainline and secondary line in discursive texts, while the non-initial position of the yiqtol form suggests the $x$-yiqtol clause to be a compound nominal clause and therefore, by definition, a background construction. Similarly, Niccacci also reanalyzes some $x$-qatal constructions as mainline verbal clauses (instead of background compound nominal clauses), just because the information they provide has to be seen as belonging to discourse’s mainline of communication. This ambiguous manner of reasoning causes the identification of the position of the verbal form as a marker of the text-linguistic function of indicating the level of communication to be a questionable business.

Niccacci is not the only one pointing to the relation between clause-internal syntax in yiqtol clauses and the expression of volitive and non-volitive meanings by these clauses. However, his attempt to account for $x$-yiqtol clauses having an unexpected jussive meaning is innovative and a nice illustration of the significance of Niccacci’s claim that the detection of verbal patterns is of utmost importance for an adequate determination of verbal functions. Niccacci shows how $x$-yiqtol clauses often adapt a volitive meaning when they are preceded or followed by a volitive clause. However, his examples are not always convincing. The $x$-yiqtol clause in the Decalogue (Exod 20.9), for instance, is interpreted by Niccacci as an indicative clause expressing an obligation:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[<Pr> יְהַבַּד]} \ [\text{<Ti> יִמְשָׁת}]^9 \ xYq0 \\
\text{[<Ob> יִשָּׁת]} \ [\text{<Pr> יִשָּׁת}] \ [\text{<Cj> -י}] \ WQt0
\end{array}
\]

\(^9\) Six days shall you labour and do all your work.

The $w$-$x$-yiqtol clause in Exod 27.20, however, though it appears to express the same type of (non-volitive) obligation, is reanalyzed by Niccacci as a clause expressing volitive meaning because it is followed by a weyiqtol clause, even though the subject of the weyiqtol clause refers to another participant than that of the $w$-$x$-yiqtol clause:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[<Ob> יִשָּׁת]} \ [\text{<Pr> יִשָּׁת}] \ [\text{<Su> יֶשָּׁת}]^20 \ WXYq \\
\text{[<Aj> יִשָּׁת]} \ [\text{<Ob> יִשָּׁת}] \ [\text{<Cj> -י}] \ WYq0
\end{array}
\]

\(^{20}\) For your part, command the Israelites to (lit. so that they) bring you olive oil – pure and refined – for the candelabrum.
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\(^{264}\) Similar conclusions have, for instance, been drawn by E.J. Revell and his student Ahouva Shulman. The first refers to approximately forty occurrences of clause-initial yiqtol forms in Judges-Kings that, despite the absence of jussive/cohortative morphological marking, clearly do have a volitive meaning; Revell, E.J., ‘The System of the Verb in Standard Biblical Prose’ (HUCA 60 (1989); pp.1–37), pp.17–19. Similarly, Shulman points out that in her corpus only six out of 102 jussive forms and five out of 197 cohortative forms are non-initial; Shulman, A., ‘The Use of Modal Verb Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose’ (PhD dissertation; University of Toronto, 1996), pp.66, 241. Compare also: Qimron, E., ‘A New Approach Toward Interpreting the Imperfect Verbal Forms in Early Hebrew’ (Leshonenu 61 (1998)), pp.31–43.
Niccacci himself also acknowledges that there are several cases in which an *x-yiqtol* clause is followed either by another non-volitive clause, for instance *weqatal*, or by a volitive clause, while another continuation form (respectively volitive or non-volitive) would have been expected.

The underlying problem here seems to be that Niccacci fails to provide clear parameters that determine whether or not the adoption of volitive meaning by *x-yiqtol* clauses takes place. As Niccacci himself recognizes, similar problems arise when it comes to the distinction between coordinate *weyiqtols* and *weqatals*, simply continuing the previous clause’s (volitive or non-volitive) meaning, and subordinate *weyiqtols* and *weqatals*, denoting, respectively, intended purpose and logical result. According to Niccacci, ‘It would be preferable if we could be more precise about the syntactic criteria for determining when they are coordinate and when subordinate’. In chapters 5 and 6 of this dissertation, the search for such syntactic parameters will be continued. At this moment, we refer to a helpful comment in this regard made by Niccacci himself, when he states that *weyiqtol* often functions as a coordinated construction when it continues a direct volitive *in the same person*. Could it be that continuation of the subject is also a significant syntactic parameter when it comes to the adoption of volitive meaning by *x-yiqtol* clauses (and coordinate *weqatals*)?

The strength of Niccacci’s concentration on patterns of clauses and verbal patterns also becomes visible in his examination of other tense shifts, which is even more comprehensive than Schneider’s discussion of different ‘Tempus-Übergänge’. Contrary to his predecessors, Niccacci does not focus on transitions involving only one of the three text-linguistic dimensions, but pays attention to different types of tense shifts, each involving their own text-linguistic dimension. A confusing aspect of Niccacci’s analysis of tense shifts might be his claim that in Biblical Hebrew such tense shifts only rarely involve transitions at more than one text-linguistic dimension. This indeed seems to be true for most of the patterns discussed by Niccacci, but what about a sequence of *(w-)*x-*qatal* → *wayyiqtol*, for example? According to Niccacci, such a sequence entails a shift at the level of linguistic perspective (from backward to zero perspective), but does not this sequence at the same time involve a transition from secondary line (in the form of, as Niccacci himself calls it, ‘antecedent information’) to mainline in many contexts?

A more general problematic aspect of Niccacci’s theories is his inclination to reintroduce in his description of the verbal functions the traditional categories of tense and aspect. Though Niccacci agrees with Weinrich and Schneider that one should avoid assigning a fixed tense equivalent to the various verbal forms, he argues that it is nevertheless desirable to distribute the verbal forms and constructions along the three ‘temporal axes’ of past, present, future. More specifically, Niccacci claims that *yiqtol* denotes future in discourse, that *qatal* expresses past in discourse and narrative, and that the simple nominal clause indicates the present in discourse. This development in the direction of a more traditional view on the functions of Hebrew verbal

---

As we will show in chapter 6, it would be too simplistic a view to argue that *qatal > wayyiqtol* constructions always entail a shift from retrospective antecedent information to zero-perspective mainline information. The *wayyiqtol* clause may also be used, for instance, to continue a secondary-line domain and signal a minor shift to foreground information within the background domain.

Others have also criticized Niccacci for not utilizing a pure text-linguistic approach. Thus, in his evaluation of Niccacci’s work, Dawson observes that Niccacci’s analyses almost never go beyond the clause level and, as such, can hardly be called text-linguistic analyses. Dawson concludes that Niccacci’s failure to look at
forms is not only visible in Niccacci’s inclination to create more and more room for an analysis of the verbal forms in terms of tense, but also reveals itself in the fact that Niccacci decides to include the category of ‘actio’ (mode of action) in his discussion of Hebrew’s verbal functions. While viewing the category of aspect as completely irrelevant for Biblical Hebrew, he asserts that the choice for verbal forms and constructions is certainly determined by ‘mode of action’, which he defines in terms of contemporaneity vs. anteriority and single vs. repeated action. Confusingly, Niccacci does not hold on to his distinction between aspect and mode of action in his later articles, in which he concludes, for example, that ‘both tense and aspect exist in Biblical Hebrew’, and that ‘the Biblical Hebrew verb system comprises both tense and aspect’, arguing that the mainline forms are to be regarded as tenses, while the nominal constructions, especially when occurring in narrative texts, indicate aspect. In the end, Niccacci finds himself


Niccacci not the only one to reintroduce the traditional categories of tense, aspect and mood in a text-linguistic analysis of the Hebrew verbal forms. A more explicit attempt to combine traditional and text-linguistic functional categories is undertaken by Jan Joosten, who in his article ‘The Indicative System of the Biblical Hebrew Verb and Its Literary Exploitation’ (in: E. van Wolde (Ed.), *Narrative Syntax & the Hebrew Bible. Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp.51–71) expresses his admiration for the new insights into the Hebrew verbal system which have been gained by text linguists and, at the same time, pleads for some caution, arguing that the features of the Biblical Hebrew verb cannot be explained by discourse factors alone. Joosten emphasizes that text-linguistic approaches to the problem of the Biblical Hebrew verb cannot replace earlier analyses of the verb in terms of tense and aspect. Instead, text-linguistic insights will have to be combined with insights gained by (traditional) morphosyntactic analyses of the verb at the level of the (isolated) verbal forms. As a result, research that focuses on the morphosyntactic function of the verbal forms remains legitimate and even necessary (pp.51–52). Compare Joosten, J., ‘A Neglected Rule and Its Exceptions: On Non-Volitive *yiqtol* in Clause-Initial Position’, in: Geiger, G., *En pase grammatike kai Sophia* (Bari: Franciscan Printing Press, 2011), p.218: “(...) it is clear that a discourse-oriented approach, although helpful and illuminating, cannot solve all problems of the Hebrew verb. The new methods add a new dimension to the analysis of verbal syntax, but they do not dispense with the longstanding need to determine temporal, aspectual and modal nuances.” See further: Joosten, J., ‘Workshop: Meaning and Use of the Tenses in I Samuel 1’, in: E. van Wolde (Ed.), *Narrative Syntax & the Hebrew Bible. Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp.72–83), and: Joosten, J., *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the basis of Classical Prose* (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd, 2012), pp.33-35, where Joosten stresses that text-linguistic functions are ‘not primary’, but ‘secondary, context-conditioned functions, albeit of a very important kind’ (p.35), and pp.349-375, where Joosten devotes a separate chapter
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confronted with the same problems as the more traditional tense and aspect theories. Thus, he repeatedly has to accept the assignment of several unrelated tense meanings to a single form.\textsuperscript{270} A final point of criticism considers the level of complexity of Niccacci’s argumentation. Especially in his discussion of the \textit{Two-Element Syntactic Construction} (2SC; also called the ‘protasis-apodosis construction’), Niccacci’s argument lacks clarity and transparency. Eventually, the reader is provided with long lists of forms and constructions that may all appear in the protases or the apodoses of this construction, which results in such a large variety of possible combinations of protasis and apodosis clause types that the explanatory power of this section is reduced to a minimum.\textsuperscript{271} Such points of criticism, however, should not obscure the significance of Niccacci’s contribution to the study of Biblical Hebrew verbal system. He has made abundantly clear that the combination of a formalist ‘bottom-up’ approach with the execution of syntactic analyses at subsequent levels opens up new possibilities for a more consistent analysis of the functioning of the Hebrew verbal forms. And there is yet another reason for which Niccacci deserves some credit, namely his attempt to provide a systematic description of the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry.

3.3.3.3 \textit{Niccacci about the Use of Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Poetry}

3.3.3.3.1 Theory on the Hebrew Verb in Poetry

As will become clear in our comparison of three of his publications, Niccacci’s views on the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry have undergone radical changes in course of time. Interestingly, these changes nicely reflect the development in the attitude towards the study of poetry’s use of verbal forms that is aimed at in this dissertation, with Niccacci’s initial views representing the current tendency among Hebraists to ignore poetry in their grammatical analyses of the Hebrew verbal system and his more recent work mirroring the desired type of approach in which the search for a single verbal system regulating the use of verbal forms in both prose and poetry takes central position.

In the final chapter of his \textit{The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose} (1990), Niccacci considers it to be likely that for the use of verbal forms poetry had its own rules, which were different from the ones at work in prose. For that reason, Niccacci argues that it is necessary to analyze poetry’s use of verbal forms independently from the way in which prose makes use of to the discussion of text-linguistic functions that ‘reflect the exploitation of [these] TAM (Tense-Aspect-Mood) functions in a textual perspective’ (p.349).

Though Joosten rightly points out that for a correct interpretation of the function of a clause, one has to take into account more parameters than only the verbal form used, his view that a text-linguistic analysis of clauses and their functions is just a helpful addition to the basic morphosyntactic analysis of verbal functions in terms of tense, aspect and mood is not convincing, as it, in fact, ignores the persistent inability of the traditional approaches to provide consistent analyses of the verbal functions. On the basis of our findings in chapter 2, we cannot agree with Joosten’s positive estimation of these traditional approaches.\textsuperscript{270} Compare Bartelmus’ criticism on Niccacci’s interpretation of \textit{yiqtol} in direct speech sections as expressing both past and future tense: if Biblical Hebrew would indeed function in such an inconsistent way, allowing the verbal forms (both in prose and in poetry) to be used promiscuously, it would never be able to function as a system of communication (Bartelmus, ‘Prima la Lingua, Poi le Parole’, p.316).\textsuperscript{271} Niccacci, \textit{The Syntax of the Hebrew verb}, pp.140–146, 152.
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verbal forms. He also points to some concrete difficulties in the distribution of verbal forms in poetic texts, like the fact that in parallel lines *yiqtol* and *qatal* forms often appear to be used for the same tense. Niccacci concludes that the criteria which guided poetry’s selection of the different verbal forms still have to be found. As long as these criteria have not been discovered, contextual and exegetical factors will have to be used in order to determine the function of each specific verbal form.

In 1997, Niccacci wrote an article, ‘Analysing Biblical Hebrew Poetry’ about the analysis of Biblical Hebrew poetry. Surprisingly, in this article Niccacci hardly pays any attention to poetry’s use of verbal forms. Instead, he restricts himself to a literary approach characterized by a concentration on the stylistic and rhetorical features of the poetic texts in the Hebrew Bible. In addition, in the introduction of his article Niccacci states that one of the three most significant characteristics of Biblical Hebrew poetry is its lack of a detectable verbal system. Only at the end of his article, after having elaborately discussed poetry’s use of segmented communication, rhetorical ordering, word pairs and parallel clauses containing similar bits of information, Niccacci again refers to the apparent lack of regularity in poetry’s use of verbal forms and states that Biblical Hebrew poetry remains a mystery from the point of view of the verbal system it uses. This time he points to the seemingly free alternation of *qatal*, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* that leads to much disagreement among Hebraists. According to Niccacci, these verbal forms often refer to the same event and, more importantly, indicate the same aspect when they are used in parallel lines. The change in Niccacci’s attitude towards the usage of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry is obvious. While first assuming the presence of a not yet discovered, but indeed existing, verbal system in this genre, he now concludes that no verbal system can be detected in Hebrew poetry, thereby suggesting that poetry’s use of verbal forms is not bound by any rules at all.

In 2006, however, Niccacci wrote yet another article in which a radical shift in his approach to the analysis of poetry’s use of verbal forms can be identified. Instead of concentrating on a literary analysis of poetic texts, this time Niccacci proposes to start the study of Hebrew poetry and its use of verbal forms by making them the object of text-linguistic analysis. Niccacci no longer doubts whether verbal forms in poetry play precise functions or, if so, whether they can be compared to the functions fulfilled by prose’s verbal forms, but now assumes that different verbal forms used in Hebrew poetry need to play different functions, like prose’s verbal forms do,

---

275 Niccacci, ‘Analysing Biblical Hebrew Poetry’, pp.77–78. Compare also Niccacci’s article ‘Syntactic Analysis of Jonah’ (*LASBF* 46 (1996), pp.26–31), in which he, looking back at his earlier studies (but see also the quotation in footnote 277), states: ‘Poetry still poses a challenge to our understanding of the Biblical Hebrew verb system. As a methodological choice, I decided from the very beginning to leave poetry aside and concentrate on good prose. The reason was that one could easily suppose that poetry employed the verb forms in a somehow different way from prose. This supposition was strengthened by the fact that if one considered poetry together with prose, one would get nowhere as the traditional approach abundantly showed’ (p.29).
and that these functions of poetry’s verbal forms are basically the same as those in prose or, more specifically, in prosaic direct speech (‘discursive prose’). Apparent differences between direct speech prose and poetry in their use of verbal forms should be related to their distinct manners of communicating information: while direct speech, like prose in general, contains pieces of information conveyed in a sequence, thus constituting linear communication, poetry makes use of parallel segments of information, in that way creating segmental communication. As a result, poetry can switch between the three temporal axes even more easily and freely than direct speech, which, as Niccacci noted in his volume *Syntax*, itself already is quite ‘loose’ in its usage of verbal forms as indicators of all three temporal axes at the main level of communication, thereby showing much more variety than narrative prose.

Niccacci criticizes the tendency among many Hebraists to disregard formal differences between the verbal forms and to translate the forms on the basis of their own interpretation (cf. chapter 1). He also rejects the attempt of others to find a systematic explanation for poetry’s use of verbal forms by assuming that some of its peculiarities, such as the alternate use of *qatal* and *yiqtol*, represent archaic phenomena also occurring in archaic poetry of other Semitic languages like Ugaritic. Instead, any ‘automatic’ application of phenomena of one language to another language without paying extensive attention to the verbal system of this second language should be avoided. Poetic texts should, first of all, be analyzed synchronically, while comparative, diachronic explanations of their peculiarities should be postponed. Synchrony is crucial, according to Niccacci.

Besides these more general theoretical remarks, Niccacci introduces a number of assumptions related to two significant difficulties characterizing the usage of verbal forms in poetry: the variation between *qatal* and *x-yiqtol* clauses and the use of the *0-yiqtol* clause.

With regard to the first issue, Niccacci starts by suggesting that *qatal* and *x-yiqtol* clauses may each refer to their own temporal axis, respectively past and future. Thus, when a *qatal* is followed by *x-yiqtol*, this indicates a shift from past to future information. In some poetic texts, the sequence of *qatal*, or its continuation form *wayyiqtol*, and indicative *x-yiqtol* is used to present an intervention of YHWH in the past as a basis for hope for a similar intervention in the future. When *qatal*, or *wayyiqtol*, and *x-yiqtol* refer to the same piece of information, a kind of ‘merismus’ emerges. The meaning of such a ‘merismus’ is that what happened in the past will also happen in the future. The reverse sequence of *x-yiqtol* and *qatal*, indicating a shift from future to past information, can also be found in Hebrew poetry. In many instances, this pattern has the same meaning as the first one: stating that YHWH’s intervention in the past provides us with hope for his intervention in the future.

Subsequently, Niccacci introduces a second possible function of alternately occurring *qatal* and *x-yiqtol* clauses, which is of a text-linguistic nature. Sometimes, it appears that both verbal forms refer to the axis of the past. In those cases, the sequence of *qatal*, or its continuation form

---

277 Cf. Niccacci, A., ‘Poetic Syntax and Interpretation of Malachi’ (*LASBF* 51 (2001)), p.60n9: “I have become more and more convinced that the BH verb system is basically the same in prose and in poetry.” Note also the more cautious formulation of this hypothesis by Niccacci in one of his earlier articles, ‘Syntactic analysis of Jonah’, p.27: “I will try to analyze Jonah 2.3–10 according to the rules of the prose. In principle, one is justified in abandoning these rules only when demonstrably they do not apply.”


wayyiqtol, and x-yiqtol, or its continuation form weqatal, represents a shift from mainline, punctual information to secondary-line information having a repetitive, habitual, explicatory or descriptive nature. Thus, the line of information presented by x-yiqtol or weqatal does not belong to the same level as the line of information presented by qatal or wayyiqtol. Instead, the former is subservient to the latter and specifies it in different ways, for example by giving a description or an explanation. In most instances, it is the context that helps to determine in which way x-yiqtol and/or weqatal, conveying background information, exactly specify the foreground information narrated by qatal and/or wayyiqtol. By fulfilling this ‘relief’ function, the verbal forms in question add some depth to the manner in which an event or an action is presented.  

Niccacci continues his article by introducing several other hypotheses that have to do with the functions of the 0-yiqtol clause. First of all, he assumes that the 0-yiqtol clause and its continuation form weyiqtol in general serve a volitive function. Sometimes, a poetic text contains an alternation of 0-yiqtol clauses and x-yiqtol clauses that should all be assigned a volitive meaning. In those instances, 0-yiqtol and x-yiqtol clauses differ from each other with regard to the level of communication they belong to, the 0-yiqtol clauses indicating main level (foreground) and the x-yiqtol clauses denoting secondary level (background). The 0-yiqtol clause can also fulfill a volitive function in past contexts, in which case it expresses finality, a function which in prosaic direct speech is mainly executed by weyiqtol forms. Niccacci considers it to be a characteristic of Hebrew poetry that also a 0-yiqtol, without a ו, can fulfill this function.  

In some poetic passages referring to a past context, however, we find a 0-yiqtol clause – which, according to Niccacci, in discursive prose always has a volitive function – that does not refer to volition. According to Niccacci, this exceptional use of the 0-yiqtol should not be regarded as being a consequence of poetic devices, such as rhythm or prosody, but as resulting from the phenomenon of ellipsis, the omission of a grammatically expected element. In poetry, this phenomenon frequently occurs in the form of the double-duty modifier technique, which is only very rarely attested in discursive prose. A ‘double-duty modifier’ is a grammatical element which governs two or more lines, but is explicitly present in only one of them, in most cases the first one. When such a double-duty modifier, for example an interrogative pronoun like למה or a conjunction like כי, modifies not only the verbal form immediately following it, but also a yiqtol form in a following clause, the clause to which this yiqtol form belongs, formally being a 0-yiqtol clause, should be reinterpreted as an <x->yiqtol clause having a non-volitive meaning.  

3.3.3.2 Evaluation  
All in all, Niccacci’s most recent contribution is a valuable proposal worthwhile to be explored and tested further in the study of Hebrew poetry’s verbal forms. Niccacci makes abundantly clear how the focus on syntactic and text-linguistic analysis opens new windows for consistent interpretations of verbal functions not only in prose, but also in poetry. His claim that poetry and discursive prose basically share the same verbal functions is both innovative and promising. As Niccacci shows, several of poetry’s complicated verbal patterns do have their equivalents in direct speech prose and can be consistently interpreted in terms of the same categories. Niccacci’s analysis of the ‘tense shifts’ attested in poetic texts to a large extent corresponds to his
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examination of these shifts in prose and, as a result, reflects the same strengths. However, it also has its weaknesses. Thus, his claim that yiqtol clauses introduce secondary-line information in retrospective sections appears to contradict the view that in direct speech sections yiqtol clauses (both 0-yiqtol and x-yiqtol) generally convey mainline information. Similarly, Niccacci’s attempt to distinguish between volitive 0-yiqtol clauses and x-yiqtol clauses on the basis of their ‘relief’ function is not very convincing. Consider, for instance, his analysis and translation of Ps 20.3–6:

May he send you help from the sanctuary, while f rom Zion may he give you support!

May he remember all your offerings, while your burnt sacrifices may he regard with favo ur!

May he grant you your heart’s desire, while all your plans may he fulfill!

May we shout for joy over your victory, while in the name of our God may we set up our banners!

It is not clear how exactly the information provided by the w-x-yiqtol clauses can be regarded as being background to the information given by the 0-yiqtol clauses. The attempt to do so seems rather artificial.

Yet, the decision to focus on syntactic clause patterns, and on the question how syntactic patterns affect a clause’s (text-linguistic) functions, proves itself to be one of utmost significance, as it creates the possibility of putting the complex and, at first sight, unexplainable alternations of verbal forms into a wholly new perspective. Illustrative is the fact that this innovative approach enables Niccacci to identify the phenomenon of the double-duty modifier, thus allowing for a higher level of consistency in the analysis of verb-initial yiqtol clauses.

A less admirable aspect of Niccacci’s study is the continuation of his inclination to leave room for an analysis of the verbal forms in terms of tense and aspect/action. It is exactly this problematic aspect which appears to underlie most of the less convincing analyses of text samples Niccacci provides. Thus, the claim that, in some instances, yiqtol and qatal both have a past reference not only makes the idea that Hebrew’s verbal forms serve the function of indicating tense highly improbable, but also gives rise to Niccacci’s dubious interpretation of yiqtol as conveying background information. It may well be assumed that a more convincing attribution of such ‘relief’ and other text-linguistic functions to verbal forms will become possible if it becomes a more self-contained operation, not influenced by analysis in terms of tense or aspect. Besides, leaving out the categories of tense and aspect will undeniably allow for a higher level of
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Interesting clues in this regard can be found in the work of Eep Talstra.

3.3.3.4 Eep Talstra

3.3.3.4.1 General Approach and Theory on the Hebrew Verb

Talstra’s attitude with respect to his formalist predecessors is twofold. On the hand, he agrees with them at many points. In several of his articles, for instance, Talstra explicitly emphasizes how he bases his views regarding the functions of verbal forms and clause types on Schneider’s application of Weinrich’s theories to Biblical Hebrew. Similarly, Talstra follows Niccacci in stating that the criterion of the position of a verb in the clause plays an important role when one tries to determine whether a verbal form should be assigned a volitive meaning or not.

On the other hand, however, Talstra criticizes Schneider and the others for not having been consistent enough in their use of the synchronic formalist approach and repeatedly argues that paying attention to verbal forms and clause types alone is not sufficient for an adequate text-linguistic analysis. One of Talstra’s central claims is that text linguists should not deal with clauses as isolated linguistic signs with fixed functions, since the function of a specific clause is only to a minor extent determined by its verbal form and internal word order. Indeed, in several of his works Talstra criticizes the text-linguistic tendency to assign fixed discourse functions to each of the clause types, which are regarded as independent linguistic signs, by emphasizing that indicating mainline and secondary line of communication, for instance, should not be seen as clause-level features.

This type of criticism can best be understood in the light of Talstra’s central focus on ‘text-level syntax’. According to Talstra verbal forms and clause types function on different levels and, as such, contribute to the syntactic structuring of the text in different ways. Talstra agrees with his fellow text linguists about the view that the functions of verbal forms and clause types should be defined in terms of the text-linguistic categories of type of communication (narrative, discursive), relief (mainline, secondary line), and perspective (prior to, simultaneous with and after actual communication), but he stresses that the exact function of a verbal form or clause in the communication process can only be discovered when one first determines the position of that

---

284 Niccacci himself admits that the decision whether a verbal form’s main function is that of indicating tense or that of denoting ‘Aktionsart’ and level of communication often causes great difficulties (‘The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System’, pp.252, 267).

285 Talstra, ‘Clause Types’, pp.169, 178; A good example of a scholar regarding ‘indicating mainline’ and ‘indicating secondary line’ as clause level functions is Eskhult; Eskhult, M., Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose (Studie Semitica Upsaliensia 12; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990). According to Eskhult, the functional contrast between the Hebrew verbal forms should be described in terms of ‘aspect’. Thus, qatal and wayyiqtol denote constative aspect (focusing on ‘states’ and presenting a situation as a single whole), while yiqtol and weqatal signal cursive aspect (focusing on ‘motions’ and presenting situations as ‘ongoing’). Eskhult links this aspectual contrast to a contrast between foreground and background and argues that the Hebrew narrator used wayyiqtol clauses to denote the event (main) line of his story, while the subj-qtl clause, marking a ‘state of affairs’, move around this event line and present marginal circumstances. In brief, Eskhult assumes a clear contrast between foreground wayyiqtol clauses and background (we)subj-qtl clauses in Hebrew narrative.

form or clause in the overall syntactic structure of the text. In other words, the interpretation of verbal forms should be guided by the search for a system of patterns of clause binding. Therefore, the main task of a text linguist is to identify a clause’s position in the syntactic hierarchy of the text by studying syntactic patterns and the relations between clauses. Besides, tense and aspectual values are not inherent to a specific form, but can only be determined on the basis of additional lexical and contextual information.

All in all, Talstra pleads for a more ‘context-based’ ‘form-to-function’ approach, which starts with analyzing syntactic forms and their distribution in patterns and, only after that, continues with categorizing the data in terms of their textual functions. But how can the relations and patterns that make up the syntactic hierarchy of a text be adequately identified and described? In line with the views of Niccacci, Talstra states that this goal can only be reached by means of a ‘bottom-up’ formal analysis: one should start with detecting the smallest syntactic patterns and, subsequently, continue by constructing larger patterns built from these smaller ones.

To facilitate such a systematic formalist type of ‘bottom-up’ analysis, Talstra and his colleagues of the Eep Talstra Centre for Bible and Computer (ETCBC) since the late 1970s have been developing an electronic database containing multi-level linguistic analyses of the Biblical Hebrew texts. Several computer programs help the text linguist to detect formal patterns at different linguistic levels, thus creating a formal grammar of each of these levels, from the lowest one (morphemes) up to the highest (texts). Talstra insists that the use of the computer for conducting textual analyses is of great significance, as it enables users of the programs to imitate the process of reading conducted by the human reader of the text, thereby focusing on the recognition of syntactic patterns occurring in the texts. At the same time, Talstra acknowledges that the computer programs have their limits, as they can only imitate the reading process.

At the level of clause relations, the interactive program syn04types helps the user to generate syntactic hierarchies of the clauses in a specific chapter. For an adequate determination of the clause relations making up a text’s syntactic hierarchy, several levels of information have to be taken into account. One should start with the parameters making up a clause’s clause type, such as the presence of a coordinate conjunction, the type and position of the verbal form and the position of the explicit subject (see the Introduction to this thesis).


the way in which they are referred to. Indeed, Talstra claims that the analysis of references to new and settled participants is absolutely required for a complete text-linguistic analysis.\textsuperscript{291} As an example, he points to the functioning of *w-X-qatal* clauses with preverbal explicit subject in narrative contexts. If the preverbal subject is determinate, the clause often functions to open a new paragraph, while if the subject is indeterminate, the clause usually introduces background information and opens a secondary-line subparagraph.\textsuperscript{292} By combining these levels of information one will be able to determine the ‘domain’ in which a clause is fulfilling its function.\textsuperscript{293} We already noticed that Talstra criticizes the tendency in many text-linguistic publications to assign fixed text-linguistic functions, such as the marking of absolute levels of communication, to the isolated clause types. Instead, text linguists should

\textsuperscript{291} Talstra, ‘A Hierarchy of Clauses’, pp.89, 97–100; The importance of participant tracking in text-linguistic analyses also becomes obvious from Talstra’s definition of a paragraph as ‘a hierarchically organized sequence of clauses, starting with the explicit introduction of one or more participants and continuing to use the same basic set of participants in the roles of subject, complement, object’ (Lecture notes, course “Hebrew Syntax, Discourse Structure and Computer: Narrative Texts” (2009–2010)); see also: Talstra, ‘Clause Types’, pp.170–174.

\textsuperscript{292} Talstra, ‘Clause Types’, p.174; Talstra, E., ‘Workshop: Clause Types, Textual Hierarchy, Translation in Exodus 19, 20 and 24’, in: E. van Wolde (Ed.), *Narrative Syntax & the Hebrew Bible. Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p.123. For illustrative examples of passages in which Talstra’s attention for participant references may enable us to more precisely interpret the function of a clause, we refer the reader to Niccacci’s discussion of texts (*Syntax*, pp.118–121) in which it is not clear whether a *wayyiqtol* clause continues a line of communication opened by an antecedent *w-X-qatal* construction or itself opens the mainline of a new narrative (and, thus, a new paragraph). Interestingly, in all of the examples mentioned by Niccacci, the *wayyiqtol* clause opening the narrative’s mainline introduces a new explicit, determinate subject and should therefore, in Talstra’s terminology, be analyzed as a *wayX*-clause, while in the *wayyiqtol* clauses simply continuing the antecedent line of communication such an explicit reference to a participant is lacking, which means that they can be labelled as *way0*-clauses.

\textsuperscript{293} For a profound and interesting analysis of the concept of ‘domain’, see: De Regt, L., ‘Domains and Subdomains in Biblical Hebrew Discourse’, in: E. Talstra, *Narrative and Comment. Contributions presented to Wolfgang Schneider* (Amsterdam: Societas Hebraica Amstelodamensis, 1995), pp.147–161. In this article, De Regt makes a distinction between the primary domain of a speaker or an author, which is his or her conceptualization of reality at the moment of speaking or writing, and subdomains representing conceptualizations of reality shared by certain characters in the author’s text. The primary domain is to be found in the narrative line of communication, while the subdomains are constituted by the dialogues between the characters sharing it. In their dialogues these characters, in turn, can refer to the dialogues between other characters (embedded direct speech) in which yet another conceptualization of reality (‘subsubdomain’) emerges. Thus, De Regt points to the phenomenon of ‘recurring and embedded subdomains’.

Interestingly, De Regt explains that a tense shift from *wayyiqtol* to *qitol* does not indicate a change in domain if the shift is not accompanied by elements that explicitly mark the beginning of a direct speech section (subdomain). Instead, such a shift seems to signal a change in the author’s attitude or interest: he no longer acts as a narrator recounting past events, but now directly addresses his audience, the readers, in order to communicate that a message is of direct relevance for them. As we will see at the end of this section, this analysis of the tense shift *wayyiqtol* \rightarrow *qitol* strongly corresponds to the one proposed by Talstra. De Regt concludes his essay by stating that, in narrative contexts, *wayyiqtol* and *qatal* dominate in the primary domain, while *qitol* and *weqatal* play a dominant role in the subdomains. With this, he links up with the text-linguistic distinction between narrative and discursive tenses as proposed by Weinrich, Schneider and others.
allow for more embeddings in the text’s structure. The positioning of a clause in a text’s syntactic hierarchy helps to indicate the level on which a clause functions. Thus, a wayyiqtol clause does not always convey a (narrative) text’s mainline of communication, but may also express foreground within a background section, for example when following a background section opening w-X-qatal clause.\(^{294}\)

A good illustration of Talstra’s approach can be found in an article of his hand about the use of the yiqtol form in narrative prose.\(^{295}\) Instead of ascribing a fixed (aspectual or tense) value to the yiqtol form in general, like most Hebraists do, Talstra considers it more appropriate to focus on the analysis of only those yiqtol forms that occur in narrative contexts. After claiming that it may be rewarding to reclaim part of the domain traditionally left for the disciplines of exegesis and literary interpretation, namely the study of ‘the type of communication’, for the discipline of linguistic analysis and to experiment with the interaction between discourse and syntax, Talstra shows that if one consistently makes use of a text-linguistic approach, it will be possible to interpret these ‘narrative’ yiqtol forms in terms of the ‘mode of communication’ they denote. More specifically, he argues that the main function of narrative yiqtols (and weqatals) is that of directly addressing the reader. The narrative mainline-interrupting yiqtol forms point to peak moments in the narrative in which the narrator changes his attitude from that of simply narrating past events to that of directly addressing his audience in order to make them realize what is the relevance of the events narrated for themselves. The discourse effect of these yiqtols is a claim: what is told here is of direct importance for the reader.

3.3.3.4.2 Evaluation

The strength of Talstra’s approach can be found in its consistency. While for the largest part adopting the theoretical basics of Schneider and Niccacci, Talstra distinguishes himself from his predecessors by his refusal to include in his approach any elements that might undermine the text-linguistic foundation of it. By consistently holding on to the focus on discourse functions of verbal forms and clause types, Talstra is able to more systematically analyze their functions. Thus, narrative yiqtols do not have to be regarded as fulfilling exceptional functions, but can well be interpreted as consistently executing their basic discourse function of marking a discursive mode of communication. At the same time, Talstra shows in a convincing manner that it is impossible to assign fixed values to isolated clause types and verbal forms and that the position of a clause in the overall syntactic hierarchy of a text plays a decisive role when it comes to the determination of the concrete text-linguistic functions of clauses and verbal forms. A significant contribution in this respect is his emphasis on the importance of identifying textual domains in which clauses fulfill their functions, as it helps us to understand how the concrete realization of the text-linguistic functions identified by Schneider is not absolute, but context-dependent.

This high level of consistency in Talstra’s ‘bottom-up’ approach is assured by its practical application in computational analyses. The use of the computer forces the researcher to be systematic and does not allow him to get rid of unexpected constructions by simply labelling them as exceptional. Besides, by developing his theoretical assumptions on the basis of a

\(^{294}\) Talstra, ‘Clause Types’, p.174.

carefully built ‘bottom-up’ linguistic database, Talstra creates the ideal situation for a type of analysis which is of a purely synchronic nature and allows the texts to speak for themselves. As Talstra himself acknowledges, there is a strong need for conducting experiments with the type of computational formalist approach he promotes in poetic/prophetic texts. Some initial attempts to do so have already been undertaken.

3.3.3.5 Talstra about the Use of Verbal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Poetry

In 2011, Talstra wrote his article ‘Sinners and Syntax. Poetry and discourse in Jeremiah 5’ which was published in a Festschrift for Alviero Niccacci. After a brief review of Niccacci’s articles about the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry (see §3.3.3.1), Talstra rightly concludes that one of the major contributions of Niccacci’s most recent article on this topic is his argument that, within the domain of linguistics, there is no need for a strict division between the narrative and poetic texts. Thus, it is not necessary to assume a separate starting point for the linguistic analysis of poetry. Instead, linguistic and rhetorical interests should cooperate in our analyses of poetic texts. Talstra claims that, since a poetic text is, in the first place, a form of linguistic communication, priority should be given to linguistic, syntactic observations. Only after having conducted a linguistic analysis of clauses, of syntactic connections between them, and of patterns of actors, can one continue with the analysis of rhetorical and literary features. For the study of verbal functions in poetic texts this entails that the approach to be taken should be similar to the one guiding the analysis of verbal forms in prose. Thus, Talstra points out that in poetry, too, a clause’s exact function is to a large extent determined by its position in the hierarchical syntactic structure of the whole text.

---

298 Talstra, ‘Sinners and Syntax’, pp.351–352. Some scholars have expressed their doubts about Talstra’s decision to analyze the functions of Biblical Hebrew’s verbal forms in poetry from a pure text-linguistic perspective. Thus, in his article ‘Masoretic Tradition and Syntactic Analysis of the Psalms’, which was included in the Festschrift Tradition and Innovation in Biblical Interpretation dedicated to Eep Talstra (pp.317–335), Luis Vegas Montaner argues that for a correct determination of verbal functions in Biblical Hebrew poetry, paying attention to higher-level syntactic patterns alone is not sufficient, and that, instead, one should concentrate on the broader interaction between poetic techniques, Masoretic accentuation and syntactic patterns. Though this suggests a balanced relation between the disciplines of grammatical and literary analysis, Vegas Montaner obviously gives priority to the second, as he repeatedly claims that for an adequate interpretation of syntactic structures one has to gain insight into literary verse structures as they are marked by conjunctive and disjunctive accents. As an example, Vegas Montaner refers to the meaning expressed by the syntactic verbal pattern qatal // wayyiqtol, which, according to him, largely depends on the question whether or not the two verbal forms belong to the same hemistich. If they do – that is: when they are separated only by minor disjunctive or conjunctive accents – then the wayyiqtol usually has a consecutive or sequential value, while when the two forms are separated by major disjunctive accents placing them in different hemistichs, the two clauses regularly express synonymous parallelism and refer to simultaneous actions.

In the end, then, Vegas Montaner, by regarding the identification of literary units on the basis of the Masoretic accents as a requirement for any attempt to systematically account for the functioning of verbal forms in their verbal patterns in Hebrew poetry, deprives text-linguistic and syntactic analysis from its
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Talstra illustrates the advantages of starting the study of poetic texts with an analysis of its linguistic signals and syntactic patterns by applying his approach to Jeremiah 5. Part of his text-linguistic analysis of this chapter is Talstra’s discussion of the use of verbal forms in it, in which he concludes that *yiqtol* is used to indicate the mainline of communication, while the background information, which provides arguments for the main statements, is denoted by *qatal* clauses that, in turn, can be elaborated by *wayyiqtol* clauses. Talstra states that this conclusion is in line with Niccacci’s observation that there are many correspondences between the use of verbal forms in direct speech prose and their usage in poetry. Indeed, both text types share the same matrix of verbal functions. At the same time, Talstra disagrees with Niccacci by claiming that in the end, verbal forms do not have fixed temporal or aspectual values, but contribute to the development of discourse by fulfilling text-linguistic functions within their domains. Thus, a *yiqtol* used within a past context and following a series of *qatals* does not indicate a shift from foreground punctuality to background habituality, but may mark an opposite transition from a

---

independent character and ascribes to it a role that is subordinate to that of the analysis of the literary, prosodic structures of the text. In this way, Vegas Montaner reintroduces the traditional idea that there is a gap between poetic language and prosaic, or common, language, as can be seen in his explicit remark that ‘Certainly the normal use of the verbal system in prose does not seem to be directly applicable to biblical poetry. Hence, we cannot leave out of our consideration any kind of data related to the system of poetic composition, especially literary structures of parallelism and prosodic relationship between clauses.’ (p.335) On the other hand, some of Vegas Montaner’s observations can be considered helpful. Thus, he suggests the position of a nominal element in sequences of verbal forms to be a significant parameter, claiming for sequences of 0-*yiqtol* > *weyiqtol*, for instance, that *weyiqtol* expresses sequentiality when the nominal element follows the first verb, while it denotes parallel, synonymous information when the nominal element follows the *weyiqtol* form. However, as we will argue at a later time, other linguistic parameters, namely those of the type figuring in Talstra’s analyses, may be decisive here, like the degree of subject continuity. Compare [renderings adopted from Vegas Montaner], for example, Ps 9.3 (same subject – parallel):

```
[<Pr> הָנָֽאָשָּׁה] <Co> אֲבָרָֽנַה <Pr> עִלָּצָֽה <Cj> -ו
ZYq0 WYq0
```

3 I will be glad and exult in you.

with Ps 119.77 (change of subject – sequential/final):

```
[<Su> בָּנָֽי] <PO> לָעַל <Pr> יִהוּ <Cj> -ו
ZYq0 WYq0
```

77 Let your mercy come to me, that I may live.

299 Talstra, ‘Sinners and Syntax’, pp.345–348. While Talstra suggests that his assignment of functionalities to the clauses in this specific chapter is largely in agreement with Niccacci’s theories about the functions of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry, a careful consideration of Niccacci’s views, as presented in his most recent article, shows that this is not true, since Niccacci does not make this distinction between mainline *yiqtol* and background *qatal* (and continuation *wayyiqtol*).

300 Talstra, ‘Sinners and Syntax’, p.349.
background passage back to the main level of communication and explain how the given background information functions as a valid argument for the mainline of communication. By thus focusing on text-linguistic functions, Talstra, more than Niccacci, is able to interpret the functions of verbal forms and clauses in poetry in a way that is consistent with his analysis of the prosaic verbal system. Niccacci, with his inclusion of the verbal categories of tense and aspect, was forced to assume some functions that were typically ‘poetic’ and even seemed to be contradictory to the functions of the same form in prose (compare his analysis of alternating qatal and yiqtol both having past reference). Talstra, in contrary, creates room for a well-founded defense of the assumption that in Biblical Hebrew the two genres of poetry and prose make use of the same verbal system.

A concrete illustration of the practical consequences of Talstra’s approach can be found in an earlier article of his hand, ‘Singers and Syntax. On the Balance of Grammar and Poetry’. In this article, Talstra points to the need for a correct balance between the different methods of analyses, claiming, on the basis of the assumption ‘that a linguistic analysis referring to language as a system comes prior to a stylistic analysis referring to the phenomena that mark the structure of a specific textual composition’, that ‘observations on the level of grammar and lexicon should have priority over observations in terms of semantics or stylistics’. Subsequently, in the main part of his article, Talstra addresses two syntactic questions arising from the constructions and verbal forms used in Ps 8.5–6, which he translates as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Su> אָנָן]} & \quad \text{[<PC> מִן]} \quad \text{NmCl} \\
\text{[<PO> וָהָבָר]} & \quad \text{[<Cj> כי]} \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Su> וּבְאֵדֵּז]} & \quad \text{[<Cj> -]} \quad Ellp \\
\text{[<PO> תָּפָּקְדָּה]} & \quad \text{[<Cj> כי]} \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Cj> -]} \quad Way0 & \quad \text{[<Co> דָּמָּו]} \quad \text{[<Mo> -]} \quad WxY0 \\
\text{[<PO> מִשָּׁה]} & \quad \text{[<Cj> -]} \quad [<Ob> הָדָּר] \quad [<Cj> -] \\
\text{[<PO> תַּעֲטָה]} & \quad [<Cj> -] \\
\end{align*}
\]

5 What is man, that you should notice him, and a human, that you should pay attention to him, that you even placed him little below gods, and with honour and splendour would crown him?

The first question regards the yiqtol clause in vs.5. On the basis of a query in the ETCBC database, Talstra concludes that the usual rendering of יִקְּטֹל yiqtol in vs.5 by an indicative present is questionable. Comparing the occurrences of ‘interrogative pronoun > יִקְּטֹל yiqtol’ with those of ‘interrogative clause > יִקְּטֹל yiqtol’, he reasons that while the first type of construction is used for asking for a reason or an explanation, the second expresses a situation the speaker regards as impossible or unrealistic. Thus, the yiqtol form in the yiqtol clause should be rendered as a modal form, according to Talstra.

The introduction of the category of ‘modality’ as a verbal function may raise questions, since it seems to question the ability of text-linguistic analysis to provide a more systematic description

of the Hebrew verbal system than analyses in terms of the traditional categories of tense, aspect and mood were able to do. However, it should be carefully noted that Talstra’s assignment of modal nuances to the َيِقْتُل form is completely based on the analysis of syntactic constructions and patterns. Thus, in contrast with his predecessors, Talstra does not assign a fixed modal function to a specific verbal form (َيِقْتُل)، but instead considers the expression of modality to be a specific function of ِيَقْتُل clauses continuing an interrogative clause. A question that remains is whether Biblical Hebrew can also use ِيَقْتُل clauses for the expression of other, for example argumentative, meanings after an interrogative clause. By restricting the function of a ِيَقْتُل clause following an interrogative pronoun to that of expressing modality, Talstra significantly narrows down the number of possible meanings expressed in sequences of an interrogative clause and a ِيَقْتُل clause. On the other hand, a modal meaning indeed appears to be expressed in all constructions of ‘interrogative clause > ِيَقْتُل’ listed by Talstra. 303

The second syntactic question addressed by Talstra concerns the alternation of verbal forms in Ps 8.5–6. The strongly varying renderings offered by Bible translations suggest that in the use of verbal forms in Hebrew poetry ‘anything goes’ (cf. our observations in §1.4, where reference is made to these same verses). Talstra, instead, again proposes to analyze the verbal forms by taking into account the syntactic pattern in which they occur and this time concentrates on the specific verbal pattern of َيِقْتُل > َوَِّيَقْتُل, claiming that َوَِّيَقْتُل, if the actor continues to be the same, indicates consequence in this type of sequence. With this claim, Talstra is not only able to systematically account for the complex alternation of verbal forms in Ps 8.5–6, but also makes us aware of the importance of taking into account further linguistic parameters influencing the exact distribution of functions within specific clause patterns, such as the degree of continuity at the level of actors and participants.

All in all, Talstra’s approach is very promising in its attempt to do justice to poetry’s use of different verbal forms in a consistent manner. His publications provide us with useful starting points in our search for a systematic description of poetry’s use of verbal forms. They prove that the most convincing results are yielded when priority is given to an independent text-linguistic approach focusing on clause types and their position in syntactic patterns.

3.4 Research Hypotheses

3.4.1 Paradigmatic Functions of Verbal Forms and Clause Types

One of the central assumptions in this dissertation is that the use of the verbal forms in prose and poetry is regulated by one single verbal system. As we have shown in the previous section, Text Linguistics provides us with many new opportunities to both take this assumption as a valid claim and make it a starting point for further research. Especially helpful, in this regard, are the comments made by Niccacci and Talstra in their later publications, in which they point to the

303 The occurrences of the pattern ‘interrogative clause > ِيَقْتُل’ mentioned by Talstra are: Exod 3.11; Num 16.11; Judg 9.28,38; 2 Sam 19.35; 2 Kgs 8.13; Job 6.11, 21.15. Later on in his article, Talstra refers to the parallels between Ps 8.5–6 and Job 7.17–18, which, too, contains a sequence of an interrogative clause followed by a ِيَقْتُل clause. It is not clear to me why Talstra does not include Job 7.17 in his initial list of occurrences of the pattern ‘interrogative clause > ِيَقْتُل’.
observation that Hebrew poetry shares numerous correspondences with discursive prose when it comes to their respective preferences in the use of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system. Narrative texts show other preferences, but still should be regarded as making use of the same verbal system as the direct speech and poetic texts. As Niccacci and Talstra have rightly suggested, these observations can well be understood in terms of the text-linguistic views on the relation between the verbal functions and the type of communication as introduced by Weinrich and applied to Biblical Hebrew by Schneider, who showed that one of the paradigmatic functions played by Hebrew’s verbal forms is that of indicating the type of communication (‘linguistic attitude of the speaker’), which can be either a more distant one (narration) or a type of communication in which both speaker and audience are directly involved (direct speech).

In line with these findings, we consider the verbal system of Biblical Hebrew to consist of ‘spheres’ representing two types of communication, a narrative and a discursive one, both containing their own constellation of preferred forms, constructions and verbal patterns. It should be observed that the two modes of communication are not used in complete isolation from each other. As the studies on ‘Tempus-Übergänge’ and ‘tense shifts’ conducted by the formalists Schneider and Niccacci make clear, direct and repeating transitions between the modes of narrative and discursive communication are not rare in Biblical Hebrew prose. Thus, discursive prose texts may contain embedded narratives (cf. Schneider’s ‘Sprosserzählungen’), while in narratives we may find sudden transitions to discursive lines of communication, not only in the form of embedded direct speeches, in which case a new, discursive, line is opened, but also in the form of brief interrupting remarks (cf. Schneider’s ‘besprechendes erzählen’ or ‘engagierten erzählen’).

From the assumption that Biblical Hebrew prose and poetry share the same grammatical system, it can be derived that similar shifts in mode of communication can be found in poetic texts. While, as we stated above, poetry shares direct speech prose’s preferences regarding its use of the Hebrew verbal system, which entails that it tends to use the discursive forms and constructions (i.e.: the discursive subsystem) more extensively than the narrative ones, this does not mean that narrative forms and constructions making up the narrative subsystem and dominating in narrative prose are fully absent in the poetic texts (as they neither were in direct

---

304 See also: Joosten, J., *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the basis of Classical Prose* (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd, 2012), pp.411-435. Joosten characterizes the ascription of totally different functions to occurrences of the same verbal form in prose and in poetry as ‘poor methodology’ and, instead, works from the assumption ‘that verbal meanings in poetry are basically the same as in prose’. If the poets had used a different verbal system, or no system at all, ‘they could not have hoped to be understood by their contemporaries’ (pp.413-414). Joosten goes on to explain the differences between the use of verbal forms in prose and poetry by identifying a greater flexibility in language use, a preference for archaisms, and a stronger attestation of the author’s subjectivity as important characteristics of the latter genre (pp.414-416).

Contrary to the approach advocated in this dissertation, then, Joosten does not so much search for grammatical mechanisms that may account for the contrasting usages of the verbal forms in poetry and prose, but rather focuses on literary explanations. Indeed, his decision to take as his point of departure ‘the use of the single forms’ (p.421) does not seem to leave him with many other possibilities. However, by shifting the focus from the single verbal form to its broader syntactic context, the present study aims to create room for an analysis in which both poetry’s and prose’s usages of the verbal forms can be regarded as ‘grammatical’, i.e., as direct expressions of the verbal functions that are part of Biblical Hebrew’s grammatical system.
speech prose). Instead, in the discursive lines of poetic texts, too, we sometimes encounter embedded narrative sublines (Ps 18, 78; Exod 15). These embedded narrative lines can well be compared to the ‘Sprosserzählungen’ representing a shift to a narrative mode of communication in direct speech texts.

The two other text-linguistic functions of verbal forms identified by Weinrich and included by the text linguists in their description of the Hebrew verbal system – denoting linguistic perspective and denoting level of communication (grounding) – we consider being adequate categories helping us to systematically account for the use of the Hebrew verb form in both prosaic and poetic texts. Though we agree with Weinrich and Schneider that in direct speech (and poetry) ‘relief’, i.e. alternation between different lines of communication, is often created by other textual (and non-textual) elements than the verbs, we emphasize that Niccacci and Talstra have clearly shown that in discursive texts Hebrew’s verbal forms still fulfill the function of denoting the level of communication. The interaction between verbal forms and other textual elements in the creation of relief in discourse is a rather interesting one. Thus, in chapter 6, we will defend the claim that the use of explicit mainline-markers, like an interrogative pronoun, may overrule the default relief function of a verbal form by anchoring, for instance, an interrogative qatal clause in the mainline of communication.

Our views on the paradigmatic text-linguistic functions of Biblical Hebrew’s verbal forms will, to a large extent, be based on the findings done by the formalist text linguists whose work was reviewed in §3.3.3. For the systematic representation of these views, which will be elaborated upon in greater detail in chapter 6, we make use of an adapted version of Schneider’s schematic display of the Hebrew verbal system (fig. 3.1). The adapted scheme is presented in fig. 3.2.

![Fig. 3.2 Discourse-level functions of the Biblical Hebrew verbal forms](image)

At discourse level, Hebrew’s verbal forms function to denote values along three dimensions: mode of communication, level of communication and perspective. As the scheme indicates, the two dimensions of perspective, which is represented in different rows, and level of communication, which is represented in different colours (light-grey: foreground; dark-grey: background), overlap. The mainline verbal forms (yiqtol, imperative, and wayyiqtol) have a neutral perspectival value, while the background forms signal either retrospective or anticipating perspective.

As the scheme shows, we agree with Schneider that yiqtol and wayyiqtol represent the two ‘Haupttempora’, indicating mainline in discursive and narrative communications, respectively. Both forms are intrinsically neutral in perspective. In narrative communication, retrospective background information is expressed by qatal forms.
The scheme also reveals some minor disagreements between our hypotheses and those of Schneider and other formalists. Thus, we do not feel convinced by Schneider’s suggestion that ייקוט clauses are used to express anticipated information in narrative communication. Could it be that in such dependent narrative clauses, too, the main function of the ייקוט form is to mark a discursive mode of communication?

Of greater significance is the fact that we differ from Schneider and Niccacci in that we assume, as indicated, a direct relation between the dimensions of perspective and level of communication. More specifically, we hypothesize that the functional values of ‘indicating mainline’ and ‘expressing forward or backward perspective’ are mutually exclusive and so the mainline verbal forms (ייקוט, imperative, and והוריקוט) are to be assigned a neutral perspectival value. The background forms, on the other hand, are assumed to always signal either retrospective or anticipating perspective. Both in narrative and in discursive communication, background is expressed by קוטל forms. With regard to discursive communication, we make a distinction between קוטל forms conveying retrospective background information and וקוטל forms denoting forward perspective. Could it be that for the expression of forward perspective in narrative communication Biblical Hebrew uses other signals than that of the verbal form?

We agree with Talstra, who notes that the paradigmatic discourse functions presented in fig. 3.2 are not absolute, but are fulfilled by the verbal forms within the specific textual domain they are part of. Both functionalists and formalists have pointed to the fact that a verbal form’s function is frequently influenced by the pair or chain of clauses in which its clause stands. The significance of taking into account textual domains and syntactic verbal patterns is also hinted at by the scheme in fig. 3.2. Thus, the determination of the mode of communication denoted by a retrospective קוטל clause can only be based on the identification of the mode of communication that is signalled by the surrounding clauses belonging to the same textual domain: if the קוטל clause precedes or interrupts a narrative line of והוריקוטs, it should be assigned a retrospective narrative value, while in discursive domains it simply shares the reference to a discursive type of communication. Similarly, the distinction between retrospective and prospective וקוטל clauses can usually be based on the verbal pattern in which the וקוטל form occurs, as prospective (discursive) וקוטל clauses frequently continue a discursive mainline form (ייקוט or imperative), while retrospective וקוטל are often preceded by other retrospective clauses (both in narrative and in discursive communication).

The fact that the assignment of verbal functions largely depends on a verbal form’s position in specific verbal patterns necessarily causes our implementation of Weinrich’s three functional axes to be still rather vague. How exactly the verbal forms fulfill these three text-linguistic functions in a specific domain of discourse can only be determined on the basis of syntactic analyses of the verbal patterns in a text, which will be our topic of discussion in chapter 6.

However, Niccacci, in particular, has shown that it is not only higher-level syntax that plays a role when it comes to the functioning of verbal forms. Quite often, a verbal form’s position in its clause also contributes to the meaning of the verbal form, especially in ייקוט clauses, which entails that attention should be paid to clause-level syntax, too. We agree with Niccacci that if a ייקוט form takes initial position in a ייקוט clause (0-ייקוט, weייקוט), it can often be assigned a jussive or volitive meaning, while non-initial ייקוט forms (x-ייקוט, w-x-ייקוט), by default, express non-volitive values. With most text linguists, we claim that it would be better, in this regard, to speak of functions of clauses and clause-types rather than of verbal forms. Indeed, at the levels of both clause-level syntax and higher-level syntax, the central linguistic unit is not so much that
of the bare verbal form, but rather that of the clause. Thus, in the verbal patterns and syntactic hierarchies to which text linguists repeatedly refer, the syntactic relations to be detected and analyzed are not those between verbal forms, but rather those between clauses. This will become particularly clear in chapter 5, where we will show how in specific sequences of clauses volitive and non-volitive functions may be inherited or blocked.

As a final consideration regarding the discourse-level functionalities in terms of mode, level and perspective of communication, we raise the hypothesis that the default type of functionality marked by the verbal forms does not necessarily correspond to the discourse-level function of clauses as a whole. Could it be that, in rare cases, other non-verbal elements (such as interrogative pronouns and adverbs) play a role in the assignment of discourse functions to clauses? In that case, one could say that the practical concretization of the default functions takes place only at discourse level and should be regarded as functions fulfilled by clauses rather than by verbal forms.

### 3.4.2 The Syntagmatic Component

In this dissertation, it is assumed that for a consistent analysis of the verbal functions more precision is required in the area of higher-level syntax. It is at this point of the recognition and analysis of clause patterns, and the parameters regulating the distribution of functions in these patterns, that we expect to make some significant contributions.

Several text linguists have already paid attention to specific sequences of specific verbal forms, but a systematic, comprehensive analysis of clause patterns has not yet been conducted. Chapters 4 and 5 will deal with a category of clauses and clause sequences in which a more systematic approach in the study of clause relations yields significant results. More specifically, we will show how the clause-level syntax indeed, as is argued by Niccacci and most of his colleagues, helps us to distinguish between volitive and non-volitive *yiqtol* clauses, but at the same time does not enable us to provide a consistent analysis of all *yiqtol* clauses in this regard. In poetic texts, in particular, many *yiqtol* clauses are attested for which a ‘simple’ ascription of volitive or non-volitive functionality only on the basis of the position of the verbal form in the clause results in inadequate analyses. While Niccacci, making a similar observation, tried to account for at least some of the exceptional 0-*yiqtol* clauses in Hebrew poetry by introducing the concept of the double-duty modifier, we will deal with this problem in a more comprehensive way, which, in the end, is believed to enable us to identify a number of general processes that influence the distribution of volitive and non-volitive functionalities in specific clause pairs, especially (but not exclusively) in the poetic texts of the Hebrew Bible.

In chapter 6, we will offer a systematic description of all clause patterns, thereby focusing not so much on the distribution of volitive and non-volitive functionalities, but rather on the concrete realizations of the default text-linguistic functions identified by Schneider and his successors in each of these patterns. As Talstra already pointed out correctly, it is not sufficient to merely define a default, ‘fixed’ text-linguistic function for each of the verbal forms, but one rather has to identify the boundaries of the specific textual domain in which a clause takes its position in

---

[^305]: However, regarding text-linguistic functions as functions of clauses rather than of verbal forms, does not entail that, in general, the ascription of these functions should be based on other criteria than that of the verbal form. Thus, we do not agree with Niccacci in his claim that the position of the verbal form is a valid criterion for the assignment of different text-linguistic functions.
clause chains and is executing its functions. As will be explained at a later time, the embedding of textual domains is an iterative process and there virtually is no limit to the number of levels of embedding, which makes the identification of textual domains and subdomains both a complex and an indispensable step in the analysis of clause functions. The importance of concentrating on the specific clause connections that are attested within such textual (sub)domains becomes clear from the fact that, as the discussions about ‘tense shifts’ and ‘Tempus-Übergänge’ by text linguists suggest, most often it is exactly in its relation with other clauses that a clause attains the actual realization of its discourse function. Thus, while the default function of a qatal clause, according to the scheme in fig. 3.2, is that of expressing secondary-line retrospective information, the concrete realization of this function, which depends on the clause’s relations with other clauses, can be rather diverse, varying from that of introducing an argument for an assertion made at the absolute main level of communication (by yiqtol clauses or imperative clauses) to that of interrupting a narrative line of wayyiqtol clauses. This all entails that, again, a clause’s text-hierarchical position functions as a decisive parameter, determining, to a large extent, the precise function to be assigned to a clause.

By adding a systematic analysis of the syntagmatic component of the Hebrew verbal system to the text-linguistic analyses conducted by formalists like Schneider and Niccacci, we create room for a consistent interpretation of the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry. As will become clear, Hebrew poets have shown themselves to be highly inventive and skilled in their use of complex syntactic patterns and mechanisms. This may explain the difficulties encountered by many scholars in their attempts to offer satisfying descriptions of the verbal system attested in Hebrew poetry.

A final remark should be made here. We acknowledge that there may be some kind of circular logic in our reasoning, as we will use our analyses of Hebrew texts both to detect a number of syntactic mechanisms that should be added to the text-linguistic description of the Hebrew verbal system and, subsequently, to test the validity of our assumption that the discovered syntactic mechanisms do indeed operate in our texts. This way of dealing with our data, however, is unavoidable in any study of text corpora of dead languages, such as Biblical Hebrew. Besides, the current approach can be considered as only a natural reflection of any research process in which the source data are allowed to ‘speak for themselves’ and are not molded so as to fit in preconceived models and views. Our ‘cyclic’ approach has enabled us to keep increasing the level of consistency in our analyses.

3.4.3 Methods and Research Instruments

With our claim that a consistent description of the use of the Hebrew verbal forms in prose and poetry can only be reached if the study of the Hebrew verbal system is not limited to the functioning of verbal forms on clause level, but also incorporates the analysis of clause types and clause patterns at discourse level, we firmly position our research in the discipline of Text Linguistics. In the previous sections, we have repeatedly expressed our preference for a formalist-distributionalist approach in which the linguistic data and their distribution in linguistic patterns attested in the texts are taken as the starting point for the intended analyses. This preference links up with the claim of leading linguists, like Thomas Payne, that ‘real’ linguistic
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analysis starts from the empirical linguistic data and tries to look for grammatical patterns that occur in all texts (of all genres) produced in a given language.\(^{306}\)

The intention to let the texts speak for themselves, instead of imposing a preconceived model or interpretation on them, requires a systematic bottom-up approach, in which each linguistic level is systematically analyzed before the researcher moves on to the next one. As the research conducted by formalists, like Richter and Talstra, has shown, this requirement can be fulfilled by using the computer as a research instrument. Fortunately, we have been able to use the linguistic database developed since the late 1970s by the *Eep Talstra Centre for Bible and Computer* under the supervision of Eep Talstra and, since September 2012, Wido van Peursen. Since all analyses on the lower linguistic levels had been completed and stored in this database, we were able to directly move on to and concentrate on the highest linguistic level, namely that of the whole text. The electronic *ETCBC* database and the accompanying software enable us to conduct the type of text-hierarchical, form-to-function approach we aimed for and to systematically test our basic assumption that a clause’s position in the syntactic hierarchy of the text strongly influences its function. Thus, since the database contains syntactic clause hierarchies of almost all chapters of the Hebrew Bible, it can be used to detect both the clause patterns and the context in which they are positioned. At the same time, specific programs allow us to generate such syntactic hierarchies by ourselves, thus enabling us to critically (re)evaluate the clause connections attested in a given text.\(^{307}\)

The syntactic clause hierarchies serve as a basis for the collection and sorting of clause patterns attested in the Hebrew Bible. For the first step in this process of collecting and sorting we have conducted several queries on the data included in the *ETCBC* database.\(^{308}\) These queries have helped us to gain some initial insights into the syntactic mechanisms influencing the distribution of functionalities in specific clause pairs. In addition, we have ourselves developed a Java program enabling us to systematically test our hypotheses and to determine the concretized discourse level functions exhibited by all clauses in a given text. The goal of the Java program has been to make proposals with regard to the functionalities of clauses and clause patterns at all


\(^{307}\) In §3.3.3.4.1, we already referred to the program *syn04types*, which facilitates a clause-by-clause analysis of the chapter selected by the analyst. For each clause, the program presents one or more mother clauses in which it could be anchored. A clause’s possible mother clauses are ranked in order of probability. This ranking is based on multiple types of observations, including those of the grammatical and lexical correspondences between a clause and its possible mother clause, the number of earlier occurrences of a similar clause connection, and the distance (in clause atoms) between the two clauses. Eventually, it is the analyst who has to decide which of the proposed clause connections is the most adequate one. His or her decisions are tabulated in different levels of indentations reflecting parallel or dependent relations between connected clauses. For a more elaborate description of the type of computational analysis supported by *syn04types*, the reader is referred to: Winther-Nielsen, N., ‘The Miraculous Grammar of Joshua 3–4: Computer-aided Analysis of the Rhetorical and Syntactic Structure’, in: R.D. Bergen, *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, p.300–319; see also Talstra, E., ‘Text, Tradition, Theology. The Example of the Book of Joel’, in: E. Van der Borgh & P. van Geest (eds.), *Strangers and Pilgrims on Earth. Essays in Honour of Abraham van de Beek* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp.322ff.

\(^{308}\) Most of the queries and their results can be found and re-executed at the [shebanq.ancient-data.org](http://shebanq.ancient-data.org) website.
textual levels. These proposals have been based on calculations made at different levels.\textsuperscript{309} First, the program defines a clause’s clause-level functionalities in terms of expressing volitivity and non-volitivity. It does so by initially assigning to each of the clauses a default function on the basis of the type of the verbal form, its position in the clause and the presence of morphological markings (cf. chapter 4) and, subsequently, identifying and analyzing the higher-level syntactic processes\textsuperscript{310} (cf. chapter 5) that may affect this default function. When it has determined a clause’s final volitive or non-volitive function, the program goes on to calculate the concrete text-linguistic functions which the clause executes at discourse level. An important part of this stage is the delimitation of textual domains within which a clause fulfills its discourse functions.\textsuperscript{311} The final product generated by the program is a suggested rendering\textsuperscript{312} of all verbal forms and a sorted list of all clause patterns attested in the chapter under investigation. In the end, the lists of clause patterns generated for all chapters that have been analyzed are assembled in an online ‘Concordance of Clause Patterns’ containing a sorted list of all occurrences of each clause pattern attested in the Psalms. For each occurrence in this concordance, a brief analysis is provided of the clause-level and discourse-level functions fulfilled by the clauses making up the pattern and of the parameters and syntactic mechanisms that have affected the assignment of these functions. In this way, we aim to make clear how the exact function of a clause is influenced not only by the mother clause, but also by larger patterns and other textual elements in the broader context.

\textsuperscript{309} Some of the calculations are made with the help of interactive procedures in which the user or analyst is asked to input some observations that cannot be made by the program itself. This mainly applies to calculations with respect to participant references and semantic correspondences between clauses.

\textsuperscript{310} The most significant part of the analysis of these syntactic mechanisms entails making observations with regard to parameters that may activate these mechanisms. Parameters studied by the program at this level are, inter alia, the presence of coordinate conjunctions, the presence of multiple-duty modifiers (see §5.3), (dis)continuation of the subject, (dis)continuation in the set of participants, the presence of negations, and the constituent type of preverbal elements.

\textsuperscript{311} Additional parameters taken into account by the program at this level include the presence of subordinate conjunctions and relative pronouns, the presence of macro-syntactic signals, the presence of ‘mainline-marking’ elements, the presence of vocatives, the presence of transitions in the type of communication as marked by alternation of 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person and 3\textsuperscript{rd}-person references, and the type of participant references (explicit vs. implicit subject, etc.).

\textsuperscript{312} In this dissertation and in the output provided by the program, we have tried to be more or less systematic in our mapping of Hebrew and English verb forms. Thus, yiqtol forms have been rendered by a present tense form, wayyiqtol forms by a simple past tense form, qatal forms by a present perfect or past perfect form, and prospective weqatal forms by a simple future form. Of course, we do not suggest a one-to-one relation between the functions of these Hebrew and English forms. However, we consider these English forms to be the most appropriate representations in the English language of the given default discourse functions of the Hebrew forms. Indeed, these basic renderings can and should be further specified on the basis of the analysis of the clause patterns in which the forms are positioned, the identification of non-verbal elements present in the clause itself and the detection of other contextual parameters.
4. Morphological and Syntactic Marking of Volitivity and Non-Volitivity

4.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, we have adopted a rather sceptical attitude with regard to attempts of Hebraists to describe the functions of Biblical Hebrew's verbal forms in terms of modality. The expression of modality in Biblical Hebrew indeed is quite a complicated issue. As we will argue below, we deem it possible to assign some specific default types of modal nuances to certain forms in Biblical Hebrew on the basis of their formal features. However, since such direct form-function correlations can only be made in a limited number of cases, the phenomenon of modality simultaneously encourages us to experiment with a new approach in which verbal functions are related not only to isolated forms, but also to broader syntactic patterns. Thus, this chapter describes a first attempt to search for regularity in syntactic patterns and to take that as a basis for the analysis of the Biblical Hebrew verb.

As we saw, some scholars maintain that Biblical Hebrew's distinction between a prefix and a suffix conjugation corresponds to a functional distinction between, respectively, a modal and a non-modal, indicative subsystem, thereby associating the functionality of expressing modality with one of the verbal conjugations. Important advocates of such an approach are Jan Joosten and Galia Hatav. Both scholars identify *yiqtol* and *weqatal* as modal tenses. It is interesting to see that the modal analyses of Joosten and Hatav have their origins in the description of Hebrew's verbal functions in terms of (absolute) tense. Both scholars point out that one of the default functionalities of *yiqtol* and *weqatal* is that of expressing future tense. Subsequently, it is reasoned that, as the expression of future perspective is essentially a modal function, it may well be that the functionality of expressing modal mood also helps us to account for uses of *yiqtol* and *weqatal* that cannot be explained in terms of (future) tense.

Indeed, the range of modal meanings that can be expressed by *yiqtol* or *weqatal* is virtually unlimited. In her work, Hatav provides the reader with examples of widely diverging usages of the *yiqtol* form. Thus, *yiqtol* may not only express absolute and relative future, but may also be used as a directive, for the expression of habituality in present and past, and for the introduction of generics. Next to the fact that it is quite difficult to see how each of these functions is exactly a modal one, – why, for example, are general statements to be labelled modal, and how does Hatav link the expression of habituality, which seems to be an aspectual function, to the modal meaning of the modal forms? – most of her analyses lack explanatory power. Gen 2.24, for example, is translated by Hatav as follows:

---


314 Although explicitly claiming that Biblical Hebrew is ‘an untensed language’ (p.161), Hatav agrees with tense-oriented theories by stating that ‘the forms *yiqtol* and *wqatal* appear in future clauses’ (p.143) and that ‘the two forms may also report future situations relative to other points of time’ (p.144).
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That is why a man leaves his father and mother, and is united to his wife, and the two become one flesh.

Now, why should these statements be labelled ‘modal’? Hatav explains that the clauses report a generic behaviour of people, but how exactly is that a modal function? Furthermore, if *yiqtol* and *weqatal* are modal forms, how can we decide that they indeed function to express a general meaning in these clauses, instead of, for example, providing a directive (‘that is why a man *should leave* his father and mother’), or expressing relative future (‘that is why (from that moment on) a man *would be leaving* his father and mother’), or denoting habituality (‘that is why a man *is used to leave* his father and mother’)? Moreover, is there any functional difference between *yiqtol* and *weqatal* (why, for example, does the author use a *weqatal* clause instead of a *w-x-yiqtol* clause?) or are they both to be analyzed simply as ‘modal forms’?

An equally random-looking analysis provided by Hatav concerns her interpretation of Num 11.5. Here, we find a *yiqtol* clause which, according to Hatav, expresses past habituality:

> We remember the fish, which we used to eat in Egypt for free.

If at all we accept Hatav’s view that the expression of past habituality should be seen as a type of modal functionality (though the expression of habitually is, in fact, an aspectual function), what, then, is it that helps us to decide that the *yiqtol* form indeed denotes past habituality here? It seems possible as well to assume that the *yiqtol* clause expresses a possibility (‘we remember the fish we *could eat*...’) or a tolerative modality (‘we remember the fish we *were allowed to eat*...’).

To summarize, this type of analyses in terms of mood (and aspect) not only invokes the impression that, in the end, the verbal form can mean anything – ‘anything goes’ – but also makes the (context-dependent) assignment of a specific (modal) functionality to a verbal form a highly subjective and arbitrary activity. If the expression of modality in all of the diverging forms identified by Hatav is the only core function shared by *yiqtols* and *weqatals*, does that really point in the direction of a complete verbal system? Moreover, Hatav herself, even though she broadens the category of modal functionality in such a way that it comprises a wide range of meanings for which a common (functional) ground can hardly be identified, has to admit that her corpus contains examples of usages of the ‘modal’ forms (*yiqtol* and *weqatal*) in non-modal clauses. Furthermore, she feels forced to argue that non-modal forms (*qatal* and *qotel*) may also express modality and that it is not always clear why these non-modal forms have been used instead of the modal ones.  

---

In the end, then, making a functional distinction between the verbal conjugations on the basis of the category of mood does not really help us. While theories like those of Joosten and Hatav rightly suggest that the Biblical Hebrew verbal system has its means to express modal meanings, they are too imprecise both in their definition of modality and in their identification of the formal features that mark modality. Before presenting our own views with regard to Biblical Hebrew’s verbal expression of modality, let us first make some more general comments about the concept of modality.

### 4.2 Modality and Linguistic Marking of Modal Meaning

Clear definitions of the concept of modality can be found in the work of the linguist Frank Robert Palmer and the Hebraist Agustinus Gianto. They explain that there is a difference between mood, which is to be seen as a grammatical category, and modality, which is a semantic category. In other words, moods function as formal features marking modal meanings. Linguists rarely agree about the number of modal categories they distinguish. From their theories it appears that they even find it difficult to reach consensus about the exact differences between modality and indicativity. However, we will adopt, in this regard, the views expressed by Lyons and his later successors, like Palmer, who state that the indicative mood is used for declarative statements, while modal utterances communicate the opinion or attitude of the speaker. Lyons specifies that modal utterances are to be defined as ‘non-factive utterances’, while ‘straightforward statements of fact’, that is: categorical assertions, should be regarded as ‘epistemically non-modal’.

Most linguists distinguish between (at least) two subcategories of modality: deontic modality and epistemic modality. Though linguists differ about their definition of these categories, the analysis offered by Jespersen, who in the 1920s identified two sets of modal meanings without using the terms ‘deontic’ and ‘epistemic’, is generally taken as a starting point. Jespersen distinguishes between modal statements containing an element of will and modal statements containing no element of will. In line with this classification, statements which express deontic modality can be regarded as expressing the speaker’s intention or will with regard to the realization of the action or event they introduce. Several subtypes of deontic modality may be distinguished, like voluntative, exhortative, tolerative and obligative modality. Statements which express epistemic modality, on the other hand, can be seen as concerning the necessity or possibility of the truth of the proposition and expressing a subjective attitude with respect to that
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318 Lyons, *Semantics*, pp.794–796; See also Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, pp.17–18, who, to a large extent, seems to adopt Lyons’ views, though he adds that the study of modality is not concerned only with non-factuality.


truth. Examples of subtypes of epistemic modality are dubitative, assumptive and declarative modality.

In many languages, modality is expressed with verbal morphology, while other languages use modal (auxiliary) verbs or other particles to do so. As Gianto rightly points out, Biblical Hebrew is one of the languages that does not only use the verb to express these different types of modality, but also makes use of particles to mark modal meanings. Particles such as ו, י, ו, and נ, for example, represent important markers of deontic modality, while adverbs like י and can be identified as signals of epistemic modality.

In his article, Gianto follows Joosten and Hatav by introducing a very broad range of modalities that can be expressed by the yiqtol form. We criticized the work of Joosten and Hatav for not providing us with clear formal criteria on the basis of which we can decide which modal function should be assigned to a specific yiqtol form. Gianto’s work does not really change this situation, as he argues that many subtypes of modality, both deontic and epistemic modality, can be expressed by yiqtol and qatal. As a result, the assignment of either deontic or epistemic modal functionalities to Hebrew’s verbal forms remains very much a matter of subjectivity, as contextual factors and personal interpretation of the texts’ meaning continue to play a determinative role. No formal criteria are given that help us to decide which of the two types of modality (let alone which of the many modal subtypes) is expressed by a specific verbal form.

As we already indicated, these problems create room for a new experiment in which parameters other than that of the individual verbal form are studied as markers of specific types of (modal) functionality. Though, as we will claim in §4.3.5, the assignment of modal meaning to verbal forms is indeed often a matter of context-based, pragmatic interpretation and should not be regarded as necessarily emerging from a presupposed modal functionality of, for instance, the yiqtol form, we will show that specific types of modal functions are grammatically marked by formal patterns attested at different syntactic levels higher than that of the isolated verbal form. Yet, Biblical Hebrew does contain a set of forms that are intrinsically modal, namely the imperative, the cohortative and the jussive. It is around these three deontic modal forms that a theory of modal functionality expressed by the Biblical Hebrew verb can and should be developed. As will become clear, it is not sufficient in this regard to restrict one’s attention to morphology, as has been done by many scholars. Instead, syntactic patterns attested at the level of the clause (and at even higher levels) should be taken into account.

4.3 Morphological and Syntactic Marking of Deontic Modality

4.3.1 Volitive Verb-initial Yiqtol Clauses vs. Non-volitive Non-verb-initial Yiqtol Clauses

When we take the volitional forms as our starting point, one of the first difficulties we have to deal with is the morphological marking of the jussive form. In Biblical Hebrew, the formal distinction between the jussive short form yiqtol and the non-jussive long form yiqtol is preserved only for a small category of verbs:

- for verbs having a י or a י as the second radical of their root (the so-called ‘hollow verbs‘): in jussive forms the י or י is not realized, not even defectively, while in non-jussive long forms it is.
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- for verbs having a נ as the last radical of their root: in jussive forms the נ (together with the vowel preceding it) is elided (‘apocopate form’), while in non-jussive long forms it is not.
- for the Hiphil stem of all verbs, except for those verbs having a נ as the final radical in their root or having a similar second and third radical in their root: in jussive forms the ה and the hireq characterizing the Hiphil stem are replaced by a tseré, a segol, or (for verbs having a guttural as their final root radical) a patach.

For most of the יִקְטְוָל forms, however, morphological analysis is of no help in determining whether they are jussive or not, as they are always realized as a ‘long form’ and simply do not have a ‘short form’ counterpart. Does this mean that for detecting jussive meanings we again have to refer to contextual analyses and (necessarily subjective) interpretations of the text’s contents? Or does Biblical Hebrew use other means to mark jussive function?

In this dissertation, we will show that this is indeed the case. Our approach is inspired by Alviero Niccacci, who has pointed out that paying attention to the bare verbal form alone is not sufficient. It is not only the type of the verbal form (יִקְטְוָל) that matters, but also its position within a clause. Niccacci is right when he observes that if the יִקְטְוָל takes initial position (0-יִקְטְוָל/wayiqtol), it can often be assigned a jussive meaning.\(^{321}\) For this reason, we consider the marking of jussive functionality to be a characteristic not so much of the bare יִקְטְוָל form, but rather of the clause type in which the יִקְטְוָל form is embedded.

The jussive, together with the cohortative and the imperative, belongs to the class of volitive forms. In line with Jespersen’s definition of the categories of deontic modality and epistemic modality, we consider the designations ‘volitivity’ and ‘deontic modality’ to be interchangeable terms referring to the same class of statements expressing the speaker’s will. Consequentially, the class of volitional statements not only encompasses cohortative, jussive and imperative statements, but also, for instance, permissives, intentional or purpose clauses, and desiderative clauses.\(^{322}\)

Our basic argument will be that all verb-initial יִקְטְוָל clauses (1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-person\(^{323}\)) have the default function of expressing deontic modality, i.e.: expressing the will or volition of the speaker. In other words, 1st-person 0-יִקְטְוָל clauses and weyiqtols have as their default meaning the expression of cohortativity, while 2nd- and 3rd-person 0-יִקְטְוָל clauses and weyiqtols have a
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\(^{322}\) In this dissertation the term ‘jussive’ is used for the short יִקְטְוָל form and for a subset of meanings that can be expressed by this form. Thus, contrary to what has become customary among Hebraists, we do not use the label ‘jussive’ to refer to the whole range of functionalities that may be assigned to the jussive form. Instead, we identify the jussive form’s functions, like those of the cohortative form, as ‘volitive’, as this enables us to account in our terminology for the non-jussive, volitional meanings the jussive form may attain.

\(^{323}\) We radically differ from Hebraists like Niccacci and Joosten, who apply the syntactic criterion of clause-initial position of the verb form only to 2nd- and 3rd-person יִקְטְוָל clauses, stating that a prefixed verbal form in clause-initial position is in principle to be considered as a *jussive* (Joosten, ‘A Neglected Rule’, p.213, *my italics*). In other words, Niccacci and Joosten do not use the criterion of the position of the verbal form for a general distinction between deontic modality and non-volitivity, but use it only to distinguish between jussive and non-jussive meaning.
default jussive meaning. All verb-initial yiqtol clauses, however, may also express other types of deontic modality, such as desiderativity (as do many 3rd-person 0-yiqtol clauses) and intentionality / purposivity (which is often expressed by a weyiqtol daughter clause having as its subject another participant than its mother clause).324

On the other hand, yiqtol clauses having the yiqtol form in non-initial position (x-yiqtol, w-x-yiqtol) share the default function of introducing statements that are not deontically modal. More specifically, we propose to take Lyons’ and Palmer’s definition of indicative statements as the default value for these non-volitive yiqtol clauses, thus assuming that they usually bring to expression factual, declarative assertions. This does not mean that these yiqtol clauses cannot express modality – in fact: Joosten and Hatav provide clear examples of (non-volitive) modal (w-)x-yiqtol clauses – but it should be noted that modal meanings of such clauses in general are not marked grammatically (i.e.: morphologically, syntactically or by the use of modal particles) and can therefore only be identified on the basis of analyses of the context, as we explained in our discussion of the work of Joosten and Hatav (§4.1). However, we will first of all search for regularities at the basic level of grammatical marking. Therefore, it is appropriate to assign to the yiqtol clauses in which the verbal form does not take initial position the simple default value of expressing non-volitive, factual and declarative statements.

As we have stated in chapter 3, the only functionalities that are inherent to the yiqtol form itself are of a text-linguistic nature. Thus, we agreed with Weinrich and Schneider that the yiqtol form signals a discursive type of communication and conveys information that belongs to the mainline or foreground of the communication and is directly relevant in this current communication between speaker and addressee. In her book on modality, Palmer explains that the two subcategories of modality – deontic and epistemic modality – are interrelated because both types of modality in the end mark the involvement of the speaker in the actual communication.325 Therefore, since it is indeed the default discourse function of the yiqtol form to strongly involve the speaker and the addressee in the actual communication, clauses containing the yiqtol form may be regarded as the most appropriate type of clauses for the expression of (deontic) modal nuances.

Our analysis of the functions of yiqtol clauses in terms of volitivity is based on an innovative type of distributionalist research. However, an interesting, somehow comparable contribution in this regard has been made by Ahouva Shulman, whose work will be discussed below.

4.3.2 Ahouva Shulman

324 Contra Vegas Montaner, ‘Masoretic Tradition and Syntactic Analysis of the Psalms’, in: W.Th. Van Peursen & J.W. Dyk, Tradition and Innovation in Biblical Interpretation (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp.317–335, esp. pp.321–326. According to Vegas Montaner the weyiqtol clause’s sequential (instead of parallel) meanings are marked by the position of the nominal element x. In yiqtol > weyiqtol sequences, for instance, a weyiqtol clause, according to Vegas Montaner, expresses sequentiality when the nominal phrase is located in the yiqtol mother clause, while it expresses synonymous parallelism when the nominal phrase is included in the weyiqtol clause. However, as we will show in the next chapters, the parameter of continuation of the same subject is a far more reliable measure point in this regard: if within such yiqtol > weyiqtol sequences the subject changes, the weyiqtol clause usually denotes purposive meaning, but if the subject remains the same the weyiqtol clause simply coordinates the volitive 0-yiqtol (or non-volitive x-yiqtol) clause.

325 Palmer, Mood and Modality, pp.96, 121.
Shulman’s article ‘The Function of the “Jussive” and “Indicative” Imperfect Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose’ is a response to recent tendencies to link, like we did above, the expression of modality to the criterion of the position of the verbal form in the clause. She criticizes those scholars who, putting all focus on the syntactic component, have argued that morphological marking of indicative and modal forms in Biblical Hebrew is non-functional in that the use of the short jussive form, for instance, no longer signals (deontic) modal functionality. As an illustration, Shulman refers to the work of P.J. Gentry, who claims that the only (functional) difference between the short and the long yiqtol form is an aspectual one, the first indicating perfective aspect and the second denoting imperfective aspect.\(^{326}\)

In her article, Shulman aims to make clear that the morphological distinction between short and long forms continues to correspond with a semantic distinction between volitive and non-volitive meanings. First of all, Shulman proposes to make a distinction between the concepts of ‘locutionary act’ – i.e.: the act of saying something – and ‘illocutionary act’ or ‘speech act’ – i.e.: the act performed in saying something. With respect to this second category, she separates between direct and indirect speech acts and explains how commands, for instance, can be uttered directly in imperative clauses (direct speech act) and indirectly in non-imperative statements (indirect speech act). According to Shulman, the jussive short forms express deontic modality and, as such, express the will of the speaker, thereby performing the direct speech act of giving orders. On the other hand the indicative long forms express epistemic modality and convey the speaker’s knowledge or certainty, thereby performing the direct speech act of ‘making a statement, a categorical assertion’. Indirectly, such epistemic modal statements may function as commands, but they are not formally marked as such. We will come back to this in §4.3.5.

Shulman convincingly illustrates all this in a discussion in which she contrasts 3\(^{rd}\)-person jussive 0-yiqtol clauses and 2\(^{nd}\)- and 3\(^{rd}\)-person prohibitive 3\(^{rd}\)-yiqtol clauses, on the one hand, with indicative 3\(^{rd}\)-person x-yiqtol clauses and 2\(^{nd}\)- and 3\(^{rd}\)-person š-qiqtol clauses on the other hand, thereby paying attention in particular to those (juridical and procedural) contexts in which the non-volitive, indicative forms appear to express (indirect) commands.

Yet, Shulman’s decision to analyze all non-jussive yiqtols as fulfilling the function of expressing epistemic modality causes some serious problems, as it eventually forces her to identify the direct speech act performed by these clauses as ‘the act of telling the people what they will do in the future’.\(^{327}\) By maintaining that non-volitive yiqtols by definition express epistemic modality, Shulman, not knowing how else to account for the ‘modal’ aspect of meaning, feels compelled to introduce a future tense element in her theory, although she has to admit that it ‘is difficult to say that we can make statements about the future’. Consequentially, Shulman, in the end, cannot but characterize these clauses as predictions and promises rather than categorical assertions.\(^{328}\)

We claim that these problems can be avoided when we restrict ourselves to labelling the non-deontic modal clauses simply as ‘non-volitive’, instead of ‘epistemically modal’. Above, we already explained that we propose to regard such non-volitive clauses that do not contain an element of will, as having the basic value of expressing declarative and factual statements, of categorical assertions (‘it is so’). On the basis of contextual features and interpretations, these
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328 Shulman, ‘Function of the “Jussive” and “Indicative” Imperfect Forms’, pp.173, 177, 179.
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clauses may subsequently be assigned a modal meaning, but that modal meaning is (in most instances) not grammatically or lexically (i.e.: by the use of modal particles) marked and should therefore be seen as a secondary, derived meaning. Moreover, these \(w\)-\(yiqtol\) clauses definitively do not always refer to a future situation. Take, for example, Gen 3.2, where Eve says to the snake:

\[
[\text{Pr}] \text{נ כל} [\text{Co}] \text{גַּן} \text{-ה עץ פ י מ}^2
\]

\(xYq0\)

2 From the fruit of any tree in the garden we can eat.

It seems appropriate to assign, on the basis of the context, a non-volitive modal (i.e.: epistemic modal) meaning to this \(yiqtol\) clause, but interpreting the \(yiqtol\) clause as conveying a promise or a prediction, as Shulman is forced to do, appears to be impossible.

In the next section, we will show how Shulman’s approach, which focuses on morphological marking of modality, can be complemented with the syntactic component described in §4.3.1. A significant difference between our approach and that of Shulman is that we deem our conclusions to be applicable to Biblical Hebrew in general and will therefore also refer to examples taken from Hebrew poetry, while Shulman decided to exclude the poetic texts from her corpus, ‘since prose and poetry have different linguistic features.’

4.3.3 Morphological and Syntactic Marking of Deontic Modality

In this section, we will show that morphological and syntactic marking of deontic modality do not exclude each other, but, in most instances, are convergent in that, if possible, they are both realized. Our discussion will be subdivided into three parts based on the person of the subject

---

330 We do not share Qimron’s view in this regard. According to Qimron, this correspondence between morphology and syntax should not be related to any semantical and functional distinctions. While originally the short \(yiqtol\) form expressed volitive/optative meanings and the long \(yiqtol\) form had a non-volitive value, in Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, this correlation of form and function is no longer attested. To Qimron’s opinion, the alternation of the two morphological forms in Biblical Hebrew and in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls no longer serves to mark functional differences, but rather depends on the position of the verbal form in the clause. Thus, if the form takes initial position, Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew language of the Dead Sea Scrolls both typically use the short form, while the long form is used when the form is not in clause-initial position. See: Qimron, E., ‘A New Approach to the Use of Forms of the Imperfect without Personal Endings’, in: T. Muraoka & J.F. Elwolde (Eds.), The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira. Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp.174–181; see esp. pp.177,181.

A somehow similar approach is defended by Van Peursen in his book The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira (Leiden: Brill, 2004), who argues, with Qimron, that ‘the original [classical Hebrew, GK] semantic contrast marked by the short and full impf. was abandoned during the biblical period’, in which the two forms ‘became allomorphs, the use of which was conditioned by their position in the clause’ (p.91, cf. p.96). Subsequently, Van Peursen goes on to demonstrate how this new system, which is completed based on syntactic considerations, was fully developed in Qumran Hebrew (p.92ff). In contrast with Qimron, Van Peursen identifies the disappearance of a functional distinction between the long and the short imperfect as quite a ‘late’ development, of which initial traces can be found in the late Biblical books of, for example, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah (p.96), but which only reached its completion in the Qumranic period. From this point of view, it can still be defended that for the major part of the Hebrew Bible morphology and syntax
of the *yiqtol* clause. Let us start with 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses in which volitive functionality is marked morphologically and/or syntactically.

### 4.3.3.1 1st-person Volitive *Yiqtol*

In most instances of volitive 1st-person *yiqtol*, syntactic and morphological marking of volitive functionality are both present, if possible. In quite a number of cases, however, the use of morphological cohortative-marking is rendered impossible, as the *yiqtol* form has a י as its third root radical or has a pronominal suffix attached to it. One could very well say that in these instances, syntactic marking accounts for the inability of Hebrew morphology to mark volitivity. An example of a cohortative *yiqtol* form derived from a verb with י as its third radical can be found in Gen 1.26:

\[
\text{Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over the cattle.}
\]

A 1st-person verbal form ending with a suffix and having a cohortative meaning is attested in Gen 29.18:

\[
\text{Let me serve you seven years for your younger daughter Rachel.}
\]

Our assumption that syntactic marking is used to mark volitivity not only in 2nd- and 3rd-person *yiqtol* clauses, but also in 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses is supported by the observation that among the 52 occurrences of 1st-person *0-yiqtol* in the books of Genesis and Exodus, we find only four instances in which a morphological marking of the cohortative, despite being possible, is not realized. In three of them, the 0-*yiqtol* clause indeed seems to have volitive meaning, while the other occurrence concerns a 0-*yiqtol* clause which does not contain any other constituents than the verbal form itself and presents an affirmative answer to a direct question. For *weyiqtol*
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32\(^{nd}\) and 32\(^{rd}\)-person *yiqtol* clauses, but also in 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses is supported by the observation that among the 52 occurrences of 1st-person 0-*yiqtol* in the books of Genesis and Exodus, we find only four instances in which a morphological marking of the cohortative, despite being possible, is not realized. In three of them, the 0-*yiqtol* clause indeed seems to have volitive meaning, while the other occurrence concerns a 0-*yiqtol* clause which does not contain any other constituents than the verbal form itself and presents an affirmative answer to a direct question. For *weyiqtol*
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32\(^{nd}\) and 32\(^{rd}\)-person *yiqtol* clauses, but also in 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses is supported by the observation that among the 52 occurrences of 1st-person 0-*yiqtol* in the books of Genesis and Exodus, we find only four instances in which a morphological marking of the cohortative, despite being possible, is not realized. In three of them, the 0-*yiqtol* clause indeed seems to have volitive meaning, while the other occurrence concerns a 0-*yiqtol* clause which does not contain any other constituents than the verbal form itself and presents an affirmative answer to a direct question. For *weyiqtol*
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32\(^{nd}\) and 32\(^{rd}\)-person *yiqtol* clauses, but also in 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses is supported by the observation that among the 52 occurrences of 1st-person 0-*yiqtol* in the books of Genesis and Exodus, we find only four instances in which a morphological marking of the cohortative, despite being possible, is not realized. In three of them, the 0-*yiqtol* clause indeed seems to have volitive meaning, while the other occurrence concerns a 0-*yiqtol* clause which does not contain any other constituents than the verbal form itself and presents an affirmative answer to a direct question. For *weyiqtol*

---

32\(^{nd}\) and 32\(^{rd}\)-person *yiqtol* clauses, but also in 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses is supported by the observation that among the 52 occurrences of 1st-person 0-*yiqtol* in the books of Genesis and Exodus, we find only four instances in which a morphological marking of the cohortative, despite being possible, is not realized. In three of them, the 0-*yiqtol* clause indeed seems to have volitive meaning, while the other occurrence concerns a 0-*yiqtol* clause which does not contain any other constituents than the verbal form itself and presents an affirmative answer to a direct question. For *weyiqtol*
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32\(^{nd}\) and 32\(^{rd}\)-person *yiqtol* clauses, but also in 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses is supported by the observation that among the 52 occurrences of 1st-person 0-*yiqtol* in the books of Genesis and Exodus, we find only four instances in which a morphological marking of the cohortative, despite being possible, is not realized. In three of them, the 0-*yiqtol* clause indeed seems to have volitive meaning, while the other occurrence concerns a 0-*yiqtol* clause which does not contain any other constituents than the verbal form itself and presents an affirmative answer to a direct question. For *weyiqtol*
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clauses the score is even better: in all of the 72 1st-person weyiqtol clauses attested in the book of Genesis, the cohortative marking, if possible, is realized. Interestingly, in poetry we find relatively more instances in which syntactic marking and morphological marking do not match. Thus, archaic poetry in particular, but later poetic texts too, contain multiple examples of 1st-person 0-yiqtol and weyiqtol clauses in which a morphological marking of the cohortative, though possible, is not realized. Take, for instance, the following series of 0-yiqtol clauses in Exod 15.9:

9 The enemy has said:
“Let me pursue,
let me overtake,
let me divide the spoil,
let my soul have its fill of them,
let me draw my sword,
let my hand destroy them!”

or the paragraph opening 0-yiqtol clause in Ps 16.7:

7 Let me bless YHWH,
who gives me counsel.

It appears that in poetry syntactic marking and morphological marking do not always converge, but that the former may render the use of the latter unnecessary. The claim that in poetry syntax and morphology do not need to correspond when it comes to their marking of (non-)volitive functionality is further supported by the observation that in the Book of Psalms, we find 23 examples of yiqtol forms that are morphologically marked as cohortative, yet do not take initial position in the clause. Though the number of volitive 0-yiqtol clauses in which morphological and

58 And they said to her:
“Will you go with this man?”
and she said:
“Yes, I want to/will go!”
syntactic marking do converge is significantly higher, this fact may point to a shift in the interaction between syntax and morphology in poetic texts where the two seem to function more independently from each other than is the case in prose. Indeed, only eight out the total sum of fifty examples in the Hebrew Bible of morphologically marked cohortatives that do not take clause-initial position are attested in discursive prose. Moreover, the type of elements preceding the verbal form in the cohortative *yiqtol* clauses is quite uniform in these prosaic texts: it is either a modifier\(^{333}\) or a constituent whose fronting has the pragmatic function of placing focus on it.\(^{334}\) In the poetic examples, on the other hand, we find many different types of preverbal elements, whose fronted position does not always appear to have a pragmatic function. Moreover, the number of constituents preceding the cohortative *yiqtol* form in the poetic examples is often higher than one. Interestingly, quite some cohortative non-verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses in poetry contain a *yiqtol* form of the verbs זָמַן (6), יֶשֶׁר (3) or שִׁפְחָה (4). Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 89.2, where two constituents precede the cohortative *yiqtol* form:

\[
\text{[<Pr> יָשִׁיר יְהוָה] [<Ti> עֹלֶל] [<Ob> יָשִׁיר] \text{ xYq0}} \]

\(^{2}\) Let me forever sing of the steadfast love of YHWH!

and in Ps 144.9, which contains two cohortative *x-yiqtol* clauses:

\[
\text{[<Vo> אֲלֹהֵי] \text{ Voct}} \]

\[
\text{[<Co> יְשֵׁר חַדְשָׁי] [<Pr> יָשִׁיר] [<Ob> אֲשִׁירָה] \text{ xYq0}} \]

\[
\text{[<Co> בִּנְבַלְוּ ישָׁשֵׁר] [<Aj> אָסָמְחָה] [<Pr> זַמָּה] \text{ xYq0}} \]

\(^{9}\) God,

let me sing a new song for you,

let me play to you upon a ten-stringed harp!

To summarize, in poetry the syntactic marking of deontic modality in 1\(^{st}\)-person *yiqtol* clauses appears to be required only when morphological marking of cohortativity is not used. The other way around, this non-realization of morphological marking does not always result from morphological restrictions (e.g.: use of suffix or ה as final root radical). In a number of poetic texts, syntactic marking simply seems to render the morphological marking unnecessary. Though syntactic and morphological marking in poetry most often go together like they do in prose, the numerous poetic examples in which only one of the two is realized lead us to conclude that in poetry, syntax and morphology are less strictly required to converge.\(^{335}\) The importance of syntactic analysis was already revealed in our observation that syntactic marking accounts for the inability of Biblical Hebrew to consistently mark volitivity or cohortativity by morphological marking: in general, when morphological marking is not realized, for whatever reason, syntactic marking makes clear that the form indeed has to be assigned a volitive meaning. In other words, 1\(^{st}\)-person 0-*yiqtol* and *wayiqtol* clauses have a default volitive

\(^{333}\) Gen 34.23 (ך); Exod 32.30 (ך); Deut 2.28 (ך); 2 Sam 18.14 (ך).

\(^{334}\) Gen 22.5, 33.14; 2 Sam 6.22. The only exception to this seems to be the *x-yiqtol* clause in Num 20.19, where the fronted adjunct יְהִינָה does not bear focus.

\(^{335}\) One could imagine, for instance, that metrical considerations sometimes favour a syntactic marking rather than a morphological one.
meaning. In some instances, especially in poetry, however, this default meaning does not seem to be actualized and the verb-initial *yiqtol* clause has a non-volitive function. Take, for instance, Ps 22.17–18:

```
[<Su> כְָּלְבִּים] [<PO> סֶבֶּבֹּנִי] [<Cj> כי] [<Ob> עצְָּםִי] [<Pr> סֶפֶּר] 17 xQtX
```

17 For dogs have gone round about me, ...

```
[<Ob> כְָּלְבִּים] [<PO> סֶבֶּבֹּנִי] [<Cj> כי] [<Ob> עצְָּםִי] [<Pr> סֶפֶּר] 18 ZYq0
```

18 I can count all my bones.

As we will argue at the end of this chapter, this small number of cases represents some of the data that guide us toward an important elaboration of the syntactic component in our theory. It is not the absence of morphological cohortative marking that causes such verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses to be non-volitive. Instead, it appears that processes on a higher syntactic level than that of the individual clause prevent these *yiqtol* clauses from fulfilling a volitive function. We conclude this section with some remarks about the different types of volitivity that can be expressed by volitive 1st-person *yiqtol* clauses. When the clause is addressed to someone having a higher status, it often expresses a humble request, as is frequently marked explicitly by the use of the volitional particle נ (‘Please, allow me to...’). In case of a 1st-person plural subject, the subject does not include the addressee in these instances (‘Please, allow us to...’). When the addressee does not have a higher status than the speaker and/or when the volitive particle is lacking, the *yiqtol* clause often expresses the speaker’s desire (‘I/we want to.../desire to...’). Finally, when the speaker addresses himself or when he uses a 1st-person plural subject in which the addressee(s) is/are included, the clause regularly expresses a self-exhortation (‘Let me.../let us...’).

### 4.3.3.2 2nd-person Volitive Yiqtol

In Biblical Hebrew, 2nd-person *yiqtol* is rarely used to express volitivity, since Hebrew already uses the imperative clause to do so for the 2nd person. Interestingly, the only examples of 2nd-person *yiqtol* clauses that contain a morphologically marked jussive form are found in poetry and all of them are clauses in which the verbal form takes initial position.337 The texts show that it is indeed

---

336 See, for instance, Gen 50.5, where Joseph asks the Pharaoh:

```
[<Ti> עָשֶׂה] [<Cj> -ו] 5 MSyn
[<Ij> יצא] [<Pr> מָלֵא] ZYq0
[<Ob> אח] [<Pr> אֲבֵרָהי] [<Cj> -ו] WYq0
[<Pr> אשְׁבֵּה] [<Cj> -ו] WYq0
```

5 Now then, please, let me go up and bury my father and return.

adequate to assign to such \(0\)-yiqtol and weyiqtol clauses the ‘broader’ default function of expressing deontic modality. Contrary to their imperative counterparts, these 2\(^{nd}\)-person volitive yiqtols do not so much emphasize the fact that a command is being made (as in imperative and jussive clauses), but rather focus on the expression of the speaker’s will or desire, often having the form of a humble request or a desiderative utterance instead of a directive command. It should be noted in this regard that in most of the rare occurrences of 2\(^{nd}\)-person jussive yiqtol forms in the Psalms, the psalmist is directly addressing someone having a higher status, namely YHWH. An example is found in Ps 71.19–21:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{God, who is like you?} & \quad \text{Voct}\text{[<Vo> \text{אלִיתֵמִי}}]^{19} \\
\text{You who have made me see many sore troubles} & \quad \text{NmCl\text{[<PC> \text{כמך}}]} \\
\text{revive me again.} & \quad \text{xQt0\text{[<Re> \text{אשר}}]}^{20} \quad \text{XYq0} \\
\text{...} & \quad \text{[<Ob> \text{הוא}}]^{21} \quad \text{ZYq0} \\
\text{May you increase my honour,} & \quad \text{[<Pr> \text{תסב}}] \quad \text{WYq0} \\
\text{and may you again} & \quad \text{[<Cj> -ו}}] \\
\text{comfort me!} & \quad \text{[<PO> \text{הتعبינמ}}] \quad \text{ZYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

\(19\) God, who is like you?

\(20\) You who have made me see many sore troubles
revive me again.

\(21\) May you increase my honour,
and may you again
comfort me!

2\(^{nd}\)-person yiqtol clauses that are not morphologically, but syntactically marked as volitive (by the initial position of the yiqtol form) are also quite scarce in our corpus. In the prose texts in our corpus, we find only 5 examples of a 2\(^{nd}\)-person 0-yiqtol clause\(^{339}\) and 5 examples of a 2\(^{nd}\)-person weyiqtol clause.\(^{340}\) None of the 0-yiqtol clauses can be assigned a deontic modal meaning. Most of them are part of complicated constructions in which the 0-yiqtol clause functions as a dependent or subordinate clause. Gen 15.15 is an exception to this. In this verse, higher-level syntactic processes of the type to be discussed in the next chapter appear to be at work:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{But you go to your fathers in peace,} & \quad \text{WXYq\text{[<Aj> \text{לבשלות}}]}^{15} \\
\text{[<Co> \text{לא באתי}]} & \quad \text{ZYq0} \\
\text{[<Pr> \text{התבנא}]} & \quad \\
\text{[<Su> \text{אתה}]} & \quad \\
\text{[<Cj> -ו}}] \\
\text{תקבר} & \quad \text{[<Pr> \text{בישב טוביה}}]
\end{align*}
\]

\(15\) But you go to your fathers in peace,

Five attestations of 2\(^{nd}\)-person jussive yiqtol clauses can be found in the Book of Psalms, two in the Book of Isaiah, and one in Job. Deut 32.18 contains the only occurrence of a short 2\(^{nd}\)-person yiqtol form in a clause in which the verbal form does not take initial position. The yiqtol form, however, is unclear and raises many questions in grammars and commentaries.

\(^{338}\) Other examples are attested in: Ps 5.12, 90.1–3, 104.20; Isa 37.26, 58.9–10.

\(^{339}\) Gen 15.15, 41.15; Exod 4.13; Lev 9.6; 1 Sam 20.19. In the three final verses, the 0-yiqtol clause is a dependent clause.

\(^{340}\) Exod 19.3; Num 17.25; 2 Chr 20.9(2*), 20.20.
you are buried in a good old age.

Most of the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{weyiqtol} clauses, instead, do have a deontic modal meaning, but not a directive one (cf. the morphologically marked volitive 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{yiqtol}s discussed above). Some of them function as purposive clauses (Num 17.25; 2 Chr 20.20), while others seem to present humble requests addressed to YHWH (2 Chr 20.9).

In poetry, the number of 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{0-yiqtol} clauses and \textit{weyiqtol} clauses is much higher.\textsuperscript{341} It is striking to note that we even find a relatively high number of them in the ancient poetry of the Pentateuch and the Early Prophets – three in Exod 15 and four in 2 Sam 22, for instance – while in their prose sections they hardly occur. Three observations can be made with regard to these poetic 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{0-yiqtol} clauses and \textit{weyiqtol}s. First, the vast majority of these clauses does not have a volitive meaning. In many instances, processes transcending the level of the individual clause appear to prevent the \textit{0-yiqtol} or \textit{weyiqtol} clause from exhibiting a volitive meaning (as was also the case with non-volitive 1\textsuperscript{st}-person \textit{0-yiqtol} clauses and \textit{weyiqtol}s). Take, for instance, Ps 4.3:

\begin{verbatim}
  [Voct] בָּנֵי יָהֳעַשׁ
  [NmC] עָצָמָה
  [Aj] יִבְּדֵלָה
  [Ob] הָרַי
  [Pr] תַּקְלְשׁ
  [Ob] בָּנוֹ
  [Pr] צֶפֶן

3 Sons of man,
   how long is my glory (turned) to dishonour,
   do you love vain words,
   do you seek after lies?
\end{verbatim}

Secondly, if the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{yiqtol} clause does express deontic modality, it always seems to be of a non-directive type. We therefore suggest that there is a functional distinction between imperatives and 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person clause-initial \textit{yiqtol} clauses. While the imperative denotes directive volition, the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person verb-initial \textit{yiqtol} clause is used to express desiderative (if addressee has a higher status than speaker)\textsuperscript{342} or permissive (if addressee has a lower status than speaker)\textsuperscript{343} modality. However, examples of 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person volitive \textit{yiqtol} clauses uttered by speakers having a higher status than the addressee, the permissive meaning of which may come close to that of the directive imperative clause, do hardly occur, while desiderative \textit{yiqtol} clauses having a speaker with a lower status than the addressee are more strongly attested. An example of a desiderative 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{0-yiqtol} clause can be found in Ps 31.20–21:

\begin{verbatim}
  [Su] תִּשְׁפַּךְ
  [PC] רֹב
  [Mo] הָרַי
  [AjC] לַעֲרָשֵׂב
  [Co] לַעֲרָשֵׂב
  [Pr] עָשְׂבַּנְוַת
  [Re] לָעַד

\textbf{341} The Psalms, for instance, contain 71 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{0-yiqtol} clauses and 13 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{weyiqtol}s, Isaiah contains respectively 17 and 14, and Job 24 and 20, respectively. For the accompanying query and its results, see: \url{http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=65}.

\textbf{342} Ps 7.10, 10.15, 10.17, 21.10, 31.5, 31.21(2*), 104.30, 144.5, 144.6(2*); Exod 15.17; 2 Sam 22.28; Isa 38.16.

\textbf{343} E.g.: Ps 2.9; Isa 41.15.
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[<Aj> רושמים] [<Co> מ-סחרא выход] ZYq0
[<Aj> רושמים] [<Po> מ-סכתה לאשה] ZYq0

How abundant is your goodness,
which you have laid up for those who fear you.

... 21 You may hide them in the covert of your presence from the plots of men,
you may hold them safe under your shelter from the strife of tongues!

Thirdly, quite some deontically modal 2nd-person verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses contain an explicit indicative form, such as the two 0-*yiqtol* clauses in Ps 10.17:

[<Pr> מעת] [<Ob> ענוים] xQt0
[<Vo> יהוה] Voct
[<Ob> לבם] ZYq0
[<Pr>תכין] ZYq0

Now that you have heard the desire of the meek,
o YHWH,
you may strengthen their heart,
you may incline your ear.

This suggests that there is a hierarchical ordering in the different types of morphological and syntactic marking. As we will argue at the end of this section, clause-level syntax indeed overrules *indicative* morphological marking. This may be related to the fact that for most verbs a morphological distinction between a long indicative form and a short jussive form simply is not possible.

4.3.3.3 3rd-person Volitive *Yiqtol*

In §4.3.1, we summarized the formal criteria regulating the possibility of constituting morphologically marked jussive forms. As the formal conditions required for the creation of such explicit 3rd-person volitive *yiqtol* are quite strict, it is not surprising that, again, both in prose and in poetry morphology appears to be supported by a syntactic component as it comes to marking volitive 3rd-person *yiqtol*.

Thus, among the 29 instances in the prosaic sections of Genesis and Exodus of a *yiqtol* clause containing an explicit 3rd-person jussive form, we find only 4 cases in which the jussive *yiqtol* form does not take initial position. Only in Gen 1.22 and 44.33, questions arise as to why morphological and syntactical marking do not correspond. 344 We provide Gen 1.22 as an example:

---

344 In Gen 30.34, the *yiqtol* form is preceded by the deictic particle *הנה* and the volitive particle *וְל*, which always takes preverbal position. In Exod 22.4, we find a jussive form in a כי-*yiqtol* protasis clause. It seems very difficult, if not impossible, to assign a volitive meaning to this form. Therefore, the problem here is not so much that of the non-correspondence of morphological and syntactic marking, but rather the dubious use of a jussive form itself.
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22 Be fruitful and multiply
and fill the waters in the seas,
and let birds multiply on the earth.

It should be noted that both in Gen 1.22 and in Gen 44.3 the *yiqtol* clause takes position in a chain of volitive clauses. Again, we assume that processes are at work at a level higher than that of the individual clause. In other words, syntax does play a role here, but, as we will explain in the next chapter, it does so on another level than that of the individual clause.

In the poetic texts in our text corpus, there are 97 morphologically marked jussive *yiqtol* forms, only eleven of which do not take initial position in their clause. The eleven instances include cases in which there is a high degree of uncertainty about the presence of a real preverbal element (Isa 27.6), cases in which the only preverbal element is the conjunction ו (Isa 27.5), and cases involving text-critical questions (Ps 21.2, where the Masoretes propose to read the indicative form [*ketib*] as a jussive one [*qeré*]). In some cases, higher-level processes transcending the level of the individual clause appear to be at work, as in Ps 7.6, where the *w-x-yiqtol* clause containing a jussive form is preceded by other volitive clauses:

4 YHWH, my God,
if I have done this,

6 then let the enemy pursue my soul
and let him overtake me
and let him trample my life down to the ground
and let him lay my soul in the dust!

In general, however, morphology and (inner-clause) syntax obviously cooperate when it comes to the marking of volitivity in 3rd-person jussive *yiqtol* clauses in our text corpus. We also searched for attestations of *yiqtol* forms that are morphologically marked as indicative, that is: attestations of a long form *yiqtol* for which a short (jussive) counterpart is available in the Biblical Hebrew verbal system. The prosaic sections in Genesis contain fourteen of them, two of which take initial position in their clause. In both cases (Gen 27.31 and 41.33–34), a volitive meaning is acceptable for the *yiqtol* clause and syntax, thus, seems to overrule morphology. Gen 27.31, where it is the Masoretic vocalization which marks the *yiqtol* form as indicative, is given as an illustration:
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31 Let my father arise and eat of his son’s game.

As short (jussive) form realizations are only available for a limited number of yiqtols, it may well be that morphological marking gradually, even if possible, became of secondary importance, being, in those cases in which the use of an explicit jussive form would be possible, only an optional additive to the inner-clause syntactic marking. Similar observations can be made with even stronger support in poetic texts, as is shown by our analyses of indicative yiqtol forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry. From the 190 attestations of indicative 3rd-person yiqtol forms in the Psalms and in Isaiah we investigated, 22 take clause-initial position. At least half of these 22 0-yiqtol clauses and weyiqtol clauses containing a form that is morphologically marked as non-jussive can (and should) be assigned a volitive meaning. An illustrative example can be found in Ps 72.2–4, which contains two verb-initial yiqtol clauses with indicative forms:

1 God, give the king your justice!

... 2 May he judge your people with righteousness,

... 4 may he defend the cause of the poor of the people,

345 Compare Joosten’s remark about Gen 41.34 and two other instances of formal indicative yiqtol in first position having a jussive function: ‘Syntax here is a better indicator than morphology as to the function of the forms’; Joosten, ‘A Neglected Rule’, p.214. But also see Joosten’s discussion of morphological and syntactic marking in his recent volume The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the basis of Classical Prose, where he explicitly denies that ‘the function of the [yiqtol] form is determined by its position in the clause’ and emphasizes that ‘position in the clause’ simply ‘helps to distinguish the long form (YIQTOL) from the short form (jussive) of the prefix conjugation’ (p.353), which implies that for Joosten, morphology has a primary function, while syntactic marking only plays a secondary, supportive role.

346 In this analysis, we paid attention to all occurrences in the Psalms and Isaiah of indicative (long) Hiphil forms. In addition, we took a random sample of fifty attestations in the Psalms and Isaiah of indicative (long) forms of hollow verbs and a random sample of fifty attestations in the Psalms and Isaiah of the indicative (long) variant of non-apocopate forms.

347 Compare: Ps 7.17, 18.47, 90.16, 104.29; Isa 5.29, 7.17, 27.5–6.
may he give deliverance to the needy!

In other cases, a volitive interpretation seems unwarranted. Take, for instance, Ps 29.8: 348

\[
\text{[<Ob> קִדֵּמְבֶר] [<Pr> יִהְיֶל] [<Su> יהוה] קֹולַ יִהוָה}
\]

\[
\text{[<Ob> קִדֵּמְבֶר] [<Pr> יִהְיֶל] [<Su> יהוה] קֹולַ יִהוָה}
\]

8 The voice of YHWH shakes the wilderness, YHWH shakes the wilderness of Kadesh.

Similarly, a non-volitive meaning is also to be ascribed to many of the 2nd-person 0-yiqtol clauses and weyiqtol clauses in our corpus that contain an indicative form. Arguing that in these instances, too, morphology overrules syntax, would make the Hebrew verbal system a very arbitrary one. If both morphology and syntax may overrule each other, how do we decide then whether syntactic or morphological marking should be taken as decisive?

In the next chapter, we will introduce a new theoretical model capable of offering a single systematic explanation both for the non-volitive 0-yiqtol clauses and weyiqtol clauses. For now, it suffices to say that these texts suggest that a clause-specific analysis, in terms of morphology and syntax alone, cannot fully account for all volitive and non-volitive functions of verbal forms and clause types. Like we did in §4.3.3.1, we conclude this subsection with some remarks about the different types of volitivity that can be expressed by volitive 3rd-person yiqtol clauses. As Shulman rightly argues, the relative statuses of the speaker and addressee with respect to each other play a central role when it comes to determining the type of volitivity expressed by the yiqtol clause. Thus, if the speaker is superior to the addressee, the yiqtol has a directive force and expresses a command ('let him do...'). If, however, the addressee has a superior status, the yiqtol clause expresses desiderative modality and has to be interpreted as a wish ('may he do...'). 349

4.3.3.4 Conclusions

To summarize this subsection, we conclude that in most cases morphology and syntax cooperate to mark both volitive and non-volitive meanings. Thus, by far most of the 1st-person cohortative, 2nd-person volitive and 3rd-person jussive yiqtol forms take a clause-initial position, while clauses in which the yiqtol form does not take initial position rarely contain a verbal form that is morphologically marked as volitive.

We have also seen that our syntactic criterion is very helpful in those instances in which morphological marking of volitive functionality is impossible. This is of crucial importance, as the incapability of morphology to mark volitivity reveals itself for all persons, in particular for the 1st- and 3rd-person: cohortative marking is impossible when the verbal root ends with a he or when the yiqtol form contains a suffix, while the jussive ‘short form’ can be created only (in the singular

---

348 See further: Ps 89.7, 96.10, 110.5–7; Isa 7.23, 42.13, 42.21, 42.23, 50.4.

349 According to Shulman (‘Function of the “Jussive” and “Indicative” Imperfect Forms’, p.178), such a desiderative (non-requesting) meaning should also be ascribed to 3rd-person jussive yiqtol clauses in which no concrete performer(s) of the action is/are identified, as in: ‘May you live long.’
of) a limited number of verbs and stem formations. We have shown that in all these cases, syntax accounts for morphology's inability to consistently mark verbal functionality.\textsuperscript{350}

At this point it should be noted that the number of other constituents in a yiqtol clause does not affect the assignment of volitive or non-volitive functionality to that clause. More specifically, even verb-initial yiqtol clauses in which the verb is the only constituent should be assigned the default function of expressing volitive meaning. Despite the fact that in such clauses the verbal form by definition has to take initial position, these clauses do not have to and should not be excluded from the system of default functionalities outlined above.\textsuperscript{351}

At the same time, however, exceptions do occur, and some categories of exceptions contain such a large amount of examples that they can hardly be labelled as ‘exceptional’. The most obvious exceptions concern those clauses in which the yiqtol form does not take initial position, yet still is morphologically marked as volitive. For these cases we can safely conclude that morphological marking overrules syntactic marking (at least inner-clause syntactical marking).

This does not apply, however, when a clause is syntactically marked as deontic modal, but contains a non-volitive form. Then, syntax overrules morphology, as we saw, for instance, in several examples of 0-yiqtol clauses and weyiqtols having an indicative long form as their first element. To put it differently and more strongly, all 0-yiqtol clauses and weyiqtols are to be assigned a default function of expressing deontic modality, irrespective of the morphological marking in the clause-initial yiqtol form.

Schematically, the relation between morphological and syntactic marking for those cases in which the two do not correspond can be outlined as follows:

\textsuperscript{350} This conclusion is in line with Joosten’s claims about the big help offered by the syntactic placement rules in the attempt to distinguish between the morphologically indistinguishable indicative and jussive forms; Joosten, ‘A Neglected Rule’, pp.213–214.

\textsuperscript{351} These conclusions are drawn on the basis of our analysis of about fifty ‘verb-only’ yiqtol clauses attested in the book of Genesis and in Psalms 1–50. For the query and its results, see: http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=64. About 75% of these clauses can very well be assigned a volitive meaning. Interestingly, in most instances other features and elements in the text support a volitive interpretation of the ‘verb-only’ 0-yiqtol clause. Thus, in eleven cases the yiqtol form is morphologically marked as a cohortative. Furthermore, in 23 occurrences (nine of them containing a cohortative form), the ‘verb-only’ 0-yiqtol clause is continued by a weyiqtol clause, which frequently does contain other non-verbal elements and sometimes includes an explicit subject that is assumed in the preceding 0-yiqtol clause (Ps 6.11, 22.28, 35.26–27(2*), 40.15, 40.17). Twelve other occurrences of ‘verb-only’ 0-yiqtol clauses are embedded in a context that is marked as volitive by preceding imperative clauses or surrounding 0-yiqtol clauses that do contain other non-verbal elements. Finally, ‘verb-only’ 0-yiqtol clauses for which a volitive interpretation seems inappropriate are not to be regarded as exceptional. Three of them are attributive 0-yiqtol clauses (see §5.7) and the others can and should be explained in terms of the syntactic mechanisms that will be introduced in the next chapter. On the basis of these findings we claim that there is no reason to exclude ‘verb-only’ 0-yiqtol clauses from the syntactic rule that verb-initial yiqtol clauses are to be assigned the default function of expressing volitive meaning.
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We argue, then, that *when a form is not morphologically marked as volitive, clause-level syntax is always decisive*. However, we have to admit that our corpus contains a significant number of texts in which a 0-yiqtol or (less often) a weyiqtol clause cannot be assigned a volitive meaning. Sometimes, indicative morphology may be seen as an additional proof of the non-volitive meaning of these clauses, but morphology cannot be considered as overruling syntax in these cases, since, as we just explained, indicative morphology is itself overruled by (volition marking) syntax far more often. Saying that, in these cases, indicative morphology overrules syntactic marking would make our theory arbitrary and, with that, would cause it to lose its explanatory power. As we have suggested several times in the subsections above, the numerous attestations of non-volitive verb-initial yiqtol clauses and volitive non-verb-initial yiqtol clauses show us that taking into consideration the morphological and syntactic features of a specific clause alone regularly is not sufficient in order to determine whether or not it has a volitive meaning. Instead, processes working at a higher syntactic level than that of the individual clause will be shown to have a decisive influence on the functionality of such clauses.

However, before further elaborating on this in the next chapter, let us first briefly discuss a number of elements about which disagreement may rise as to whether or not they should be regarded as ‘regular’ preverbal elements making the yiqtol clause into an (w)jx-yiqtol clause.

4.3.4 The Preverbal Element

As has been pointed out in the previous sections, for a correct determination of the default function (in terms of volitivity) of a yiqtol clause, it is essential to make a distinction between clauses in which the yiqtol form takes initial position and those in which the verbal form is preceded by another element within the clause. Of course, it is only when such a preceding element is part of the same clause as the yiqtol form that we are dealing with an x-yiqtol clause having a non-volitive default function. However, there may be some debate about which
elements should be regarded as ‘inner-clause’ preverbal elements and which should not. In this section, some of these elements will be discussed.

First of all, our corpus contains several examples of 0-yiqtol clauses that are preceded by a dependent infinitive construct constituent clause. Are these infinitive construct clauses to be analyzed as regular preverbal elements, making the whole sentence of the type x-yiqtol, or do we have to make a more rigid distinction between the two clauses both having their own predicate, thereby analyzing the 0-yiqtol clause as having a default volitive functionality? In other words, is the function of expressing (non-)volitivity to be assigned to clauses or to complete sentences? The attestations of this sequence in the discursive prose sections of the Pentateuch support the second type of analysis, according to which the infinitive construct clause is to be analyzed as the preverbal x-element in an x-yiqtol clause. A both interesting and possibly confusing observation to be made here is that in poetic texts, in particular in the book of Psalms, we find a significant number of combinations of a dependent clause and an independent 0-yiqtol clause in which the yiqtol clause contains a verbal form that is morphologically marked as volitive. This may raise the question whether it would not be better to assume that yiqtol clauses being part of the sequence infinitive construct > yiqtol in general have a volitive meaning. Yet, such a theory would provide us with many unexplainable infinitive construct > yiqtol constructions in which the yiqtol clause without doubt has a non-volitive meaning. An illustrative set of examples of such non-volitive infinitive construct > yiqtol constructions can be found not only in prose, but also in poetic texts like Prov 21.11:

352 See, for instance, Ps 14.7(53.7); Job 17.2.
353 Prov 21.11, 28.12, 28.28, 29.2, 29.16; See also: Isa 17.12, 18.3, 27.7–8, 27.10–11, 28.18–19, 33.1, 57.12–13; Job 10.4, 13.3, 13.26, 20.22; 2 Sam 22.45.

11 When one punishes a scoffer, the simple becomes wise, and, when one instructs a wise man, he gains knowledge.

Taking, on the contrary, as our starting point the view that sentences consisting of a combination of an infinitive construct clause and a 0-yiqtol clause have a default non-volitive value, would not make the poetic examples in which the yiqtol clause contains an explicit volitive form unexplainable. Instead, these cases can very well be explained by referring to the hierarchical scheme drawn at the end of the previous section: morphological marking of volitivity overrules syntactic marking.

At a more general level, we do not deem it acceptable to automatically apply functions of clause types to independent clauses constituting a single sentence with a preceding dependent
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Other constructions in which 0-yiqtol clauses together with a preceding constituent clause form a single x-yiqtol sentence prove this supposition to be true. Thus, in Ps 71.20 the yiqtol form is preceded by an x-qatal subject clause together with which it constitutes a non-volitive X-yiqtol sentence:

\[\text{You who have made me see many sore troubles,} \]
\[\text{revive me again.}\]

The same is true for situations in which the 0-yiqtol clause contains a verb of saying pointing to a direct speech section which precedes the yiqtol form. Then, the direct speech section is to be analyzed as the preverbally positioned object of an x-yiqtol sentence, as in Ps 12.6:

\[\text{“Because of the oppression of the weak and because of the groaning of the needy I do now arise.” says YHWH.}\]

The deictic particle הנה frequently leads to debates about whether or not it should be seen as a clause-external element having its own predicative value. Our query-supported investigations have shown, however, that an analysis of הנה as a clause-internal preverbal element of an x-yiqtol clause is to be preferred in most cases. Of course, these cases are different from those instances in which a pronominal suffix is attached to the deictic הנה, which then constitutes a clause-external element having its own predicative value.

354 One could argue that it would be better to speak of ‘functions of (yiqtol) sentences’ then. However, such a terminology both raises the false impression that sentences cannot but contain only a single predicate (such as a yiqtol form) and ignores the fact that the expression of volitivity and non-volitivity indeed seems to be a clause-level issue (notice, for instance, that our syntactic functional analysis is very well applicable to coordinate yiqtol clauses that make up a sentence with other (preceding or following) coordinated clauses). The reservations expressed in this paragraph only concern independent yiqtol clauses preceded by a dependent (daughter) clause.


Examples of הנה-yiqtol in our corpus: Gen 37.7; 1 Sam 9.7, 20.21, 21.15; Ps 7.15, 59.8; Isa 49.22, 52.13. For the query and its results, see: [http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=66](http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=66). Again, the position of הנה-yiqtol within a specific sequence of (volitive) clauses may cause it to acquire a volitive meaning, as is probably the case in Ps 55.8.
separate nominal clause followed by an independent 0-yiqtol clause with a default volitive meaning, as in 2 Sam 15.26:

\[\text{荏근\[Is\]} NmCl\]
\[\text{ניינש\[Co\]} ZYq0\]
\[\text{تحضير\[Pr\]} NmCl\]

26 Behold, here I am.
Let him do to me what seems good to him.

Again, syntactic marking (the verbal form does not take initial position) may be overruled by volitive morphological marking, as in Prov 1.23, where הנה is followed by a cohortative form:

\[\text{וה\[Ob\]} NmCl\]
\[\text{לבם\[Co\]} xYq0\]
\[\text{לי\[Ob\]} ZYq0\]
\[\text{יע\[Pr\]} NmCl\]

23 Behold, let me pour out my spirit on you,
let me make my words known to you!

Contrary to הנה, the macro-syntactic sign הנה is always to be regarded as a clause-external element, which means that a 0-yiqtol clause immediately following it should be assigned a default volitive meaning instead of being reinterpreted as a non-volitive x-yiqtol clause. An example can be found in Gen 41.33–34:

\[\text{עתה\[Ti\]} MSyn\]
\[\text{ו\[Cj\]} NmCl\]
\[\text{אם\[Ob\]} ZYqX\]
\[\text{יושב\[Pr\]} WYq0\]
\[\text{לע\[Su\]} ZYqX\]
\[\text{ארץ\[Cj\]} WYq0\]
\[\text{מטרים\[Pr\]} WYq0\]
\[\text{לע\[Co\]} NmCl\]
\[\text{-talk\[Pr\]} NmCl\]

33 Now then,
let Pharaoh select a man discrete and wise
and let him set him over the land of Egypt!

34 Let Pharaoh do this
and appoint overseers over the land!

---

357 See also: 1 Sam 14.43; 2 Kgs 22.20; Isa 29.14, 38.5.

358 Queries in the ETCBC-database provide us with ca. 20 attestations of the pattern הנה > 0-yiqtol in the Hebrew Bible, of which most occur in direct speech prose (for the accompanying queries and their results, see http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=67 [on all occurrences of הנה + yiqtol] and http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=68 [on all occurrences of a macro-syntactic signal followed by a verb-initial yiqtol clause]). See, for instance: Gen 44.3, 47.4, 50.5; Exod 3.18, 32.30; Num 14.17; Judg 17.3; 1 Sam 25.26, 26.8, 26.19; 2 Sam 2.6, 2.7, 14.32; 1 Kgs 8.26; 2 Kgs 1.14; 1 Chr 19.7; Ezra 10.3; Neh 6.7; Isa 5.5; Hos 2.12; and Nah 1.13. That a 0-yiqtol clause indeed keeps its volitive default function when it is preceded by the macro-syntactic sign הנה is supported by the observations that the volitive particle נ- is present in nine occurrences of this pattern and that in five instances volitive morphological marking is used in the 0-yiqtol clause.
The same type of analysis is applicable to sequences of vocative > 0-\textit{yiqtol} and those of a ‘topicalized element’ (traditionally called ‘casus pendens’) > 0-\textit{yiqtol}. Both vocatives and ‘topicalized elements’ do not belong to the clause immediately following them, but are ‘extra-clausal’. As regards a topicalized element, it is quite natural to identify it as an extra-clausal element, since it is regularly referred to by a resumptive element within the clause following it. Indeed, such topical elements are to be seen as examples of ‘extraposition’. If they are followed by a 0-\textit{yiqtol} clause, that clause has a default volitive function. An example of the pattern vocative > 0-\textit{yiqtol} can be found in 2 Kgs 1.13:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Voct} & \text{ZYqX} \\
\text{Voct} & \text{ZYqX} \\
\end{array}
\]

Man of God, please let my life and the life of these fifty servants of yours be precious in your sight.

A volitive 0-\textit{yiqtol} clause resuming a topicalized element is attested in Ps 10.15:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ZI} & \text{Ob} \\
\text{Fr} & \text{Pr} \\
\text{Fr} & \text{Pr} \\
\end{array}
\]

Break the arm of the wicked, and concerning the evildoer: may you seek out his wickedness.

4.3.5 \textit{Syntactic Marking and (Context-dependent) Pragmatic Functions}

In our examination of Shulman’s views in §4.3.2, we argued that her theory was undermined by her decision to interpret non-jussive \textit{yiqtols} as expressing not only epistemic modality, but simultaneously also future tense. Indeed, Shulman claims that these non-volitive \textit{yiqtol} clauses always present predictions or promises about events or actions that will take place in the future. We have seen, however, that such an analysis of verbal functions is not in agreement with the many non-future usages of non-jussive \textit{yiqtol} forms attested in our corpus. Therefore, we decided that the only functional difference to be made between verb-initial \textit{yiqtol} clauses on the one hand and non-verb-initial \textit{yiqtol} clauses on the other hand is that the first express deontic modality and so contain an element of will, while the second present a declarative and factual statement, a categorical assertion (‘it is so’). Specifications of this general function of expressing non-volitive meaning, such as the expression of epistemic modality or future tense, cannot be made on the basis of the verbal form itself, but, in most instances, can only be ascribed to a clause on the basis of contextual features and considerations about the genre of a text. In short,

\[\text{http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=69}\]

\[\text{http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=70}\]
then, one has to distinguish between the grammatically marked functions of a clause and the pragmatic secondary interpretations of a clause’s meaning. The distinction between grammatical marking and pragmatics represents a contrast between expressed meanings of utterances, i.e., explicatures, and contextual interpretations of intended meanings of utterances, i.e., implicatures. While the former are grammatically encoded, the latter are inferred by the recipient on the basis of the context. Let us illustrate the difference between these two domains with an example. Consider the utterance: “It is freezing cold in this room”. The expressed meaning here is that the temperature in the room is extremely low. However, when someone, shivering on his chair and looking at an open window, utters these same words, one will interpret the utterance as an indirect request to shut the window. Though the utterance is not grammatically encoded as a request, this will be the contextual meaning, the implicature, inferred by the addressee (if he shows at least some degree of empathy). As another illustration of the contrast between expressed and inferred meaning, we may refer to the genitive constructions in English. If someone speaks about ‘the painting of John’, contextual clues are required in order to help the addressee decide whether the painting in question is a creation made by John himself, a portrait representing John made by someone else, or simply a work of art being in John’s possession. In other words, the grammatical encoding only marks that there is a relation between John and the painting, but context is needed to determine the exact nature of this relation.

Now, though Shulman’s inclination to analyze non-volitive yiqtols as referring to future events may suggest otherwise, her article is remarkably helpful when it comes to making a clear distinction between grammatical and pragmatics. Thus, Shulman gives a lucid discussion of 2nd-person and 3rd-person ל- yiqtol clauses and נ- yiqtol clauses occurring in Hebrew prose. She explains how, especially in legislative texts, the non-volitive נ- yiqtol clauses may seem to pragmatically function like the volitive נ- yiqtol clauses in that they, too, express a prohibition. Shulman emphasizes, however, that the נ- yiqtol clauses have the grammatical structure of a statement ‘in order to convey the speaker’s knowledge and certainty, not his desire, that the acts will be performed’. Leaving aside Shulman’s focus on future reference here, she is right in stressing that grammar here points to a functional difference in terms of the (non-)expression of the speaker’s will. As we already noted in §4.3.2, Shulman refers to direct and indirect speech acts in this regard, stating that נ- yiqtol and jussive yiqtol directly express the speaker’s will, while נ- yiqtol and indicative yiqtol directly express a statement and may indirectly function as commands. In other words, by using the first category of (volitive) forms, ‘the speaker performs a


362 Hebrew prose contains three exceptional cases of נ- followed by a jussive form: Gen 4.12, Gen 24.8, and 1 Kgs 2.6. In Gen 4.12, a jussive meaning is not possible at all, while in Gen 24.8 and 1 Kgs 2.6 it seems appropriate to assign to the נ- yiqtol clause the pragmatic function of expressing a command, instead of analyzing it as a volitive statement directly expressing the speaker’s will.
direct speech act of giving orders’, while by using the second category of (non-volitive) forms, he performs the act of making a statement.\textsuperscript{363}

A well-known and illustrative example, in this regard, is represented by the Decalogue (Exod 20.1–17), which uses indicative forms (both negative [ל-יִקְטָל] and affirmative [indicative יִקְטָל]) to give instructions to the people of Israel. The difference between these statements and those introduced by volitive יִקְטָלs is, to use the words of Lyons, one between ‘categorical assertions and commands (…) between “it is so” and “so be it”’.\textsuperscript{364} Thus, grammatically speaking, God did not so much express his will when he gave his Ten Commandments, but rather made some indisputable statements: ‘this is how you behave – no discussion!’

Our own analyses of 2nd-person 0-יִקְטָל, weyiqtol, יִקְטָל, (w-)x-יִקְטָל and ל-יִקְטָל clauses in Hebrew prose and poetry link up with this. It is interesting to see that in Genesis 2nd-person ל-יִקְטָל is repeatedly used for a declarative utterance that may pragmatically function as a command, but is grammatically marked as making a factual declaration. In Genesis 2 and 3, for instance, four times a ל-יִקְטָל clause is used to express God’s message to Adam and Eve that they are not to eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Take Gen 2.16–17:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Pr> ת כל ] [<Mo> כל ] [<Co> גן ] [<Fr> ע-ו טוב ] [<Cj> -ו ] [<Co> ממנו ] [<Pr> ת כל ] [<Ng> ל ] xYq0
\end{verbatim}

16 You can freely eat of every tree in the garden,
17 but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil – you do not eat of that!

In these verses, God does not express his desire that Adam and Eve refrain from eating the food, that is: he does not issue a direct command, but he presents it as a simple indisputable fact that Adam and Eve are not going to eat from the tree. Indirectly – that is: pragmatically – the assertion of God may function as a command, but first and for all, the grammatical features of the clause makes clear that we are dealing with a factual statement here.

A similar analysis is applicable to Gen 24 and 28, where Abraham tells his servant that he (the servant) is not to take a wife for his son from among the Canaanites (Gen 24.3, 24.37), while Isaac says something similar to his son Jacob in Gen 28.1 (cf. Gen 28.6).\textsuperscript{365}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Co> מ-בנה נני ] [<Ob> אש ] [<Fr> תק ] [<Ng> לא ] xYq0
\end{verbatim}

1 You do not marry one of the Canaanite women!

The use of indicative ל-יִקְטָל makes clear that Abraham and Isaac do not inform their addressees about their will (‘so be it…’), but make a non-volitive statement, the exact function of which is context- and genre-specific and is therefore a question of pragmatics. As Shulman suggests, this factual situation is often an anticipated situation, which in English and Dutch justifies the use of future tense to translate the יִקְטָל. However, it should be realized that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Or, in Shulman’s words, ‘the act of telling the people what they will do in the future’; Shulman, ‘Function of the “Jussive” and “Indicative” Imperfect Forms’, p.172.
\item Lyons, Semantics, p.751.
\item Compare also: Gen 9.4, 17.15, 24.8, 30.31, 31.52, 44.23.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
4. Morphological and Syntactic Marking of Volitivity and Non-Volitivity

it is not the default function of the *yiqtol* clause to refer, by definition, to anticipated events. Indeed, it may be that ‘the context refers to a future situation’, and occasionally adverbial constructions may point to such a future reference, but all this is not marked grammatically and should therefore not be considered part of the Hebrew verbal system. This can be made clear by taking a look at the use of א-יִקְוָל in poetic texts. In the Psalms, for example, א-יִקְוָל rarely has the pragmatic force of a command and in most cases simply refers to a ‘timeless truth’. Take, for example, Ps 51.18:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Ob> זב] [<Pr> תופים] [<Ng> לא] [<Cj> ר] 18} & \quad \text{xYq0} \\
\text{[<Pr> אתה] [<Cj> -ז] 18} & \quad \text{WYq0} \\
\text{[<Pr> תורה] [<Ng> לא] [<Ob> עלול]} & \quad \text{xYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

18 For you have no delight in sacrifice, so that I may give it; you are not pleased with a burnt offering.

In these and other verses, the analysis of the non-volitive *yiqtol* clause as introducing a prediction or promise is not warranted. Similar things can be said about affirmative 2nd-person (indicative) *x-yiqtol* clauses, which are not discussed by Shulman, but should be seen as the non-volitive counterparts of imperatives and the rarely occurring volitive 2nd-person *0-yiqtol* clauses. Such clauses regularly, though far more often in prose than in poetry, can be regarded as functioning pragmatically as a command, but the direct, grammatically marked speech act they perform is always that of declaring a factual situation. Though future references may be detected on the basis of contextual or lexical signals, the default value of indicative *x-yiqtol* always remains that of expressing a now and permanently valid truth, as is well illustrated by examples from poetry, like Ps 5.13:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Ob> זיימ] [<Pr> תמר] [<Su> אתה] [<Cj> י] 13} & \quad \text{xXYq} \\
\text{[<Vo> אתה]} & \quad \text{Voct} \\
\text{[<PO> ב-צנה] [<Ob> תשוענה] [<Aj> הג] } & \quad \text{xYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

13 For you bless the righteous, o YHWH, you cover him with favour as with a shield.

In sum, then, we can state that while for many occurrences of non-verb-initial *yiqtol* in prosaic texts a future rendering may be possible, this is not so for many attestations of the non-verb-initial *yiqtol* in the poetic passages in our corpus. Therefore, instead of leaving poetry out of consideration by following Shulman’s assumption that it has its own set of rules, it proves to be very helpful to include poetic texts in the text corpus to be analyzed, as this prevents us,

---

366 Shulman, ‘Function of the “Jussive” and “Indicative” Imperfect Forms’, p.177.
367 See, for instance: Ps 10.13, 16.10, 17.3, 22.3, 40.12.
368 In Gen 1–33 alone, we find at least nineteen occurrences of indicative 2nd-person *x-yiqtol* for which an interpretation as command is acceptable, while in the whole Psalter we find only four such occurrences, all of which are preceded by a clause that is grammatically marked as volitive.
particularly in the case of non-volitive yiqtol clauses, from making the mistake of describing the Hebrew verbal functions in terms of tense.

Our comments on the distinction between grammatically marked functionalities and pragmatic meaning also apply to 2nd- and 3rd-person weqatals used in legislative contexts: the default function of these weqatals is that of presenting a logical next step with respect to the preceding clause, but pragmatically they often have the force of a command, even when they are not preceded by a clause that is grammatically marked as volitive.

The process of inferring pragmatic meanings is guided by contextual clues. Thus, linguists like Brown and Levinson\(^{370}\) have pointed to the domain of ‘interactional pragmatics’, stating that relational or interactional clues play an important role when it comes to determining indirect, contextual meanings of utterances. One of these clues concerns the relative statuses of the speaker and the addressee. Indeed, the texts we have studied show that non-volitive yiqtol clauses with the pragmatic force of a command typically (though not necessarily) have a 2nd-person subject and are addressed to one or more participant(s) having a lower status than the speaker. More concretely, most such yiqtol clauses express instructions addressed by or on behalf of YHWH, who does not express his desire or permission that some actions be executed (“so be it”), as is done in imperative clauses or (in some poetic texts) in 2nd-person 0-yiqtol clauses, but instead utters non-volitive statements (“so is it”), that only on the basis of contextual and genre-specific clues can be assigned the pragmatic function of a command.

In studies of the Hebrew verbal system by Hebraists, the distinction between grammatical encoding and pragmatics is frequently overlooked. It seems a common mistake to mix up the contextual interpretations of the meaning of a verbal form resulting from inferential processes with the ‘expressed meaning’ of a verbal form as it is marked by grammatical encoding. As a consequence, Hebrew grammarians often end up with long lists of possible functions and meanings that can be ascribed to the various verbal forms without recognizing that most of these functions are not grammatically marked, but were inferred on the basis of their own interpretations of the context. For an illustrative example of this, we may refer to discussions in grammars about ‘suspicious’ jussive forms in poetic texts. Thus, Gesenius-Kautzsch, Lettinga and Waltke-O’Connor all claim that in some (unspecified) cases there is a ‘split between form and meaning’, arguing that, next to ‘indicative’ long form yiqtols having a jussive function, we also find, although more rarely, yiqtol forms that are morphologically marked as jussive, but in these texts do not have a jussive function. Instead of explaining such ‘exceptions’ by a refinement of the linguistic theory, grammarians usually feel tempted to reduce, due to these exceptional cases, the role of morphological (and more generally, grammatical) marking and make it subordinate to that of intuitive interpretation by the reader. Thus, Waltke and O’Connor state that “Because of the widespread polysemy of yqtl forms the interpreter must in most instances judge on the basis of semantic pertinence whether the form is jussive or non-perfective.”\(^{371}\) That such a reduction of the role of linguistic analysis may indeed lead to strong confusion is also supported by Gesenius-Kautzsch’s remark that “since the jussive in numerous cases is not distinguished in form from the imperfect (...), it is frequently doubtful which of the two the writer intended”.


\(^{371}\) Waltke & O’Connor, Introduction, p.566, §34.2.1a. Compare their remark on jussive forms with a non-jussive meaning: ‘it is best in problem passages of this nature to be governed by sense rather than by form.’ (p.567, §34.2.1c).
4. Morphological and Syntactic Marking of Volitivity and Non-Volitivity

Most grammars do attempt to find explanations for exceptional, apparently ‘non-grammatical’ uses of jussive and indicative *yiqtol*. Thus, the use of a jussive form in such non-jussive contexts is explained by Waltke-O’Connor by referring to the possibility of textual corruptions and the presence of vestiges of an earlier verbal system.\(^{372}\) Gesenius-Kautzsch explains them as being the result of ‘misunderstandings of defective writing’ and rhythmical considerations.\(^{373}\) Though such explanations are not difficult to understand, it may be questioned whether they are indeed always required. Instead of taking the expected meaning of a clause as a starting point, why not start with the forms and formal patterns in it? Many occurrences of jussive *yiqtol* that are deemed exceptional by the grammarians may not be that exceptional at all. Take Ps 11.6 for instance. The use of the jussive form in this verse is relativized by Gesenius-Kautzsch as being the result of a wrong interpretation of a defective form,\(^{374}\) while Lettinga, too, argues that the form here functions as a normal imperfective.\(^{375}\) However, why not follow the grammatical (morphological) marking and assign a volitive meaning to the jussive form?

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Pr> יב] [<Ob> צדיק] [<Su> יהוה] }^5 & \quad XxYq \\
\text{[<Su> נפש] [<Pr> הרשי-אحدد temas] [<Ob> לאו] [<Cj> -ה] }^6 & \quad WxQX \\
\text{[<Ob> ילמש] [<Co> על-℞השעימ] [<Pr> ימש] }^6 & \quad ZYq0
\end{align*}
\]

5 YHWH tests the righteous and the wicked, while his soul has hated the wicked and him that loves violence.

6 Let him rain coals of fire and brimstone on the wicked.

A central supposition in this dissertation is that, irrespective of developments in the verbal system, the texts, as we now have them, present to us a constellation of verbal forms and functions that was undeniably regarded as systematic at the moment that the texts reached their final version. Such an approach to the texts is required even more strongly in a theory adding the possibility of syntactic marking of volitivity. The credibility of such a theory would be strongly undermined if all *yiqtol* clauses that do not seem to express the meaning that is suggested by syntactic (and morphological) marking were simply considered exceptional and if syntactic marking would be made subordinate to pragmatic interpretations of the functions of such clauses. We therefore do not follow the grammars, which do show such tendencies, but will search for more systematic explanations for those instances in which syntactical marking and apparent meaning do not seem to correspond.

### 4.4 Summary and General Conclusions

In this chapter we have shown that it is necessary to introduce a syntactic component in the description of the Hebrew verbal system, which helps us to distinguish between deontic modal, volitive *0-yiqtol* and *weyiqtol* clauses and non-volitive (*w*-*)-yiqtol* clauses. At the same time, the introduction of this syntactic component raises new questions, as we do encounter *yiqtol* clauses

---


\(^{374}\) Kautzsch, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, p.323.

that do not seem to exhibit the meaning marked by the inner-clause syntax. In poetic texts in particular, we find numerous examples of non-volitive verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses and volitive non-verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses, the ‘diverging’ meaning of which cannot be explained by pointing to morphological markings overruling inner-clause syntax or by considering it as a result of secondary pragmatic interpretations.

In the next chapter, we will show how these *yiqtol* clauses still can be included in the Hebrew verbal system by further elaborating the syntactic component. In the preceding sections, we already hinted several times to syntactic processes operating at higher levels than that of the individual clause. Paying attention to inner-clause syntax alone is not enough when it comes to determining a clause’s function. Extra-clausal syntactic processes also play an important role and, as we will see, may even overrule both morphological and inner-clause syntactic marking.
5. **Text-level Syntax: Inheritance and Blocking in Clause Patterns**

5.1 **Introduction**

5.1.1 *Higher-level Syntactic Processes*

In the previous chapters, we have claimed that Biblical Hebrew’s verbal forms themselves basically perform the three discourse-level functions of indicating type of communication, level of communication and linguistic perspective. Attempts to explain the functions of the Biblical Hebrew verbal forms in ‘lower-level’ terms of tense, aspect and mood generally result in long lists of apparently non-related functionalities for each individual verbal form (see chapters 1 and 2). In §4.3.5, it was stated that such attempts are characterized by a mixing-up of the two domains of grammatical marking and pragmatic interpretation: temporal, aspectual and modal meanings in general are not signalled by the Hebrew verbal form, but are to be determined on the basis of non-verbal adverbial and lexical elements and the pragmatic interpretation of other contextual clues. As an exception to this, we have discovered that the detection of modal meaning, or, more specifically, deontic modal meaning, is not a matter of pragmatic interpretation. Instead, Biblical Hebrew uses morphology (cohortative and jussive forms) and inner-clause syntax to mark volitive meaning. We also noticed that morphological and syntactical marking correspond in most cases, and that when they do not, there is a clear hierarchical order of markings in which clause-level syntax follows volitive morphology and precedes indicative morphology.

However, just as looking at the verbal form alone is not sufficient for a complete description of the Hebrew verbal system, taking into account the grammatical (morphological and syntactic) features of the isolated clause only is not sufficient either. There are cases in which a volitive interpretation of a verb-initial *yiqtol* clause is impossible, as in Ps 22.8:

```
[<Co> ל [-3] [<Su> ילעגו] [<Pr> ב] ] 8
```

8 All who see me mock at me, 
    they make mouths at me, 
    they wag their heads.

There are also cases in which a non-volitive interpretation of a non-verb-initial *yiqtol* clause is impossible, as in Ps 20.3–6, where the *w*-yiqtol clauses seem to adopt a volitive meaning:

```
[<Co> ואתך] [<Ob> כל-[Cj>-ו] [<Pr> והי] [<Aj> לעך] ] 5
[<Pr>طعمך] [<Ob> כל-[Cj>-ו] [<Pr> והי] [<Aj> לעך] ] 5
[<Pr>אמרך] [<Ob> כל-[Cj>-ו] [<Pr> והי] [<Aj> לעך] ] 5
[<Pr>赎回ך] [<Ob> כל-[Cj>-ו] [<Pr> והי] [<Aj> לעך] ] 5
```
May he send you help from the sanctuary, and give you support from Zion.
May he remember all your offerings, and regard with favour your burnt sacrifices.
May he grant you your heart’s desire, and fulfill all your plans.
May we shout for joy over your victory, and in the name of our God set up our banners.

In this chapter, we will extend the syntactic component of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system by identifying several manners in which syntactic processes operating at levels higher than that of the individual clause influence the assignment of volitive and non-volitive functionality to clauses. Cautious and often implicit references to the need to perform analyses at another, higher level than that of the individual clause have been made by some Hebraists, in particular by text linguists like Niccacci, who acknowledges that in some passages, like Ps 20.3–6, a (w-)x-yiqtol clause fulfills a jussive function even though the verbal form does not come first in the sentence. Niccacci then argues that ‘the only valid criterion for making the distinction is contextual in character’, stating that a (w-)x-yiqtol can be labelled as jussive when preceded by one of the ‘direct volitive forms’, i.e.: cohortative, imperative and jussive. Other interesting claims made by Niccacci concern his remark that ‘the very presence of weyiqtol in second position shows the preceding construction to be volitive as well’ and his observation that a 0-yiqtol clause’s default functionality may be blocked by the presence of a double-duty modifier in a preceding clause.

By showing that for a correct analysis of a clause’s functions one should take into account the specific clause pair in which the clause stands, Niccacci creates new perspectives for a more consistent analysis of the Hebrew verbal forms and clauses. However, a more refined approach is needed, as is shown by clause patterns like the one attested in Ps 51.9b, where it seems incorrect to assign a volitive meaning to the w-x-yiqtol clause, despite its being preceded by a jussive 0-yiqtol clause:

---

376 See §3.3. See also Hatav’s discussion of Gen 6.13–14, where we find a sequence of an imperative clause, a 2nd-person x-yiqtol clause and a 2nd-person weqatal clause. Hatav argues that the imperative ‘imposes its interpretation on the rest of the clauses’ and admits that ‘this suggestion warrants a more thorough syntactic (...) analysis of Biblical-Hebrew’; Hatav, G., The Semantics of Aspect and Modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1997), p.149.

Similarly, Gianto concludes his article ‘Mood and Modality in Classical Hebrew’ by mentioning the observation that ‘after a finite verb with a specific type of modality (...), the perfect [weqatal, GK] assumes and continues the modality of the previous finite verb, in whatever form it may appear (as the imperfect, the imperative, the jussive, the cohortative or even the perfect)’; Gianto, A., ‘Mood and Modality in Classical Hebrew’, in: Past Links: Studies in the Languages and Cultures of the Ancient Near East (Israel Oriental Studies; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1998), p.196.


378 Niccacci, Syntax, p.80.
The example suggests that more parameters should be taken into account. In this specific case, the switch in subject can be regarded as preventing the daughter clause from adopting its mother clause’s volitive functionality.

The more refined approach proposed in this chapter implies a search for additional features active at the level of clause connections that could explain what exactly happens with a clause’s default volitive or non-volitive function when it is linked to its mother clause with which it then constitutes a clause pair. The first question to be addressed concerns the exact processes and mechanisms that affect the distribution of functionalities within a given clause pair. We propose a distinction between two types of mechanisms, namely those involving the inheritance of (volitive or non-volitive) functionality and those involving the blocking of the assignment of (volitive) functionality. The second question to be dealt with regards the parameters required for the activation of the processes of inheritance and blocking. Examples of important parameters are ‘(dis)continuity’ of the subject/agent, the constituent type of the preverbal element, and the type of connection between mother and daughter clause (syndetic vs. asyndetic). It will also be necessary to examine the relative status of each parameter: do relevant parameters always support the same analysis of a clause’s functions and if not, which parameter is decisive?

We assume that the current lack of systematic syntactic research into the distribution of functionalities within clause pairs is related to the tendency among Hebraists (including Niccacci) to ignore, in their linguistic analyses, the poetic texts in the Hebrew Bible. Interestingly, we found that precisely in poetic texts processes of inheritance and blocking operate on a very frequent basis (though, of course, this does not mean that they are completely absent in prose). Our concentration on poetic texts, therefore, will enable us to more systematically investigate the mechanisms that determine the passing on and blocking of functions in clause pairs.

### 5.1.2 Outline of the Chapter

In this chapter, we provide an analysis of all clause pairs in which the volitive or non-volitive default functionality of the daughter clause may be affected by its relation to the mother clause. The chapter consists of five parts.

The first two sections deal with the mutual influence of clauses on each other’s functionality as it becomes visible within specific sequences of a mother clause and its daughter clause. In the first part, we discuss sequences of clauses in which inheritance of volitive or non-volitive functionality may take place and concentrate on the identification of the parameters that enable or block activation of these processes of inheritance. In the chapter’s second section, clause pairs are discussed in which blocking mechanisms block the ascription of volitive functionality to verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses. A distinction is made between inherited clause modifying elements (multiple-duty modifiers) that result in a redefinition of clause types and processes of blocking related to a clause’s position within a specific domain of communication.

The chapter’s third part deals with the recursive nature of the processes of inheritance and blocking and makes clear that the activity of these processes is not restricted to the domain of
isolated clause pairs. In many cases, a mother clause affecting its daughter clause’s function in one of the ways described in the first two sections is itself the daughter clause of another clause by which it may itself be prevented from exhibiting its default function. Inheritance and blocking of functions and elements will be shown to be iterative processes that operate ‘top-down’ through complete chains of clauses. This necessitates an accurate identification of the chain of clauses to which a specific clause pair belongs. The section contains many illustrative examples of texts in which processes of inheritance and/or blocking taking place earlier in a clause chain affect the functionalities passed on and exhibited in later clause pairs belonging to that same clause chain.

In the chapter’s fourth part, we will pay special attention to the *weqatal* clause, which we will show to be a clause type that is remarkably sensitive to the adoption of functionality from its mother clause. As such, the *weqatal* clause constitutes an example *par excellence* of the working of the mechanism of inheritance and its recursive nature.

The final part of the chapter contains a brief overview of the similarities and the differences between prose and poetry in their use of the higher-level syntactic processes. Again, the inclusion of and concentration on poetry in our investigation of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system will prove to be of vital importance, as it enables us to clearly identify the higher-level syntactic rules that are part of it and so to offer a consistent analysis for Hebrew’s general use of verbal forms and clause types.

To keep our discussion of patterns, mechanisms and parameters as clear as possible, we have avoided the inclusion of an overload of texts for illustration. At the start of the subsections, however, references are made to pattern numbers in the exhaustive and structured overview of all occurrences of each pattern in the Psalms as provided in the online ‘Concordance of Clause Patterns’ that can be found on the website accompanying this dissertation. In the statistical data presented at the beginning of each subsection, we provide information about the total number of attestations of a given pattern in the Book of Psalms and in the direct speech prose sections found in the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, I-II Samuel, I-II Kings, and I-II Chronicles. We also show in how many of these attestations the distribution of functionality is affected by higher-level syntactic mechanisms of inheritance and blocking.

### 5.2 Inheritance of Volitive and Non-volitive Functionality

In this section, we discuss clause pairs in which volitive and non-volitive functions are inherited by the daughter clause. For each of the clause pairs, we examine which parameters activate the mechanism of inheritance, thus causing the mother clause’s function to override the default function of the daughter clause. If the mechanism of inheritance is not activated, the daughter clause, in principle, is not prevented from fulfilling its default (volitive) function (which was identified in the previous chapter). The recursive nature of processes of inheritance – that is: their activity in whole clause chains – is taken for granted in this section and receives full attention in §5.4.

---

379 This online concordance of all clause patterns attested in the Psalms can be found at: [http://nbviewer.ipython.org/github/ETCBC/Biblical_Hebrew_Analysis/blob/master/PhD/ConcordanceOfPatterns.ipynb](http://nbviewer.ipython.org/github/ETCBC/Biblical_Hebrew_Analysis/blob/master/PhD/ConcordanceOfPatterns.ipynb).

380 As stated in the chapter’s outline, this part does not take into account the effect of blocking mechanisms on a clause’s functions. Clause pairs in which the daughter clause is prevented from fulfilling its default (volitive) function by the presence of a double-duty modifier in its mother clause, for instance, will be left out of consideration and only be discussed in §5.3.1.2.
The clause pairs are divided into two categories on the basis of the presence or absence of the conjunction ɬ in the daughter clause. In some patterns, the presence of the conjunction ɬ (syndetic parataxis) is an important additional parameter enabling daughter clauses to inherit functionality from their mother clause. We start this section, however, with a discussion of pairs of clauses that are asyndetically connected.

In the first subsections, we discuss clause pairs consisting of a 0-yiqtol daughter clause and an X/x-yiqtol mother clause in which the preverbal x-element is not a multiple-duty modifier, but an explicit subject (denoted by capital X\(^{381}\)) or another clause constituent (denoted by small x).\(^{382}\)

### 5.2.1 Asyndetic Clause Connections

#### 5.2.1.1 (w-)X-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol

[default: non-volitive > volitive]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern: 120–130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in Psalms: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance: 20 (35.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in prose: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance: 1 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explicit subject in daughter clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agent continuity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 5.1 Inheritance in sequences of non-volitive (w-)X-yiqtol > volitive 0-yiqtol**

---

\(^{381}\) For a more elaborate explanation of the clause type labels used in the following sections, see §0.5.

\(^{382}\) Contrary to what Niccacci and Joosten suggest, the non-volitive meaning of the 0-yiqtol daughter clause, in such clause pairs, cannot always be accounted for by assuming the presence of a double-duty modifier in the mother clause. See Joosten, J., ‘A Neglected Rule and Its Exceptions: On Non-Volitive yiqtol in Clause-Initial Position’, in: Geiger, G., En pase grammatike kai Sophia (Bari: Franciscan Printing Press, 2011), pp.215–218. See further §3.3.3.3.1.
In Hebrew poetry, we find a number of interesting examples of sequences of \((w-)X\)-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol in which the 0-yiqtol adopts the non-volitive values of its \((w-)X\)-yiqtol mother clause. The parameter of *continuation of the same subject* is an important requirement that should be fulfilled in sequences of \((w-)X\)-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol clauses in order to activate the process of inheritance. Good examples\(^{383}\) can be found in Ps 12.8:

\[
[<\text{Su}> \text{אתה}]^8 \quad \text{XYqt} \\
[<\text{Vo}> \text{יהוה}] \quad \text{Voct} \\
[<\text{PO}> \text{משמר}] \quad ---- \\
[<\text{Ti}> \text{לי-שלם}] \quad [<\text{sp}>\text{מ-זระยะ } \text{ו/ו}] \quad [<\text{PO}> \text{מענה}] \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

\(^8\)You, YHWH, protect us, you guard us ever from this generation.

in Ps 9.9:

\[
[<\text{Aj}> \text{.APPLICATION}] \quad [<\text{Ob}> \text{בן-עריצי}] \quad [<\text{Pr}> \text{ישפט}] \quad [<\text{Su}> \text{אתה}] \quad [<\text{Cj}> \text{-ו}]^9 \quad \text{WWXYq} \\
[<\text{Aj}> \text{حلول}] \quad [<\text{Ob}> \text{לאומיה}] \quad [<\text{Pr}> \text{ידין}] \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

\(^9\)And He judges the world with righteousness, He judges the peoples with equity.

and in the only occurrence of this clause sequence in all discursive prose sections in the Hebrew Bible, Gen 15.15:

\[
[<\text{Aj}> \text{.APPLICATION}] \quad [<\text{Ob}> \text{בן-משלת}] \quad [<\text{Pr}> \text{לשתך}] \quad [<\text{Su}> \text{אתה}] \quad [<\text{Cj}> \text{-ו}]^{15} \quad \text{WWXYq} \\
[<\text{Aj}> \text{הדבר}] \quad [<\text{Ob}> \text{שבאה טובה}] \quad [<\text{Pr}> \text{תבוא}] \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

\(^15\)But you go to your fathers in peace, you are buried in a good old age.

The explicit subject may have the form of one or more dependent subject clause(s), as in Isa 46.6:

\[
[<\text{Aj}> \text{-ו}] \quad [<\text{Ob}> \text{שלום}] \quad [<\text{Re}> \text{ולימ}] \quad [<\text{PC}> \text{ eiusmod}] \quad [<\text{Pr}> \text{-ו}] \quad \text{Ptcp} \\
[<\text{Pr}> \text{بذلך}] \quad [<\text{Ob}> \text{-ו}] \quad [<\text{Cj}> \text{ברק}] \quad \text{WxY0} \\
[<\text{Ob}> \text{ישכר}] \quad [<\text{Pr}> \text{צורי}] \quad \text{XYqt} \\
\text{...} \\
[<\text{Pr}> \text{.Ct רצוני}] \quad \text{ZYq0} \\
\text{...} \\
[<\text{PO}> \text{והושק}] \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

\(^6\)Those who lavish gold from the purse and weigh out silver in the scales,

---

\(^{383}\) Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in Isa 24.14, 45.2–4, 60.7 and, possibly, 2 Sam 23.7.
hire a goldsmith,  
...  
they fall down,  
...  
7 they lift it.

Furthermore, the explicit subject does not have to be the only preverbal element in the $X$-\textit{yiqtol} mother clause, as can be seen in Ps 84.7–8, where the explicit subject, which is a participle clause, is followed by an object:

\[ <\text{Co}> \text{בכ-העמק-ב} \quad xYq0 \]
\[ <\text{PC}> \text{עב י} \quad XxYq \]
\[ <\text{PO}> \text{ישיותו} <\text{Ob}> \text{מעין} \]
\[ ... \]
\[ <\text{sp}> <\text{Co}> \text{עלן-מל-החליל} <\text{Pr}> \text{לדר} \quad ZYq0 \]

7 They who go through the valley of Baca make it a place of springs,  
...  
8 they go from strength to strength.

Inheritance of non-volitive functionality does not take place when the verbal form in the $0$-\textit{yiqtol} daughter clause is morphologically marked as volitive, as in Ps 17.15, where the $0$-\textit{yiqtol} clause contains a cohortative form:

\[ <\text{Ob}> \text{מתונך} [<\text{Pr}> \text{הקיץ-ב}] \quad \text{InfC} \]
\[ <\text{Ap}> <\text{Pr}> \text{בעה-זה-צדק-ב} \quad \text{ZYq0} \]
\[ <\text{Co}> \text{ל-תומך-ساهمך} \quad \text{XxYq} \]

15 I behold your face in righteousness,  
I want to be satisfied,  
when I am awaking,  
with your form.

Syntax-overruling morphological marking of volitive meaning may also be present in the $(w-)$-$X$-\textit{yiqtol} mother clause. Then, the $0$-\textit{yiqtol} daughter clause keeps fulfilling its default volitive function, as in Judg 5.3:

\[ <\text{Pr}> \text{י ה-נכי} <\text{Su}> \text{נכי-נכי} <\text{Co}> \text{יהוה-ל} \quad ZYq0 \]
\[ <\text{Pr}> \text{י להי-ליהוה-ל} <\text{Ap}> <\text{Co}> \text{ל-יהוה-אלהי-ישראל} \quad \text{ZYq0} \]

3 To YHWH I want to sing,  
I want to make melody to YHWH, the God of Israel!

In each of the previous examples, the non-volitive functionality of the $0$-\textit{yiqtol} daughter clause(s) could be accounted for by assuming a continued, implicit ‘presence’ of an explicit subject phrase or clause being part of the mother clause. In other words, what is inherited in these patterns is
not so much the non-volitive functionality of the mother clause, but rather its explicit subject, which would require a reanalysis of the 0-yiqtol clause(s) as an <X>-yiqtol clause. Such an analysis is not applicable, however, if mother and daughter clause do not share the exact same subject. In that case, the absence of volitive meaning in the 0-yiqtol daughter clause cannot be caused by the implicit resumption of the mother clause’s subject, but is to be explained rather in terms of inheritance of non-volitive functionality. Indeed, the activation of such a process of inheritance is not affected by differences between mother and daughter clause in the way they refer to the (same and single) participant having the semantic role of agent. Thus, in Ps 49.4–5, the mother clause uses a synecdoche construction to refer to the 1st-person participant being the daughter clause’s subject:

\[
\text{[<Ob> [תבכמ] [בבר נ] [פי] 4 XYqt [<Pr> [יודו] [Su] 4 ] ] ...}
\]

\[
\text{[<Ob> [אוני] [ל-מעש] [Pr] 5 ] [אס]}
\]

\[
\text{[<Ob> [אמהות] [ב-ענור] [Aj] 4 ] [Pr] ZYq0 [<Su> [ב] ] ]}
\]

4 My mouth speaks wisdom,

... 5 I incline my ear to a proverb.

I solve my riddle to the music of the lyre.

The parameter of continuation of the same agent is also at work in pairs in which both the X-yiqtol mother clause and the 0-yiqtol-X daughter clause contain an explicit subject. In such pairs of clauses, the mechanism of inheritance of non-volitive functionality is only activated in case the subjects of mother and daughter clause are synonymous. Take Ps 140.14, for example:

\[
\text{[<Co> [מדימת] [Pr] [ו] [YHWH קול] [Pr] [YHWH יב] [Su] 14 ] [X] XYqt}
\]

\[
\text{[<Co> [פש] [Pr] [ט] [YHWH יב] [Su] [YHWH יב] ZYqX ] [Pr] ] [אמהות] [ב-ענור] [Aj] 4 ] [Pr] ZYq0 [<Su> [ב] ] ]}
\]

14 Surely the righteous give thanks to your name, the upright dwell in your presence.

In addition to the semantic correlation between the subjects, such clauses usually share other semantic and/or syntactic similarities, as in Ps 29.8:

\[
\text{[<Ob> [מד蓖] [Pr] [ו] [YHWH קול] [Pr] [YHWH יב] [Su] 8 ] [X] XYqt}
\]

\[
\text{[<Ob> [מדбед] [Pr] [ו] [YHWH קול] [Pr] [YHWH יב] [Su] [YHWH יב] ZYqX ] [Pr] ] [אמהות] [ב-ענור] [Aj] 4 ] [Pr] ZYq0 [<Su> [ב] ] ]}
\]

8 The voice of YHWH shakes the wilderness, YHWH shakes the wilderness of Kadesh.

As the considerations above imply, inheritance of non-volitive functionality does not take place when there is a clear change in subject, as in Ps 25.3:

\[
\text{[<Pr> [בשת] [Ng] [ל] [Su] 3 ] [Pr] XYqt}
\]

\[
\text{[<Pr> [בשת] ZYqX ] [Pr] ] [אמהות] [ב-ענור] [Aj] 4 ] [Pr] ZYq0 [<Su> [ב] ] ]}
\]

384 Similar examples are found in Job 15.4 and 18.5–9.
5. Text-level Syntax: Inheritance and Blocking in Clause Patterns

[<Mo> רָחֵם [PC> בֹּנֶד] [Re> ה] Ptcp

Yea, none that wait for thee are put to shame;
let be ashamed,
who are acting treacherously.

5.2.1.2 \((w-)x\cdot yiqtol > 0\cdot yiqtol\) [default: non-volitive > volitive]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns:</th>
<th>140–150(^{385})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in Psalms:</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance:</td>
<td>15 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in prose:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance:</td>
<td>1 (^{386}) (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters:</td>
<td>1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Explicit subject in daughter clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Agent continuity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{385}\) The non-realization of the 0-yiqtol clause’s default volitive function in these types of patterns is more often caused by blocking mechanisms (in particular by the presence of a multiple-duty modifier; see §5.3.1.1) than by inheritance of non-volitive functionality.

\(^{386}\) The single example of this pattern involving inheritance in our corpus of direct speech prose texts is found in Deut 19.2–3, where the yiqtol clauses may pragmatically function as commands, but are syntactically marked as declarative factual statements:

\(^{2}\) Three cities you set apart for you in the land,
which YHWH, your God, is giving you,
to possess.

\(^{3}\) You prepare for you the roads
and will then divide into three parts the area of the land,
which YHWH, your God, gives you as a possession.
5. Text-level Syntax: Inheritance and Blocking in Clause Patterns

While in many (w-)x-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol sequences one could account for the blocking of the 0-yiqtol clause’s default volitive functionality by assuming the implicit presence of the mother clause’s explicit subject in the daughter clause, we have already shown that not all non-volitive 0-yiqtol clauses can be explained by referring to the assumed presence of such a volition-blocking element in an ancestor clause. This is certainly also true for occurrences of the (w-)x-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol sequence, in which the blocking of the volitive functionality of the 0-yiqtol clause is systematically realized if the required parameters, which will be discussed below, are set.

At the level of the simple clause sequence, there are no major differences between the pattern (w-)X-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol and the pattern (w-)x-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol. As the scheme shows, one should first identify volitive morphological markings, as these precede any kind of syntactic marking (see our hierarchical ‘marking scheme’ in §5.2.3). Thus, if the mother clause contains a verbal form that is morphologically marked as volitive, the daughter always keeps fulfilling its default volitive function, as in Ps 14.7 (/ 53.7):³⁸⁷

³⁸⁷ Compare Isa 27.4 and 41.2–3.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[Ob] [Su] [Pr]} & \quad \text{InfC} \\
\text{[Su] [Pr]} & \quad \text{xYqX} \\
\text{[Su] [Pr]} & \quad \text{ZYqX}
\end{align*}
\]

³⁸⁷ When YHWH is restoring the fortunes of his people, 
let Jacob rejoice, 
let Israel be glad.

The same is true for those instances in which the verbal form in the 0-yiqtol daughter clause is morphologically marked as cohortative or jussive: the morphological marking overrules the
possible activation of inheritance mechanisms in the syntactic pattern and prevents the *0-yiqtol* clause from attaining non-volitive functionality, as in Ps 31.6–8:

6 Into your hand I commit my spirit.

... 8 Let me rejoice
    and let me be glad for your steadfast love.

If volitive morphological marking is absent, the parameter of *continuation of the same subject* is of crucial importance for inheritance to take place. Good examples of this can be found in Ps 36.5:

5 He plots mischief while on his bed,
   he sets himself in a way,
   that is not good.

in Isa 33.17:

17 The king in his beauty your eyes see,
    they behold a land that stretches afar.

and in Isa 58.2:

2 Yet they seek me daily
    and delight to know my ways as if they were a nation,
    that has done righteousness,
    ... 
    they ask of me righteous judgements.

388 Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in Exod 15.6; Deut 32.11; Isa 13.11–13, 38.14, 42.13, 42.16, 43.5–6, 52.13; Job 12.14, 19.3. 19.7.
Again, the parameter of ‘continuity of the same subject’ may be redefined to include also those patterns in which continuation of the agent is grammatically marked by pronominal suffixes attached to a lexeme referring to a body part. An example of such a construction, which reflects the stylistic figure of a synecdoche, is found in Ps 41.7:

\[
\text{[<Su> לבו] [<Pr> ידבר] [<Ob> שא] 7 xYqX}
\text{[<Co> ול] [<Ob> קבין] ZYq0}
\text{[<Co> ו-החת] [<Pr> א] ZYq0}
\text{[<Pr> ידבר] ZYq0}
\]

7 His heart utters empty words, he gathers mischief, he goes abroad, he tells it.

If the parameter of ‘continuity of the same subject’ is not active, which means that there is a switch of subject between the (w-)x-yiqtol mother clause and the 0-yiqtol daughter clause, inheritance of the non-volitive default functionality does not take place. One of the numerous examples of this can be found in Ps 18.7:

\[
\text{[<Ob> לו] [<Pr> ק] [<sp><Aj> לי / צ -- ב] 7 xYq0}
\text{[<Pr> ע] [<Co> אלהי] [<Gj> -] WxY0}
\text{[<Ob> כלל] [<Aj> מ-הうちに] [<Pr> ישמע] ZYq0}
\]

7 In my distress I call YHWH, and to my God I cry for help. May he hear my voice from his temple.

In many such instances, the 0-yiqtol clause contains an explicit subject. Indeed, as we concluded for the previous pattern, the presence of an explicit subject in the 0-yiqtol clause often hinders any form of inheritance of non-volitive functionality, unless that subject is synonymous to the one of its mother clause. Other lexical correspondences usually confirm the level of continuity marked by the synonymous character of the subjects of the clauses, as in Isa 57.13:

\[
\text{[<Su> רוח] [<Pr> שים] [<Ob> ולא כלל] [<Gj> -] 13 WxYX}
\text{[<Su> יתש] [<Pr> ק] ZYqX}
\]

13 Yet the wind carries off all of them, a breath takes them away.

---

389 Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in both prosaic sections – Gen 30.31; Num 14.11–12; 2 Sam 3.23, 16.9 – and poetic sections – Isa 3.6–7, 24.9, 33.10–11, 41.11–12, 43.9, 50.2, 50.8, 53.10–11; Job 15.22–24, 20.16; Exod 15.16–17.

390 Similarly, Isa 41.11. In the given example taken from Isa 57.13, the preverbal object of the mother clause is assumed to be present in the daughter clause (ellipsis).
If, on the other hand, a mother clause and its daughter clause have non-synonymous subjects, then the use of an explicit subject in the daughter clause signals that that clause maintains its volitive default functionality, as in Ps 82.5:

\[ <\text{Pr}> \text{בִּיתֵיהָנָם} [<\text{Co}> \text{יחָמֹלךְ}] \]
\[ <\text{Su}> \text{מִיָּמָיו} [<\text{Pr}> \text{ yatָּמוּ} \text{אָתָי}] \]

\[ \text{יִשָּׁלוּ} 5 \]
\[ \text{בֵּין} 5 \xi q0 \]
\[ \text{בֵּין} 5 \text{Yq}X \]

In darkness they walk about;
let all of the foundations of the earth be shaken!

5.2.1.3 \((w-)\emptyset\text{-}\text{yiqtol} > x\text{-}\text{yiqtol}\)

\[ \text{[default: volitive > non-volitive]} \]

Pattern: 580

Number of attestations in Psalms: 89
  with inheritance: 33 (37.1%)
Number of attestations in prose: 16
  with inheritance: 5 (29.4%)

Parameters:
1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause
2. Explicit subject in daughter clause
3. Agent continuity

In sequences of \((w-)\emptyset\text{-}\text{yiqtol} > x\text{-}\text{yiqtol}\), inheritance of functionality occurs under the same conditions as those required for inheritance of functionality in the \((w-)x\text{-}\text{yiqtol} > 0\text{-}\text{yiqtol}\) pattern. Thus, if the \(x\text{-}\text{yiqtol}\) daughter clause has as its implicit subject the same participant as its \((w-)\emptyset\text{-}\text{yiqtol}\) mother clause, it inherits that clause’s volitive default function. Good examples\(^\text{391}\) of this can be found in Ps 2.9:

\[ \text{In darkness they walk about; let all of the foundations of the earth be shaken!} \]

\[ \text{5 In darkness they walk about; let all of the foundations of the earth be shaken!} \]

---

\(^{391}\) Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in Isa 35.1–2, 41.1; Job 10.18–19, 14.13–15, 19.23–24; Deut 32.23; 2 Sam 22.43. In prose, rare examples can be found in Gen 23.8–9, 24.55; Exod 32.30; Lev 1.3; Num 20.17; Deut 2.27.
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You should break them with a rod of iron, like a potter’s vessel you should dash them in pieces.

in Ps 5.12:

But let all who take refuge in you rejoice, Let them ever sing for joy.

in Ps 18.21 (// 2 Sam 22.21), where the morphological marking of the indicative long form in the x-yiqtol daughter clause is overruled by the syntactic pattern:

May YHWH reward me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands may he recompense me.

in Ps 66.13–15:

Let me come into your house with burnt offerings, let me pay you my vows,

... let me offer to you burnt offerings of fatlings with the smoke of the sacrifice of rams, let me make an offering of bulls and goats.

in Isa 42.11:

Let the inhabitants of the rock sing for joy, let them shout from the top of the mountains.

and in Judg 5.24:
May Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, be blessed above women, above tent-dwelling women may she be blessed!

Also the presence of a negation will not prevent the x-yiqtol daughter clause from inheriting its mother clause’s volitive functionality. See, for instance, Ps 101.2–3:

$$[<\text{Co}> \text{אשחתך}]_2 \text{xYq0}$$
$$[<\text{Aj}> \text{ב-כזר בתי}]_2$$
$$[<\text{Ob}> \text{ל-נדנין עמי}]_3 \text{xyq0}$$

Let me walk with integrity of heart within my house, let me not set before my eyes anything that is base!

If the x-yiqtol clause has as its subject another participant than the (w-)Ø-yiqtol mother clause, there is no inheritance of volitive functionality. An example can be found in Ps 31.5–6:

$$[<\text{Co}> \text{חותניינ}]_5 \text{zyq0}$$
$$[<\text{Po}> \text{.black}]_6$$
$$[<\text{Co}> \text{ל]}_7$$
$$[<\text{Pr}> \text{וז}]_8$$
$$[<\text{Re}> \text{ית}]_9$$

5 You should take me out of the net, which they have hidden for me.

6 Into your hand I commit my spirit.

In many (w-)Ø-yiqtol > x-yiqtol sequences characterized by a subject change, the daughter clause contains an explicit subject. However, this does not mean that when an x-yiqtol daughter clause contains an explicit subject, it never inherits volitive functionality. As was true for (w-)x-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol-X sequences, inheritance of functionality can also take place in (w-)Ø-yiqtol > x-yiqtol-X patterns, provided that there is a lexical or semantic continuity in subject reference, for instance by the use of synonymous subjects. Such types of participant continuity may be accompanied by other lexical correspondences or parallelism in syntactic structures, as in Ps 33.8:

$$[<\text{Su}> \text{ץ-הכל}]_8 \text{zyqX}$$
$$[<\text{Co}> \text{יהוה}]_9$$
$$[<\text{Pr}> \text{ייוו}]_10$$
$$[<\text{Co}> \text{ממנו}]_11$$

8 Let all the earth fear YHWH, let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him!

A similar type of analysis applies when the explicit subjects of two parallel clauses are identical instead of synonymous, as in Ps 72.17:

$$[<\text{PC}> \text{עולם}]_17 \text{zyqX}$$
$$[<\text{Su}> \text{מו}]_18$$
$$[<\text{Pr}> \text{יהי}]_19$$
$$[<\text{Su}> \text{מו}]_20$$
$$[<\text{Pr}> \text{ינינ}]_21$$
$$[<\text{Co}> \text{מפני}]_22$$

17 May his name endure forever, may his name continue as long as the sun!

---

392 Similarly, Ps 49.8–10 and Isa 47.7.
or when they have an identical referent, as in Ps 34.2–3, where the explicit subject in the
daughter clause with its pronominal suffix attached to a body-part lexeme refers to the 1st-
person subject of the mother clause:

\[
\text{אמבר ה [ב-בלי תע] \text{זYq0}}
\]

\[
\text{...}
\]

\[
\text{Let me bless יHWH at all times,}
\]

\[
\text{...}
\]

\[
\text{let my soul make its boast in יHWH!}
\]

**5.2.1.4 \((w-)Ø-yiqtol > X-yiqtol\)**

[default: volitive > non-volitive]

| Pattern: 400 |
| Number of attestations in Psalms: 20 |
| with inheritance: 12 (60.0%) |
| Number of attestations in prose: 0 |
| with inheritance: 0 (0.0%) |
| Parameters: |
| 1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause |
| 2. Subjects of mother and daughter refer to different (animate) participants |

The sequence \((w-)Ø-yiqtol > X-yiqtol\), in which the \(X\)-yiqtol daughter clause has an explicit subject as (one of) its preverbal element(s), does not occur very often in our text corpus. It is even completely absent in discursive prose.

As was true for the reversed sequence of \(X\)-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol-X, the use of an explicit subject in the daughter clause does not automatically render inheritance of functionality impossible. Instead, lexical correspondences between the subjects and the verbs used in both clauses are usually sufficient for the activation of the process of inheritance of volitive functionality, as in Ps 21.9:

\[
\text{זYqX}
\]

\[
\text{XYqt}
\]

\(9\) May your hand find out all your enemies,
your right hand may find out those who hate you.
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and in Ps 149.2:

Let Israel be glad in his Maker, let the sons of Zion rejoice in their King!

A similar type of analysis applies to those instances in which the X-
\textit{yiqtol} daughter clause has as its explicit subject a personal pronoun referring to the same participant as the implicit subject of the \textit{(w-)}\textit{-yiqtol} mother clause. Again, semantic correlations play a significant role, as in Ps 104.33–34:

Let me sing to YHWH as long as I live, let me sing praise to my God while I have my being,

However, by referring to such lexical correspondences, we are not yet able to cover all cases of inheritance in the pattern under investigation. Instead, the conditions under which inheritance takes place do not seem to be as restrictive as those regulating inheritance processes in other patterns, which makes it quite difficult to define strict parameters regulating the distribution of functionality within this pattern. Thus, inheritance of functionality is not hindered when the daughter clause introduces another non-animate agent, as in Ps 61.8:

May he be enthroned forever before God, may steadfast love and faithfulness watch over him!

On the basis of such texts, we claim that it is more helpful to identify a shared characteristic of those instances in which inheritance of volitive functionality does \textit{not} occur, namely the introduction of a \textit{new animate agent} in the daughter clause. Inheritance of volitive functionality is hindered if the daughter clause has as its agent an animate participant that is fully absent in the mother clause or at least does not play an agentive role in it, as in Ps 119.78:

Let the godless be put to shame, because they have subverted me with guile.
Observations with regard to the degree of continuity in the complete set of participants thus play an important role in the identification of activated and non-activated mechanisms of inheritance.

5.2.1.5 imperative > x-yaqtol

Pattern: 570
Number of attestations in Psalms: 80
  with inheritance: 12 (15.0%)
Number of attestations in prose: 17
  with inheritance: 7 (41.2%)
Parameters:
1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause
2. Subjects of mother and daughter refer to same participant

In sequences of an imperative mother clause and an x-yaqtol daughter clause, the parameter of 
continuation of the same subject again proves itself to be of central importance. Based on the data found in our texts, we conclude that when a (non-prohibitive) x-yaqtol clause with a 2nd-person subject has an imperative clause as its mother clause, it always inherits the volitive value of the imperative clause and, therefore, has to be assigned a jussive, or – in case the addressee has a higher status than the speaker – a desiderative, meaning. Clear examples can be found in Ps 17.8:

[<Aj> שמעתי ב-אישה בת עין] 8 Z1m0
[<PO> בן-לא נסמי [תמתניינ] > [<Aj> xYq0

8 Keep me as the apple of the eye,
in the shadow of your wings you may hide me!

in Ps 140.2:

393 In 25 attestations of the pattern in the Psalms (31.3%), the x-yaqtol daughter clause is a prohibitive clause containing the negation לא.

394 Another example from beyond the Psalms can be found in Isa 41.23.
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Deliver me, YHWH, from evil men, from violent men you may preserve me!

and in Isa 45.11:

An exception to this is constituted by the class of patterns in which the x-yiqtol daughter clause starts with any of the modifiers ז, י ז, או, as in Ps 51.2:

Sometimes, especially when the sequence imperative > x-yiqtol is interrupted by (an)other clause(s), both the mother clause and the x-yiqtol daughter clause contain a vocative, as in Ps 51.16–17:

Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, God, God of my salvation!
- Let my tongue sing aloud of your deliverance!
Adonai, you may open my lips!

In §4.3.5, we explained how in prosaic legislative contexts 2nd-person x-yiqtol clauses may pragmatically function as commands, while their grammatically marked function is that of expressing a factual-declarative statement. However, when such x-yiqtol clauses are anchored in an imperative clause, this distinction between grammatically marked function and pragmatic
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function disappears since the activation of the parameter of subject continuation allows the \textit{x-yiqtol} clause to inherit its imperative mother clause’s volitive meaning. Take, for instance, Gen 6.14, where YHWH commands Noah to build a ship and to follow several prescriptions in doing so:\textsuperscript{395}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ob> התבה עץ נמר] [<sc> יד] [<Pr> השה] 14 ZIm0
[<Ob> התבה א-היה] [<Pr> התשה] [<Ob>] xYq0
[<Co> [מש-היה] [<Lo> מג-כבר]]

14 Make for yourself an ark of gopher wood,
you should make rooms in the ark
and you should then cover it inside and out with pitch.
\end{verbatim}

In non-legislative prosaic sections, imperative > 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person \textit{x-yiqtol} sequences in which the \textit{yiqtol} clause inherits volitive functionality from the imperative mother clause are attested, too. Note that in these instances, like in many poetic examples, the speaker regularly does not have a higher status than the addressee (contrary to what is the case in legislative contexts in which YHWH is the speaker). As such, the speaker is not in the position to simply prescribe how the addressee has to act (non-volitive command), but is expressing his will in the form of a request, as in Gen 34.9:\textsuperscript{396}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Pr> התנו] [<Co> תנו] [<Ob> תנו] [<Ij> נ] [<Pr> תנו] 8 ZIm0
[<Ob> תנו] [<Pr> התנה] [<Cj> -ו] 9 WIm0
[<Co> [טננה] [<Pr> מנה] [<Ob> מתנה] [<Mo>ף] xYq0
[<Co> [刖] [<Pr> נ incompet] [<Ob> נתנה] [<Cj> -ו] WxY0

8 Please give her to him as a wife,
and make marriages with us!
Your daughters you may give to us
and our daughters you may take for yourselves!
\end{verbatim}

If the subject of the \textit{x-yiqtol} daughter clause does not refer to the 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person participant being the subject of the imperative mother clause, inheritance of the imperative clause’s volitive functionality does not take place.\textsuperscript{397} Our corpus contains several examples of imperative > \textit{x-}

\textsuperscript{395} See also: Gen 7.1–2; Exod 14.2, 16.16, 16.25–26, 29.1–2.
\textsuperscript{396} Similarly: Gen 18.4–5, 21.23 and 41.55.
\textsuperscript{397} A rare exception to this may be found in Isa 45.21, where a 3\textsuperscript{rd}-person \textit{x-yiqtol} clause suddenly and briefly interrupts a direct speech section addressed to a 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural participant group.

\begin{verbatim}
[<Pr> חנור] 21 ZIm0
[<Pr> התשה] [<Cj> -ו] WIm0
[<Mo> יוהד] [<Pr> ועש] [<Mo> א] xYq0

21 Declare
and present your case!
- yes, let them take counsel together!
\end{verbatim}
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*yiqtol* sequences, for instance, in which the subject of the *x-yiqtol* daughter clause is the speaker instead of the addressee, as in Ps 34.12:

\[
\begin{align*}
[<Pr>] \text{לכו} & \quad Z\text{Im}0 \\
[<Vo>] \text{בונים} & \quad \text{Voct} \\
[<Co>] \text{ HttpClientModule} & \quad Z\text{Im}0 \\
[<PO>] \text{למדכם} & \quad x\text{Yq}0 \\
[<Ob>] \text{יהוה} & \quad \text{xYq}0
\end{align*}
\]

12 Come, sons, listen to me! I teach you the fear of YHWH.

5.2.1.6 imperative > *X-yiqtol*  
(default: volitive > non-volitive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern: 390</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in Psalms: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance: 8 (38.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in prose: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance: 3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subjects of mother and daughter refer to different (animate) participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We deliberately discuss the sequence imperative > *X-yiqtol*, in which an explicit subject takes preverbal position in the *yiqtol* daughter clause, separately from the pattern imperative > *x-yiqtol*. We do so, because processes of inheritance are regulated by different factors in the two types of patterns. More specifically, there is an interesting correspondence between sequences of imperative > *X-yiqtol* and those of *(w-)*Ø-*yiqtol* > *X-yiqtol*, as in both patterns the question as to whether or not the *X-yiqtol* daughter clause introduces a new animate agent plays a central role.

It should be noted that, though the reference changes from 2\textsuperscript{nd} person to 3\textsuperscript{rd} person, the participant group playing the role of subject remains the same. Indeed, Isa 45.21 is clearly exceptional in its use of clause types and its sudden switch from 2\textsuperscript{nd} to 3\textsuperscript{rd} person. Even the *Versiones* (Pesjitta, Targum and Vulgate) have great difficulties in rendering this verse and have made the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-person *yiqtol* clause into a 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person imperative clause.
Our text corpus does not contain examples of imperative > 2nd-person *X-yiqtol* sequences in which the *X-yiqtol* clause, because of its continuation of the same subject, inherits the volitive value of the imperative mother clause. Yet, we do encounter a large number of instances of the imperative > *X-yiqtol* pattern in which the *X-yiqtol* clause has as its indirect agent the same participant as the one addressed in the imperative mother clause, which repeatedly seems to activate processes of inheritance. In these instances, the parameter ‘continuation of the same agent’ can take several forms.

First of all, we encounter texts in which the *X-yiqtol* daughter clause has as its 3rd-person subject the participant who is addressed directly in the imperative clause, as in Ps 150.1–6:

```
[<Lo> הַמֵּלֶךְ] [<Pr> הַמֵּלֶךְ] ZIm0
[<Lo> הָדַּרְכָּעַ] [<PO> הֶדְרָכָע] ZIm0
...
[<Ob> ה] [<Pr> הַמֵּלֶךְ] [<Su> נַחַנָּה] XYq0
```

1 Praise God in his sanctuary, praise him in his mighty firmament!

... 6 Let everything that breathes praise YHWH!

A comparable example is found in Isa 33.20, where the mode of direct address communication is continued and the reference to the actor of the imperative clause in the *X-yiqtol* daughter clause is continued in the form of a pronominal suffix attached to a lexeme denoting a body part (synecdoche: ‘your eyes’):

```
[<ap><Ob> עֵינֵיכֶם] [<Pr> הִשְׂמָה] XYqt
[<ap><ap><Ob> הָלַּנְנ] [<Pr> הָלַּנְנָ] ZIm0
```

20 Look upon Zion, the city of our appointed feasts!
Let your eyes see Jerusalem, a quiet habitation, a tent!

---

398 In prose: Exod 35.5. A more complicated case is found in Ps 20.10. Here, we accept the proposal made by several translators (see, for instance, the footnote in the RSV) to regard the subject of the *X-yiqtol* clause as a synonym referring to YHWH (who is directly addressed in the imperative clause):

```
[<Vo> יְהֹוָה] Voct
[<Pr> הָזַּכְת] ZIm0
[<Ti> הַמַּלְכָּ] [<PO> הַמַּלְכָּ] XYq0
[<Ps> נַחַנָּה] InfC
```

10 O YHWH, give victory!
May the King answer us on the day, of our calling.

Others (including BHS) suggest to include the word *הַמַּלְכָּ* in the imperative clause. This would make the *yiqtol* clause into a 0-yiqtol clause in which case continuation of volitivity would be undisputable.
It should be noted that in such patterns there are often lexical correspondences between the verbs used and sometimes between other clause constituents (such as the objects in the given example) too. Yet, it is not correct to regard the parameter of ‘continuity of the same agent’ as the only parameter affecting the activation of the process of inheritance in this pattern. Instead, just as was the case in \((w-)Ø-yiqtol > X-yiqtol\) patterns, the mechanism of inheritance is also activated if the \(X-yiqtol\) daughter clause has as its subject a non-animate participant/entity. Usually, there is an unmistakable presence of semantic or lexical interrelatedness and participant continuity between the clauses in such patterns. An example can be found in Ps 17.1–2:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{<!Ob> חָשְׁבֹּתָה} \\
\text{<!Pr> רֹאִיתִי} \\
\text{<!sp><!Ob> בִּלְאָ לֹא שְׁמַעְתִּי} \\
\text{<!Pr> אֲנָה} \\
\text{<!Su> מַשְׁפֵּטִי} \\
\text{<!Co> מְלִי מֵנִי} \\
\end{array}
\]

1 Attend to my cry!
Give ear to my prayer from lips free of deceit!
2 Let my vindication come from you!

As a matter of fact, in this type of patterns, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person actor of the imperative clause does not have to be referred to at all in the \(X-yiqtol\) daughter clause, as long as the daughter clause’s subject does not introduce a new animate participant. Take, for instance, Ps 43.3:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{<!Ob> אָוָדְתִי} \\
\text{<!Pr> שָׁלָל} \\
\text{<!PO> תְנַשַׁע} \\
\text{<!Su> הָוָה} \\
\text{<!Co> יָאוֹרָנִי} \\
\end{array}
\]

3 Send out your light and your truth!
Let them lead me,
Let them bring me to your holy hill and to your dwelling!

and Ps 25.20–21:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{<!Ob> נֹפֶשַׁה} \\
\text{<!Pr> נַשָּׁר} \\
\text{<!PO> חֲצִילָא} \\
\text{<!Cj>-ו} \\
\text{<!PO> תְּפִלְיָה} \\
\text{<!Su> יַמְּוָיָה} \\
\end{array}
\]

20 Guard my life, and deliver me!
21 May integrity and uprightness preserve me.

Only if the explicit subject of the \(X-yiqtol\) clause introduces a new animate agent, inheritance of volitive functionality is rendered impossible, as in Ps 41.5–6:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{<!Vo> יהוֹ ה} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Voct}\]

\[\text{399 Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Gen 35.11, 43.8; Exod 10.24; Num 1.50, 4.19.}\]
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[YHWH, be gracious to me, heal me!]

... My enemies say of me in malice: “When does he die?”

5.2.2 Syndetic Clause Connections

In pairs consisting of clauses that are coordinated by means of the \( \text{ו} \) conjunction, the set of parameters regulating the process of inheritance of functionality is extended with that of the presence of the coordinate conjunction, which, as we will see, regularly functions as a strong marker of continuation.

5.2.2.1 \((w-)x\)-yiqtol > weyiqtol

Patterns: 270–280

Number of attestations in Psalms: 29
  - with inheritance: 5 (17.2%)
Number of attestations in prose: 9
  - with inheritance: 4 (44.4%)

Parameters:
1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause
2. Mother and daughter share same subject

The sequence \((w-)x\)-yiqtol > weyiqtol is one of the patterns in which the weyiqtol clause may express a non-volitive meaning. As the assignment of functionalities in this pattern changes significantly when the preverbal \( x \)-element in the \((w-)X\)-yiqtol mother clause is the clause’s explicit subject, a separate subsection will be devoted to sequences of \((w-)X\)-yiqtol > weyiqtol. In
the current section, we will restrict ourselves to \textit{x-qiqtol} > \textit{weyiqtol} sequences in which the \textit{x}-
element is not the subject constituent.

As was already indicated above and will be discussed in greater detail in the concluding part of this section, syntactic markings are always overruled by \textit{volitive} morphological marking. If the verbal form in the \textit{(w)-x-qiqtol} mother clause is morphologically marked as volitive, there is no longer a non-volitive meaning that could be inherited and the \textit{weyiqtol} daughter clause simply fulfills its default volitive function, as in 1 Kgs 1.37: \footnote{Similarly, Ps 4.9.}

\begin{verbatim}
[<PC> ולאש] [<Pr> יהוה] [<Cj> יתלב] [<Su> יבר] [<Pr> יונה] 37 xQtX
[<PC> [עבlished text]
[<Aj> מ-כמא אדרי / ה-מלך / זוד]

37 As YHWH has been with my lord the king,
thus he may be with Solomon
and make his throne greater than the throne of my lord king David.
\end{verbatim}

Similarly, if the \textit{weyiqtol} daughter clause contains a form that is morphologically marked as volitive, morphology prevents the acquisition of a non-volitive meaning by the daughter clause, which could otherwise have resulted from the syntactic connection between the respective clauses, as in Isa 1.24: \footnote{Compare Ps 27.6 and Prov 15.25.}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Co> [אנכוה] [<Pr> נמי] [<Ij> היה] 24 xYq0
[<Co> [מ-ואוב] [<Pr> [אנכוה] [<Cj> א-1] WYq0

24 Ah, I vent my wrath on my enemies,
and want to avenge myself on my foes.
\end{verbatim}

It is even possible that both mother and daughter clause contain a verbal form which is morphologically marked as volitive, as, for instance, in Ps 42.5:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Pr> [אנכוה] [<Ob> עליה] 5 xYq0
[<Ob> [מש] [<Co> [אנכוה] [<Pr> [אנכוה] [<Cj> א-1] WYq0

5 Let me remember these things,
and let me pour out my soul.
\end{verbatim}

If volitive morphological marking is absent in the daughter clause and the parameter of \textit{continuation of the same subject} is activated, the \textit{weyiqtol} clause usually inherits its mother clause’s non-volitive value. Clear examples\footnote{Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Exod 24.7; Num 22.6; 1 Kgs 18.5; Isa 41.25, 44.16; Job 12.15, 13.19, 20.8.} can be found in Ps 5.4:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Vo> יהוה] 4 Voct
[<Ob> [akens] [<Pr> [טיש] [<Ti> בעק] xYq0
[<Ob> [akens] [<Pr> [טיש] [<Ti> בעק] xYq0

\end{verbatim}
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YHWH, in the morning you hear my voice, in the morning I prepare a sacrifice for you and watch.

in Ps 83.4:

They lay crafty plans against your people and they consult together against your protected ones.

and in Isa 14.13:

I ascend to heaven, above the stars of God I set my throne on high and I sit on the mount of assembly in the far north.

The presence of a negation in the (w-)x-yiqtol mother clause does not prevent it from passing on a non-volitive value to its weyiqtol daughter clause, as in Job 15.30:

He does not escape from darkness, but goes away by the breadth of his mouth.

The subject shared by the x-yiqtol clause and the weyiqtol clause is sometimes introduced explicitly only in the weyiqtol clause, as in Isa 45.25:

In YHWH triumphs and glories all the offspring of Israel.

---

404 See also Isa 41.11. Compare the numerous occurrences of coordinated 0-yiqtol > weyiqtol-X in the Psalms (pattern 230).
If the parameter of *continuation of the same subject* is not realized, the *weyiqtol* clause does not inherit the *x-yiqtol* clause’s non-volitive functionality and nothing prevents it from executing its default function of ‘indicating a volitive next step’. More specifically, the *weyiqtol* clause often, but not always,\(^{405}\) introduces an intended purpose, which is true in any case for those cases in which it has as its subject a (main) participant that was already introduced in the *(w-)*-x-yiqtol mother clause with a non-agent semantic role, as in Ps 102.27:\(^{406}\)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\langle \text{PO} \rangle \text{החלים} \quad \langle \text{Aj} \rangle \text{לבו} \\
\langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{לפו} \quad \langle \text{Cj} \rangle \text{ו} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{27}\)Like a cloak you change them, so that they may pass away.

5.2.2.2 *(w-)*x-yiqtol > weyiqtol

[default: non-volitive > volitive]

**Patterns:** 250–260

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of attestations in Psalms:</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance:</td>
<td>11 (61.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in prose:</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance:</td>
<td>9 (81.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parameters:**

1. Mother and daughter have same or synonymous subject(s)
2. Fronting of subject in mother has pragmatic function
3. Mother contains negation
4. Subjects of mother and daughter refer to different (animate) participants
5. Volitive morphology in mother clause

\(^{405}\) For *weyiqtols* with a plain volitive meaning see: Lev 15.24; Ps 145.21; Isa 38.16 and 45.24.

\(^{406}\) In the ‘Concordance of Patterns’, *weyiqtol* clauses with a purposive meaning are identified by the label ‘final’ in the column providing information about the final function of a clause. Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Gen 34.23; 1 Kgs 22.20; 1 Sam 20.4; Job 12.15.

Compare the comments made by Muraoka in his article ‘The Alleged Final Function of the Biblical Hebrew Syntagm <Waw + a Volitive Verbal Form>’ in E. van Wolde (ed.), *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp.229–241. Muraoka also notes that the subject of final *weyiqtol* clauses usually is not identical to that of the main (mother?) clause. However, because of the many differences between the syntagm *<waw + volitive form>* and final syntagms like *<le + inf.constr.>* and *<lema'an + yiqtol>*, Muraoka concludes that no inherent final function should be assigned to the *weyiqtol* clause. The interpretation of volitive *weyiqtol* as expressing an intended purpose, according to Muraoka, rather is a matter of pragmatics and translation techniques. To our opinion, however, clear linguistic criteria, such as the change of subject and the reference in the *weyiqtol* clause’s subject to a participant with a non-agent semantic role in the mother clause, can be identified on the basis of which it *is* possible to consistently assign purposive and other meanings to the volitive *weyiqtol* clause.
If the *weyiqtol* clause continues an (*w*-)*X*-yiqtol clause, in which the preverbal *x*-element is an explicit subject, the assignment of functionalities to both clauses is radically different from that in the (*w*-)*X*-yiqtol > *weyiqtol pattern. On the basis of our data, it can reasonably be concluded that in case the parameter of *continuation of the same subject* is active, the pattern (*w*-)*X*-yiqtol > *weyiqtol is used to express two parallel volitive statements. The assignment of functionalities within such sequences can be analyzed in two ways.

First, it could be assumed that in this specific pattern, the process of inheritance runs in the reverse direction, that means: from daughter clause to mother clause. In that case the (*w*-)*X*-yiqtol clause inherits a volitive default value from its *weyiqtol* daughter clause. However, since we do not find other clause patterns in Biblical Hebrew revealing such a type of ‘backward inheritance’ and since the assumption that inheritance of functionality may run in a backward direction would constitute a major challenge to the basically sequential nature of the reading process, it is more plausible to explain the exceptional functionality of the (*w*-)*X*-yiqtol > *weyiqtol sequence as being a specific characteristic of the sequence itself. It is a peculiar function of the (*w*-)*X*-yiqtol > *weyiqtol sequence as a whole to express two parallel volitive statements. In other words, the (*w*-)*X*-yiqtol > *weyiqtol sequence is to be considered as a single functional unit. Illustrative examples are found in Gen 28.3:

\[ \text{<<Ob}} [\text{<<Pr}} [\text{<<Su}} [\text{<<Cj}} \text{<<3}} \text{<<Wyql} \]

---

407 Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Exod 35.10; Deut 1.11, 13.12, 17.13, 19.20, 21.21; Isa 14.10, 49.7; 2 Sam 22.46.
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3 And may God Almighty bless you
and may he make you fruitful
and may he multiply you,
so that you will become a company of peoples,

4 and may he give the blessing of Abraham to you and to your descendants with you!

in Ps 41.3:

3 May YHWH protect him
and keep him alive!

and in 1 Sam 2.10, where the second weyiqtol clause contains an explicit jussive form:

10 May YHWH judge the ends of the earth
and give strength to his king
and exalt the horn of his anointed!

It should be noted that in two of the above-mentioned examples the volitive meaning of the functional unit X-yiqtol > weyiqtol is passed on to other coordinate weyiqtol clauses.

It is not required that the explicit subject be the only preverbal element in the X-yiqtol clause (though most often it is). Other elements can take position between the fronted explicit subject and the verbal form, as in Ps 85.14 (note the presence of an explicit jussive form in the weyiqtol clause):

14 Let righteousness go before him
and prepare the way of his steps.

If the weyiqtol clause contains an explicit subject that is synonymous to the subject in the X-yiqtol clause, the X-yiqtol > weyiqtol-X sequence should still be analyzed as a single functional unit introducing parallel volitional statements. See, for example, Ps 72.10–11 (note that the X-yiqtol clause’s first daughter, which is also an X-yiqtol clause, adopts volitive meaning, too):
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10 May the kings of Tarshish and of the isles render him tribute, may the kings of Sheba and Seba bring gifts, and may all kings fall down before him!

If the subjects of the $X$-$yiqtol$ clause and the $weyiqtol$ clause are not identical or synonymous, the analysis of the sequence as constituting a single functional unit usually is no longer valid, unless the daughter clause introduces a non-animate agent as its subject and there are clear lexical correspondences between mother and daughter clause, as in Ps 21.10:

10 May YHWH swallow them up in his wrath, and may fire consume them.

If such semantic overlap is absent, the clauses both fulfill their default functions of expressing, respectively, non-volitive and volitive meaning. As was true for the $(w$-$)x$-$yiqtol > weyiqtol$ pattern, the $weyiqtol$ clause again can be used to express purposive meaning (finality) in such cases, in particular when it has as its subject a participant that in the $(w$-$)x$-$yiqtol$ mother clause had a non-agent semantic role, as in Isa 46.6:

6 Those who lavish gold from the purse and weigh out silver in the scales, hire a goldsmith, so that he may make it into a god.

However, even if the $(w$-$)X$-$yiqtol$ mother clause and the $weyiqtol$ daughter clause share the same subject, they should not automatically be analyzed as a single functional unit consisting of volitive clauses. Instead, certain factors may hinder the distribution of volitive functionality and, as a consequence, support an analysis of the $(w$-$)X$-$yiqtol > weyiqtol$ that is similar to the one proposed for $(w$-$)x$-$yiqtol > weyiqtol$ pairs of clauses sharing the same subject. A significant
conclusion to be drawn from our data is that when the fronting of the explicit subject in the X-yiqtol clause serves an obvious pragmatic function, the occurrence of the X-yiqtol clause should no longer be interpreted in terms of the X-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence as a whole. In other words, the X-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence is not to be seen as a deliberate combination of exactly these two clause types in order to present two parallel volitive statements, but rather as a secondary result caused by the fronting of the subject to express another (pragmatic) function. In such instances the weyiqtol clause ‘simply’ inherits the non-volitive default functionality from its X-yiqtol mother clause (like it does in the x-yiqtol > weyiqtol pattern). This type of analysis applies in particular to those instances in which the fronted subject in the X-yiqtol clause is a personal pronoun, as in Job 15.4:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[<Ob> יָאְבִּיא בְּיָמַר] }^4 \\
\text{[<Pr> יָאְבִּיא בְּיָמַר]} \quad \text{XYqt} \\
\text{[<sp><Ob> יִנְתֶּn] \\
\text{[<Pr> יָאְבִּיא בְּיָמַר]} \quad \text{WYq0}
\end{array}
\]

Yes, it is you who do away with the fear of God
and hinder meditation before God.

and in Deut 32.39:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[<Pr> נָמְצָא] }^39 \\
\text{[<Su> יָאְבִּיא בְּיָמַר]} \quad \text{XYqt} \\
\text{[<Pr> נָמְצָא]} \quad \text{WYq0}
\end{array}
\]

It is I who kill
and make alive.

and if the mother clause’s explicit subject is an interrogative pronoun, as in Deut 30.12:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[<Co> מָה-שִׁמְשָּׂא] }^{12} \\
\text{[<sc> יֶעָלֶה] } \quad \text{XYqt} \\
\text{[<Pr> מָה-שִׁמְשָּׂa]} \quad \text{WYq0} \\
\text{[<Po> מָה-שִׁמְשָּׂא]} \quad \text{WYq0} \\
\text{[<Ob> נָתֶנֶנֶn] } \quad \text{WYq0}
\end{array}
\]

Who goes up for us to heaven,
and (who) brings it to us,
and (who) causes us to hear it,
so that we may do it?

5 A false witness does not go unpunished
and utters lies;
he does not escape.

Most translations interpret the weyiqtol clause as a subject clause. In that case, we would have here an example of an X-yiqtol > w-X-yiqtol sequence. However, if we would regard the weyiqtol clause as an independent clause, then it may be considered to inherit the non-volitive functionality of its X-אֲחֵא-yiqtol mother clause, which would entail that the X-אֲחֵא-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence has to be analyzed in a way similar to that of the x-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence.

410 Similarly, Isa 35.4 and 46.4.
A similar analysis is applicable to many of the \( w-\text{-}X\text{-}yiqtol > \text{weyiqtol} \) sequences, in which the fronting of the explicit subject in the \( w-\text{-}X\text{-}yiqtol \) clause has the pragmatic function of denoting contrast between (the behaviour, actions, etc.) of two participants, as in Prov 13.5:\(^{411}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Su> צדיק] [<Pr> י נ] [<Ob> קדב] [<Cj> -1] WXYq} & & xYqX \text{\footnote{A righteous man hates falsehood, but a wicked man acts shamefully and acts disgracefully.}} \\
\text{[<Pr> באש] [<Su> רחש] [<Cj> -1] WYq0} & & \\
\text{[<Pr> צדיק] [<Cj> -1] WYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

Another condition preventing the \( X\text{-}yiqtol > \text{weyiqtol} \) sequence from fulfilling its function of expressing parallel volitive statements is the use of subordinate conjunctions at the beginning of the \( X\text{-}yiqtol \) clause. In such instances, the \( \text{weyiqtol} \) clause adopts the non-volitive value from its mother clause. Take Ps 69.36, for instance:\(^{412}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Ob>anic] [<Pr> י נ] [<Su> אפרים] [<Cj> -1] xXYq} & & \\
\text{[<Ob> י נ] [<Pr> י נ] [<Cj> -1] WYq0} & & \\
\text{[<Ob> י נ] [<Pr> י נ] [<Cj> -1] WYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{36}\) For God saves Zion and rebuilds the cities of Judah.

5.2.2.3 \((w-)\text{Ø-}yiqtol > w-\text{-}yiqtol\) [default: volitive > non-volitive]

Pattern: \(670\)

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Number of attestations in Psalms:} \(36\)
  \item \textbf{with inheritance:} \(16\) (44.4%)
  \item \textbf{Number of attestations in prose:} \(39\)
  \item \textbf{with inheritance:} \(27\) (69.2%)
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Parameters:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause
  \item 2. Subjects of mother and daughter refer to same participant
\end{itemize}

\[1. \text{Does } w-\text{-}yiqtol \text{ contain a verbal form which is morphologically marked as volitive?} \]

\[2. \text{Do subjects of mother and daughter clause refer to the same participant?} \]

\[w-\text{-}yiqtol \text{ expresses volitive meaning} \]

\[w-\text{-}yiqtol \text{ inherits volitive meaning} \]

\[w-\text{-}yiqtol \text{ expresses default non-volitive meaning} \]

\[\text{Fig. 5.9 Inheritance in sequences of volitive } (w-)\text{Ø-}yiqtol > \text{non-volitive } w-\text{-}yiqtol\]

\(^{411}\) Compare also Ps 59.17 and Isa 57.13.
\(^{412}\) Similarly, Exod 23.8.
For the pattern \((w-)Ø-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol\), it is (again) helpful to distinguish between sequences in which the daughter clause contains a preverbal explicit subject \((w-X-yiqtol)\) and those in which it does not \((w-x-yiqtol)\). This first subsection deals with clause pairs belonging to the second category.

For occurrences of the pattern in which mother and daughter clause share the same subject, a rather straightforward analysis can be provided: the \(w-x-yiqtol\) daughter clause usually simply coordinates its mother clause and adopts its volitive meaning, as in Ps 20.3–6, which was already quoted at the beginning of this chapter and contains a series of four such \(0-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol\) sequences:


\[
\begin{align*}
[\langle Co\rangle \text{ כִּדְשָׁי} ] [\langle Ob\rangle \text{ תועֵד} ] & \text{ZYq0} \\
[\langle PO\rangle \text{ יָשֵׁים} ] [\langle Co\rangle \text{ לַפִּיטֵי} ] & \text{WxY0} \\
[\langle Ob\rangle \text{ חֲלֹּֽהַּיְוִֽשָׁלִּים} ] [\langle Pr\rangle \text{ סִירֵי} ] & \text{ZYq0} \\
[\langle Pr\rangle \text{ שָׁביָּיִנָֽה} ] [\langle Ob\rangle \text{ פִּיטֵי} ] & \text{WxY0} \\
[\langle Pr\rangle \text{ לָיֵֽוֹן} ] [\langle Co\rangle \text{ בְּעָלְךָ} ] & \text{ZYq0} \\
[\langle Pr\rangle \text{ מִלָּֽה} ] [\langle Ob\rangle \text{ כִּי} ] & \text{WxY0} \\
[\langle Co\rangle \text{ בַּעְלֵי} ] [\langle Pr\rangle \text{ פָּרָֽהַיְיָנֵי} ] & \text{ZYq0} \\
[\langle Pr\rangle \text{ בּוֹֽדָל} ] [\langle Co\rangle \text{ לְבָלָי} ] & \text{WxY0} \\
[\langle Pr\rangle \text{ יִתְנַֽה} ] [\langle Co\rangle \text{ וּנְחָיָה} ] & \text{WxY0} \\
\end{align*}
\]

3 May he send you help from the sanctuary, and give you support from Zion.

4 May he remember all your offerings, and regard with favour your burnt sacrifices.

5 May he grant you your heart’s desire, and fulfill all your plans.

6 May we shout for joy over your victory, and in the name of our God set up our banners.

Compare also Job 18.18:

\[
\begin{align*}
[\langle Co\rangle \text{ נָאָה} ] [\langle Co\rangle \text{ וַ-מָּאָרָו} ] & \text{ZYq0} \\
[\langle PO\rangle \text{ יָדוֹמָה} ] [\langle Co\rangle \text{ לִֽמְבָּל} ] & \text{WxY0} \\
\end{align*}
\]

18 Let them thrust him from light to darkness and drive him out of the world.

As was true for \((w-)Ø-yiqtol > x-yiqtol\) sequences characterized by a continuation of the same subject, inheritance of the mother clause’s volitive functionality is not hindered when the \(w-x-yiqtol\) daughter clause contains a negation, as in Ps 28.5:

\[
[\langle PO\rangle \text{ וֹרַֽס} ] \text{ZYq0}
\]

\[413\] Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Gen 12.3, 32.21, 34.11; Exod 26.24, 32.13; Num 12.14, 31.19–20; 2 Kgs 7.12; Isa 5.6, 41.15, 42.12, 44.28, 45.8, 58.9–10; Num 24.8; Deut 32.41.

\[414\] Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Gen 42.2, 43.8, 47.19; Deut 13.12, 17.13, 19.20, 20.8; Lev 22.2; 1 Sam 5.11, 14.26, 29.4; 2 Sam 14.24, 22.38; 1 Kgs 18.22–23; Isa 12.2, 40.31, 41.12; Prov 31.7.
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Let him break them down, and not build them up again.

And in Ps 119.46, where the w-וָyiqtol clause inherits the weyiqtol clause’s purposive meaning:

41 Let your steadfast love come to me, and may not be put to shame.

... so that I may speak of your testimonies before kings, and may not be put to shame.

The parameter of ‘continuity of the same subject’ may be defined in quite a broad manner, so that it also includes those cases in which the participant referred to by the daughter clause’s implicit subject is referred to in a more indirect way in the subject of the mother clause, for example in the form of a synecdoche, as in Job 21.20:

20 Let their own eyes see their destruction and let them drink of the wrath of the Almighty!

Examples of sequences of 0-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol-X in which the w-x-yiqtol daughter clause contains a postverbal explicit subject are rare, but it seems appropriate to analyze them in a way similar to other 0-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol pairs. Take Ps 109.9–10, for instance, where the presence of the conjunction ו, the syntactic parallelism between the clauses with regard to their (postverbal) positioning of the explicit subject, and the use of identical subjects together support the analysis that the w-x-yiqtol-X clause inherits volitive functionality from its 0-yiqtol-X mother clause:

9 May his children be fatherless, ... and may his children wander about.

Inheritance of volitive functionality does not take place when the w-x-yiqtol clause has as its subject another participant than the mother clause. In such cases, the w-x-yiqtol introduces a non-volitive statement.415 Though the meaning of such w-x-yiqtol clauses sometimes may appear to be closely related to that of purposive weyiqtol, especially when the w-x-yiqtol clause has as its

415 See Num 1.3–4; Isa 44.26; Job 14.21(2*), 18.2.
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subject a participant having a non-agent semantic role in the mother clause, their inner-clause syntax should not be overlooked. Instead, \textit{w-x-yiqtol} differs from \textit{weyiqtol} in such clause patterns in that it does not express an intended purpose, but offers a factual assertion, which may sometimes take the form of a promise. In contrast with \textit{weyiqtol} clauses, such \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clauses do not express a desired effect, but rather a factual/promised/expected effect. This presumed difference between \textit{w-x-yiqtol} and \textit{weyiqtol} leads, for example, to the following rendering of Ps 51.9:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Aj> ההסנינ [ב-אוהז]} & \text{ZYq0} \\
\text{[<Pr> [Cj> -1]} & \text{WYq0} \\
\text{[<PO> כיים]} & \text{ZYq0} \\
\text{[<Pr> [Ajl [Cj> -1]} & \text{WxY0}
\end{align*}
\]

\[9\text{You should purge me with hyssop, so that I may be clean. You should wash me, then I am whiter than snow.}\]

Such a non-volitive analysis of \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clauses, which takes into account the formal syntactic differences between \textit{weyiqtol} and \textit{w-x-yiqtol}, is also applicable to many of the negative \textit{w-ל-yiqtol} clauses that continue a volitive \textit{weyiqtol} clause, as in Num 17.25:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<sp>[Aj> [Co> [Ob> [Cj> -1]} & \text{ZIm0} \\
\text{[<sp>[Ob> [Pr> [Cj> -1]} & \text{WYq0} \\
\text{[<Pr> [Ng> [Cj> -1]} & \text{WxY0}
\end{align*}
\]

\[25\text{Put back the rod of Aaron before the testimony to be kept as a sign for the rebels, and you should make an end of their murmurings against me; then they do not die.}\]

5.2.2.4 \textit{(w-)Ø-yiqtol} > \textit{w-X-yiqtol} \hspace{1cm} \text{[default: volitive > non-volitive]}

\text{Pattern: 490}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Number of attestations in Psalms:} & 16 \\
\text{Number of attestations in prose:} & 6 \\
\hline
\text{with inheritance:} & 6 (37.5\%) \\
\text{with inheritance:} & 1 (16.7\%) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\text{Parameters:}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Volitive morphology in daughter clause
\item Subjects of mother and daughter refer to different (animate) participants
\end{enumerate}

\[416\text{In some respect, \textit{w-ל-yiqtol} appears to function as a negative counterpart of consecutive \textit{weqatal} in such sequences. Similarly, Exod 9.28, 28.28; Num 27.16–17; 2 Sam 14.11.}\]
The Hebrew Bible contains several examples of \((w-)\Ø-yiqtol > w-X-yiqtol\) sequences in which the \(w-X-yiqtol\) clause (containing a preverbal explicit subject) inherits volitive value of its \((w-)\Ø-yiqtol\) mother clause. As was true for most of the clause pairs we discussed above, an important parameter enabling the process of inheritance to take place is that of continuation of the same subject. Thus, volitive functionality is inherited by the \(w-X-yiqtol\) daughter clause if its subject is synonymous to the mother clause’s subject, especially when there are some further lexical correspondences between the clauses (in their verbs, for instance). Take, for example, Isa 40.30: \(^{417}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Su>} & \text{نعيم} [\text{[<Pr>} \text{יעפו} [\text{[<Cj>-1]} \text{WYqX}} \\
\text{[<Pr>} & \text{יעפו} [\text{[<Cj>-1]} \text{WYq0}} \\
\text{[<Pr>} & \text{כבו} [\text{[<Su>כְּשָלָה} [\text{[<Cj>-1]} \text{WXxY}}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{30}\) Let youths be faint and be weary and let young men fall exhausted.

The required level of subject continuity may also be realized by means of pronominal suffixes, for example, as can be seen in Ps 7.17 (where the subjects can also be seen as synonymous): \(^{418}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Co>} & \text{ישוע} [\text{[<Su>}כְּשָלָה} [\text{[<Pr>רֹד} [\text{[<Cj>-1]} \text{ZXqX}} \\
\text{[<Pr>רֹד} & \text{כְּשָלָה} [\text{[<Co>יִעָשֶׂש} [\text{[<Cj>-1]} \text{WXxY}}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{17}\) May his mischief return upon his own head, and on his own pate may his violence descend.

Though semantic correspondences between the subjects of a mother clause and its daughter clause play an important role when it comes to the activation of processes of inheritance in the pattern \((w-)\Ø-yiqtol > w-X-yiqtol\), it does not always appear to be sufficient to pay attention only to (the semantic and referential correspondences between) the subjects of the clauses. Indeed,

\(^{417}\) Similarly: Ps 145.10; Job 17.8–9.
\(^{418}\) See further: Ps 109.7; Deut 32.42.
the *w-X-yiqtol* clause may produce a statement which is semantically parallel to that of the mother clause, but has a different assignment of grammatical roles to the participants, as in Ps 18.7b:

```
[<Ob> שמעת ב.] [<Aj> יהוה] [<Pr> פניו] [<Co> זניו] [<Pr> תבו] [<sp> ל-מְנוּ] [<Cj> -ו] [<Cj> -ו] [<Cj> -ו] [<Cj> -ו] [<Cj> -ו] WXYq
```

7 May he hear my voice from his temple, and may my cry to him reach his ears.

A similar example, involving only one animate participant, can be found in Ps 35.8:

```
[<Su> שעווה] [<PO> בתהו] [<Pr> יד] [<Ng> א] [<Su> ידע] [<Cj> -ו] [<Su> ידע] [<Re> יסף] [<PO> תלבדו] WXYq
```

8 Let ruin come upon him, which he does not know, and let his net, which he has hidden, ensnare him!

Yet, inheritance of volitive functionality does *not* take place in all instances of the *0-yiqtol > w-X-yiqtol* pattern. Instead of trying to define a clear set of parameters to be realized in order for inheritance to be activated, it will be more helpful to investigate what exactly characterizes those cases in which inheritance of volitive functionality is hindered. Given that the process of inheritance is operating in so many, and mutually diverging, occurrences of the *0-yiqtol > w-X-yiqtol* sequences, which factors do prevent inheritance from taking place? In other words, how can the level of continuity marked by the conjunction ו and activating the mechanism of inheritance be ‘destroyed’?

At this point, we refer to our analysis of earlier patterns, like that of imperative > *X-yiqtol*, and argue that, as was the case in these patterns, it is again the absence of the introduction of a new animate agent in the *w-X-yiqtol* daughter clause which leaves room for inheritance of volitive functionality. So, to put it otherwise, when a *w-X-yiqtol* daughter clause, instead of being parallel to its mother, identifies either an already introduced or a new animate main participant as the new agent, then inheritance of functionality does not take place.

New agent introducing *w-X-yiqtol* clauses often open a new window in discourse and are regularly accompanied by significant changes in the set of participants, as in Isa 40.30–31:

```
[<Su> נוע ים] [<Pr> יעפו] [<Cj> -ו] [<Cj> -ו] [<Cj> -ו] WYqX
[<Pr> יגע] [<Cj> -ו] WXYq
[<Su> יגעו] [<Re> לשם] [<Pr> יכ לו] [<Su> ב ו ים] WXYq
[<Ob> כ] [<Pr> ייפו] [<Su> יהוה] [<Cj> -ו] XQt0
```

30 May youths be faint and be weary
and may young men fall exhausted,

but they who wait for YHWH renew their strength.

and in Ps 71.13–14:

13 May those who seek my hurt be covered with scorn and disgrace,

but I hope continually.

Interestingly, as the second example shows, the new agent introduced in the *w*-X-*yiqtol* daughter clause is often referred to by a personal pronoun. In other instances, especially when a *w*-X-*yiqtol* clause has as its new agent a main participant which is already (explicitly or implicitly) present in the mother clause, the clause simply continues the domain of discourse of its mother clause. In such cases, its functioning is comparable to that of the *w*-X-*yiqtol* clause introducing a new subject after the *(w-)*Ø-*yiqtol* mother clause, that is: it frequently introduces a non-volitive fact, as in Ps 51.15.419

419 See also: 1 Sam 24.13; 2 Sam 2.6; Isa 41.16, 53.10; Job 10.18, 14.15; Deut 33.29. A both questionable and illustrative example in this regard is found in Gen 1.20:

20 Let the waters bring forth swarms of living creatures and let birds fly above the earth across the firmament of the heavens.

Most translations assign a volitive meaning to the *w*-X-*yiqtol* clause in this verse, but is that possible according to the criteria we mention in the main text? On the one hand, one could point to an assumed, but rather vague, parallelism between the two clauses and state that the ‘birds’ in the daughter clause belong to the same semantic category as the ‘living creatures’ in the mother clause. On the other hand, the birds represent an animate group of participants and have an agentive role in the daughter clause. This may lead us to suppose that the mechanism of inheritancy is blocked here. Now, which observation should be considered superior? That of semantic relations between participants or that of the introduction of a ‘new’ animate participant? Could the ‘relative importance’ of the newly introduced participant play a role in this?

It might be argued that the ‘new agent’ presented by the *w*-X-*yiqtol* daughter clause has to be a main participant in order for inheritance to be prevented. The frequent use of a first-person personal pronoun in non-inheriting *w*-X-*yiqtol* clauses can be presented as an argument for this view. For our text in Gen 1.20, this would entail that a volitive rendering of the daughter clause is acceptable. The more or less parallel passage in Gen 1.22, consisting of a sequence of an imperative clause and a *w*-X-*yiqtol* clause containing a form morphologically marked as jussive, appears to support our analysis:

22 Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas,
Let me teach transgressors your ways,  
then sinners return to you.

and in Ps 119.175:

Let my soul live  
and praise you,  
while your ordinances help me.

As is generally true for all patterns, volitive morphological marking may overrule all of the parameters involved in marking functionality by syntax. An illustrative example can be found in Gen 33.14, where the presence of a cohortative form in the w-x-yiqtol daughter clause overrules the introduction of a new agent in the form of a pronominal subject (which otherwise would have prevented the w-x-yiqtol daughter clause from attaining a volitive meaning):

Please, let my lord pass on before his servant,  
and as for me, let me lead on slowly, according to the pace of the cattle,  
which are before me.

### 5.2.2.5 imperative > w-x-yiqtol  
[default: volitive > non-volitive]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>660</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in Psalms:</td>
<td>16 $^{421}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance:</td>
<td>4 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in prose:</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inheritance:</td>
<td>8 (38.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Volitive morphology in daughter clause  
2. Subjects of mother and daughter refer to same participant |

420 Compare Gen 44.33; 2 Sam 14.7.  
421 In ten attestations of the pattern in the Psalms (62.5%), the w-x-yiqtol daughter clause is a prohibitive clause containing the negation לא.
The imperative > \textit{w-x-yiqtol} sequence in its adoption of volitive and non-volitive functionalities corresponds in many ways to the \((w-)\emptyset\text{-}yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol\) sequence. For that reason, we will again discuss separately those sequences in which the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} daughter clause contains a preverbal explicit subject (\textit{w-X-yiqtol}) and those in which it does not. This subsection is devoted to the second category.

In case of continuation of the same subject, the inheritance of the imperative clause’s volitive functionality by the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clause is beyond question. Good examples\footnote{Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Prov 22.17; Deut 33.7,11; Job 21.3. The pattern occurs remarkably often in discursive prose: Gen 42.19–20, 44.1–2; Exod 5.18, 29.2–4; Lev 8.31, 9.2–3, 24.14–15; Num 8.6–7, 23.5, 23.16; 1 Sam 17.17–18.} are attested in Ps 85.8:

\begin{verbatim}
<PO> [רָאָיָנ] 8 ZI~O
<Vo> [יְהוָה] Voct
<Ob> [תָּסְדִּד] ----
<Co> [לנו] [<Pr> יַעַב] [<Ob> וישכ] [<Cj> -1] WxY0
\end{verbatim}

\textit{Show us,}
\textit{YHWH,}
\textit{your steadfast love}
\textit{and may you grant us your salvation!}

and in Gen 32.17:

\begin{verbatim}
<Co> [עֶבֶר] 17 ZI~O
[<Pr> בְּן נְעֶר] WxY0
<Ob> [רָחַּם] [<Co> בְּיִי נוּר] [<Pr> גִּשְׁמִי] WxY0
<Co> [לִפְנֵי] [<Pr> הָרָה] [<Ob> -1] WxY0
\end{verbatim}

\textit{Pass on before me}
\textit{and you should put a space between drove and drove!}

The presence of the non-prohibitive negation \(לֹא\) in the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} daughter clause does not prevent inheritance of volitive functionality from taking place, as can be seen in 1 Sam 29.7:\footnote{422 Other examples from beyond the Psalms can be found in: Prov 22.17; Deut 33.7,11; Job 21.3. The pattern occurs remarkably often in discursive prose: Gen 42.19–20, 44.1–2; Exod 5.18, 29.2–4; Lev 8.31, 9.2–3, 24.14–15; Num 8.6–7, 23.5, 23.16; 1 Sam 17.17–18.}
Inheritance of volitive functionality does not take place when the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clause has as its subject another participant than the mother clause. In such cases, the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} introduces a non-volitive, factual statement, as in Job 17.10:\footnote{Compare 1 Sam 14.34. Note that such sequences of imperative > \textit{w-ו-יqtol} are fairly rare (they are completely absent in the Psalms).}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ij> נא] [<Pr> בא] [<Cj> -ו] 10 WxY0
[<Ob> עםכם] [<Aj> בכם] [<Pr> אםם] [<Ng> אלו] [<Cj> -ו] WxY0
\end{verbatim}

But come on now, 
and though I do not find a wise man among you.

A more difficult instance of the pattern is found in Isa 54.2, where the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clause contains an impersonal 3rd-person subject, while the sequence is characterized by strong semantic correspondences between the two clauses:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ob> מקוםך] [<Pr> מקוםך] [<Cj> -ו] 2 ZIm0
[<Pr> ישות] [<Ob> השלתם] [<Ng> אלו] [<Cj> -ו] WxY0
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{Enlarge the place of your tent, 
and let them stretch out the curtains of your habitations; 
do not spare!}

The verbal form in the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clause raises many questions, both in the old \textit{Versiones} and in recent translations. The critical apparatus of the BHS proposes to read an imperative form here and refers to the LXX, the Peshitta and the Vulgate, which have all opted for an imperative form in their text (cf. Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling and Contemporary English Version). The semantic correspondences between the two clauses and the absence of a new main participant in the \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clause both seem to favour a volitive interpretation of that clause (cf. our remarks on the pattern \textit{0-/weyiqtol} > \textit{w-X-yiqtol}).
Our corpus contains a few examples of imperative > w-X-yiqtol sequences in which the clauses share the same 2nd-person subject. In all of these sequences, both the imperative clause and the w-X-yiqtol clause contain an explicit 2nd-person singular subject and the w-X-yiqtol clause adopts the imperative clause’s jussive value. We present Exod 28.1–3 as an example.\(^{425}\)

1 Then you must bring near to you Aaron your brother,

...and you should speak to all the wise-hearted.

However, as was true for (w-)Ø-yiqtol > w-X-yiqtol sequences, in imperative > w-X-yiqtol sequences, too, inheritance of volitive functionality is not merely regulated by the parameter of *continuation of the same subject*. Rather, inheritance is blocked only in case the daughter clause introduces as its new agent an animate participant that may either be entirely new on the scene or was already introduced (as a non-agent) before.

This entails that inheritance of volitivity does also take place if the w-X-yiqtol clause contains an explicit subject which refers in a less direct way to the 2nd-person subject of the imperative clause, for example in the form of a synecdoche, as in Prov 23.26:

\[<\text{Pr}> \text{תנה}^{26} \] ZIm0
\[<\text{Vo}> \text{בִּי} \] Voct
\[<\text{Co}> \text{לֵכָּב} \] ----
\[<\text{Ob}> \text{עֵנִי} \] [<\text{Su}> תְרֵשָׁנָה] [<\text{Cj}> -י] WXxY

\(^{26}\) Give, son,

\(^{425}\) See further: Ps 59.9; Deut 5.27.
your heart to me
and let your eyes delight in my ways!

or in the form of a participant or entity that is somehow semantically or referentially related to
the imperative mother clause’s 2nd-person subject, as in Isa 41.1, which involves a shift from 2nd-
person to 3rd-person communication:

1 Keep silence before me, coastlands!
- yes, let the peoples renew their strength!

and in Ps 69.25 (note the presence of the 2nd-person singular suffix in the daughter clause’s
subject):

25 Pour out your indignation upon them
and let your burning anger overtake them!

That (direct or indirect) ‘continuity of the same subject’ is not a decisive parameter in this pattern
becomes clear in texts in which the w-X-yiqtol clause’s subject is related to another constituent in
the imperative clause than its subject, as in Ps 102.2:

2 YHWH,
hear my prayer
and let my cry come to you!

Here, semantic correspondences between the two clauses (‘my prayer’ // ‘my cry for help’) and
the absence of an explicit reference to another animate agent in the daughter clause’s subject
create a level of continuity that enables the activation of the mechanism of inheritance of volitive
meaning.427

426 Similarly, Isa 45.8.
427 One may raise the question to which extent the parameters of ‘absence of a new animate agent’ and
‘semantic parallelism’ can be seen as two independent markers of continuity. What if, for instance, only the
first one is realized? This is what happens in Gen 9.1–2, where the w-X-yiqtol daughter clause’s subject does
not have another animate agent as its subject, which may give rise to the following interpretation:
On the other hand, if semantic correspondences are absent and the new agent of the \textit{w-X-yiqtol} clause is a new animate participant, then inheritance of volitivity is hindered, despite the use of a continuity marking coordinate conjunction. This is illustrated by Ps 7.7–8.\textsuperscript{428}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Pr> קום] ZIm0
[<Vo> יהוה] Voc
[<Aj> ב-אפר] ----
[<Co> ב-עבורה צפוריה] ZIm0
[<Co> יאלי] [<Pr> שעוה] [<Cj> -] WIm0

... [<PO> תסובבכ] [<Su> לאמזים] [<Cj> -] WXYq
[<Pr> שובב] [<Lo> ל-מרים] [<Co> עליה] [<Cj> -] WxI0
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{7} Arise, o YHWH, in your anger! Lift yourself up against the fury of my enemies, and awake for me, ... \textsuperscript{8} while the assembly of the peoples gathers around you, and over it take your seat on high.

and in 1 Sam 1.17:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Co> לה-לשלם] ZIm0
[<Ob> אלהים ש虬] [<Pr> טן] [<Cj> -] WXYq
[<Co> שעהל] [<Pr> במ-עמו] [<Cj> -] xQt0
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{17} Go in peace, and the God of Israel grants you your petition, which you have made to him.

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ob> אלה-ה-אפר] [<Pr> -] WIm0
[<Cj> -] WXYq
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{1} Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and let fear of you and dread of you be upon every beast of the earth and upon every bird of the air!

On the other hand, the absence of semantic correlations between mother and daughter clause, together with the fact that the daughter clause contains a form of the verb \textit{יהוה} which is morphologically marked as indicative, may plead for a non-volitive interpretation of the \textit{w-X-yiqtol} clause:

\textsuperscript{1} Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth! And fear of you and dread of you is upon every beast of the earth and upon every bird of the air.

\textsuperscript{428} Compare: Gen 43.13–14; Num 23.15; 1 Sam 17.37, 19.2–3; 2 Sam 10.12, 14.8; 1 Kgs 5.20.
Inheritance of volitivity does not occur either when the w-X-yiqtol clause has as its agent a main participant that was already introduced in the preceding clause, but did not yet take up the semantic role of agent, as in Ps 37.5:429

5 Commit your way to YHWH, trust in him, and he acts.

As is true at a more general level, parameters blocking inheritance of volitivity can be overruled by volitive morphological marking, as in Gen 22.5, where the w-X-yiqtol daughter clause, which on the basis of the syntactic pattern and the parameters set in it (i.e.: change of subject) should be assigned a non-volitive meaning, contains a cohortative form and therefore does have a volitive function:

5 Stay here with the ass and let me and the lad go yonder and let us worship and let us come back to you!

5.2.3 Conclusions

The starting point in the examination of the distribution of volitive and non-volitive functionality in any clause pair is constituted by the default volitive and non-volitive functions of the mother and the daughter clause. In the clause pairs discussed in the previous sections, the sequence of default functions is either non-volitive > volitive or volitive > non-volitive. A crucial factor playing a role in the analysis of mechanisms of inheritance is that of the order of the clauses. In sequences consisting of similar clause types but having them positioned in a different mother-daughter relation, different functionalities are passed on. Thus, while in x-yiqtol > (w-)Ø-yiqtol sequences non-volitive value can be inherited by the daughter clause, the mother

429 Similar examples beyond the Psalms can be found in Gen 42.37; Exod 2.9, 4.12; Job 13.22, 21.3. We would like to draw attention to the presence of a pronominal subject in Ps 37.5 and several other texts. In particular for such instances in which the w-X-yiqtol clause contains an pronominal subject, a more argumentative meaning for the w-X-yiqtol clause may be suggested. A slightly adapted rendering of Ps 37.5, for instance, could be:

5 Commit your way to YHWH, trust in him, since it is he who acts.
clauses may pass on to its daughter *volitive* meaning in reversed sequences of \((w-)\emptyset\text{-yiqtol} > x\text{-yiqtol}\).

In the preceding subsections, we have discussed nearly\(^{430}\) all of the clause pairs in which inheritance of the mother clause’s functionality by the daughter clause may take place and we have examined for each of them the precise parameters that activate or deactivate the mechanism of inheritance. A first parameter, on the basis of which we categorized the clause pairs into two groups, is that of the presence of the conjunction \(\text{ו}\), which proved to be a significant marker of continuity, with that contributing to the activation of the inheritance mechanism.

Two other important parameters regulating the activation of the process of inheritance are those of ‘continuity of the same subject/agent’ and ‘presence of an explicit subject in the daughter clause’. At this point, it should be noted that different combinations of parameters result in different distributions of functionalities. Thus, in sequences of asyndetically juxtaposed *yiqtol* clauses (without \(\text{ו}\)), the presence of an explicit subject in the daughter clause almost by definition (except for cases of strict lexical and/or syntactic parallelism) blocks or deactivates the inheritance of any functionality, while in pairs consisting of clauses paratactically related to each other by a coordinative \(\text{ו}\), the presence of an explicit subject in the daughter clause is a less important marker.

The importance of identifying the variation in and relative statuses of the different parameters also becomes obvious in several syntetic clause pairs (but also in asyndetic clause pairs containing an imperative mother clause), in which the mechanism of inheritance is frequently activated even though, for instance, there is no continuation of the same subject/agent. In these clause pairs the degree of continuation marked by the presence of a \(\text{ו}\) and lexical correspondences between the clauses is not disturbed by the absence of other continuity-marking parameters like that of ‘continuation of the same agent’. In other words, in these patterns ‘agent continuity’ has a status in the hierarchy of parameters controlling the process of inheritance which is relatively low in comparison to the status it has in the parameter hierarchies of some other (asyndetic) clause pairs.

Another significant observation is that in all patterns, the activation of the mechanism of inheritance (of non-volitive functionality), by whichever parameter, can be overruled by the presence of volitive morphological marking in the daughter clause. The relative statuses of morphological and inner-clause syntactical marking of functionalities were outlined in a hierarchical scheme in the previous chapter. On the basis of the findings presented in the foregoing section, we grant the extra-clausal syntactic process of inheritance a hierarchical position in between that of volitive morphological marking and that of inner-clause syntax, which means that volitive morphological marking precedes patterns of inheritance signalled by extra-clause syntax, while such mechanisms of inheritance, in turn, precede clause functionalities marked by the position of the verbal form (inner-clause syntax) and the use of the long ‘indicative’ form. The resulting hierarchical scheme is as follows:

\(^{430}\)We devote a separate section at the end of the chapter to the *weqatal* daughter clause, which we consider to be the ‘inheriting clause type’ *par excellence*.
Several of the above-mentioned examples suggested that the domain of inheritance is not restricted to that of the single clause pair, but that daughter clauses can pass on to their own daughters the functions they have just inherited themselves. Before going deeper into the recursive nature of the process of inheritance, however, we first have to introduce another type of mechanism which affects the distribution of functionality in a clause pair, namely that of blocking of volitive functionality. As will become clear in the next section, this type of mechanism plays a role in many clause sequences containing a verb-initial yiqtol clause.

5.3 Clause Type Redefinition and Blocking of Volitive Functionality

Clauses are not only prevented from fulfilling their default functions by the inheritance of (non-)volitive functions. In this section, we will show how multiple-duty modifiers, explicit subjects and specific types of mother clauses may render it impossible for a 0-yiqtol or weyiqtol clause to fulfill a volitive function.

5.3.1 Multiple-duty Modifiers

Even when taking into account the mechanisms described in the previous section, our data still confront us with occurrences of verb-initial yiqtol clauses that unmistakably have a non-volitive function, which, however, we are not yet able to account for. In this section, we introduce another mechanism that helps us explain many of these non-volitive w-(Ø-)yiqtol clauses. As will

---

431 This hierarchical ordering will also prove to be applicable to extra-clausal syntactic processes of blocking.
be illustrated below, the adoption of a volitive meaning by verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses can be blocked not only by inherited functions, but also by inherited *elements*.

Now, what exactly are these elements? In general, they may be characterized as modifying elements that govern both the clause at the front of which they are positioned, and that clause’s daughter clauses, which, in fact, *inherit* the modifying element from their mother. These ‘clause modifiers’ are elements which always take clause-initial position and are to be analyzed as (implicitly) present in all daughter clauses that coordinate the clause in which they are introduced. They can thus be regarded as openers of a ‘domain of governance’, i.e.: a sentence consisting of one or more clauses governed by a single modifying element. When a verb-initial *yiqtol* clause belongs to a domain governed by such a modifier, it has to be reanalyzed as a *w-<x->yiqtol* clause, in which the *<x-* represents the implicitly assumed double-duty modifier element, and as such has to be assigned the default function of a standard *x-yiqtol* clause, namely that of expressing non-volitive meaning. In this way, these clause modifiers ‘block’ the ascription of volitive functionality to verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses. The assignment of volitive default functions to such clauses simply is no longer valid, as the inheritance of a clause modifier implicitly makes these clauses non-verb-initial.

Our class of clause modifiers can be divided into three subclasses. The first subclass is constituted by interrogative pronouns and phrases, like *mi* (sometimes in combination with the negation לא: ‘is it not so that...’). The second subclass includes subordinate conjunctions and relative pronouns. The most important representative of this subclass is the conjunction *כ*. Other clause modifier conjunctions attested in our corpus are, for instance, *א* (which affects the functions of *0-yiqtol* and *weyiqtol* clauses continuing a protasis clause) and *למשת* (which often seems to express an intended result / purpose and then does not so much block volitive functionalities of *0-yiqtol* and *weyiqtol* daughter clauses, but rather substitutes it for a purposive meaning) and its negative counterpart *פתאום*. As already indicated, the relative pronouns *א*, *ט*, *וע* and *כ* also belong to this category. Finally, the third subclass of clause modifiers is made up of deictic adverbs, like *לָּקֶס* and *נָּלָּקֶס*. The existence of clause modifiers governing multiple clauses and possibly affecting the meaning adopted by these clauses has already been acknowledged by Hebraists like Niccacci and Joosten. As we saw in chapter 3, Niccacci introduced the term ‘double-duty modifier’ to refer to elements

---

432 The interrogative pronoun *mi* is different from all other ‘clause modifiers’ in that it functions as a clause constituent and usually represents a clause’s subject. Nevertheless, its behaviour is different from that of regular explicit subjects (see §5.3.1.2), which is why we include *mi* in our set of clause modifiers instead of discussing it in §5.3.2 which deals with preverbal subjects.

433 It may be interesting to note that several of the elements we identified as possible multiple-duty modifiers have a certain inherent modal value. Thus, the interrogatives often are to be associated with the dubitative mood (Palmer, F.R., *Mood and Modality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp.78–81), while the conjunction *א* is used to open modal protasis clauses referring to optional worlds. Similarly, *למשת* and *פתאום* impose a (negative) purposive meaning on their clause and its daughter clauses. Finally, the deictic adverb *לָּקֶס* usually denotes future modality. One may argue that by passing on their inherent modal values, these multiple-duty modifiers are able to overrule the default volitive functionality of the verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses within their domain of governance. However, since not all ‘multiple-duty modifier elements’ can be assumed to have such an intrinsic modal value, we favour the explanation offered in the main text and redefine verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses governed by a multiple-duty modifier as *(w-)<x->yiqtol* clauses.
preventing verb-initial daughter clauses from adopting their default volitive function. While the term ‘double-duty modifier’ may suggest that the modifying elements to which it refers govern just two clauses, the Hebrew Bible contains numerous examples of clause chains in which modifiers govern three or even more clauses. Take, for example, Ps 16.9–11:

Note that taking into account more than only pairs of two clauses here is of crucial importance as that enables us to correctly explain the non-volitive value of the 0-yiqtol clause as resulting not from the inheritance of functionality from its ל-yiqtol mother clause, but rather from the impact of the modifying element כי in its grandmother clause. Since the number of clauses governed by a single modifying element is not limited to two, we prefer to use the term ‘multiple-duty modifier’ for a mother clause’s modifying element which may be inherited by multiple daughter clauses. Contrary to Niccacci and Joosten, we do not regard constituents like subjects, objects, complements and adjuncts as multiple-duty modifiers. Indeed, such elements, explicit subjects in particular, may sometimes be implicitly assumed in a 0-yiqtol or weyiqtol daughter clause, as we have shown for the pattern X-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol, but they do not have an inherent ‘volitivity blocking’ power. This view is supported by the fact that a sequence of X-yiqtol > weyiqtol, in which the mother clause’s explicit subject is assumed in the weyiqtol clause, is to be analyzed in a manner which is different from regular [multiple-duty modifier]-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequences: the weyiqtol is not prevented from having a volitive meaning, but instead the sequence as a whole is to be analyzed as volitive. Moreover, in many other examples presented in the previous sections, the mother clause did contain an explicit subject (or another constituent), while that constituent, even if it took clause-initial position, could not be assumed to be (implicitly) present in the daughter clause. For that reason, we consider it necessary to discuss patterns in which an explicit subject in the mother clause does indeed seem to affect the functionality of the daughter clause in a separate section, which will be done in §5.3.2.

Another argument for our decision to exclude non-modifying constituents, like the subject and the object, from the category of multiple-duty modifiers is constituted by the observation of a significant difference between the mechanisms of the multiple-duty modifier and of simple inheritance. Interestingly, the ‘blocking’ effect of multiple-duty modifiers in the form of a redefinition of the clause types of daughter clauses is rarely (if ever) overruled by other syntactic processes (of inheritance) taking place earlier in the clause chain, while inheritance of non-volitive functionality – also when it concerns a daughter clause in which a subject, an object, a

\[<Aj> \text{علي} [<Pr> \text{שפרה}] [<Su> \text{ناق הנו} ] \]
\[\ldots\]
\[<Co> \text{ל-_svואל} [<Ob> \text{נמיש} [<Pr> \text{תרעบอก}] [<Ng> \text{ל} [<Cj> \text{בי}] \]
\[<Ob> \text{חטבדר} [<Pr> \text{וכות} [<Ng> \text{ל} [<Ob> \text{תשת} [<Pr> \text{ל-ראות} [<Ng> \text{ל} [<Cj> \text{כי}] \]
\[<Ob> \text{תרעניק} [<PO> \text{ראד חימי} \]
\[\text{XQtl\ldots}\]
\[\text{xYq0}\]
\[\text{xYq0}\]
\[\text{InfC}\]
\[\text{ZYq0}\]

6 Yea, the heritage has been pleasing to me,
\[\ldots\]
for you do not give me up to Sheol,
(for you do not let your godly one
see the Pit,
(for you) make me know the path of life.
complement or an adjunct is assumed as (implicitly) present – can easily be hindered by other processes of inheritance operating earlier in the same clause chain (see §5.4). The activation of the process of inheritance of multiple-duty modifiers is controlled by parameters similar to the ones regulating the mechanism of inheritance of functionalities. Thus, agent-continuity and continuity in the set of participants frequently enable a modifier element to govern more than one clause. However, as will become clear in the following sections, ‘agent continuity’ is not absolutely required in order to enable a modifier to extend its ‘domain of governance’ over multiple clauses. Other (and sometimes less obvious) markers of continuity may also create room for modifiers to govern multiple clauses.\textsuperscript{434}

Now that we have provided the theoretical background of the multiple-duty modifier construction, let us illustrate more concretely how it operates in Biblical Hebrew. Each of the next subsections is devoted to a specific type of clause sequence in which the multiple-duty modifier affects the functionality of the daughter clause(s).

\section*{5.3.1.1 \textit{[multiple-duty modifier]-yiqtol} > \textit{0-yiqtol}}

Redefinition as: \textit{[multiple-duty modifier]-yiqtol} > \textit{<x>-yiqtol}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns: 120–150</th>
<th>Number of attestations in Psalms: 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of attestations in prose: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have shown in §5.2.1.1 and §5.2.1.2, \textit{0-yiqtol} clauses may inherit non-volitive functionality from \textit{(w-)X-yiqtol} and \textit{(w-)Jx-yiqtol} mother clauses. In some cases, however, the volitive default function of the \textit{0-yiqtol} daughter clause is not so much overridden by an inherited non-volitive function, but the very assignment of volitivity to the \textit{0-yiqtol} clause is rather ‘blocked’ by the fact that the \textit{0-yiqtol} clause presumes an implicitly present multiple-duty modifier and should therefore be reanalyzed as an \textit{<x>-yiqtol} clause. It is interesting to observe that our corpus of discursive prose texts does not contain any example of such a sequence of \textit{[multiple-duty modifier]-yiqtol} > \textit{<x>-yiqtol}. As will also become clear in the following sections, the phenomenon of the multiple-duty modifier is indeed predominantly attested in poetic texts.

We already pointed to the correspondences between the phenomena of the multiple-duty modifier and ‘simple’ inheritance when it comes to the conditions under which they are activated. Indeed, in order to determine whether a modifying element governs more than one clause, signals marking continuity between the modifier’s clause and following clauses should be taken into account. Thus, many \textit{0-yiqtol} clauses that are governed by a multiple-duty modifier have as their subject/agent the same participant as the mother clause in which the modifying element is located. Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 10.1, where the interrogative pronoun \emph{למה} governs two \textit{yiqtol} clauses:\textsuperscript{435}

\textsuperscript{434} In the data provided as input to our Java program and presented at the website, clauses that inherit a governing modifying element from a mother or ancestor clause have simply been marked as ‘coordinate’. As a result, our program did not have to make complicated analyses of apparent and less apparent levels of continuity, but could simply take the coordinate marking as a basis for the decision whether or not a modifying element governs multiple clauses.

\textsuperscript{435} Other \textit{(w-)Jx-yiqtol} > \textit{0-yiqtol} sequences in which a question word functions as multiple-duty modifier can be found in: Ps 2.1–2 (תלמה), 44.25 (תלמה), 62.4 (תלמה, העיון), 78.40 (ב, בע), 85.6 (נ, נ), 85.7 (נ, נ), 88.15 (תלמה), 89.7 (ם), 106.2; Isa 1.5 (תוון, העיון) 24 (תלמה), 42.23 (י, י), 57.4 (תלמה), 63.17 (תוון, העיון), 64.11 (נ–נ); Judg 5.30 (נ–נ).
5. Text-level Syntax: Inheritance and Blocking in Clause Patterns

Why, o YHWH, do you stand afar off?
(Why) do you hide yourself in times of trouble?

in Ps 27.5, where the conjunction כי governs three yiqtol clauses:

\[ \text{[<Qu> לאמה] } ^1 \]
\[ \text{[<Vo> יוהו] Voct} \]
\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-רהוים] 튼喉} \]
\[ \text{[<Pr> -ל-יהוה / ברויה] } ^7 \]
\[ \text{[<sp><Ti> תועליס] ZYq0} \]

\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-ב] [<Pr> תעמד] ----} \]
\[ \text{[<sp><Ti> צ ה--ב/עתות -ל]}
\[ \text{[<Pr> תעלים] ZYq0} \]

\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-ב] [<Pr> תעמד] ----} \]
\[ \text{[<sp><Ti> צ ה--ב/עתות -ל]}
\[ \text{[<Pr> תעלים] ZYq0} \]

\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-ב] [<Pr> תעמד] ----} \]
\[ \text{[<sp><Ti> צ ה--ב/עתות -ל]}
\[ \text{[<Pr> תעלים] ZYq0} \]

\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-ב] [<Pr> תעמד] ----} \]
\[ \text{[<sp><Ti> צ ה--ב/עתות -ל]}
\[ \text{[<Pr> תעלים] ZYq0} \]

\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-ב] [<Pr> תעמד] ----} \]
\[ \text{[<sp><Ti> צ ה--ב/עתות -ל]}
\[ \text{[<Pr> תעלים] ZYq0} \]

\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-ב] [<Pr> תעמד] ----} \]
\[ \text{[<sp><Ti> צ ה--ב/עתות -ל]}
\[ \text{[<Pr> תעלים] ZYq0} \]

5 For he hides me in his shelter in the day of trouble,
he conceals me under the cover of his tent,
he sets me high upon a rock.

and in Ps 8.5–7, where כי governs five clauses, thus being a rather ‘extreme’ example of a multiple-duty modifier:

\[ \text{[<Su> הנתש] [<PC> הם] } ^5 \]
\[ \text{[<Po> בחנוה] [<Cj> כי] xYq0} \]
\[ \text{[<Su> ב-אוהד] [<Cj> -1] Ellp} \]
\[ \text{[<Po> חפכן] [<Cj> כי] xYq0} \]
\[ \text{[<Co> -מ-אלהים] [<Mo> משתור] [<Cj> -1] Way0} \]
\[ \text{[<Po> חסパーハ] [<Cj> ב-ברד -1] WxY0} \]
\[ \text{[<Co> -ב-ממש] [<Po> חסパーハ] [<Cj> -] ZYq0} \]
\[ \text{[<Co> -ה-רצל] [<Pr> השת] [<Ob> ל] xQt0} \]

5 What is man,
that you are mindful of him,
and the son of man,
that you care for him,
6 (that) you made him little less than God,
and (that) yes/indeed, you crown him with glory and honour,
7 (that) you give him dominion over the works of your hands,
(that) you have put all things under his feet?

---

\[ \text{Beyond the Psalms, other (w-)x-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol sequences in which כי functions as multiple-duty modifier can be found in: Isa 44.2–3, 47.1, 47.5, 52.1; Prov 23.31. Sequences of (w-)x-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol in which another element than כי or a question word has the role of multiple-duty modifier are attested in: Isa 16.9 (אושי), 58.9 (ן); Prov 1.28 (ן); Job 20.12–13 (ן); Deut 32.38 (אושי).} \]
Parameters other than that of ‘continuation of the same subject’ also enable inheritance of multiple-duty modifiers. Thus, we find examples of [multiple-duty modifier]-yiqtol > <x>-yiqtol sequences in which the <x>-yiqtol clause contains an explicit subject that is synonymous to that of its mother clause, as in Ps 94.3–4:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[<Pr> יִעַל] [<Su> רַעְשֵׁנִי] 3 \\
[<Pr> יִיְתָנָה] 4 \\
[<Ob> יְתַק] \\
[<Su> יָאוֹן] [<Pr> יְהָמְרָיו] 5
\end{array}
\]

3 How long do the wicked exult,
4 (how long) do they utter,
   (how long) do they speak hard things,
   (how long) do all the evildoers boast?

Semantic correspondences between the subjects of both clauses may also be of a ‘non-synonymous’ type, as in Isa 45.23, where כי governs two yiqtol object clauses:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[<Pr> נֶבֶנֶה] [<Co> בַּי] 23 \\
[<Pr> נֶבֶנֶה] [<Co> בַּי] \\
[<Su> כָּלַר] [<Pr> יְבָרְכָו] \\
[<Su> כָּלַל] [<Pr> יָשְׁבָעַ] 25
\end{array}
\]

23 By myself I have sworn,
... that to me every knee bows,
   (that) every tongue swears.

and in Job 21.17–18:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[<Pr> יִדְעַ] [<Su> רַעְשֵׁנִי] [<Aj> מִי] 17 \\
[<Su> לְעִלָּמָה] [<Co> אָבָא] [<Cj> יָשָׁב] \\
[<Aj> תְּבוֹלָ] [<Ob> בַּאֲמָו] [<Pr> הָתָּל] \\
[<Aj> הַמִּי] [<Pr> וָיָ] 18
\end{array}
\]

17 How often is it that the lamp of the wicked is put out,
   that their calamity comes upon them,
   that he distributes pains in his anger,
18 that they are like straw before the wind?

Not surprisingly, our hierarchical ordering of morphological and syntactic markings also applies to constructions involving the use of a multiple-duty modifier. More concretely, we assume that also in these cases the volitivity eliminating power of an inherited modifier is overruled in case the yiqtol clause inheriting it contains a verbal form that is morphologically marked as volitive. Ps 25.8–9 is an illustrative example of this: 437

437 Compare Ps 9.15:
5. Text-level Syntax: Inheritance and Blocking in Clause Patterns

8 Good and upright is YHWH. Therefore he instructs sinners in the way, 
9 (therefore) he may lead the humble in what is right and may teach the humble his way.

5.3.1.2 [multiple-duty modifier]-yiqtol \(\rightarrow\) weyiqtol

Patterns: 250–280
Number of attestations in Psalms: 16
Number of attestations in prose: 4

The conjunction \(\text{למען}\), however, frequently introduces an intended result and, as such, may be regarded as a kind of volitional (purposive) conjunction. See further Ps 139.8–9:

8 If I ascend to heaven, you are there, and (if) I want to make my bed in Sheol, you are there!
9 (If) I take the wings of the morning (if) I want to dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there your hand may lead me and your right hand may hold me!

8 If I ascend to heaven, you are there, and (if) I want to make my bed in Sheol, you are there!
9 (If) I take the wings of the morning (if) I want to dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there your hand may lead me and your right hand may hold me!
A first remarkable observation to be made with respect to the [multiple-duty modifier]-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence is that it is the only type of multiple-duty modifier construction with multiple attestations in our corpus of discursive prose texts. An example is found in Deut 30.12 : 438

\[
\begin{align*}
&[<\text{Co}> \text{מי (interrogative pronoun)}] [<\text{Sc}> \text{ל-שם נמה}] \quad \text{XYqt} \\
&[<\text{Co}> \text{ל-שם נמה}] [<\text{Po}> \text{י-ה} ] \quad \text{WYq0} \\
&[<\text{Ob}> \text{אנה}] [<\text{Cj}> \text{-י}] \quad \text{WYq0} \\
&[<\text{Po}> \text{נעשנה}] [<\text{Cj}> \text{-י}] \quad \text{WYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

12 Who goes up for us to heaven, and (who) brings it to us, and (who) causes us to hear it, so that we may do it?

Yet, the number of occurrences of the same construction in our collection of poetic texts is significantly larger. Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 42.3, where the multiple-duty modifier is a question word: 439

\[
\begin{align*}
&[<\text{Pr}> \text{בפו}] [<\text{Qu}> \text{מתי}] \quad \text{XYq0} \\
&[<\text{Aj}> \text{לפי אלים}] [<\text{Cj}> \text{-י}] \quad \text{WYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

3 When do I come
and appear before God?

and in Ps 118.17, where the conjunction כי functions as a multiple-duty modifier: 440

\[
\begin{align*}
&[<\text{Pr}> \text{אמות}] [<\text{Ng}> \text{לא}] \quad \text{XYq0} \\
&[<\text{Pr}> \text{אניה}] [<\text{Cj}> \text{亚马}] \quad \text{XYq0} \\
&[<\text{Ob}> \text{אמות}] [<\text{Cj}> \text{-י}] \quad \text{WYq0}
\end{align*}
\]

10 I do not die,
because/but I live
and recount the deeds of YHWH.

438 The other examples can be found in Exod 19.3 (כ), 23.12 (לעון), and in Deut 16.19 (כ). Note that, as we indicated in §5.3.1, the part of speech of כי (interrogative pronoun) is more important than its constituent type (subject). Otherwise, we would have been forced to assign a volitive meaning to all clauses in Deut 30.12 (cf. §5.2.2.2).

439 Other x-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequences in which a question word functions as multiple-duty modifier can be found in: Isa 40.25 (ם), 40.27 (לעון), 46.5 (למה), 46.6 (למה); Job 13.24 (למה), 15.2 (ו), 15.8 (ו), 18.4 (ו), 19.2 (ו), 21.17–18 (כ). Sequences of x-yiqtol > weyiqtol in which an element other than כי or a question word has the role of multiple-duty modifier are attested in: Isa 41.20 (למה), 43.10 (למה); Job 11.10 (כ), 19.5 (כ).

440 Beyond the Psalms, other x-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequences in which כי functions as multiple-duty modifier can be found in: Isa 49.18; Job 13.26–27, and 15.5. Sequences of x-yiqtol > weyiqtol in which an element other than כי or a question word has the role of multiple-duty modifier are attested in: Isa 41.20 (למה), 43.10 (למה); Job 11.10 (כ), 19.5 (כ).
Subject continuity is also realized if the subjects of mother and daughter clause are synonymous or belong to a same semantic class, as in Isa 35.6, where the modifier זגoverns two yiqtol clauses:

\[
[<\text{Su}> \text{ פסת}] [<\text{Aj}> \text{ יול} - <\text{Ti}> זג] \quad 6 \quad xyqX \\
[<\text{Su}> \text{ קלח אתל}] [<\text{Pr}> \text{ יהי} - <\text{Cj}> -<1>] \quad wyqX
\]

6 Then the lame man will leap like a dear
and (then) the tongue of the dumb will sing for joy.

Though agent or subject continuity is a significant marker of a level of continuity enabling modifying elements to spread their governing power across multiple clauses, it is not required and the job can also be done by other continuity marking parameters, such as the presence of semantic correspondences between the clauses, as in Isa 13.13, where both clauses are governed by the conjunction כל.

\[
[<\text{Pr}> \text{ ראוני}] [<\text{Ob}> \text{ שמש}] [<\text{Aj}> \text{ יול}] \quad 13 \quad xyq0 \\
[<\text{Aj}> \text{ ב-שבת יוהו בכאת}] [<\text{Co}> \text{ והрешת}] [<\text{Pr}> \text{ התם-} - <\text{Cj}> -<1>] \quad wyqX
\]

13 Therefore I make the heavens tremble,
and (therefore) the earth is shaken out of its place at the wrath of YHWH of hosts.

A switch in subject reference usually prevents a multiple-duty modifier from affecting the functionality of weyiqtol daughter clauses. An interesting example in this regard is Ps 55.13, where the two volitive 1st-person weyiqtol clauses interrupt the non-volitive explanatory section governed by the conjunction כי and so should not be reinterpreted as non-volitive w-<x->-yiqtol clauses:

\[
[<\text{PO}> \text{ ירפה}] [<\text{Su}> \text{ זום} - <\text{Ng}> \text{ לא}] [<\text{Cj}> \text{ כי}] \quad 13 \quad xxyq \\
[<\text{Pr}> \text{ אשא}] [<\text{Cj}> -<1>] \quad wyq0 \\
[<\text{Pr}> \text{ זכריה}] [<\text{Co}> \text{ עלי}] [<\text{Su}> \text{ שמוט}] [<\text{Ng}> \text{ לא}] [<\text{Co}> \text{ ומונת}] [<\text{Pr}> \text{ אספה}] [<\text{Cj}> -<1>] \quad wxyq0
\]

13 For it is not an enemy who taunts me –
then let me bear it;
(for) it is not an adversary who deals insolently with me –
then let me hide from him.

An example of a [modifier-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence in which the volatility-eliminating capability of the modifying element is overruled by volitive morphological marking in the daughter clause can be found in Ps 139.8, where a cohortative weyiqtol clause adopts the protasis introducing conjunction כי from its mother clause:

\[
[<\text{Co}> \text{ שמוט}] [<\text{Pr}> \text{ אסף}] [<\text{Cj}> \text{ כי}] \quad 8 \quad xyq0 \\
[<\text{Su}> \text{ יוהו}] [<\text{PC}> \text{ שמ}] \quad \text{NmC1}
\]

441 See further: Ps 49.19 ( כי), 51.18 ( כי), 72.12–14 ( כי); Isa 19.20 ( כי).
If I ascend to heaven,   you are there,   and (if) I want to make my bed in Sheol,   you are there!

5.3.1.3 [multiple-duty modifier]-qatal > 0-yiqtol

Redefinition as: [multiple-duty modifier]-qatal > <x>-yiqtol

Patterns: 160
Number of attestations in Psalms: 12
Number of attestations in prose: 1

That inheritance of non-volitive functionality and inheritance of a multiple-duty modifier indeed are two different things becomes obvious from the fact that the second phenomenon can also take place in patterns with mother clauses that, seen from the perspective of the verbal form they contain, would never be able to pass on non-volitive meaning to their daughter clauses. Thus, this section will deal with multiple-duty modifiers that are located in a qatal mother clause and from there exert their influence on verb-initial yiqtol daughter clauses, which, as a result, should be redefined as <x>-yiqtol clauses with a non-volitive function.

We have found only one possible occurrence of this sequence in our discursive prose texts.442 Our poetic corpus, however, contains numerous examples of the [multiple-duty modifier]-qatal > 0-yiqtol construction. In most of them, the 0-yiqtol clause has as its subject the same participant as the qatal mother clause. Illustrative examples are found in Ps 96.13 (// 98.9), where the conjunction כי functions as a multiple-duty modifier:443

\[
\text{[<Pr> בן] [<Cj> כי] [<Su>ל] [<Pr>ב] [<Aj>רשש] [<Ob>הב] [<Pr>.Tasks] [<Aj>ז]-ו] [<Su>מעノ] [<Cj>-ו] [<Pr>Ellp]}
\]

13 For he has come

442 Namely Judg 21.22, where the 0-yiqtol clause appears to have lost its volitive functionality because of the multiple-duty modifier construction כי לא אולא:

\[
\text{[<Ob>אמות] [<PO>ת noen] [<Ti>ת ה-י] [<Co>הלם] [<Pr>.Tasks] [<Su>אמות] [<Ng>לא] [<Cj> כי] [<Pr>משה] [<Aj>ו] [<Pr>ZYq0] [<Ti>xQt0] [<Aj>מיד] [<Su>עמים] [<Cj>-ו] [<Pr>InfC]}
\]

22 Grant them [your daughters] graciously to us,

because it is not so that you have given them [your daughters] to them [the Benjaminites], (because it is not so that) you are guilty.

443 Beyond the Psalms, other x-qatal > 0-yiqtol sequences in which כי functions as multiple-duty modifier can be found in: Isa 25.4–5; Job 15.25–26; Deut 33.9–10; 2 Sam 22.18–19.
to judge the earth,
(for) he judges the world with righteousness
and the peoples with his truth.

in Deut 33.8, where both clauses are governed by the relative אֲשֶׁר:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<PC> יָשָׂר]} & \quad \text{[<Su> לֵא-אַשָּׂר]} \quad \text{NmCl} \\
\text{[<Lo> ב-מָתָה]} & \quad \text{[<Pe> וַּמֹּתָה]} \quad xQt0 \\
& \quad \text{[<Lo> יְהוָה]} \quad \text{[<Pe> וַיְהוָה]} \quad ZYq0
\end{align*}
\]

8 Your Thummim and your Urim are with your godly one,
whom you have tested at Massah,
(with whom) you strive at the waters of Meribah.

and in Isa 41.2–3, where the question word מי governs both clauses:\footnote{444}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Co> מְמֹרָה]} & \quad \text{[<Pr> מְעַרְבָּה]} \quad XQt1 \\
& \quad \text{...} \\
& \quad \text{[<Ob> גוֹיִים]} \quad \text{[<Co> ויִתְנַטָּה]} \quad ZYq0 \\
& \quad \text{[<Pr> וַיִּתְנַטֶּה]} \quad \text{[<Ob> מְלַטִים]} \quad WxY0 \\
& \quad \text{[<Aj> בַּכְשֵׁף נְשָׁה]} \quad \text{[<Co> קָשׁוֹת]} \quad ZYq0 \\
& \quad \text{[<Aj> בַּכְשֵׁף נְשָׁה]} \quad \text{[<Co> קָשׁוֹת]} \quad Ellp
\end{align*}
\]

2 Who has stirred up one from the east,
... (who) gives up nations before him,
and then he tramples kings under foot;
(who) makes them like dust with his sword,
like driven stubble with his bow?

Again, the required level of continuity does not always have to be marked by direct subject continuation. In some instances, the clauses’ subjects are related to each other in a less direct way. In such cases, reference to the same participant is done by pronominal suffixes, for instance, as in Ps 74.1:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Qu> לְמָה]} & \quad xQt0 \\
\text{[<Vo> אָלֹהִים]} & \quad Voct \\
\text{[<Aj> נְזַח]} & \quad \text{[<Pr> נְזַח]} & \text{----} \\
\text{[<Co> ב-כָּנֵן מְרַעְיֵתָךְ]} & \quad \text{[<Su> אָפֵךְ]} \quad \text{[<Pr> עָשָׂה]} \quad ZYqX
\end{align*}
\]

1 Why,
God,
have you cast us of forever,

\footnote{444} Note that מי here governs three ‘blocks’ of clauses. These blocks exhibit a further internal organization. Thus, the second block consists of a O-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol sequence and entails a change in subject: the O-yiqtol clause has the same subject (מי) as its X-qatal mother clause, while the subject of its w-x-yiqtol daughter clause refers to the ‘him’ of the O-yiqtol clause. Compare Ps 80.5–7 (עֹז מֶה) and Job 15.9 (מַעְתָּה).
(why) does your anger smoke against the sheep of your pasture?

In addition, continuation of the governance domain of a modifying element can be marked by semantic analogies between mother and daughter clause, as in Ps 73.6:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[Su]} \text{ גואות} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{ לע tvb} \ [\text{Mo}] \text{ גונכון}^6 \ xQtX \\
&\text{[Co]} \text{ על} \ [\text{Su}] \text{ התמיס} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{ יועכו} \ZYqX
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore pride has encompassed them like a chain, (therefore) a garment of violence covers them.

and in Ps 2.1–2, where לע tvb governs two parallel blocks of clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[Su]} \text{ גוים} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{ ג ו} \ [\text{Qu}] \text{ למה} \ [\text{Ob}] \text{ ייק} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{ יהגו} \ [\text{Su}] \text{ ל מים} \ [\text{Cj}] \text{ - ו} \ xQtX \\
&\text{[Ob]} \text{ ייק} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{ יהגו} \ [\text{Su}] \text{ מלכי} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{יתיצבו} \ [\text{Cj}] \text{ - ו} \ZYqX \\
&\text{[Co]} \text{ קיוו} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{ ייעטו} \ [\text{Su}] \text{מס} \ [\text{Pr}] \text{יעטף} \ZYqX
\end{align*}
\]

1 Why have the nations been conspiring, and/but (why) do the peoples plot in vain?

2 (why) do the kings of the earth set themselves, and/but (why) have the rulers taken counsel together against YHWH and his anointed?

We do not find in our corpus indisputable examples of \textit{[modifier-}qatal > \textit{<x>-yiqtol} \textit{sequences in which the modifying element is prevented from exerting its volitivity-eliminating force by volitive morphological marking in the daughter clause}.\textsuperscript{446}

\textsuperscript{445} See further: Ps 22.17–18 (ך), 59.4, 80.13–14 (ך).  

\textsuperscript{446} The only possible example of a \textit{[multiple-duty modifier]-qatal > 0-yiqtol} \textit{pattern in which the 0-yiqtol clause contains a verbal form that is morphologically marked as volitive may be} Is 59.9–11, where the conjunction \textit{ךנ} appears to govern a sequence of no less than eight clauses, two of which contain a cohortative form. However, it is not that easy to assign a volitive meaning to these clauses. Indeed, Waltke & O’Connor (\textit{Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990)}) identify the cohortative forms as ‘pseudo-cohortatives’. They refer to Moran’s analysis of 1\textsuperscript{st}-person early Canaanite \textit{yaqtula} forms, which, according to him, in course of time were used not only to express intended result, but also actual result. However, such a resultative interpretation is not likely to be correct for most of the ‘pseudo-cohortative’ forms identified by Waltke & O’Connor, who themselves argue that the pseudo-cohortative can be used to refer to past time, but can also describe gnomic situations and have a future-time reference. The identification of such a wide range of different functionalities weakens the argument made by Waltke & O’Connor. Is it true that ‘anything goes’ or would it still be possible to assign a volitive meaning to these apparently strange cohortatives?

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[Co]} \text{ ממע} [\text{Su}] \text{ מפטש} [\text{Pr}] \text{ זרד} [\text{Aj}] \text{ כו} \ xQtX \\
&\text{[Co]} \text{ ל -רו} [\text{Pr}] \text{ מעה} \ZYq0 \\
&\text{[Ob]} \text{ קור} [\text{Pr}] \text{ נושא} [\text{Aj}] \text{ כו} \ZYq0 \\
&\text{[Pr]} \text{ נושא} [\text{Aj}] \text{ כו} \ZYq0
\end{align*}
\]
5.3.1.4 [multiple-duty modifier]-nominal/participle clause > 0-yiqtol

Patterns: 190–200
Number of attestations in Psalms: 5
Number of attestations in prose: 0

The poetic texts in our corpus contain a small number of texts in which a 0-yiqtol clause is governed by a multiple-duty modifier belonging to a mother clause that does not contain a finite verb form.

We find, for instance, several examples of a [multiple-duty modifier]-nominal/participle clause > <x>-yiqtol sequence. Agent or subject continuity again is an important continuity marking parameter, as can be seen in Ps 46.11, where כי introduces a sequence of three object clauses:

Be still and know that I am God, (that) I am exalted among the nations, (that) I am exalted in the earth!

and in Ps 23.4–5, where the conjunction כי governs three clauses:

It is therefore that justice has remained far from us, ...

that we look for light, ...

that we want to / have to grope for the wall like the blind and that we want to / have to grope like those who have no eyes, ...

that we all growl like bears and repeatedly moan like doves.
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4 I fear no evil,
   for you are with me,

5 you prepare a table before me in the presence of my enemies,
you have anointed my head with oil.

Again, the level of continuity needed for enabling modifying elements to include other clauses in their domain of governance can also be reached by less direct signals of continuation, such as the less direct semantic links between mother and daughter clauses in Ps 4.3.\(^{447}\)

\[<\text{Vo}> \text{בֵּן} \text{אֱשֶׂר}^3 \quad \text{Voct} \]
\[<\text{PC}> \text{עֵד} \text{מַה} \quad \text{NmCl} \]
\[<\text{Su}> \text{בְּנוֹדִי} \quad \text{NmCj} \]
\[<\text{Aj}> \text{בַּ-כָּלָה} \quad \text{NnCj} \]
\[<\text{Ob}> \text{תָּאָבֹתָן} \quad \text{ZYq0} \]
\[<\text{Pr}> \text{זָמַה} \quad \text{ZYq0} \]

3 Sons of man,
   how long is my glory (turned) to dishonour,
   (how long) do you love vain words,
   (how long) do you seek after lies?

The mother clause containing the multiple-duty modifier may also be a participle clause. An example of such a \[\text{multiple-duty modifier}-\text{participle clause} > 0-\text{yiqtol} \] sequence can be found in Ps 149.4:

\[<\text{Co}> \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad \text{ZYqX} \]
\[<\text{Su}> \text{בַּ-עֲשֵׂ}^2 \quad \text{ZYq0} \]
\[<\text{Pr}> \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad \text{ZYq0} \]

2 Let Israel be glad in his Maker,

\[<\text{Co}> \text{רִיכִ}^4 \quad \text{Ptcp} \]
\[<\text{Su}> \text{זָרַד}^4 \quad \text{ZYq0} \]
\[<\text{Pr}> \text{בַּ-שָּׁעַת} \quad \text{ZYq0} \]

4 For YHWH is taking pleasure in his people,
   (for) he adorns the humble with victory.

5.3.2 Resumption of the Subject

Patterns: (130), 160, 190–200
Number of attestations in Psalms: 8
Number of attestations in prose: 0

In the introduction to §5.3.1, we have explicitly rejected the suggestion made by Niccacci and Joosten to count explicit subjects (and other constituents) among the multiple-duty modifiers that may have a ‘blocking’ effect on the assignment of volitive meaning to verb-initial \textit{yiqtol} clauses by causing them to behave like \textit{yiqtol} clauses. Indeed, explicit subjects do not by default have a domain of governance consisting of multiple clauses, like the multiple-duty modifiers do. This does not mean, however, that explicit subjects in mother clauses cannot be

\(^{447}\) Compare Deut 32.10–11.
implicitly present in the daughter clauses and, in that way, affect the functionality of those clauses.

In this short section, we argue that fronted explicit subjects sometimes and only in specific patterns may function in a way comparable to multiple-duty modifiers. Thus, by being implicitly assumed in a 0-yiqtol daughter clause, such explicit subjects prompt for a redefinition of this daughter clause as an \(<X>\)-yiqtol clause. However, the number of instances in which the ascription of volitive meaning to a yiqtol clause is ‘blocked’ in this way is rather small. Besides, the conditions under which explicit subjects prevent verb-initial yiqtol daughter clauses from fulfilling their default function of expressing volitive meaning are very strict. Of course, the daughter clause is to have exactly the same subject as its mother clause. Next to that, the explicit subject in the mother clause is required to take preverbal or ‘pre-predicate’ position. Finally, it is only the functioning of asyndetic 0-yiqtol clauses that can be affected by a resumed explicit subject.

There are no restrictions on the type of the mother clause. In §5.2.1.1, we already discussed sequences of \(w-(X)\)-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol and noted that in several of them one might assume the resumption of the mother clause’s explicit subject in the 0-yiqtol daughter clause. However, a 0-yiqtol clause may also inherit a subject from an \(X\)-qatal mother clause, which is what happens in Ps 110.5–6:448

\[
\text{[<Ob> מלכים / [<Pr> המן ז] [<sp> ע] [<Su> אתים]]} \quad \text{XQtl}
\]
\[
\text{[<Co> מב] [<Pr> ב-ניים]} \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]
\[
\text{[<Ob> מלח]} \quad \text{ZQt0}
\]
\[
\text{[<sp><Ob> מלך / [<Pr> יראש]} [<Pr> אים]} \quad \text{ZQt0}
\]

\[
\text{[<Co> גוים / [<Pr> מץ]} \quad \text{XQtl}
\]
\[
\text{[<PC> בסכם]} [<Su> ה] \quad \text{Ptcp}
\]
\[
\text{[<Aj> גילו - ו] [<Pr> תובלנה]} \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]
\[
\text{[<Co> מלך} [<Pr> תב ינה]} \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

\[
\text{[<Pr> ע] [<Ob> ע] [<Pr> י וב]} \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

\[
\text{[<Co> לך} [<PC> נפש] [<Su> סמכנ]} \quad \text{NmCl}
\]
\[
\text{[<Co> ל-ריע] [<Ob> של] [<Pr> שיש]} \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

\[
\text{[<Co> מקד] [<Pr> מש] [<Ob> ב-ים]} \quad \text{XQtl}
\]

6 Adonai at your right hand has shattered kings on the day of his wrath, executes judgement among the nations, has filled them with corpses, has shattered him who is chief over the whole earth.

6 Adonai is with those who uphold my life, requites my enemies with evil.

15 Her virgin companions are being brought to you, are led along with joy and gladness, enter the palace of the king.

16 See also: Ps 74.14, 115.12–13; Isa 42.12, 44.13, 50.4.
In each of these examples the 0-yiqtol clause is to be reinterpreted as a non-volitive <X>-yiqtol clause. A mother clause’s explicit subject is not ‘imported’ in the 0-yiqtol daughter clause if it does not take ‘pre-predicate’ position in the mother clause. In that case, the 0-yiqtol clause maintains its default volitive function, as in Exod 15.14–16:

\[ \langle Su \rangle \text{עמים} [\langle Pr \rangle \text{מעו}]_{14}^{14} \quad ZQtx \\
\langle Pr \rangle \text{ירגון} \quad ZYq0 \]

14 Now that the peoples have heard it, let them tremble!

### 5.3.3 Blocking Mechanisms in Domains of Discourse

Besides the phenomena of the multiple-duty modifier and the ellipsis of an explicit subject, Biblical Hebrew has yet another syntactic mechanism that prevents verb-initial yiqtol clauses, in particular 0-yiqtol clauses, from adopting a volitive meaning. It will be shown that if a 0-yiqtol clause is located within a narrative or a prospective domain of discourse, it frequently loses its volitive meaning.

More specifically, we hold that 0-yiqtol clauses that are positioned within a chain of narrative wayyiqtol clauses or within a clause chain initiated by the prospective macro-syntactic sign היה not only have a specific discourse function (which will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter), but are also prevented from executing their default volitive function. The narrative or prospective-discursive mode of communication marked by the chains of wayyiqtol or weqatal clauses thus has a volitivity-blocking effect on the verb initial yiqtol clauses that are embedded in them.

#### 5.3.3.1 Wayyiqtol > 0-yiqtol

Pattern: 170

| Number of attestations in Psalms: | 25 |
| with inheritance: | 22 (88.0%) |
| Number of attestations in prose: | 1 |
| with blocking: | 1 (100%) |

Volitive default function of 0-yiqtol is always blocked

Our text corpus contains numerous examples of the sequence of wayyiqtol > 0-yiqtol, which almost exclusively occurs in poetic texts. Clause chains consisting of a series of wayyiqtol clauses interrupted by one or more 0-yiqtol clause(s) have raised many questions among Hebraists, who have undertaken several attempts to account for the use of the yiqtol clauses in such narrative contexts. Even more difficulties arise when one observes that in some such narrative line interrupting 0-yiqtol clauses a short jussive yiqtol form is used. Does morphological marking still
have a function in these clauses for which a volitive interpretation often appears to be impossible? Most grammars tend to minimize the formal differences between wayyiqtol clauses and narrative line interrupting 0-yiqtol clauses by stating that the yiqtol forms, too, function as ‘punctual preterita’ and mark an archaic style. Waltke & O’Connor refer to the work of David Robertson who argues that in poetic texts recounting history ‘unbound yqtol is used of the past where no habitual or frequentative notion is relevant’. Other Hebraists, like Walter Gross, separate between short and long yiqtol forms. Thus, Gross claims that short yiqtol forms tend to take clause-initial position, while long yiqtol forms mostly occur clause internally. He links the clause-initial yiqtol to the wayyiqtol, which according to him denotes perfective meaning, while he assigns to the non-clause-initial forms the function of indicating ‘historical imperfect aspect’.

Though such functional differences may, at first sight, seem helpful at a theoretical level, it is rather questionable whether they can also be defended when one tries to apply them to concrete texts. Indeed, the number of text samples provided by grammars in order to support and illustrate such views is remarkably low. Moreover, most grammars, while distinguishing between wayyiqtol forms and ‘narrative’ yiqtol forms at a theoretical level, in their presentation of sample texts generally even fail to analyze them as two distinct forms. Thus, many narrative line interrupting yiqtol are ‘explained away’ by analyzing them as resulting from mistaken interpretations of defective spelling, from confusion between form groups or textual corruptions, or from poetic devices and techniques like ‘rhythmical shortening’. However, is it acceptable to overlook the formal differences in this way, i.e.: by accounting for them with non-linguistic arguments? Is it indeed ‘best in problem passages of this nature to be governed by sense rather than by form’? We claim that it is not and instead hold that the alternation of wayyiqtol and 0-yiqtol clauses should be explained by referring to the text-linguistic functions of the verbal forms both clause types contain: the wayyiqtol clauses signal a narrative, more distant mode of communication, while the interrupting yiqtol clauses denote sudden shifts to discursive communication. While the speaker uses wayyiqtol clauses to merely recount a series of historical events, he includes the yiqtol clauses in his narrative in order to arouse the attention of his audience and to communicate that this information is of direct relevance for them in the actual interaction.

Now, if the functional difference between wayyiqtol and yiqtol clauses is to be defined in terms of the verbal forms’ text-linguistic functions, why then do the Biblical authors frequently use O-
yiqtol clauses instead of x-yiqtol clauses? In other words, can one also make a functional distinction between 0-yiqtol clauses and x-yiqtol clauses embedded in series of wayyiqtol clauses?

When comparing the sequence wayyiqtol > 0-yiqtol to that of wayyiqtol > x-yiqtol several interesting observations can be made. First of all, the pattern wayyiqtol > 0-yiqtol occurs far more often than the wayyiqtol > x-yiqtol sequence in our corpus of poetic texts. Secondly, our corpus contains not a single example of a wayyiqtol > x-yiqtol sequence in which the x-yiqtol daughter clause directly continues its mother clause’s subject, while narrative 0-yiqtol clauses in most cases (19 out of 25: 76%) do share their wayyiqtol mother clause’s subject. Thirdly, it should be noted that the x-yiqtol clauses are rarely followed by other wayyiqtol clauses, while the 0-yiqtol clauses most often are. So, while 0-yiqtol clauses in most instances are clearly embedded within the narrative section in which they are surrounded by wayyiqtol, the x-yiqtol clauses regularly mark a transition to a section communicating a more independent type of discursive mainline information. Instead of simply continuing the series of narrated events, the x-yiqtol clauses usually interrupt it by presenting a kind of conclusion directly valid to the readership, as is the case in Ps 106.43.\(^457\)

\[^40\] Then the anger of YHWH was kindled against his people, and he abhorred his heritage,
and he gave them into the hand of the nations, and those who hated them ruled over them, and their enemies oppressed them, and they were brought into subjection under their power.

\[^41\] and many times he delivers them,
but they are rebellious in their purposes! –

\[^42\] They were brought low through their iniquity,
but he regarded their distress.

\[^457\] The Bible translations generally provide a past tense rendering of the yiqtol clauses in this verse. For other instances of wayyiqtol > x-yiqtol beyond the Psalms, see Isa 3.16, 9.16, 15.4, 41.7, 41.25, 48.19.
drawing the audience’s attention to specific moments in the series of events and providing it with a vivid portrayal of these events: the audience sees it all happening right before its eyes. Since this discourse-level function is rarely (if ever) fulfilled by yiqtol clauses in which the verbal form does not take initial position, it can be argued that the syntactic position of the yiqtol form, in this specific context only, does not mark a clause-level function (i.e.: volitive meaning), but rather serves as an irreplaceable marker of vivid, highlighting discourse. Consequently, we assume that the realization of a 0-yiqtol clause’s default volitive function is blocked by its embeddedness in a narrative line of communication.

This applies to narrative-line interrupting 0-yiqtol clauses that have as their subject the same participant as the wayyiqtol mother clause, as in Ps 78.13–16 (we use the English present tense to mark in our translations the shift from narrative to discursive communication signalled by the 0-yiqtol clause).

13 When he had divided the sea, he let them pass through it, and made the waters stand like a heap,

14 and led them with a cloud in the daytime,

... – yes, he cleaves rocks in the wilderness! –

and gave them drink abundantly as from the deep,

16 and made streams come out of the rock, and caused waters to flow down like rivers.

The same type of analysis, however, is also valid for 0-yiqtol clauses having another subject as their wayyiqtol mother clause, as in Ps 107.25–28.

458 Compare also Ps 78.44–51, 106.6–12; Job 19.9–11; and Deut 32.15–19.
459 Compare: Exod 8.20–21 (the only occurrence of the wayyiqtol > 0-yiqtol sequence in discursive prose); Ps 64.9, 69.11–13, 106.13–19, 107.25–27; Job 12.24–25.
Then he commanded, and raised the stormy wind, and it lifted up its waves.

– look, they mount up to heaven –...

Then they cried to YHWH in their trouble.

The next example shows that the vivid, discursive type of communication initiated by a 0-yiqtol clause can be continued by several other 0-yiqtol clauses. In order to distinguish them from regular sequences of discursive mainline marking yiqtol clauses, such discursive chains of narrative-line interrupting yiqtol clauses are generally, but not necessarily, followed by a switch back to the narrative line of communication they are embedded in. In the previous examples, the narrative line was resumed by mainline wayyiqtol clauses. The Biblical authors could, however, also use qatal clauses for this, as in Job 16.12–15.

When I was at ease, he broke me asunder, and when he had seized me by the neck, he dashed me into pieces and set me up as his target.

Look, his archers surround me, he slashes open my kidneys, and does not spare, he pours out my gall on the ground,

he breaks me with breach upon breach, he runs upon me like a warrior! –

Then I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin and have laid my strength in the dust.

12 When I was at ease, he broke me asunder, and when he had seized me by the neck, he dashed me into pieces and set me up as his target.

13 – Look, his archers surround me, he slashes open my kidneys, and does not spare, he pours out my gall on the ground,

14 he breaks me with breach upon breach, he runs upon me like a warrior! –

15 Then I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin and have laid my strength in the dust.

Compare Prov 24.32. For more information on narrative qatal clauses, we refer the reader to the next chapter.
Even when the narrative line is not continued after the 0-yiqtol clause, the yiqtol clause is still affected by its being anchored in a wayyiqtol clause and thus remains part of the narrative section, which it concludes. It is interesting to note that in the examples of such wayyiqtol > 0-yiqtol sequences in our corpus, there is also a high level of continuation in the set of participants and one can often identify several semantic correspondences between the 0-yiqtol clause and its wayyiqtol mother clause. Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 80.10–11.\footnote{Compare further: Ps 18.36–37 (// 2 Sam 22.36–37), 18.40 (// 2 Sam 22.40), 81.8, 138.3; 2 Sam 22.44.}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Co> פניה] [<Pr> יתינה] ZQt0
[<Ob> שרשה] [<Pr> תוכסי] [<Cj> -1] Way0
[<Ob> י роль] [<Pr> שחר] [<Cj> -1] Way0
...
[<Co> עד] [<Ob> צור] [<Pr> תשלח] ZYq0
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{When you had cleared the ground for it, it took deep root and filled the land,}

\footnote{– indeed, it sends out its branches to the sea!}

and in Ps 37.40:

\begin{verbatim}
[<PC> יהוה] [<Su> ידיקים] [<Cj> -1] NmCl
...
[<Su> ידיקים] [<PO> עזרים] [<Cj> -1] WayX
[<PO> ילעט] [<Cj> -1] Way0
[<Co> הקדים] [<PO> וחמשים] [<Cj> -1] ZYq0
[<PO> ישעיהו] [<Cj> -1] WYq0

\end{verbatim}

\footnote{And the salvation of the righteous is from YHWH;}

\footnote{YHWH helped them and delivered them; yes, he delivers them from the wicked, and saves them!}

A similar analysis applies when the wayyiqtol mother clause and its 0-yiqtol daughter clause are semantically parallel by containing subjects and verbs belonging to the same semantic categories, as in 2 Sam 22.15–16:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ob> צור] [<Pr> וישלח] [<Cj> -1] Way0
[<PO> יתמה] [<Cj> -1] Way0
...
[<Su> אפקק י] [<Pr> זרו] [<Cj> -1] WayX
\end{verbatim}
Then he sent out arrows and scattered them,

... and the channels of the sea were seen
- yes, there the foundations of the world are laid bare at the rebuke of YHWH.

When such semantic correspondences are absent and the 0-yiqtol clause has as its subject a different participant than the wayyiqtol clauses preceding it and is not embedded within a narrative section continued afterwards by other wayyiqtol or qatal clauses, it signals a switch back from the narrative domain to the mainline of discourse. However, such 0-yiqtol clauses are usually not anchored in the directly preceding wayyiqtol clause, but instead relate back to a clause that either preceded or initiated the narrative domain.\(^\text{462}\)

Before we conclude this section, there is one subcategory of 0-yiqtol clauses anchored in a wayyiqtol clause which should be given some additional attention, namely those containing a jussive form.\(^\text{463}\) Should volitive morphology be seen as overruling syntactic patterns in these clause sequences too? Or do these sequences constitute an exception to the hierarchical ordering of morphological and syntactic ways of marking volitivity and non-volitivity that was presented in §5.2.3? Should we follow the suggestion made by scholars using a diachronic approach to identify such jussive forms as remnants of the old short yaqtul form and, with that, as pointers of an archaic style?

Such a diachronic solution at first sight may seem plausible.\(^\text{464}\) However, behind it lies an approach which significantly differs from the one guiding our analyses. Thus, scholars offering a

\(^{462}\) In this case, the narrative domain as a whole may serve as background information providing an argument for the volitive statement made in the 0-yiqtol clause. An illustrative example can be found in Ps 40.2–4, which is discussed in detail in §6.3.2.2 and §6.3.3.3.

\(^{463}\) Of the 28 narrative line continuing 0-yiqtol clauses in our corpus, four contain an explicit indicative yiqtol form (Ps 18.36–37 and 18.40, and the parallel verses in 2 Sam 22) and eight contain a jussive form. All of the 0-yiqtol clauses containing a jussive form have as their subject the same participant as their wayyiqtol mother clause.

\(^{464}\) Though the analysis of wayyiqtol as a ‘past preterite’ and as deriving from the same short Proto-Northwest Semitic yaqtul form as the short yiqtol form is broadly accepted among Hebraists, different views are held by some of them. Thus, Elizabeth Robar, in her recent article ‘WAYYIQTOL as an Unlikely Preterite’ (Journal of Semitic Studies LVIII/1, Spring 2013; pp.21–42), argues, mainly on the basis of diachronic and comparative analyses, that wayyiqtol never was a preterite and proposes to interpret the wayyiqtol form as a ‘narrative present’, constituting, together with the short yiqtol, the short variant of a present/future form. She stresses that the claim that wayyiqtol has its origins in the short yaqtul form with a preterite meaning has to face several morphological difficulties. For instance, the Hebrew Bible contains quite a number of wayyiqtols that are unmistakably long. Robar also refers to the many long yiqtol forms having a jussive meaning (cf. our conclusions in §4.3.3.4). These cases are not to be seen as mere irregularities, but as clues for a different interpretation of the verbal system, according to Robar, who argues that wayyiqtol never establishes the reference time by itself, but always continues the reference time set by preceding forms and usually serves to express a resultative perfect meaning. In narrative contexts, for example, the wayyiqtol does not so much signal the continuation of narrative, preterite past meaning, but rather introduces a (present) state resulting from the past action referred to in the preceding context. Robar defends her diverging views by means of multiple comparisons with other languages, some of which are (distantly) related to Biblical Hebrew (modern Aramaic dialects) and some of which are not (late Egyptian, Coptic).
diachronic explanation for the use of the jussive forms in narrative contexts generally start from the assumption that these forms unmistakably have to be interpreted as having a past tense reference and simply continuing the narrative line represented by the surrounding wayyiqtol clauses. However, what would happen if we do not take the interpretation of the text and the origin of Biblical Hebrew’s verbal forms as our starting point, but make use of a synchronic approach that works from form to function?

We assume that, despite the obvious morphological relation between the short yiqtol form used in O-yiqtol clauses and the wayyiqtol form, it can still be maintained that the formal difference between the two clause types entails a functional difference, which should be defined not in terms of volitive or non-volitive functionality, but rather in terms of the discourse-level functions of the verbal forms. Thus, while the wayyiqtol forms convey information of a narrative nature, narrative-line interrupting yiqtol forms mark a transition to a discursive type of communication. We hold that a O-yiqtol clause containing a short jussive form and being embedded in a narrative section functions in a way similar to the O-yiqtol clause that does not contain such a short jussive form: both signal a shift to non-volitive, discursive mainline communication. Such instances are unique in that they represent the only cases in which volitive morphological marking is not decisive, but is overruled by higher-level syntax (instead of the other way around). An example

We do not agree with Robar’s analysis of wayyiqtol as a completely dependent tense. Contrary to Robar’s view, we assume that in general it is the wayyiqtol form which itself marks a piece of communication as having a narrative nature instead of merely continuing (as a relative present) a narrative type of communication. Moreover, we consider most examples provided by Robar as unconvincing, since their analysis appears to be supported more by diachronic considerations and a rather subjective interpretation of the (con)text than by objective synchronic analyses of other occurrences of similar usages of wayyiqtols. Thus, one of the main prompts for Robar’s study was the existence of long wayyiqtol forms, which she accounts for as being markers of ‘discourse prominence’, a function that may be realized in different ways: by giving a small number of examples Robar aims to illustrate that such ‘discourse prominence’ marking long wayyiqtols may be used for ‘lexical disambiguation’, for ‘marking of narrative boundaries’, or for ‘highlighting the Leitmotif or discourse theme’. However, not only does the categorizing of these seemingly unrelated functions under one central denominator of ‘discourse prominence’ evoke the impression of being rather superficial, the assignment of these functions to long wayyiqtols also seems to be based merely on subjective, interpretational arguments.

Yet, Robar’s study is valuable in that it reminds us of the fact that the analysis of wayyiqtol (and short yiqtol) as deriving from a past preterite yaqtul is not as self-evident as is often assumed in studies on the Hebrew verbal system. Another significant contribution of Robar’s work is her implicit claim that for a correct analysis of verbal forms, one has to take into account the context or, more specifically, the verbal forms by which they are preceded and together with which they constitute a verbal pattern. Finally, by introducing the categories of ‘topic continuity’ and ‘discourse prominence’ Robar correctly suggests that the verbal forms do not only fulfill functions within their own clause, but also contribute, at a higher level, to the development of discourse.

After having made this grammatical observation, one may raise the question as to why some O-yiqtol clauses that are embedded in narrative domains make use of a short yiqtol form, while others contain a long form. In our data, we have not found any clear differences between the two categories of clauses. It should be noted that the distinction between long and short yiqtol form can only be made for a limited number of verbs (see §4.3.1) and for that reason may not have been functional. One might refer to diachronic studies to further account for the non-volitive use of the jussive yiqtol in narrative contexts. Thus, the diachronic relatedness of the jussive yiqtol to the wayyiqtol may help us to further understand the possibly ‘archaic’ use of the jussive forms in these contexts.
of a 0-yiqtol clause with a jussive yiqtol form embedded in a narrative domain is found in Ps 18.10–14:

He bowed the heavens, and came down,
... and he rode on a cherub, and flew, and came swiftly upon the wings of wind.

Look! He makes darkness his covering around him.

Interestingly, in the parallel text in 2 Sam 22.11–15, another clause has been given the form of a 0-yiqtol clause. Here, the 0-yiqtol clause contains an explicit subject:

He bowed the heavens, and came down,
... and he rode on a cherub, and flew, and came swiftly upon the wings of wind.
... and made darkness around him his covering.

Look! YHWH thunders from the heavens and the Most High utters his voice!

He sent out arrows.

See further: Ps 78.21–26, 107.29: Deut 32.18.
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... YHWH thundered in the heavens.

In the specific context of narrative communication, both clause-internal syntax and morphology are overruled by the discourse-level syntactic pattern. Neither the initial position of the verbal form nor the use of jussive morphology fulfills its default function of marking volitive meaning. Instead, both serve to identify a close relationship between the 0-yiqtol clause and the surrounding short yiqtol form containing wayyiqtol clauses: the 0-yiqtol clause is embedded in and part of the narrative communication within which it executes its specialized discourse function of directly addressing the audience.

5.3.3.2 הָיָה > 0-yiqtol

Pattern: 180
Number of attestations in Psalms: 0
  with inheritance: 0
Number of attestations in prose: 11
  with blocking: 11 (100%)

Volitive default function of 0-yiqtol is always blocked

In Biblical Hebrew, extensive prospective domains of discourse are often opened by the macrosyntactic sign הָיָה. We assume that all clauses belonging to the clause chain anchored in הָיָה are to be assigned an anticipating value. In other words, one may argue that all clauses continuing the (secondary) line of discourse initiated by הָיָה inherit the ‘forward perspective’ value of this macrosyntactic marker. This is also true for yiqtol clauses, which, however, keep fulfilling their function of denoting discursive foreground within the domain to which they belong.

Though we do not find such prospective-line interrupting yiqtol clauses in the poetry of the Psalms, the Hebrew Bible does contain quite a number of texts in which yiqtol clauses are embedded in prospective domains. As is generally true for all yiqtol clauses embedded in prospective domains, 0-yiqtol clauses, too, besides expressing discursive foreground, inherit the anticipating functionality of the הָיָה form. It appears that this adoption of prospective perspectival value prevents such 0-yiqtol clauses from fulfilling their default volitive function. As was true for 0-yiqtol clauses embedded in narrative domains, these prospective 0-yiqtol clauses, too, realize their ‘foreground’ function by highlighting certain parts of the message that is communicated. By using such yiqtol clauses instead of prospective weqatal clauses, the author is able to draw the reader’s attention to specific, directly relevant predictions or promises made in the domain of prospective communication.

The book of Isaiah contains several examples of direct sequences of הָיָה > 0-yiqtol. We find three of them in Isa 7.21–23:467

---

467 See also: Isa 7.18, 10.12, 10.27, 11.11–12, 17.4, 23.17, 24.21, 27.12, 27.13, and 66.23–24.
And it will be on that day
that a man keeps alive a young cow and two sheep;
and it will be because of the abundance of milk,
which they give,
that he eats curds;

and it will be on that day
that it is true for every place,
where there are a thousand vines, worth a thousand shekels of silver,
that it becomes briers and thorns.

A similar sequence can be found in a discursive prose section in Lev 14.9:

And it will be on the seventh day
that he shaves all his hair off his head

The specification of the anticipated moment or period can have the form of an adjunct phrase to be included in the היה clause, but can also be done in a temporal adjunct infinitive construct clause, which is to be anchored not in the following (0-yiqtol) clause, but in the היה clause, as is defended in Viktor Ber, The Hebrew Verb HYH as a Macrosyntactic Signal (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008), pp.87–95 (יהיה + ו + infinitive construct), 280–286 (יהיה + + infinitive construct). According to Ber, the construction serves to front a temporal expression in discursive texts. His examples also show that the construction היה > infinitive construct in most instances is continued by a weqatal clause, which supports an analysis according to which the temporal inf.c. clause is not to be anchored in its daughter clause, but rather in the היה phrase together with which it forms a temporal expression. This entails that a 0-yiqtol clause following a היה phrase + temporal clause is indeed to be analyzed as a 0-yiqtol (instead of being reinterpreted as an <x-yiqtol having the temporal clause as x-element [cf. §4.3.4]), whose default volitive function is blocked by its being positioned in a prospective section opened by היה.

21 And it will be on that day
that a man keeps alive a young cow and two sheep;

22 and it will be because of the abundance of milk,
which they give,
that he eats curds;

23 and it will be on that day
that it is true for every place,
where there are a thousand vines, worth a thousand shekels of silver,
that it becomes briers and thorns.

9 And it will be on the seventh day
that he shaves all his hair off his head
and that he shaves off all his hair - his beard and his eyebrows;
then he will wash his clothes
and bathe his body in water
and then he will be clean.

The 0-yiqtol clause does not have to be directly anchored in the היה, but it may also be located further down in the clause chain opened by היה, as in Deut 28.15-22.\textsuperscript{469}

\begin{verbatim}
[<Pr> היה] [<Cj> -] \textsuperscript{15} MSyn
[<ap><Co> ב-הוורת / אולותיכם] xYq0
...
[<Su>FINAL] ב-הכלהת-ה-אלות] WQtX
[<Pr> בלך] [Cj -] WQt0
...
[<Ob> if] [<Co> ב-] [Su] יהוה] ZYqX
[<Pr> ב-] ZYqX
...
[<Ob> מת-הדבר] [Co -] [Su] יהוה] ZYqX
[<Pr> ב-] ZYqX
...
[<Co> ב-] [Su] יהוה] [PO] וככה] ZYqX
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{15} And it will be
that then all these curses will come upon you
and will overtake you;

\textsuperscript{20} then יהוה sends upon you curses, confusion and frustration,

\textsuperscript{21} then יהוה makes the pestilence cleave to you,

\textsuperscript{22} then יהוה smites you with consumption, and with fever, and with inflammation.

5.4 Analyzing Clause Chains – the Recursive Nature of Inheritance and Blocking

Now that we have identified and discussed all patterns in which blocking of volitive functionality (of 0-yiqtol clauses) and inheritance of volitive and non-volitive functionalities and clause modifying elements may take place, we have to conclude that we are still confronted with yiqtol clauses whose (non)volitive functionality cannot be accounted for by concentrating only on mechanisms operating between mother and daughter clause. Thus, we already argued that multiple-duty modifiers often govern a series of more than two clauses and referred in this regard to Ps 94.3-4:

\textsuperscript{469} Compare Deut 28.1–13; 1 Sam 17.25.
How long do the wicked exult,
(how long) do they utter,
(how long) do they speak hard things,
(how long) do all the evildoers boast?

For an adequate determination of the final 0-yiqtol-X clause’s function, it is not sufficient to take into account only the relation with its mother clause. Instead, one has to start at the root of this clause chain – the X-yiqtol clause in vs.3 – and then notice how the multiple-duty modifier requires a reanalysis of all three 0-yiqtol clauses in vs.4 as <x-yiqtol clauses.

At a more general level, we claim that indeed attention has to be paid to the recursive character of processes of inheritance and blocking. It is not sufficient to look at clause pairs only, since the mother clause in a specific clause pair often is itself the daughter clause of another mother clause, which in turn has its own mother clause, and so on. As processes of inheritance and blocking may be at work in all of the clause pairs attested in a text, it is always necessary to identify and examine the whole chain of clauses (with all the clause connections in it) in which a specific clause sequence is located. Processes of inheritance and blocking operating earlier in the clause chain may affect the functionalities passed on and blocked in later connections of clauses in that same clause chain. Thus, an x-yiqtol clause can be prevented from passing on to its 0-yiqtol daughter clause non-volitive functionality because it has itself inherited volitive functionality from a volitive mother clause. Moreover, a process of inheritance or blocking can itself easily transcend the boundaries of a single clause pair, as we just illustrated for the phenomenon of the multiple-duty modifier.

In this section, we explain and illustrate for each of the patterns discussed in §5.2 how processes operating earlier in the clause chain may influence the assignment of functionalities within that specific pattern. Since the passing on of volitive functionality in patterns starting with an imperative mother clause is never affected by processes of inheritance or blocking operating in sequences preceding the imperative clause in the same clause chain, those patterns will be left out of consideration here. Let us again start with the clause sequences in which clauses are asyndetically positioned next to each other.

5.4.1 Asyndetic Clause Connections

5.4.1.1 ... > (w-)X-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol
([volitive >) volitive > volitive]
Patterns: 120–130

For the sequence (w-)X-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol, we concluded in §5.2.1.1 that, in case of agent continuation, the 0-yiqtol clause usually inherits the X-yiqtol mother clause’s default non-volitive functionality. In §5.2, we also discussed, however, a number of patterns in which the X-yiqtol clause and the w-X-yiqtol clause do not fulfill their default non-volitive function. Thus, if the two types of clauses are anchored in an imperative clause, they frequently adopt that clause’s volitive functionality. What happens if these two types of patterns coincide, i.e.: when a (w-)X-yiqtol
clause simultaneously is the daughter of an imperative clause and the mother of a 0-yiqtol clause?

In Ps 43.3–4, we find such an example of an X-yiqtol clause inheriting an imperative clause’s volitive meaning and at the same time being the mother clause in an X-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol sequence in which there is a continuation of the same subject. Normally, the 0-yiqtol clause would be inheriting the X-yiqtol clause’s non-volitive functionality in such a pattern, but here the X-yiqtol clause’s default function is overridden by an inherited volitive function, so that the 0-yiqtol clause, in turn, keeps its default volitive meaning:

\[
\begin{align*}
[&<\text{Ob}> \text{שרולא יאמותי}] & \text{ZI} & 0 \\
[&<\text{Pr}> \text{יהלך זא cháלך ואינא ישכנן}] & \text{XY} & \text{qt} \\
[&<\text{PO}> \text{יהללו}] & \text{ZY} & \text{q} & 0
\end{align*}
\]

3 Send out your light and your truth!
Let them lead me,
Let them bring me to your holy hill and to your dwelling!

A similar analysis is appropriate when an X-yiqtol mother clause inherits itself volitive functionality from a 0-yiqtol (grand) mother clause, as in Ps 149.2–3:

\[
\begin{align*}
[&<\text{Co}> \text{ב-ishlist}] & \text{ZY} & \text{q} & \text{X} \\
[&<\text{Su}> \text{ב-מלכתי}] & \text{XY} & \text{qt} \\
[&<\text{Co}> \text{יוולו}] & \text{ZY} & \text{q} & 0
\end{align*}
\]

2 Let Israel be glad in his Maker,
let the sons of Zion rejoice in their King,
3 let them praise his name with dancing!

If one desires to reanalyze the 0-yiqtol daughter clauses in these examples as <X>-yiqtol clauses in which the explicit subject of the X-yiqtol mother is presumed (cf. §5.3.2), the pattern becomes of even bigger interest, since it would entail that the X-yiqtol clause, instead of being prevented from overriding a 0-yiqtol daughter clause’s (volitive) functionality, itself passes on an inherited volitive functionality to an <X>-yiqtol daughter clause.

The use of an X-yiqtol clause in an X-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence can also prevent an X-yiqtol clause from passing on non-volitive functionality to other daughter clauses. As we concluded, the X-yiqtol > weyiqtol pattern, as a whole, has to be analyzed as a volitional functional unit in case both clauses share the same subject. Any 0-yiqtol clause anchored in such an X-yiqtol clause simply keeps fulfilling its default volitive function, as in Ps 66.4:

\[
\begin{align*}
[&<\text{Co}> \text{מל ה-ארץ וישתוהו}] & \text{XY} & \text{qt} \\
[&<\text{Pr}> \text{ב-ים זא}] & \text{WY} & \text{q} & 0 \\
[&<\text{Co}> \text{פשך}] & \text{ZY} & \text{q} & 0
\end{align*}
\]

4 Let all the earth worship you
and sing praises to you!

\footnote{\begin{enumerate}
\item Similarly, Isa 41.1.
\item See also: Ps 67.2.
\end{enumerate}}
Let them sing praises to your holy name!

5.4.1.2 ... > (w-)x-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol  
([volitive >) volitive > volitive]  
Patterns: 150–160

While in some of the patterns discussed in the previous subsection it may be questioned whether or not the 0-yiqtol granddaughter clause should be reanalyzed as an <x-yiqtol clause inheriting a functionality that was inherited and passed on by its X-yiqtol mother clause, this confusion does not arise in the patterns dealt with in this subsection. It is obvious from our data that the passing on of non-volitive functionality by x-yiqtol clauses and w-x-yiqtol clauses to their 0-yiqtol daughter clauses can be hindered by the fact that the (w-)x-yiqtol itself has a mother clause from which it inherits a specific type of functionality. We find, for instance, numerous examples in which an x-yiqtol mother clause having a 0-yiqtol daughter clause is itself anchored in a volitive 0-yiqtol clause from which it inherits volitive meaning. This is what happens in Ps 66.13–15:472

13 Let me come into your house with burnt offerings,  
let me pay you my vows,  
...

15 let me offer to you burnt offerings of fatlings with the smoke of the sacrifice of rams,  
let me make an offering of bulls and goats.

In such cases, the 0-yiqtol granddaughter clause is not prevented from executing its default volitive function. Likewise, a 2nd-person (w-)x-yiqtol clause which inherits volitive functionality from an imperative clause will no longer override the default volitive functionality of its own 2nd-person 0-yiqtol daughter clause by imposing on it a non-volitive value. Instead, the default volitive meaning of the 0-yiqtol clause is simply preserved. An example of this can be found in Ps 66.13–15:473

---

472 See further: Ps 138.1–2, 145.1–2; Isa 53.10–11.  
473 Compare Isa 58.2.

An x-yiqtol mother clause’s non-volitive functionality may also be overruled by volitional formulae like יתן מי. In such cases, too, the x-yiqtol does not prevent its 0-yiqtol daughter clause(s) from having a volitive value, as in Job 14.13–15:

---

13 Oh, that
Hear, 
God, 
my voice in my complaint!
You may preserve my life from dread of the enemy,
3 you may hide me from the secret plots of the wicked!

5.4.1.3 ... (w-Ø-yiqtol > x-yiqtol) [(non-volitive/blocking >) non-volitive > non-volitive]

In the sequences (w-Ø-yiqtol > x-yiqtol) and (w-Ø-yiqtol > X-yiqtol), the ‘normal’ process of inheritance (of volitive functionality) can be hindered by several factors. More specifically, the volitive default function of a verb-initial yiqtol mother clause may not only be overruled by an inherited non-volitive meaning, but the ascription of volitivity can also be blocked by the clause’s inheritance of multiple-duty modifiers or by its embeddedness in narrative or predictive domains of communication.

The effect of preceding processes of inheritance in the same clause chain on the distribution of functionalities in (w-Ø-yiqtol > x-yiqtol) clause chains can be seen in Ps 142.2-3, where a 0-yiqtol clause inherits a non-volitive meaning and, as such, does not prevent its x-yiqtol daughter clause from fulfilling its default non-volitive functionality:

2 With my voice I cry to YHWH,
with my voice I make supplication to YHWH,
3 I pour out my complaint before him,
I tell my trouble before him.

A similar analysis is valid if the 0-yiqtol clause is anchored in an X-yiqtol grandmother clause, as in Isa 46.6-7, where the explicit subject consists of two dependent clauses:

2 Compare: Isa 42.3.
475 Compare Ps 63.11.
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Those who lavish gold from the purse and weigh out silver in the scales, hire a goldsmith, they fall down, yes, they worship, they lift it, on their shoulders they carry it.

These verses form a nice illustration of the need to take into account whole clause chains instead of just pairs or triplets of clauses. For a correct analysis of the function of the final $x$-yiqtol clause, for instance, one has to work down from the beginning of the clause chain in order to realize that its 0-yiqtol mother clause does not exhibit its default volitive function, but inherits non-volitive functionality from its 0-yiqtol mother clause, which in turn adopted that non-volitive value from the X-yiqtol mother clause that initiated the clause chain.

When it comes to the influence of preceding blocking mechanisms on the actual assignment of functions to the clauses in 0-yiqtol > $x$-yiqtol sequences, we find a nice example in Isa 59.9, where the 0-yiqtol clause imports from its $x$-qatal mother clause the modifierכן על and in its redefined form as an $<x$-yiqtol has no volitive functionality to pass on to its $x$-yiqtol daughter clause:

Similarly, a 0-yiqtol mother clause does not pass on a volitive value to its $x$-yiqtol daughter clause when it (together with its yiqtol daughter clause(s)) interrupts a series of narrative wayyiqtol clauses. However, in such contexts, the 0-yiqtol clause exports another type of (discourse)

---

6 Those who lavish gold from the purse and weigh out silver in the scales, hire a goldsmith, ...

7 They fall down, yes, they worship, they lift it, on their shoulders they carry it.

9 It is therefore that justice has remained far from us, that we look for light, that we walk in gloom.

---

476 See also: Ps 27.5–6 ($\gamma$-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol > $x$-yiqtol), 72.12–14 ($\gamma$-yiqtol > 0-yiqtol > $x$-yiqtol).
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functionality to its \textit{x-yiqtol} daughter clause, namely that of highlighting certain events in the narrative by vividly portraying them (cf. §5.3.3.1). An example can be found in Deut 32.15–19:

15 Then he forsook God, who had made him, and scoffed the Rock of his salvation; 

16 – Indeed, there they stir him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominable practices they provoke him to anger, they sacrifice to demons! –

The default volitive function of a verb-initial \textit{yiqtol} clause is also blocked and therefore incapable of being passed on when the clause sequence is embedded in a chain of prospective clauses initiated by the macro-syntactic sign \textit{ויהי} clause, as in Isa 7.23:

21 And it will be on that day that a man keeps alive a young cow and two sheep; 

22 and it will be because of the abundance of milk, which they give, that he eats curds; 

23 and it will be on that day that it is true for every place, where there are a thousand vines, worth a thousand shekels of silver, that it becomes briers and thorns.

5.4.1.4 \textit{\ldots > (w-)Ø-yiqtol > X-yiqtol} \textit{([non-volitive/blocking >) non-volitive > non-volitive]} 
Pattern: 400
In (w-)Ø-yiqtol > X-yiqtol sequences, too, further attention should be paid to the clauses that precede the verb-initial yiqtol clause in the wider clause chain. Our corpus does not contain very clear examples of (w-)Ø-yiqtol > X-yiqtol sequences, in which the (w-)Ø-yiqtol clause inherits a non-volitive value from a yiqtol mother clause and subsequently passes it on to its X-yiqtol daughter clause. We do, however, find texts in which the (w-)Ø-yiqtol mother clause is otherwise prevented from fulfilling its volitive default function. See, for instance, Ps 107.25–28, where the pattern is embedded in a narrative chain of wayyiqtol clauses:

```
[<Pr> אני מ] [<Cj> -ר] 25 Way0
[<Ob> ועמד] [<Pr> [<Cj> -ר]
[<Ob> שלומּות] [<Pr> [<Cj> -ר]
[<Co> וזעֶית] [<Pr> [<Cj> -ר] 26 ZYq0
[<Co> ותרומת] [<Pr> [<Cj> -ר]
[<Pr> ברשיה] [<Co> [חמתו] XxYq
[<Pr> החמתו] [<Co> [חמתו]
[<Aj> סע ה] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
[<Aj> עמד] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
[<Aj> ימעד] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
[<Aj> י🍉ו] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
[<Aj> ירדו] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
[<Aj> ירדו] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
...[<sp> ירדו] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
[<Aj> ירדו] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
[<Aj> ירדו] [<Pr> [<Ob> [ת поможет] ZYq0
```

25 Then he commanded, and raised the stormy wind, and it lifted up its waves.
26—there they mount up to heaven, they go down to the depths, their soul melts away because of trouble.
27they reel back and forth and stagger like drunken men! —
28Then they cried to YHWH in their distress.

5.4.2 Syndetic Clause Connections

5.4.2.1 ... > (w-)x-yiqtol > weyiqtol [(volitive >) volitive > volitive]
Pattern: 280

As we argued above, in clause pairs of the type (w-)x-yiqtol > weyiqtol, the weyiqtol clause usually inherits the (w-)x-yiqtol clause’s default indicative functionality in case the parameter agent/subject continuity is set to active. However, this process of inheritance may be affected if the (w-)x-yiqtol mother clause itself inherits volitive functionality from its own mother clause. In that case, the volitive value passed on by the (w-)x-yiqtol clause to its weyiqtol daughter clause coincides with that daughter clause’s default function, as happens to be the case in Isa 35.1–2:

```
[<Su> והם] [<Pr> [תמנה] [<Cj> -ר] 1 WYqX
[<Aj> ימתה] [<Pr> [תמנה] [<Cj> -ר] WYq0
```

477 Compare: Ps 138.7, 145.1–2; Isa 41.23.
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Let the desert rejoice
and blossom like the crocus,
and rejoice with joy and singing!

5.4.2.2 ... (w-)yiqtol > weyiqtol

In §5.2.2.2, we identified the (w-)yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence (with continuation of the same subject) as a single functional unit. In our corpus, we find a very small number of examples of the (w-)yiqtol > weyiqtol sequence in which the sequence’s adoption of volitive meaning is rendered impossible by its embeddedness in a specific context.

Thus, in Ps 78.6, the two clauses are prevented from constituting an independent volitive pair because they are embedded in a clause chain governed by the multiple-duty modifier:  

```
[<Pr>ה Phaser [<Mo> EIF 2 xYq0
[<Aj> את גלה ורנ [<Cj>-] WYq0
```

5 And he has appointed a law in Israel,
which he has commanded our fathers
to teach to their children,
so that the next generation might know them,
(so that) the children,
who are born,
might arise
and tell them to their children.

In Ps 18.46, the analysis of the clause pair as a volitive unit is rendered impossible by its being embedded in a series of discursive remarks interrupting a chain of narrative clauses:

```
[<Aj> את והרחיב [<Ob>מש [<Cj>-] WxQ0
[<Ob> אם וה브וחה [<Pr>צוח [<Re>דל-הדעת [<Ps>לבנומ [<Su>למש [<Cj>-] xYqX
[<Su> עלון] XYqt
[<Pr>ויתל] ZYq0
[<Pr>וים] -------
[<Co>על [<Pr>יספ ו [<Cj>-] WYq0
```

5 And he has appointed a law in Israel,
which he has commanded our fathers
to teach to their children,
so that the next generation might know them,
(so that) the children,
who are born,
might arise
and tell them to their children.
You girded me with strength for the battle,  
Yes, you make my assailants sink under me!  

Yes, you deliver me from strife with the peoples,  
you make me the head of the nations!  

Yes, foreigners lose heart  
and come trembling out of their fortresses!

5.4.2.3 ... > (w-)Ø-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol 

Pattern: 670

As was true for the (w-)Ø-yiqtol > x-yiqtol pattern, in (w-)Ø-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol sequences, too, processes operating earlier in the same clause chain may prevent the verb-initial yiqtol mother clause from fulfilling its default volitive functionality and subsequently passing it on to its w-x-yiqtol daughter clause.

Let us first consider those cases in which preceding operations involving inheritance affect the distribution of functionality in the (w-)Ø-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol pattern. Thus, the function passed on by the (w-)Ø-yiqtol clause may be an inherited non-volitive function, as happens to be the case in Ps 22.18–19:

18 They stare,  
they gloat over me,  
19 they divide my garments among them,  
and for my raiment they cast lots.

and in Ps 107.13–14:

13 From their distress he delivers them,  
14 he brings them out of darkness and gloom,  
and breaks their bonds asunder.

As we saw, such inheritance of non-volitive functionality by the Ø-yiqtol or weyiqtol clause can be overruled by morphological marking. Thus, if the verb-initial yiqtol clause contains a cohortative or jussive form, it maintains its default volitive function and will still be able to pass it on to its w-x-yiqtol daughter clause, as in Ps 75.10–11:

478 Compare: 1 Kgs 18.5; Isa 42.14–15, 50.2–3.
But I rejoice forever, 
let me sing praises to the God of Jacob, 
and let me cut off all the horns of the wicked.

The assignment of functions to the clauses in \((w-)Ø-\text{yiqtol} > w-x-\text{yiqtol}\) sequences may also be influenced by blocking mechanisms that are active in the same clause chain. This happens, for instance, when the sequence is embedded in a narrative domain. Again, we assume that in such contexts another type of (discourse) functionality is exported by the \(Ø-\text{yiqtol}\) clause to its \(w\-\text{x-}\text{yiqtol}\) daughter clause, namely that of highlighting and vividly portraying certain historical events in the narrative, as is the case in Job 16.12–13:

\[\text{ŽqtX} \quad \text{WayO} \quad \text{WayO} \quad \text{WayO} \quad \text{WayO} \quad \text{ŽqX} \quad \text{ŽqO} \quad \text{WxYO} \quad \text{ŽqO}\]

12 When I was at ease, 
he broke me asunder, 
and when he had seized me by the neck, 
his archers surround me, 
and set me up as his target.

13 Yes, his archers surround me, 
he slashes open my kidneys, 
and does not spare, 
he pours out my gall on the ground.

A similar highlighting functionality is passed on by \(Ø-\text{yiqtol}\) clauses if the sequence is embedded in a domain started by \(\text{יהיה}\), as in Lev 14.9, which contains a series of instructions:

\[\text{ŽqO} \quad \text{WqO} \quad \text{WxYO}\]

479 Compare: Ps 18.36–38.
480 Compare: 1 Sam 17.25.
And it will be on the seventh day
that he shaves off all his hair - his head and his beard and his eyebrows
yes, that he shaves off all his hear;
then he shall wash his clothes
and bathe his body in water.

Finally, if the verb-initial yiqtol clause is to be redefined as a (w-)x-yiqtol clause because of its
resumption of a multiple-duty modifier, it no longer passes on a volitive value, but instead allows
the w-x-yiqtol daughter clause to fulfill its default non-volitive functionality, as in Isa 59.9–11:

It is therefore that justice has remained far from us,
that we look for light,
that we all growl like bears
and repeatedly moan like doves.

The (w-)Ø-yiqtol > w-X-yiqtol sequence shows some similarity with the (w-)Ø-yiqtol > w-x-yiqtol sequence when it comes to the mechanisms that prevent the default process of inheritance (of volitive functionality) in this pattern from being activated.
Thus, the assignment of volitive function to the verb-initial mother clause may be blocked by its
inheritance of a multiple-duty modifier, so that as a result the clause does not prevent its
daughter clause from fulfilling its default non-volitive function, as in Ps 80.13–14:

Why have you broken down its walls,
does the boar out of the forest ravage it
and do all that move in the field feed on it?

481 Compare: Ps 85.7; Job 21.7–13.
Similarly, a \((w-)\Ø\-yiqtol\) clause’s default volitive function will also be overridden, and thus be prevented from being passed on to the \(w\-X\-yiqtol\) clause, if the sequence is embedded in a narrative domain, in which case the \(w\-X\-yiqtol\) clause adopts from its \((w-)\Ø\-yiqtol\) mother clause the functionality of highlighting a specific event by depicting it in a vivid manner. This is the case in Ps 107.26–27, which we already quoted in §5.4.1.4:

\[
[<Pr> ימְרָא] [<Cj>-] Way0 \\
[<Ob> זָרָעָה] [<Cj>-] Way0 \\
[<Ob> נְגֵּל] [<Pr> חָרֶם] [<Cj>-] Way0 \\
[<Co> שָׂם] [<Pr> עָלָיו] Way0 \\
\]

\[
[<Aj> יָוֵשׁ] [<Pr> בְּ-] Wey0 \\
[<Pr> לְ-] WXYq \\
[<sp> <Aj> שָׂקָע] [<Co> בְּ-] [<Pr> וַיִּשְׁכָּע] [<Cj>-] Way0
\]

Then he commanded,
and raised the stormy wind,
and it lifted up its waves.

26 there they mount up to heaven,

\[
[<Aj> יָוֵשׁ] [<Pr> בְּ-] Wey0 \\
[<Pr> לְ-] WXYq \\
[<sp> <Aj> שָׂקָע] [<Co> בְּ-] [<Pr> וַיִּשְׁכָּע] [<Cj>-] Way0
\]

Then they cried to YHWH in their trouble.
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5.4.3 Other Patterns Involving Recursive Processes of Inheritance

The previous subsections have mainly shown how processes of inheritance or blocking earlier in a clause chain can affect the nature of mechanisms of inheritance and blocking later in the same chain. Thus, the process of inheritance of non-volitive meaning that is usually activated in \(x\-yiqtol > O\-yiqtol\) sequences will be deactivated and replaced by a process of inheritance of volitive functionality if the \(x\-yiqtol\) clause itself inherits jussive functionality from an imperative mother clause. In this case, and in most of the patterns discussed above, the functionality inherited by the granddaughter clause eventually coincides with that clause’s default function. In our example, the \(O\-yiqtol\) already has a default volitive meaning which corresponds to the volitive value it inherits from its \(x\-yiqtol\) mother clause.

There are other clause chains, however, in which, for example, the iterative nature of the mechanism of inheritance is more obvious in the sense that the granddaughter’s default function and the function it inherits from its mother, which in turn inherited it from its own mother, do not coincide. In this final section, we discuss a number of such clause chains, which are characterized by the fact that in each of them daughter and granddaughter clause share the same default functions. In such clause chains, earlier processes of inheritance and blocking may not so much cause a deactivation or replacement of a default process operating between daughter clause and granddaughter clause – because there is none –, but may rather give rise to an initial activation of the mechanism of inheritance. To put it in more concrete terms, while in
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the simple sequence \(0-\text{yiqtol} > 0-\text{yiqtol}\), for example, both clauses would execute their default volitive functions and there would be no syntactic processes of inheritance or blocking operating between the two clauses, the mechanism of inheritance may become activated if the first \(0-\text{yiqtol}\) clause inherits non-volitive meaning from an \(x-\text{yiqtol}\) clause. In that case, the two \(0-\text{yiqtol}\) clauses no longer fulfill just their default functions, but the mechanism of inheritance will, under the conditions described in §5.2, force the second \(0-\text{yiqtol}\) clause to adopt the new non-volitive meaning of the first \(0-\text{yiqtol}\) clause.

5.4.3.1 \(\ldots > (w-)\emptyset-\text{yiqtol} > (w-)\emptyset-\text{yiqtol} ([\text{non-volitive/blocking} >] \text{non-volitive} > \text{non-volitive})\)

Patterns: 110, 240

In sequences of two verb-initial yiqtol clauses, both clauses usually keep their default volitive function. However, what happens if the default function of the first verb-initial yiqtol clause is overridden or blocked by its mother clause? Because of the recursive nature of the inheritance and blocking mechanisms, the second verb-initial yiqtol clause will, in case of a sufficient level of continuation, be affected as well. Take, for instance, Ps 64.5–7, where the first \(0-\text{yiqtol}\) clause inherits non-volitive functionality from its \(x-\text{yiqtol}\) mother clause and passes it on to its own \(0-\text{yiqtol}\) (grand)daughter clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{PO} \rangle \text{יוהז} & \langle \text{Mo} \rangle \text{מזאש} \quad xYq0 \\
\langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{יויאו} & \langle \text{Ng} \rangle \text{לא İ} \langle \text{Cj} \rangle -1 \quad WxY0 \\
\langle \text{Co} \rangle \text{לחוқי ער יער} & \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{ספגר} \quad ZYq0 \\
\langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{מסמך} & \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{מקשיש} \quad ZYq0 \\
\langle \text{Ob} \rangle \text{ל-מעקשיש} & \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{ימייל} \\
\ldots & \langle \text{Ob} \rangle \text{עולה} \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{המש} \quad ZYq0
\end{align*}
\]

5 Suddenly they shoot at him, while they do not fear.
6 They hold fast to their evil purpose, they talk of laying snares secretly,
7 they search out iniquities.

and Ps 22.8, where both \(0-\text{yiqtol}\) clauses should be reanalyzed as \(<X>-\text{yiqtol}\) clauses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{Co} \rangle \text{לי} & \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{ילעגו} \quad XYqt \\
\langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{ייפטי ו} & \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{יספ ו} \\
\langle \text{Ob} \rangle \text{מוק ים} & \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{טמון-ל} \\
\ldots & \langle \text{Ob} \rangle \text{עולת} \langle \text{Pr} \rangle \text{י פ ו} \quad ZYq0
\end{align*}
\]

8 All who see me mock at me, they make mouths at me, they wag their heads.

\[482\] Compare: Ps 10.5–10, 56.6–7; Isa 14.13–14, 50.2–3.
and, similarly, Ps 68.4, where the granddaughter clause is a *weyiqtol* clause, which adopts the non-volitive functionality that was inherited by its *w-yiqtol* mother clause:483

4 But the righteous are joyful,
they exult before God
and are jubilant with joy.

Interestingly, the parameters regulating such an iterative activation of the inheritance mechanism are similar to those identified in §5.2. Inheritance also takes place, for instance, if there is a less direct type of agent continuity, for example in the form of pronominal references, as in Ps 41.7:484

7 His heart utters empty words,
he gathers mischief,
he goes abroad,
he tells it.

5.4.3.2 .. > *(w-)*yiqtol > *(w-)*yiqtol  
\[[\text{volitive > volitive > volitive}]\]

Patterns: 600, 690

In pairs of *yiqtol* clauses both having the *yiqtol* form in non-initial position, both clauses normally fulfill their default function of expressing non-volitive meaning. However, if the clause pair is preceded by a volitive clause, this will induce the activation of the mechanism of inheritance within the clause pair, if the required parameters of continuation are realized.

In Ps 65.11, for example, the first *w-yiqtol* clause inherits volitive functionality from its imperative mother clause and subsequently passes on this acquired volitive meaning to its *w-yiqtol* daughter clause:

11 Water its furrows abundantly,
settle its ridges!
You may soften it with showers,

---

483 Compare: Ps 52.7; Isa 42.14, 44.16.
484 Compare: Ps 49.5–6.
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you may bless its growth!

Similarly, in Ps 62.5, an \textit{x-yiqtol} daughter clause inherits volitive functionality from its \textit{0-yiqtol} mother clause and passes it on to its \textit{w-x-yiqtol} daughter:

\[
[<\text{Ob}> \text{רָוָש}] \text{[}<\text{Pr}> \text{עִבְּרָה}] \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{בַּפֶּז}] \text{[}<\text{Cj}> \text{בָּרָבָש} \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{כָּלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Cj}> \text{כַּלְכַּל} \text{[}<\text{Pr}> \text{יקְלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{קָבָם}] \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{כָּלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Cj}> \text{כַּלְכַּל}] \text{[}<\text{Pr}> \text{יקְלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{כָּלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Cj}> \text{כַּלְכַּל}] \text{[}<\text{Pr}> \text{יקְלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{כָּלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Cj}> \text{כַּלְכַּל}] \text{[}<\text{Pr}> \text{יקְלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{כָּלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Cj}> \text{כַּלְכַּל}] \text{[}<\text{Pr}> \text{יקְלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Aj}> \text{כָּלָל}] \text{[}<\text{Cj}> \text{כַּלְכַּל}]
\]

\[Z_{\text{Yq}0}\]
\[x_{\text{Yq}0}\]
\[W_{\text{xY}0}\]

Let them take pleasure in falsehood,
let them bless with their mouths
and inwardly curse.

5.4.4 Conclusions

In this section, we have shown that for a correct determination of inherited and blocked elements and functionalities, it is required that one takes into account complete chains of clauses. For all of the sequences discussed in §5.2, except those in which the mother clause is an imperative clause, which by definition is not sensitive to processes of inheritance or blocking, we have provided examples in which the expected passing on of volitive or non-volitive functionality did not take place because of the mother clause being influenced by processes of inheritance or blocking operating earlier in the clause chain.

We therefore conclude that the analysis of the functions of a text’s clauses always has to start at the root of the syntactic clause hierarchy. It is only in this way that one can avoid an incorrect assignment of volitive or non-volitive functionalities to clauses. To put it otherwise, when selecting a random clause in a text in order to define its function as either volitive or non-volitive, one has to take a recursive approach. The clause’s function can only be determined after one has examined whether functionality is inherited from the mother clause or whether the mother clause otherwise blocks the assignment of specific functions to its daughter clause. However, before identifying such processes of inheritance and blocking operating between a clause and its mother clause, the function (in terms of volitivity or non-volitivity) of the mother clause has to be determined in the same way, i.e.: by investigating whether that mother clause inherits functionality from or is otherwise prevented from fulfilling its default function by its own mother clause. This recursive process of detecting mechanisms of inheritance and blocking has to go on until one has arrived at the start, the root, of the clause chain, from where one can move down to the clause one is interested in.

The mechanisms of inheritance and blocking themselves should also be considered as being of a recursive nature: multiple-duty modifiers may block the ascription of default volitive functions to a series of verb-initial clauses by causing them all to be redefined as \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clauses, and inherited functionalities may be passed on from clause to clause within the same clause chain. It is for these reasons that any attempt to define the functionality of clauses requires a detection of all processes of inheritance and blocking activated in the text.
We could use the following metaphor to illustrate the hierarchical approach we advocate. Let us imagine the text as an upside-down tree consisting of a root (the text’s first clause) and several branches and sub-branches, each representing a separate clause chain. For a correct determination of a specific clause’s function, we have to work down from the root of the text in order to identify the exact branch (or clause chain) in which the clause is positioned. After that, we have to recursively work down through that specific branch from its root down to the clause we are interested in (and sometimes even further down, so as to take into account the daughter clauses of our clause) and keep track of how mechanisms of inheritance and blocking have determined the distribution of functions in the clauses preceding our clause. Only then will we be able to correctly define our clause’s function.

As the metaphor makes clear, one clause can constitute the root of multiple clause chains (branches). Our data suggest that there are certain restrictions on the degree of influence a root or mother clause can have on each of its children. Some factors appear to have restrictive effects on a clause’s capability to affect the functionality of its daughter clauses. Thus, if the distance (measured in terms of the number of intermediate clauses) between mother and daughter is large or if the mother has multiple other daughter clauses that precede the current daughter, the ability of the mother to determine that specific daughter clause’s meaning may be reduced to a minimum. Though it is difficult to find maximal numbers for the number of (daughter) clauses that can be positioned between a specific clause and its mother without affecting the interaction (i.e.: the activity of processes of inheritance and blocking) between these two clauses, it is beyond any doubt that the syntactic processes of inheritance and blocking can only operate within the boundaries of a domain of discourse. If a clause opens a new domain of discourse, which is usually marked by significant changes in the set of participants or by a switch from direct address to indirect comment, it will not be subject to the power of its mother clause.

5.5 Weqatal: the Inheriting Clause Type

The mechanisms of inheritance and blocking mainly affect the assignment of functionality to yiqtol clauses. However, Biblical Hebrew has another clause type whose function is to a large extent influenced by the mother clause in which it is anchored, the weqatal clause. In this section, we illustrate how processes of inheritance of the type discussed in the previous sections may determine the functioning of weqatal clauses.

The weqatal clause type can be regarded as an ‘empty’ clause type in that its inherent functionality is minimal. Though in some texts, mainly those containing predictive and sometimes prescriptive/legislative discourse, the weqatal clause may appear to be used as a more self-contained ‘backbone form’, it should be noted that it almost never opens a new domain of

---

485 We acknowledge that this approach requires quite some work and energy. In order to help translators, exegetes and other interested people get familiar with it, we have put complete hierarchical analyses of all Psalms on the website accompanying this book.

486 For getting an idea of these limits, we refer the reader to our ‘Concordance of Patterns’ in which we have noted for each clause pair the distance in clause atoms between the mother and the daughter clause.

487 More information on boundaries of linguistic and discursive domains and their effects on the functional interaction between clauses is provided in the next chapter.
5. Text-level Syntax: Inheritance and Blocking in Clause Patterns

discourse, but nearly always continues another clause type, which somehow ‘colours’ the concrete functionality of the weqatal daughter clause. In the following subsections, we will show that when a weqatal clause is anchored in a volitive mother clause it may, under certain conditions, adopt that mother clause’s volitive value, while it expresses non-volitive meaning when it is connected to a non-volitive mother clause.

5.5.1 imperative > weqatal

[default: volitive > non-volitive]

Pattern: 1390
Number of attestations in Psalms: 1
with inheritance: 1 (100.0%)  
Number of attestations in prose: 74
with inheritance: 52 (70.3%)

The pattern imperative > weqatal is broadly attested in discursive prose. In case the parameter of continuation of the same subject is active, the volitive functionality of the imperative mother clause is always inherited by the weqatal daughter clause. Illustrative examples can be found in Gen 44.4:

7 Rise up, follow after the men, and then overtake them and then say to them (...)  

488 We have found fourteen occurrences of discourse-initial weqatal clauses in the Hebrew Bible. However, in most instances such a weqatal clause continues a direct speech section that was already opened, but was briefly interrupted by a speech formula like (Exod 30.18; Ezek 11.17, 16.59, 17.22, 25.13, 30.6, 30.10, 30.13, 38.10) or by a short narrative remark (Exod 4.8, Jer 25.27). Weqatal clauses opening an independent direct speech section by introducing an anticipated situation are hardly attested (but see, for instance, Num 14.13).

489 The pattern has ten occurrences in Genesis, eighteen in Exodus, eighteen in I Samuel and six in II Samuel.
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and in Exod 3.16:

\[
\text{[Pr} \text{: לך}]_{16} \text{ZIm0} \\
\text{[Ob} \text{: אמת קדק ישריא}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Pr} \text{: אמת}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Cj} \text{: אלת}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Co} \text{: להם}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Pr} \text{: מ ת}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Cj} \text{: ו}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Vo} \text{: יהוה}] \text{Voct} \\
\text{[Aj} \text{: מך למען}] \text{Ellp} \\
\text{[Vo} \text{: יהוה}] \text{Voct} \\
\text{[Co} \text{: עוני - ל}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Cj} \text{: - ו}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Aj} \text{: טובך למען}] \text{XImX} \\
\text{[Su} \text{: תhma}] \text{Voct} \\
\text{[Pr} \text{: זכ}] \text{WQt0} \\

16 Go and then gather the elders of Israel together and then say to them (...)

It is interesting to note that imperative > weqatal sequences with continuation of the same subject are hardly attested in the poetry of the Hebrew Bible. The only occurrence of such a pattern in the Psalms is found in Ps 25.7–11, where the sequence of the imperative clause and the weqatal clause is interrupted by quite an elaborate section in which YHWH is no longer directly addressed, but is referred to by 3rd-person references. In vs.11, the author resumes the line of communication in which YHWH is directly addressed by a sequence of an elliptic adjunct + vocative, which parallels the adjunct + vocative construction in the imperative sentence in vs.7. The subsequent weqatal clause with its 2nd-person singular subject should be anchored in the imperative clause:

\[
\text{[Aj} \text{: חסדים - לummy טופך}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Vo} \text{: יהוה}] \text{Voct} \\
\text{[Su} \text{: תhma}] \text{Voct} \\
\text{[Aj} \text{: מך למען}] \text{Ellp} \\
\text{[Vo} \text{: יהוה}] \text{Voct} \\
\text{[Co} \text{: עוני - ל}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Cj} \text{: - ו}] \text{WQt0} \\
\text{[Aj} \text{: טובך למען}] \text{XImX} \\
\text{[Su} \text{: תhma}] \text{Voct} \\
\text{[Pr} \text{: זכ}] \text{WQt0} \\

7 According to your steadfast love you must remember me for your goodness’ sake, YHWH, ...

11 for your name’s sake, YHWH, and pardon my guilt!

In imperative > weqatal sequences involving a switch in subject, inheritance of the imperative clause’s volitive functionality does not take place. In discursive prose, such sequences are again well attested. In many cases, especially when the weqatal clause has as its subject a participant having a non-agentive role in the mother clause, the weqatal clause can be assigned a consecutive meaning, as in Gen 8.17:492

490 The book of Isaiah contains three such sequences, but all of them obviously belong to prosaic (direct speech) sections: Isa 6.9, 7.3–4 and 20.2.
491 Cf. Longacre, R.E., ‘Weqatal forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose. A Discourse-modular Approach’, in: R.D. Bergen (Ed.), Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), p.55. Note the differences between weqatal and weyiqtol in this respect. While new subject-introducing weyiqtol clauses usually denote intentionality and refer to a desired purpose (cf. §5.2.2.1), new subject introducing weqatal clauses, even when anchored in a volitive clause, do not have such volitive connotations, but express consecutivity and refer to a situation that will (not may) result from what was described in the
Every living thing that is with you, you must bring forth with you, so that they will breed abundantly on the earth, and will be fruitful and will multiply upon the earth.

In Hebrew poetry, imperative > weqatal sequences in which the daughter clause has a different subject than the mother clause are extremely rare, too. An example may be found in Isa 29.1–2, where the weqatal clause, introducing a new (1st-person singular) main participant and implying a shift from 2nd-person to 3rd-person communication, simply opens a new secondary line of discourse continued by other weqatal clauses:

1 Oh Ariel, Ariel, add year to year, let the feasts run their round!

2 Yet I will distress Ariel, and there will be moaning and lamentation.

5.5.2 (w-)Ø-yiqtol > weqatal [default: volitive > non-volitive]
Patterns: 1400–1410
Number of attestations in Psalms: 7
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With inheritance: 3 (42.9%)
Number of attestations in prose: 28
With inheritance: 15 (53.6%)

Do subjects of mother and daughter clause have the same referent?

**wegatal** inherits volitive meaning

**wegatal** expresses default non-volitive (often consecutive) meaning

---

**Fig. 5.15 Inheritance in sequences of volitive (w-)Ø-yiqtol > non-volitive weqatal**

In our prosaic corpus, the sequence (w-)Ø-yiqtol > weqatal does not have as many attestations as the imperative > weqatal sequence. Examples of a weqatal clause having the same subject as its verb-initial yiqtol mother clause and, as a result, inheriting that mother clause’s volitive value can be found in Gen 1.14:

```
[<Lo> ב-רקיע-ה-שמש] [<Su> [<Pr> יהי] 14 ]
[<Co> ל-הבריחי] [<Pr> יהי] 15 ]
[<Co> ל-אמרות]-ול-ימי-ו-בח-לילה] [<Co> [<Pr> יהי] ]
[<Pr> [<Cj> -ו] ]
[<Pr> [<Cj> -ו] ]
```

Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and then let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years, and then let them be lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth.

and in Gen 37.20:

```
[<Pr> [<Su> [הנה גהו]] [<Cj> -ו] ]
[<Pr> [ה י] ]
[<Pr> [אמור] [<Cj> -ו] ]
```

Come now, and let us kill him and let us throw him into one of the puts and let us then say (...)

---

14 Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and then let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years,

15 and then let them be lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth.

---

494 Compare: Gen 41.34(2*), 47.25; Num 16.5, 18.2–3; Deut 1.41; Judg 11.37, 19.13; 2 Sam 13.5, 17.1–2.
A rare example of the pattern with continuation of the same subject in poetry can be found in Ps 17.14:

May their children have more than enough
and then leave something over to their babes.

The mechanism of inheritance is not only activated if the weqatal daughter clause implicitly resumes the subject of its verb-initial yiqtol mother clause, but also when it contains an explicit subject that is identical to that of its (w-)Ø-yiqtol mother clause, as in 1 Sam 24.13:

May YHWH judge between me and you
and then may YHWH avenge me upon you,
but my hand is not against you.

Another interesting occurrence of the pattern is found in Exod 34.9, where the weqatal clauses have the same agent as the preceding 0-yiqtol-X clause, but refer to that agent in 2\textsuperscript{nd}-person, while the 0-yiqtol clause contains a 3\textsuperscript{rd}-person reference. Still, the level of continuation is high enough to enable the 0-yiqtol clause to pass on volitive functionality to its weqatal daughter clauses:

If now I have found favour in your sight,
Adonai,
please let Adonai go in the midst of us,
... and then may you pardon our iniquity and our sin
and then may you take us for your inheritance.

The recursive nature of the mechanisms of inheritance and blocking has its effects on (w-)Ø-yiqtol > weqatal sequences that are preceded by other clauses in the same clause chain. Both in

\footnotesize{Compare Ps 49.9, 64.11.}
prose and in poetry, we find texts in which the \((w-)Ø-yiqtol\) is prevented from passing on its volitive default function to its weqatal daughter clause. This happens, for instance, if the sequence is embedded in a prospective domain opened by the macro-syntactic signal \(\text{יהיה} \text{ו} \text{ייחד}\), as in Isa 11.11–12:\footnote{See also: Exod 33.8–9; Deut 28.8–13(3*), 28.15–36(3*); Isa 66.23–24.}

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{[<Ti>} & \text{[<Pr>} \text{[<Cj> ייחד]}] 11 \\
\text{[<Ob>} & \text{[<Pr>} \text{[<Aj> אדוין]}] \\
\text{[<Su>} & \text{[<Pr>} \text{[<Aj>]}] \\
\text{[<Ob>} & \text{[<Pr>} \text{[<Aj>]}] \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Wq0}\]

\[\text{ZYqX}\]

\[\text{InfC}\]

...  

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{[<Aj>} & \text{[<Ob>} \text{[<Pr>} \text{[<Cj> ייחד]}] 12 \\
\text{[<Ob>} & \text{[<Pr>} \text{[<Aj>]}] \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Wq0}\]

11 And it will be on that day  
that Adonai extends his hand yet a second time  
to recover the remnant of his people,

12 ... and will raise an ensign for the nations  
and will assemble the outcasts of Israel.

If the \((w-)Ø-yiqtol\) clause’s default volitive function is overridden by an inherited non-volitive function it exports to its weqatal daughter clause this non-volitive value, as happens to be the case in Ps 52.7:\footnote{Compare Isa 52.13.}

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{[<Ti>} & \text{[<PO> יותך]} \text{[<Su> ⸬-ל建设用地]} 7 \\
\text{[<PO> יותך]} & \text{[<Su> ⸬-ל建设用地]} \\
\text{[<Co> יותך]} \text{[<Pr> ⸬-ל建设用地]} & \text{[<Cj> ייחד]} \\
\text{[<Co> יותך]} & \text{[<Pr> ⸬-ל建设用地]} & \text{[<Cj> ייחד]} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{XYq0}\]

\[\text{ZYq0}\]

\[\text{WYq0}\]

\[\text{Wq0}\]

7 But God breaks you down forever,  
he snatches  
and tears you from your tent,  
and will then uproot you from the land of the living.

Inheritance of volitive functionality is also hindered when the weqatal has another subject than its \((w-)Ø-yiqtol\) mother clause. In such cases, the weqatal clause regularly introduces a logical result or consequence, in particular when it has as its subject a participant having a non-agentive semantic role in the yiqtol mother clause.  
Illustrative examples can be found both in poetry, as in Ps 41.3[Q]:\footnote{Compare Isa 56.12. In all other instances of 0-yiqtol > weqatal with subject switch in poetry (Ps 10.6–10, 69.36; Isa 7.18, 18.6, 23.17, 27.13, 44.2–3), the default volitive function of the 0-yiqtol clause is blocked, either by its being embedded in a prospective section, or by its being governed by a multiple-duty modifier, or by its inheritance of non-volitive functionality from a mother clause.}

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{[<PO> יותך]} & \text{[<Su> ⸬-建设用地]} 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{XYq0}\]
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3 May YHWH protect him
and keep him alive,
so that he will be called blessed in the land.

and in prose, as in Gen 28.3:

3 And may God Almighty bless you
and may he make you fruitful
and may he multiply you,
so that you will become a company of peoples.

5.5.3 **Prohibitive yiqtol > weqatal**  
(default: prohibitive > non-volitive)

| Pattern: 1450 |
| Number of attestations in Psalms: 1 |
| Number of attestations in prose: 15 |

| with inheritance: 0 (0.0%) |
| with inheritance: 6 (40.0%) |

The prohibitive יָּרֵךְ-yiqtol > weqatal pattern does not occur very often in the Hebrew Bible. If the weqatal daughter clause has the same subject as its יָּרֵךְ-yiqtol mother clause, it sometimes seems to inherit an affirmative volitive meaning. An example can be found in Num 21.34 (// Deut 3.3).

**Fig. 5.16 Inheritance in sequences of prohibitive yiqtol > non-volitive weqatal**

The prohibitive יָּרֵךְ-yiqtol > weqatal pattern does not occur very often in the Hebrew Bible. If the weqatal daughter clause has the same subject as its יָּרֵךְ-yiqtol mother clause, it sometimes seems to inherit an affirmative volitive meaning. An example can be found in Num 21.34 (// Deut 3.3).

499 Compare: Gen 12.3; Lev 15.24; Deut 2.4; 2 Sam 3.21.
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\[
\text{[Co]} \quad \text{[Pr]} \quad \text{[Cj]} \quad -\quad \text{WQt0}
\]

\[
\text{[ap][Co]} \quad \text{[Pr]} \quad \text{[Cj]} \quad -\quad \text{xQt0}
\]

34 Do not fear him, for I have given him into your hand, and all his people, and his land, so do then to him as you have done to Sihon, king of the Amorites!

In Jer 17.21, we find an example of a weqatal clause which not only inherits the volitive aspect of its \(w\)-\(\text{yiqtol}\) mother clause’s function, but also the negation, thus obtaining a prohibitive meaning:

\[
\text{[Co]} \quad \text{[Pr]} \quad \text{[Cj]} \quad -\quad \text{WxY0}
\]

\[
\text{[Co]} \quad \text{[Pr]} \quad \text{[Cj]} \quad -\quad \text{WQt0}
\]

21 Take heed for the sake of your lives, and do not bear a burden on the Sabbath day and then bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem.

If the weqatal clause has a different subject, volitive (or prohibitive) meaning is not inherited, as can be seen, for example, in Ps 143.7:

\[
\text{[Co]} \quad \text{[Pr]} \quad \text{[Cj]} \quad -\quad \text{xYq0}
\]

\[
\text{[Co]} \quad \text{[Pr]} \quad \text{[Cj]} \quad -\quad \text{WQt0}
\]

7 You should not hide your face from me, so that I would be like those who go down in the Pit.

5.5.4 \((w-)X/x\text{-yiqtol} > \text{weqatal} \quad [\text{default: non-volitive} > \text{non-volitive}]

Patterns: 1430–1450
Number of attestations in Psalms: 25
with inheritance: 16 (64.0%)

\[
\text{wegoatal inherits non-volitive meaning}
\]

\[
\text{wegoatal expresses default non-volitive (often consecutive) meaning}
\]

Fig. 5.17 Inheritance in sequences of non-volitive yiqtol > non-volitive weqatal

501 Compare: Gen 47.29–30; Num 10.31; Deut 21.8; Hos 4.4–5.
Sequences of \((w-)X/x\text{-yiqtol} > \text{weqatal}\) are well attested in our corpus. In these patterns, the \text{weqatal}\ clause usually does not have a volitive meaning. One could argue that in case of ‘subject continuity’ the \text{weqatal}\ clause inherits its mother clause’s non-volitive functionality and at the same time denotes a ‘next step’, as in Ps 90.6:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Pr> ב-בכיר]} & \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Pr> דחי]} & \quad WQt0 \\
\text{[<Pr> ימוהל]} & \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Pr> כיוש]} & \quad WQt0
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Pr> \text{תקומם}]} & \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Ob> הדר]} & \quad WQt0 \\
\text{[<Ob> נר]} & \quad Ptcp \\
\text{[<Ob> גנוהמ]} & \quad Ptcp
\end{align*}
\]

6 In the morning it flourishes
and then will grow up.
In the evening it fades,
and then will wither away.

However, on the basis of our findings presented before, it seems difficult, if not impossible, to assume the activity of the same mechanism of inheritance in \((w-)X/x\text{-yiqtol} > \text{weqatal}\) sequences that involve a change in subject. For all the patterns discussed so far, the introduction of a new animate agent prevented mechanisms of inheritance (and blocking) from being activated and it seems unwarranted to make an exception to this for the current pattern. Here, one can see that the \text{weqatal}\ clause has the expression of non-volitive information as its default functionality and that this default setting is overruled in the volitive patterns discussed in the previous subsections, while it is confirmed in \((w-)X/x\text{-yiqtol} > \text{weqatal}\) sequences with agent continuity and simply left unchanged in similar sequences involving agent discontinuity. In this final type of clause patterns, the \text{weqatal}\ clause’s default discourse function of denoting a ‘next step’ is frequently concretized in the adoption by the \text{weqatal}\ clause of a consecutive meaning, in particular if it has as its subject a participant having a non-agentive role in the non-volitive mother clause. Such a consecutive \text{weqatal}\ can be found in Isa 58.12:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Pr>}"ו-ודרור]} & \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Ob>}"ו-דרור]} & \quad WQt0 \\
\text{[<Ob>}"נמי]} & \quad Ptcp \\
\text{[<Ob>}"נתיבות]} & \quad Ptcp
\end{align*}
\]

12 The foundations of many generations you raise up,
so that one will call you:
“he who repairs the breach”,
“he who restores streets”.

Yet, clause pairs of \((w-)X/x\text{-yiqtol} > \text{weqatal}\) only in the default situation represent a sequence of two non-volitive clauses. The \text{yiqtol}\ mother clause will attain volitive meaning if mechanisms of inheritance enable a grandmother clause to pass on this type of functionality to the \text{yiqtol}\ clause. If, in that case, the \((w-)X/x\text{-yiqtol}\ mother clause and its \text{weqatal}\ daughter clause share the same subject, the process of inheritance iterates further down the clause chain and also causes the \text{weqatal}\ to inherit volitive functionality.

All this happens, for instance, if the \((w-)X/x\text{-yiqtol}\ clause is anchored in an imperative mother clause, as in Ps 143.10–11:
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Another text illustrating the need to take into account iterative processes for a correct determination of a weqatal clause’s functionality can be found in Isa 49.7, where the X-yiqtol mother clause construes a ‘volitive pair’ with a weyiqtol daughter clause and has an intermediate weqatal daughter clause sharing the volitive pair’s functionality:

\[
\begin{align*}
&[Pr] \text{malhym} \ [Su] \text{keim} \ [Cj] \ -1 \ Xyqt0 \\
&\ldots \\
&[Aj] \text{hemah} \ [Cj] \ -1 \ Wyq0
\end{align*}
\]

Let kings see it
and then arise,

and let them prostrate themselves because of YHWH!

5.6 Patterns of Inheritance in Poetry and Discursive Prose: a Comparison

One of the interesting observations that can be made on the basis of the facts presented in this chapter is that Biblical Hebrew poetry and Biblical Hebrew discursive prose strongly differ in their use of the Hebrew verbal system. Many of the ‘inheritance patterns’ analyzed in §5.2 hardly occurred in the prosaic texts from the Hebrew Bible, while the number of attestations in poetic texts was overwhelming. As an illustration, we provide a schematic overview of the number of occurrences of several patterns in the discursive prose sections of the Pentateuch, I/II Samuel.
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and I/II Kings, and in the poetic texts of the Psalms. Note that for each pattern only the occurrences involving (explicit or implicit) subject continuation have been counted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Frequency in prose of Pentateuch, Samuel and Kings</th>
<th>Of which involving inheritance</th>
<th>Frequency in Psalms</th>
<th>Of which involving inheritance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(w-)Ø-yiqtol &gt; x-yiqtol</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w-)x-yiqtol &gt; Ø-yiqtol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19 / 19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w-)X-yiqtol &gt; Ø-yiqtol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20 / 7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w-)Ø-yiqtol &gt; w-x-yiqtol</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w-)x-yiqtol &gt; weyiqtol</td>
<td>5 / 4*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6 / 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w-)X-yiqtol &gt; weyiqtol</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* number of occurrences in which daughter clause inherits a multiple-duty modifier from mother clause

Fig. 5.18 Frequencies of some clause patterns involving inheritance of functionality

As is indicated in the table, the phenomenon of the multiple-duty modifier, too, plays a much more significant role in the poetry of the Psalms than in the prosaic texts, where the multiple-duty modifier is active in a very limited number of x-yiqtol > weyiqtol sequences only. Noting, on the other hand, that clause patterns like that of imperative > weqatal are virtually absent in poetry, while they are used quite frequently in discursive prose, we can conclude that the differences between prose and poetry in their use of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system are obvious. That we are indeed dealing here with differences between the two genres of poetry and prose and not with differences related to linguistic preferences of specific authors and redactors or differences resulting from the diachronic development of the Hebrew verbal system, can be proven by the fact that the mechanisms of inheritance and blocking are almost completely absent in the prosaic sections of, for example, the books of the Pentateuch, but do occur in the poetic sections of these same books.

So, what conclusions can be drawn from these observations? First of all, the differences noted above should be placed in the right perspective by additional observations of the many correspondences between Hebrew discursive prose and poetry in their use of the verb. Thus, we claim (and will show in the next chapter) that the verbal forms in poetry fulfill the same text-linguistic functions of indicating type of communication, level of communication and perspective as they do in prose. Moreover, as we have seen in §5.2 and §5.3, most of the patterns discussed there do have at least some occurrences in prosaic texts.

For these reasons, we claim that Hebrew poetry and (discursive) prose make use of one verbal system, but show different preferences while doing so. More specifically, poetry shows a greater preference for the Hebrew verbal system’s mechanisms of inheritance and blocking than discursive prose, although these mechanisms are sometimes utilized in discursive prose, too. Exactly this difference in preference may well be regarded as the main cause of the lack of consistency in how commentaries, grammars, studies and Bible translations deal with the verbal forms in Hebrew poetry. Hebrew poetry makes extensive use of a part of the Hebrew verbal system that has not yet been systematically investigated before, i.e.: the mechanisms of inheritance of blocking. If these mechanisms are incorporated into the description of the Hebrew verbal system, we will be able to achieve a far more consistent analysis of the Hebrew verbal forms, in poetry, in particular, but also in discursive prose.
5.7 Excursus – Exceptional Verb-Initial *Yiqtol* Clauses Referring to a Contingent World?

Taking into account the Biblical Hebrew verbal system’s mechanisms of inheritance and blocking described in this chapter helps us to consistently assign volitive and non-volitive functionalities to most of the *yiqtol* clauses occurring in the Biblical texts. However, our corpus contains a limited number of verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses for which a volitive interpretation seems impossible, even though these clauses’ default volitive functionalities are not blocked or overruled by inherited functions.

Grammarians like Lettinga make clear that in some cases the *O-yiqtol* clause should be analyzed as an asyndetic attributive clause.\(^{502}\) Interestingly, such attributive *O-yiqtol* clauses hardly occur in prosaic texts, while they are quite well attested in poetry.\(^{503}\)

However, when leaving out of consideration such attributive *O-yiqtol* clauses, we are still saddled with a small number of exceptional, non-volitive verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses. Most of these clauses are found in poetic texts belonging to the later wisdom literature in the books of Proverbs and Job. Interestingly, these texts have in common that the verb-initial *yiqtol* clause appears to refer not to the actual world, but to an ‘optional’ world. Thus, though these *yiqtol* clauses differ from the ‘normal’ verb-initial *yiqtol* in that they do not express the speakers will and so do not refer to a ‘desired world’, they correspond to them in the fact that they, too, express modality and refer to a contingent world.\(^{504}\) It might be assumed, then, that in course of time, Biblical Hebrew developed the possibility to use verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses in a more general way to express other nuances of modality (such as that of the irrealis) than just that of volition.\(^{505}\)

Illustrative examples of non-volitive *O-yiqtol* clauses possibly expressing irrealis mood can be found in Isa 26.10:

\[
\[\text{<Su>} \text{רְשֵׁש} \] [\text{<Pr>} \text{יחַת}]^{10} \quad \text{ZYqX} \\
\ldots \\
\[\text{<Pr>} \text{יעול}] [\text{<Lo>} \text{נָמַת אֱוֹדֶה}] \\
\quad \text{xYqO} \\
\[\text{<Ob>} \text{נָאָה וַיָּהָו} \text{יַהַנְוַי}] [\text{<Pr>} \text{יֹאָה}] [\text{<Ng>} \text{בֵּל}] [\text{<Cj>} -] \\
\quad \text{WxY0}
\]

\(^{10}\) Would favour be shown to the wicked,

---

\(^{502}\) Lettinga, *Grammatica*, §84c, p.174.

\(^{503}\) Queries in the *ETCBC* database provide us with interesting figures: we have found only five attributive *O-yiqtol* clauses in prosaic texts (Exod 18.20; Num 24.14; 2 Sam 23.4; 2 Kgs 3.8; Neh 11.17). In our analyses of the Psalms, however, no less than 23 *O-yiqtol* clauses have been identified as attributive clauses. The book of Isaiah contains an equal number of 23 attributive *O-yiqtol* clauses. Other occurrences of attributive *O-yiqtol* are attested in Jeremiah (2), Hosea (2), Micah (1), Habakkuk (2), Zechariah (2), Job (8), Proverbs (3), Canticles (2) and Lamentations (2). For the query and its results, see: [http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=71](http://shebanq.ancient-data.org/hebrew/query?id=71).

\(^{504}\) Compare Niccacci’s analysis of some *O-yiqtol* and *weyiqtol* clauses as implicit protases (Niccacci, ‘The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System’, pp.253, 264–265). Niccacci, too, seems to suggest a broader modal function (‘irrealis’) for at least some verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses.

\(^{505}\) Compare Gesenius’ remarks on the non-volitive usage of the jussive form: ‘...in the consciousness of the language the *voluntative* has in such cases become weakened almost to a *potential* mood, and hence the *jussive* serves to express facts which may happen *contingently*, or may be expected.’ See: Kautzsch, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §109i, p.323.
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... he would deal perversely in the land of uprightness
and would not see the majesty of YHWH.

and in Job 10.16:506

If I have sinned,
woe to me!
and if I have been righteous,
I do not lift up my head,
... and if it would be high,
you would hunt me down like a lion
and again
work wonders against me.

Note that in both examples the modal yiqtol clause passes on the function of expressing irrealis mood to its daughter clause(s), if it has any, even if there is no subject/agent continuation. Therefore, we may assume that the non-volitive modal verb-initial yiqtol clauses open a modal subdomain and cause all the daughter clauses belonging to that domain to continue the reference to the contingent world. However, the number of texts to which this analysis of verb-initial yiqtol clauses applies is rather small and the highest concentration of such texts is found in portions of the Hebrew Bible that are of a later date. Further research into the phenomenon of such non-volitive, modal, verb-initial yiqtol clauses may therefore benefit from a diachronic analysis, which is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

506 See further: Ps 104.20, 104.22; Isa 41.12; Prov 14.5; Job 14.21.
6. Discourse-Level Functions of Clause Patterns in the Psalms

6.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, it has been shown that the study of clause patterns is of crucial importance for the correct assignment of volitive and non-volitive functionalities to yiqtol and weqatal clauses. When applying the identified mechanisms in the process of reading a text, one will experience, however, that the context of discourse also has its effects on the functioning of clauses. Clause patterns are much more than just linguistic constructions in which mechanisms of inheritance and blocking can be activated in order to affect the distribution of (non-)volitive functions. In this chapter, we introduce the assumption that clause patterns can also be regarded as distributors of specific discourse-level functions to the clauses they consist of.

In §3.4, we provided the following schematic representation of our views on the three-fold discourse functions of the Hebrew verbal forms:

![Fig. 6.1 Three-dimensional discourse-level functions of the Biblical Hebrew verbal forms: mode of communication, perspective, and level of communication](image)

At discourse level, Hebrew’s verbal forms function to denote values along three dimensions: mode of communication, level of communication and perspective. As the scheme indicates, the two dimensions of perspective and level of communication, which is represented in colour (light-grey: foreground; dark-grey: background), overlap. The mainline verbal forms (yiqtol, imperative, and wayyiqtol) have a neutral perspectival value, while the background forms signal either retrospective or anticipating perspective.

The functions fulfilled by the Hebrew clause types and verbal forms are, however, not as fixed as the scheme may suggest. Instead, the clause types have their default settings in terms of the three dimensions, but the actual concretization of these settings is to a large extent determined by the wider communicative and discursive domains\(^5\) in which the clause is included. Within

\(^5\) In this chapter, we use the terms ‘communicative domains’ and ‘domains of communication’ to identify domains characterized by continuation in the type of communication (narrative domain vs. discursive domain) or by continuation in the level and perspective of communicated information (e.g.: secondary-line retrospective domain vs. mainline zero-perspective domain). The terms ‘domains of discourse’ and ‘discursive domain’, however, refer to textual domains that are characterized by a certain level of continuity in the temporal and situational setting and in the set of participants playing a role. The two types of domains do not necessarily overlap. Thus, a narrative can consist of multiple paragraphs each having their
such domains, the alternation of specific verbal forms mark different types of continuities and discontinuities at each of the three text-linguistic levels of type of communication, level of communication and perspective. This entails that the discourse functions of the verbal forms and the clause types, as presented in the scheme, are not to be approached as abstract concepts, but rather as default settings, whose actualization depends on the wider communicative context which the respective clauses are part of.

A good environment for studying the type of discourse functionality executed by Hebrew’s verbal forms and clause types is that of the pattern of mother and daughter clause. In this chapter, we will investigate how the discourse functionalities of verbal forms and clause types are concretized in specific combinations of mother and daughter clauses. Thus, a qatal clause in itself marks discursive mainline of communication. If it follows a qatal clause, its function is that of marking a shift from secondary-line information to mainline information. But can we say more than that? Is it possible to systematically assign more concrete functionality to such shifts, and if so, which parameters should be taken into account in order to do so correctly?

Attempts to answer these questions will be undertaken later in this chapter, but at this point we draw the reader’s attention to the significant fact that the embedding of clause patterns and communicative domains is a recursive procedure. Since patterns of mother and daughter clauses can be embedded both in higher-level communicative and discursive domains and in lower-level subdomains, identical sequences of clauses do not always involve a similar concretization of their verbal forms’ discourse functions. A connection between a secondary-line mother clause and a mainline daughter clause may involve a transition from argumentative information to a main level assertion as well as a simple shift from background to foreground communication embedded within a larger argumentative domain of communication. In our search for a systematic description of functionalities of sequences of mother and daughter clauses we should thus take care to avoid improper generalizations that do not take into account a clause pattern’s broader communicative context.

As an adequate analysis of the discourse functionalities executed by a clause pattern’s verbal forms can only be performed in case of a correct identification of communicative and discursive domains and subdomains, the chapter’s first part offers an introduction of the parameters and linguistic signals that provide us with important clues with respect to the range and boundaries of these domains. This section will also go deeper into other factors that may affect the exact functioning of verbal forms in specific combinations of clauses, such as the relative order of the clauses and the activation of mechanisms of inheritance and blocking (which should be detected before one starts the analysis of discourse functions).

The remainder of the chapter will be devoted to a systematic description of clause patterns and the functions fulfilled by their mother and daughter clauses. The patterns will be categorized on the basis of the interclausal shifts taking place at the three levels of discourse functions identified above. We will start with the discussion of patterns involving no shifts at all, then continue with

---

own set of participants, while, on the other hand, we may find transitions between different types of communications (i.e.: between communicative subdomains) within a single domain of discourse.

Finally, we use the term ‘linguistic domain’ for chains of clauses and clause atoms belonging to the same linguistic level. Good examples of linguistic (sub)domains are chains of coordinated attributive clause atoms governed by a single relative pronoun and chains of clause atoms governed by a subordinate conjunction, like כי.
patterns involving a shift in both perspective and level of communication, and finally conclude with patterns involving a shift in type of communication only. While our conclusions in the previous chapters were based on an examination of both prosaic and poetic texts from different books in the Hebrew Bible, we have decided to base our research into the discourse functions of clause patterns primarily on the Psalms, since it is in these poetic texts, with their challenging alternations of different verbal forms and clause types, that this undiscovered, yet exciting part of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system appears to play a most prominent role.

The results presented in this chapter are the fruit of extensive computational analyses of the Psalms conducted by means of a Java computer program we developed for our experiments. To keep this chapter’s line of argumentation simple and clear, we have decided to leave out a detailed description of the experiments that brought us to the findings we present here. Thus, the sample texts provided below do not serve the function of proving the correctness of the analyses made in the respective sections, but should rather be regarded as clarifying illustrations of the types of patterns discussed in them. To demonstrate the experimental basis of our approach, however, we have created a companion website, which we already referred to in the Introduction of this dissertation. The link http://nbviewer.jupyter.org/github/ETCBC/Biblical_Hebrew_Analysis/blob/master/PhD/Introduction.ipynb will bring the reader to a digital Notebook containing a webpage for each of the 150 Psalms with a translation and an analysis of each Psalm’s clause patterns as made by the Java program. In addition, the visitor will have the opportunity to search for and compare multiple occurrences of specific clause patterns by following the links to the web pages of the Psalms and that of the ‘Concordance of Clause Patterns’. This final digital document contains a sorted presentation and annotation of all clause patterns attested in the Psalms.

6.2 Parameters Regulating the Assignment of Discourse Functions to Clause Patterns

6.2.1 Continuity and Discontinuity Markers in Communicative and Discursive Domains

In our experiments, we regularly experienced that the influence of a specific combination of mother and daughter clause on the actual concretization of the default discourse functions of both clauses had its limitations. In certain types of patterns the context-specific concretization of the default functions of mother and daughter clause is largely determined by the specific connection between these clauses. However, such a pattern-specific specification of the default functions does not always take place. This gives rise to the assumption that parameters other than the connection between mother and daughter clause may also affect the actualization of the discourse functions of clauses in a specific clause pattern. Thus, if the daughter clause marks a shift to another discursive or linguistic domain, the process of functional interaction between mother and daughter clause, which is responsible for the pattern-specific concretization of the clauses’ default discourse functions, is usually deactivated.

In this section, we will introduce the parameters that indeed play a role in the activation and deactivation of the process of discourse function concretization. At the dissertation’s companion
website, the reader can observe and further experiment with the functioning of these parameters in the actual poetic discourse of the Psalms.

For the activation of the syntactic mechanisms of inheritance and blocking, the presence of a sufficient level of continuity in the set of participants proved to be a significant parameter. As will become clear in this chapter, the same is true for the assignment of discourse functions to clauses in their clause patterns. In case significant shifts in the set of participants or in the type of participant references signal a transition from one discursive domain to another, any form of interaction between the subsequent clauses is usually ruled out and the binding of the two clauses no longer affects their discourse functions.

Similarly, long distances between mother and daughter clauses (measured in terms of the number of intermediate (daughter) clauses)\(^{508}\) may also prevent a specific combination of mother and daughter clause from being functional, that is: the influence of the specific mother-daughter connection between two clauses on the concretization of the discourse functions of these clauses diminishes as the relative distance between the two clauses increases, causing clauses that are separated from their mother by multiple intermediate clauses to fulfill only the most basic concretization of their default discourse function, such as simply opening a secondary-line retrospective domain of communication without having any more ‘pattern-specific’ functional value (such as providing argumentative information).

In the previous chapter, we concluded that the parameter of ‘agent/subject continuity’ strongly affected the ascription of volitive and non-volitive functionalities to clauses by enabling or blocking the activation of mechanisms of inheritance. In this chapter, it will be shown that the same parameter also plays an essential role when it comes to the marking of discourse level functions of clause patterns. More specifically, quite a number of clause patterns have different types of functionalities that are to be assigned to them in case of, respectively, presence or absence of ‘agent/subject continuity’\(^{509}\).

Besides the presence of subject or agent continuity, another category of significant markers of continuity is that of the multiple-duty modifiers. When shared by mother and daughter clause, these multiple-duty modifiers (e.g.: subordinate conjunctions, relative pronouns, etc.) signal a certain degree of continuity in the clause pattern and, in fact, in the whole chain of clauses that inherit this modifying element. Clause patterns that occur inside clause chains governed by such a modifying element usually function in a way similar to that of their equivalents in non-

\(^{508}\) As we have already noted in the previous chapter, it is not easy to define the maximal relative distance between a mother and its daughter clause that still allows the combination of the two clauses to be functional. It seems that such maximal numbers differ for different patterns. Particularly, in patterns involving the activation of the mechanisms of inheritance and blocking, restrictions on the distance between mother and daughter clause are obvious. In sequences consisting of a retrospective background clause and a volitive mainline clause, on the other hand, the interclausal distance can be quite large, which allows the retrospective clause to introduce a long argumentative section before the actual command or exhortation is expressed. The overview of occurrences per pattern in the concordance will give the reader a global idea of the limits imposed on the relative distance between mother and daughter in a given clause pattern.

\(^{509}\) This dichotomy between patterns with and patterns without continuity of agent is regarded as being of such a significance that it has been taken as one of the major sorting criteria in our ‘Concordance of Patterns’. Thus, the occurrences of each pattern are divided into three subcategories: those involving ‘agent continuity’ (final number in verbal pattern code = 1), those without ‘agent continuity’ (final number in verbal pattern code = 2), and those in which the daughter clause is a dependent clause (final number in verbal pattern code = 3).
dependent domains. We will hold, for example, that a mother and daughter clause in a sequence of qatal > x–yiqtol occurring within a linguistic subdomain, such as an attributive section or a clause chain governed by כי, can attain the same discourse functions as they do in similar sequences occurring in non-dependent linguistic domains. However, when introduced in a daughter clause, these multiple-duty modifiers usually function as openers of linguistic (sub)domains and as such signal a certain level of discontinuity in the pattern of mother and daughter clause. Though the concept of such a linguistic subdomain should not incorrectly be identified with that of the discursive domain (see note 507), the two sometimes do affect a clause’s function in a comparable way. Thus, in clause patterns involving an internal shift to a dependent linguistic subdomain (for instance, patterns containing an attributive or constituent daughter clause), the specific combination of mother and daughter clause is no longer functional (as it also is not when the daughter clause opens a new domain of discourse), and the discourse function of the daughter clause is (partly) marked by its initial modifying element. The pattern imperative > qatal serves as an illustrative example in this regard. If the qatal daughter clause starts with the subordinate conjunction כי, it is this conjunction which signals the discourse function of the qatal clause to be, for instance, that of introducing an argument. However, if such a modifying element is lacking — and the two clauses belong to the same linguistic domain — this specific clause combination itself is a marker of the respective discourse functions of introducing a mainline command and providing some type of background argumentation.

For these reasons, it is of crucial importance to correctly define the boundaries of linguistic domains and subdomains, which is to be done on the basis of different markers of continuity enabling the resumption of governing modifiers (cf. §5.3.1).

Until now, we have mainly considered parameters of continuity and discontinuity figuring at the level of the clause pattern. One can observe, however, several elements that have a structuring role at the higher level of the whole discourse and are used to mark continuity and discontinuity between alternating lines of communication. An important category of such discourse-level structuring elements is that of the macro-syntactic signals, which are particularly prominent in prosaic and prophetic direct speech sections, but can also be found in our poetic corpus of the Psalms. The phrase عنها, for instance, frequently, instead of just having a temporal meaning, marks a return to the absolute mainline of communication, especially after an interruptive line of communication, such as an embedded direct speech section or a separate communicative domain with its own set of participants. Take Ps 2.10, for example:

\[\text{In rare cases, linguistic domains of governance do seem to concur with communicative domains. This concerns, for instance, a small number of texts in which the conjunction כי opens a clause which starts a new discursive domain instead of simply starting a subordinate clause (compare, for instance, the alternation of subordinate and non-subordinate כי clauses in Ps 49.19–20). Though it is not always easy to make a distinction between these different usages of the כי conjunction, we alert the reader that the analysis of the function of this conjunction often has consequences for the identification of the discourse functions fulfilled by its clause. Similar observations on deviating usages of the conjunction כי have been made by Follingstad, who proposes to reinterpret כי, because of its exceptional syntactic distributional characteristics, as a deictic focus particle; cf. Follingstad, C.M., Deictic Viewpoint in Biblical Hebrew Text; A Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Analysis of the Particle כי (Dallas: SIL International, 2001), pp.119,138.}\]
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Why have the nations been conspiring, and/but (why) do the peoples plot in vain?

(why) do the kings of the earth set themselves, and/but (why) have the rulers taken counsel together against YHWH and his anointed?

Let me tell of the decree of YHWH, since he has said to me:

Now then, o kings, be wise! Be warned, o rulers of the earth!

After a direct speech section in which YHWH addresses the I-figure (vs.8–9), the psalmist resumes the mainline of his Psalm and continues his plea addressed to the kings and rulers of the earth. In prophetic and prospective discourse, transitions between domains or paragraphs are frequently marked by the macro-syntactic signal היהו. A similar function is fulfilled in narrative sections by its counterpart יהי. Neither of them, however, occurs in the Psalms. The status of the phrase הנה seems to be somewhat ambiguous. In some texts, it indeed appears to have a structuring role at discourse level, while in others it has the clause-level function of a deictic particle (in which case it may still affect a clause’s discourse function, as we will see in the next section).

Another category of discourse-level structuring elements is that of the vocatives. Though vocatives may also be embedded in single clauses or in a series of subsequent clauses belonging to the same domain of discourse, they are frequently utilized to mark the beginning of a new discursive domain.

All of these elements assist us in identifying the correct boundaries between discursive and linguistic domains. Since the discourse functions of clauses and clause patterns are determined to a large extent by the presence or absence of transitions between linguistic and discursive
domains, any attempt to assign such functions to a clause should start by the detection of the markers of continuity and discontinuity that have been introduced in this section.

### 6.2.2 Other Parameters Regulating the Assignment of Discourse Functions to Clauses

Though the actual realization of a clause’s discourse function strongly depends on the clause patterns and the communicative domains in which it is positioned, it still holds that the starting point for any analysis of a clause’s discourse function is provided by the verbal form, which determines the default settings of the functioning of that clause at discourse level. An interesting exception to this is formed by clauses which contain an element belonging to the set of what we will call ‘mainline markers’ or ‘mainline anchors’. As was already briefly indicated in chapter 3, we assume that such mainline marking elements are capable of overruling the default settings of a clause’s discourse function as they are marked by the verbal form. More specifically, mainline markers may override the verbal form’s relief function of indicating the level of communication to which a clause belongs.

The set of mainline markers can be further subdivided into two subcategories.

The first subcategory consists of interrogative pronouns. On the basis of our data, we conclude that clauses initiated by such interrogative pronouns are by definition anchored in the mainline of communication, irrespective of the verbal form they contain. This entails that in interrogative qatal clauses, the verbal qatal form’s relief function of indicating secondary-line communication is overruled by the presence of the interrogative pronoun. The qatal form then only fulfills its default perspectival function of denoting retrospective perspective. As an illustrative example, let us repeat the first two verses of Ps 2:

1. Why have the nations been conspiring, and/but (why) do the peoples plot in vain?
2. (why) do the kings of the earth set themselves, and/but (why) have the rulers taken counsel together against YHWH and his anointed?

Because of the (continued) presence of the interrogative pronoun etc, each of the four clauses \(x\)-qatal, \(w\)-yiqtol, \(O\)-yiqtol, \(w\)-qatal) belongs to the Psalm’s mainline. The qatal forms in the first and fourth clause only mark the shift from zero to retrospective perspective within this mainline of communication.

The second subcategory of mainline markers consists of a small set of deictic particles, such as הנה and כ. Like the interrogative pronouns, these deictic particles, too, may override the relief function of a verbal form and always draw a clause into the mainline of communication. An example can be found in Ps 39.6, where a qatal clause starting with the deictic particle הנה continues the mainline initiated by an imperative clause:
Let me know, YHWH, my end.

Behold, you have made my days a few hand-widths, and my lifetime is as nothing in your sight.

The overriding effect of mainline markers on the relief function of verbal forms is most obvious in sequences in which a clause containing such a mainline anchor is preceded or followed by a background clause. As should be expected on the basis of what was said before, such sequences are to be analyzed in a way similar to other sequences of a mainline clause and a secondary-line clause. Thus, a *qatal* clause preceding a regular mainline clause, like an imperative clause, frequently introduces an argument, as in Ps 25.17:

Since they have enlarged the troubles of my heart, bring me out of my distresses!

In a similar way, a clause pattern consisting of a *qatal* mother clause and a *qatal* daughter clause containing a mainline marker also represents a shift from background information to mainline information, as in Ps 31.23, where the daughter clause starts with the mainline marking interjection נְפֵּץ:

When I had/have said in my alarm, “I have been cut off from your sight!” surely, you have heard my supplications, when I was crying to you for help.

The analyses and text samples provided in this chapter and in the ‘Concordance of Patterns’ suggest that, as was also true for the distribution of volitive and non-volitive functionality, a significant factor affecting the assignment of discourse functions to clause patterns is that of the relative order of its clauses. A good example is provided by sequences of a non-volitive mainline clause and a background retrospective *qatal* clause. If the *qatal* clause is the mother of the mainline clause, it frequently introduces given information, which the speaker assumes to be known by his audience at the moment the mainline statement is made. If, however, the *qatal*
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Clause is the daughter of the mainline clause, the relation between the two clauses is not always functional. Instead, the qatal clause may be functionally more related to one of its daughter clauses or may even open a new domain of discourse. Our data suggest that in patterns consisting of a non-volitive mainline clause and a retrospective qatal clause, the qatal clause often provides ‘pattern-specific’ given information if it is the mother clause, while, if it wants to express this same function as a daughter clause, it generally requires the presence of a subordinate conjunction like ﹜. In other words, the function of supplying mainline preceding given information can be fulfilled by simple qatal mother clauses, while that of offering mainline following given information is usually marked by explicit linguistic elements, like subordinate conjunctions.

For a correct identification of discourse functions, it is required that the detection of processes of inheritance and blocking of volitive and non-volitive functionalities, as described in the previous chapter, be completed. As we will see, clause patterns containing a volitive mainline clause often exhibit discourse functions that are different from the ones fulfilled by clause patterns including a non-volitive mainline clause. In sequences of an x-yiqtol clause and a qatal clause, for example, one may make incorrect assumptions about the clauses’ discourse functions, in case one has not noticed that, within a particular context, the x-yiqtol clause’s default non-volitive function is overridden by an inherited volitive function. Similarly, in sequences of a nominal mother clause and a 0-yiqtol daughter clause, the actual concretization of discourse functions changes if the 0-yiqtol clause inherits its nominal mother clause’s explicit subject and should therefore be redefined as a non-volitive <X->yiqtol clause.

One of the crucial assumptions made in this chapter is that the mechanism of inheritance is not reserved for the regulation of the assignment of volitive and non-volitive functionality. Instead, discourse functions can be inherited, too, as can clearly be seen in sequences of a qatal mother clause and a mainline discursive (imperative, yiqtol) or mainline narrative (wayyiqtol) daughter clause. In such sequences the qatal clause often initiates a longer chain of retrospective clauses. After it has been found that the qatal mother clause’s function is that of offering a certain type of given information (explanatory, argumentative, etc.) for a later mainline daughter clause, the discourse functions of the retrospective daughter clauses located in between the mother qatal clause and the mainline daughter clause are to be recalculated on the basis of the specific discourse function the initial qatal clause has acquired. This analytical process, which is imitated by our computer program, can be visualized as follows:

Both the qatal mother clause and the qatal daughter clauses simply fulfill their default relief and perspectival function: conveying secondary-line retrospective information.

On the basis of its interaction with the mainline daughter clause, the qatal mother clause’s default discourse function is concretized, for example to that of introducing argumentative information.

Finally, the qatal mother clause passes on its concretized function (of providing argumentative information) to the intermediate qatal daughter clauses.
First, the qatal mother clause passes on a simple, default retrospective secondary-line value to the chain of qatal clauses. After that, the default function of the qatal clause has been concretized on the basis of its interaction with a mainline daughter clause. In the final step, the functionality of the intermediate qatal clauses is recalculated on the basis of the new information about the qatal mother clause’s specific function.\(^{511}\) An illustrative example can be found in Ps 60.4, where the second 0-qatal clause adopts its mother clause’s function of offering preceding given information:

\[
\begin{align*}
[\text{Ob}] & \text{רְעָשֶׁת} & \text{ZQt0} \\
[\text{Pr}] & \text{הָעָלֶה} & \text{ZQt0} \\
[\text{PO}] & \text{מְסַמֵּחַ} & \text{ZQt0} \\
[\text{Ob}] & \text{בָּהֵיהּ} & \text{ZIm0} \\
[\text{Pr}] & \text{פַּחַת} & \text{ZIm0}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\) Now that you have made the land to quake,

(now that) you have rent it open,

repair its breaches!

Let us conclude this section by introducing two final linguistic parameters that, according to our analyses of the linguistic data in our corpus, may influence the assignment of discourse functions to clauses.

In a small number of patterns, the presence of a negation in the daughter clause has an effect on the functioning of the pattern as a whole. At this point we note that negative clauses are to be analyzed in a way similar to their affirmative counterparts when it comes to the effect of their volitive or non-volitive functionality on the actualization of their discourse function. Thus, patterns consisting of a retrospective background mother clause and a prohibitive daughter clause (with the negation ל), for instance, are to be analyzed differently from sequences of a retrospective background mother clause and an indicative negative daughter clause (containing the negation ל). On the other hand, we will show that there can be interesting differences between the processes of discourse function concretization that operate in clause patterns with affirmative daughter clauses and those with negative daughter clauses.

In other patterns, it will be necessary to take into account the person marking of the subject. Thus, the specification of the type of given information offered by a qatal clause with a 1\(^{\text{st}}\)- or 2\(^{\text{nd}}\)-person subject reference (‘now that…’) in certain patterns seems to be different from that of the type of given information provided by 3\(^{\text{rd}}\)-person qatal clauses (‘when…’).

It is by this clear constellation of parameters that one can gain insight into the complex patterns of communication that are expressed by Biblical Hebrew’s system of clause relations. In the next part of this chapter, we will explain how the interaction between these parameters contributes

\(^{511}\) It would be interesting to investigate to what extent this analytical process mirrors the process of reading or listening conducted by the original audience. At which point did the reader and/or listener realize that the information conveyed by the qatal clauses was of an argumentative type? Did he also have to ‘reason backwards’ after having encountered the mainline daughter clause and (consciously or unconsciously) perform the process of recalculation of discourse functions? It may well be supposed that this whole process of identifying the functionality of specific clause combinations, which may to us look somewhat cumbersome, indeed belonged to the basic linguistic knowledge of the native speakers of the Hebrew language we encounter in the Psalms.
to the concretization of discourse functions of clauses in the specific clause patterns that are attested in the Psalms.

6.3 Discourse Functions of Clause Patterns

6.3.1 Introduction

The clause patterns discussed below are divided into four main categories. These categories reflect four principal types of discourse-level functional shifts that are marked by specific sequences of clauses:

1. Patterns without shifts in type, level or perspective of communication (§6.3.2)
2. Patterns involving shifts in level and perspective of communication (§6.3.3)
3. Patterns involving shifts in type of communication (§6.3.4)
4. Patterns consisting of participle or nominal clauses (§6.3.5)

In order to give an initial overview of the wealth of clause patterns attested in our poetic corpus of the Psalms and the categories in which they can be placed, we present two matrices on the following pages.

The first matrix (fig. 6.2) is a frequency table in which we have noted the frequencies of each combination of mother and daughter clause type we found in the 150 Psalms. For each of the patterns, we have made a distinction between occurrences involving ‘agent/subject continuity’ (subpattern 1: SS), occurrences in which such continuity is absent (subpattern 2: DS), and occurrences in which either the mother or the daughter clause opens a linguistic subdomain by being a dependent (i.e.: attributive, subordinated) clause (subpattern 3).

In fig. 6.3, we present a second matrix in which we have annotated the default shifts in discourse functionality taking place in each of the clause patterns that is attested in our corpus. This matrix, which is based on the schematic representation of the verbal discourse functions in fig. 6.1, serves as a starting point for our discussion of clause patterns in the following sections of this chapter. It also contains the pattern numbers which are referred to in the headings of the subsections.

The most significant difference between the matrices in fig. 6.2 and fig. 6.3 concerns the absence of different columns for the different subcategories of patterns in fig. 6.3. As a matter of fact, the data in the second matrix in fig. 6.3 do not represent occurrences of patterns in which the daughter clause is a dependent clause. These occurrences are not included in this matrix, because the relation and interaction between mother and daughter clause in such cases cannot

This subcategorization has also been applied in the ‘Concordance of Patterns’, where the subpattern numbers are represented by the final digit in the multiple-digit pattern labels. Thus, code 11 identifies a sequence of two imperative clauses in which the two clauses share the same agent, while code 12 stands for a sequence in which there is no agent continuity. In the pattern labels provided in the subsection headings and in fig. 6.3, the subpattern digits are ignored and replaced by 0. Thus, all sequences of two imperative clauses are represented by the single code label 10.

Patterns in which the daughter clause functions as a constituent (i.e.: subject, object, adjunct, etc.) clause have been included neither in our ‘Concordance of Patterns’ nor in the countings presented in the scheme in fig. 6.2.
be regarded as functional (cf. §6.2.1): clauses that open a new (dependent) linguistic subdomain are not affected by their mother clause in their execution of discourse functions. From the frequency matrix in fig. 6.2 we can deduce several interesting observations. First of all, among the total number of 4805 clause patterns in the Psalms, high frequencies are found for sequences of two imperative clauses (409 attestations: 8.5% of total), sequences of yiqtol clauses that both have the verb in non-initial position and contain a non-subject preverbal constituent (250 attestations: 5.2% of total), asyndetic sequences of two qatal clauses (505 attestations: 10.5% of total), and pairs of two nominal clauses (247 attestations: 5.1% of total). These findings obviously point to the presence of a certain regularity in poetry’s use of verbal forms and clause types. As will also become clear from the matrix in fig. 6.3, the patterns having the highest frequencies are those in which there is no transition between communicative domains, i.e.: the patterns in which there is no shift between different perspectives or levels of communications. Instead, for most clause sequences that do entail such a communicative shift, the number of attestations is rather low, though there are some interesting exceptions to this, such as the pattern (w-x)-qatal > x-yiqtol (101 attestations: 2.1% of total). Some possible combinations of clauses (26 out of 171: 15.2%) are not even attested at all in our corpus, in particular those having a weqatal or wayyiqtol mother clause. More generally speaking, the number of weqatal forms throughout the Psalms, in particular, is indeed remarkably low.

Our frequency matrix, which represents a quantitative analysis of all 4805 clause patterns attested in the Book of Psalms, leads us to the conclusion that Biblical Hebrew poetry is fairly systematic in its selection of specific clause patterns. It obviously has a consistent preference for certain segments of the matrix of possible clause combinations. Though we do find a few patterns with extremely low frequencies, most of the attested clause sequences seem well-established and integrated in Hebrew poetry’s use of the verbal system. In the following examination of patterns, we will follow the order of pattern categories suggested by the code list accompanying the matrix in fig. 6.3. We will deal with these categories within a larger framework constituted by the four main types of categories introduced at the beginning of this section. The structure of the core of this chapter can therefore be summarized as follows:

1. Patterns without shifts in type, level or perspective of communication (§6.3.2)
   a. Patterns involving continuation of discursive mainline (§6.3.2.1) [cat.Ia]
   b. Patterns involving continuation of narrative mainline (§6.3.2.2) [cat.Ib]
   c. Patterns involving continuation of retrospective secondary line (§6.3.2.3) [cat.Ic]

---

513 For more detailed statistic analyses of the clause patterns in the Hebrew Bible, we refer the reader to the ‘Concordance of Patterns’ Notebook and to the quantitative information provided at the beginning of the subsections below.

514 A considerable number of attestations of the nominal clause > nominal clause pattern (123 out of 370: 33.2%) is found in introductory parts of Psalms. These occurrences have been excluded from our countings, since they are not part of the linguistic discourse of the Psalm itself, but merely function as a kind of title to the Psalm.

515 This number also includes those patterns for which only subcategory 3 (i.e.: either mother or daughter clause being a dependent clause) is attested.

516 Though the frequency matrix may suggest that the wayyiqtol form is quite well attested in the Psalms, a closer look at the data in the ‘Concordance of Patterns’ reveals that it is only a small set of Psalms which is responsible for the relatively substantial frequencies of this form in our matrix. Thus, long chains of wayyiqtol forms can be found in Ps 18, 40, 69, 78, 105, 106 and 107.
d. Patterns involving continuation of prospective secondary line (§6.3.2.4)[cat.IId]

2. Patterns involving shifts in level and perspective of communication (§6.3.3)
   a. Patterns involving a shift from antecedent information to discursive mainline (§6.3.3.1)[cat.II]
   b. Patterns involving a shift from discursive mainline to antecedent information (§6.3.3.2)[cat.III]
   c. Patterns involving a shift from antecedent information to narrative mainline (§6.3.3.3)[cat.IV]
   d. Patterns involving a shift from narrative mainline to antecedent information (§6.3.3.4)[cat.V]
   e. Patterns involving a shift from discursive mainline to anticipating information (§6.3.3.5)[cat.VI]
   f. Patterns involving a shift from anticipating information to discursive mainline (§6.3.3.6)[cat.VII]

3. Patterns involving shifts in type of communication (§6.3.4)
   a. Patterns involving a shift from discursive mainline to narrative mainline (§6.3.4.1)[cat.VIII]
   b. Patterns involving a shift from narrative mainline to discursive mainline (§6.3.4.2)[cat.IX]

4. Patterns consisting of participle or nominal clauses (§6.3.5)
   a. Patterns with a participle or nominal mother clause (§6.3.5.1)[cat.I,II,III,VI,VIII]
   b. Patterns with a participle or nominal daughter clause (§6.3.5.2)[cat.I,II,V]

At the start of each subsection, we have included the numerical codes of the patterns expressing the category of functional shifts (I, II, III..., etc.) discussed in that subsection. As we already indicated, these numerical codes are also included (in superscript) in fig. 6.3 for ease of reference. We recommend the reader to also look up these code references in the online ‘Concordance of Clause Patterns’ in order to get a more comprehensive overview of the discourse functions that should be ascribed to the patterns under investigation and the parameters that affect this assignment of discourse functions. This will also enable the reader to easily find other sample texts containing a specific pattern without being restricted to the limited number of illustrative texts that is provided in this dissertation.

Since it is our aim to be complete in our description of each pattern category, the code lists occasionally contain code references to patterns that are not attested in the Psalms and will therefore not be found in the ‘Concordance of Clause Patterns’. These pattern types do occur, however, in other Biblical books and in that case will have to be analyzed in a way corresponding to the type of analysis suggested for the other patterns belonging to the same pattern category.
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**Fig. 6.2** Frequency Table of Observed Clause Patterns in the Psalms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Function</th>
<th>Clause Pattern</th>
<th>Normalized Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Statement</td>
<td>v. v.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>v. v.</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Conclusion</td>
<td>v. v.</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>v. v.</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>v. v.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>v. v.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>v. v.</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table continues with similar entries for various clause patterns and their respective normalized counts.
6.3.2 Patterns without Interclausal Shifts

The set of clause patterns in which there is no shift in type of communication, level of communication and perspective (69 out of the 145 types of patterns attested in the Psalms (see patterns of category I in fig. 6.3): 47.6%) can be further categorized into four subsets. The largest subset consists of clause patterns in which the daughter clause continues the discursive mainline that was initiated or already continued by the mother clause. This subcategory of patterns is not only the largest in this particular category, but also has an overall high score: 59 out of the 145 types of clause patterns attested in our corpus (40.7%) fully or partially belong to this subset of patterns.

The next subset of ‘shift lacking’ clause patterns concerns those sequences in which there is a continuation of a narrative mainline. In contrast with the previous subset, this subcategory comprises only two types of patterns, namely those having both a wayyiqtol mother and a wayyiqtol daughter clause.

The third subset regards those patterns in which the mother clause opens or continues a secondary retrospective line of communication which is carried on by the daughter clause. It will not be surprising that the qatal clause plays a crucial role in these patterns.

The final subset contains the patterns which are characterized by a continuation of anticipating secondary-line communication. This subset is again quite a small one and has the weqatal clause as its central clause type.

6.3.2.1 Continuation Discursiv Mainline

Patterns (cat.Ia): 10-40 (450), 100-150 (393), 210-280 (208), 390-420 (109), 480-510 (65), 570-600 (384), 660-690 (132)
Total number of attestations: 1741 (36.2%)

A first interesting observation with regard to the category of clause patterns involving a continuation of discursive mainline is that it includes almost all of the clause sequences in which the syntactic mechanism of inheritance of volitive or non-volitive functionality can be activated, except for those sequences containing a weqatal daughter clause. Indeed, the process of inheritance of (non-)volitivity is predominantly active at the main level of non-narrative communication.

As we already noted, the sequence imperative > imperative, which is one of the few types of clause sequences in this subcategory in which the mechanism of inheritance never plays a role, has a remarkably high frequency rate in the Psalms. As can be found in the ‘Concordance of Clause Patterns’, the pattern is often part of a longer chain of imperative (or other volitive) clauses. Despite the high number of occurrences of this pattern, there is hardly any variation in the discourse functions fulfilled by its clauses. In some cases, the daughter clause opens a new paragraph or even a new mainline of communication by addressing a new (group of) participant(s), but in the overwhelming majority of occurrences the daughter clause simply carries on the mainline of communication that was opened or continued by its mother.

Similar observations are applicable to other sequences of a mainline mother clause and an imperative daughter clause. In all occurrences of such patterns ((w-)Ø-yiqtol > imperative, (w-)x-yiqtol > imperative, (w-)x-yiqtol > imperative), the daughter clause carries on a mainline of communication that was opened or continued by its yiqtol mother clause. This is true both when
the mother clause has a volitive meaning and when it has not, although it is interesting to note that in most sequences of x-yiqtol > imperative the yiqtol mother clause has a prohibitive meaning. Patterns consisting of a verb-initial yiqtol mother clause and an imperative daughter clause are quite rare in our corpus.

In clause patterns including a sequence of a mainline mother clause and a yiqtol daughter clause (being verb-initial or not), nothing surprising happens either. Thus, while many of these patterns proved to be interesting study objects when it came to the activation and deactivation of the syntactic mechanisms of inheritance and blocking, the assignment of discourse functions to them is rather ‘monotonous’. 517 An exception to this is formed by those occurrences that are embedded in a ‘non-standard’ contextual environment. These instances can well be regarded as interesting indicators of the need to determine the exact communicative domain in which a specific pattern is located. Let us take as an example the patterns consisting of two verb-initial yiqtol clauses, which can be assigned the default value of representing a continuation of discursive mainline. However, this default value needs some further specification in case the pattern is embedded in a narrative domain, as it is several times in, for instance, Ps 18 an 78. As we concluded in §5.3.3.1, such verb-initial yiqtol clauses often function to highlight a certain historical event and to evoke the audience’s attention by marking a sudden transition from a narrative to a discursive mode of communication. Indeed, instead of continuing an absolute mainline of communication, 517 An interesting subcategory of mainline continuing clause patterns is that consisting of a 0-yiqtol mother clause and a coordinating weyiqtol daughter clause containing an explicit subject that is implicitly assumed in the 0-yiqtol mother clause. These clause patterns reveal an interesting syntactic phenomenon, which is predominantly attested in Biblical Hebrew poetry, namely that sequences of two verb-initial yiqtol clauses (and, more rarely, two wayyiqtol clauses [e.g.: Ps 18.8]) are treated as a single syntactic unit in which the subject constituent takes final position. Illustrative examples are found in Ps 40.15 and 17:

```
[<Pr> בושי] 15 ZYq0
[<Mo> יהוה] [<Pr> זיפתי] [<Cj> א] WYqX
[<Ob> מבקש] [<PC> פסח] Ptcp
[<PO> ] InfC
[<Mo> אזהר] [<Pr> 시ן] ZYq0
[<Su> חמש עדת] [<Cj> א] WYqX

...

[<Pr> יושב] 17 ZYq0
[<Su> כל] [<Co> בך] [<Pr> יושב] [<Cj> א] WYqX
[<PO> משכיח] Ptcp
```

Let be put to shame,
and let be put to confusion altogether,
they who are seeking to snatch away my life!
Let be turned back,
and let be brought to dishonour who desire my hurt!

... 17 May rejoice,
and may be glad in you all
who are seeking you!
sequences of such verb-initial *yiqtol* clauses open and continue an interruptive discursive strand (or subdomain) of communication within a broader narrative domain. An example of such a string of mainline clauses belonging to an embedded discursive mainline subdomain can be found in Ps 18.14–20:

```
14 YHWH thundered in heavens,
and he sent out his arrows,
and scattered them.

15 Look! He reaches from on high,
take me,
he draws me out of many waters,
he delivers me from my strong enemy and from those who hate me.

16 YHWH was my stay
and he brought me forth into a broad place.

17 Look! They come upon me in the day of my calamity.

18 Such discursive sublines embedded in narrative domains may also be constituted by other types of sequences of *yiqtol* clauses, although their initiation is frequently done by a 0-*yiqtol* clause.

A similar instance of *yiqtol* clauses that, despite having the indication of the main level of communication as their default value, do not belong to the text’s mainline of communication may be detected in cases in which a mainline clause pattern belongs to a foreground line of communication embedded in a retrospective (or prospective) background section. A rare example of this is attested in Ps 50.19–20, where the 0-*yiqtol* and x-*yiqtol* clauses carry on the foreground communication initiated by a w-x-*yiqtol* clause continuing a retrospective *qatal* clause. For a correct understanding of the pattern, it should be noted that the foreground marking chain of *yiqtol* clauses is embedded in a retrospective section:
Now that you have given your mouth free rein for evil, and, indeed, you attach your tongue to deceit, you sit, you speak against your brother, you slander your own mother’s son; now that you have done these things and I have been silent, …

I want to rebuke you and lay the charge before you.

Mainline clause patterns with a weyiqtol daughter clause in their functioning at discourse level are not different from patterns with 0-yiqtol daughter clause. Their default function is that of continuing a discursive mainline of communication and it can be executed both in discursive sublines interrupting narrative domains (e.g.: Ps 37.40) and in dependent clauses. However, some additional comments can be made about the exact type of volitive meaning the weyiqtol daughter clauses may attain in these (and other) sequences. If the parameter of ‘agent continuity’ is not set, then the weyiqtol clause frequently expresses a purposive or final meaning, in particular when the subject of the weyiqtol does refer to an animate participant that was already introduced (with a non-agent role) before in an ancestor clause. An example of a purposive weyiqtol daughter clause anchored in an imperative mother clause can be found in Ps 37.34:

Wait for YHWH, and keep to his way, so that he may exalt you to possess the land.
Our corpus also contains examples of sequences of mainline clauses that are embedded in a linguistic subdomain, such as an attributive domain or a domain opened by the subordinating conjunction כי. As we already mentioned, the assignment of discourse functions to such sequences is not different from that to similar sequences in non-embedded domains: they simply involve a continuation of main-level communication within the domain in which they are located. 518

6.3.2.2 Continuation Narrative Mainline
Patterns (cat.lb): 1300–1310 (148)
Total number of attestations: 148 (3.1%)

In strong contrast with the previous subcategory of ‘continuation patterns’, the set of patterns conveying a continuation of a narrative mainline of communication is very small, as it only contains sequences of two wayyiqtol clauses (category Ib in fig. 6.3). Though most such sequences belong to an absolute narrative mainline, we also find in our corpus chains of wayyiqtol clauses that are embedded in a background section providing some sort of additional information creating a logical or temporal framework in which a preceding or following mainline statement is to be understood. An illustrative example is attested in Ps 40.2–4, where a chain of wayyiqtol clauses continues, in the form of an embedded narrative, an explanatory background section opened by a qatal clause:

2 Now that I had waited patiently for YHWH, and (now that) he inclined to me, and (now that) he heard my cry.

518 In our ‘Concordance of Patterns’, the continuation of a dependent domain has been labelled as ‘coordination’. This label also accounts for the fact that clauses continuing a dependent domain usually import the dependency marking elements (relative pronouns, subordinate conjunctions, etc.) from an ancestor clause. Mainline clauses being coordinate to a mainline constituent mother clause are assigned the discourse function label ‘coordDpLnMn’ (‘coordination dependent line main’), while mainline clauses continuing a domain governed by a subordinate conjunction bear the functional label ‘coordSbLnMn’ (‘coordination subline main’). The functional labels for most other clauses embedded in a dependent domain are construed in a similar way, except if the connection between two coordinated clauses results in the attainment of other specific functionalities (argumentative, explanatory, etc.) by the clauses.
Sequences of wayyiqtol clauses may also open and continue narrative mainline communication in series of coordinated dependent clauses. This does not change their default functional values. In all of these contexts, wayyiqtol clauses are used to narrate successive events. In order to make the successive character of the actions referred to by the wayyiqtol clauses more visible in the translation, one may utilize more sophisticated constructions\(^{519}\) than just that of simple coordination, especially in case of agent discontinuity. Take, for instance, Ps 55.6–7:

and Ps 64.8–10:

\(^{519}\) One should be aware that the rendering proposed in the following examples does not assume a functional difference between the first wayyiqtol clause and its successors: they all serve to express narrative mainline information. With the suggested renderings, we merely aim to highlight the aspect of successivity in the chain of wayyiqtol clauses. Similar purposes can be realized by using ‘(and) then…’ as a representation of the connection between two wayyiqtol clauses. Note that the proposed rendering is to be distinguished from the one to be proposed for some sequences of background qatal > mainline wayyiqtol (‘when X had done..., X/Y did...’), which do entail a shift in level and perspective of communication.
and declared the work of God.

6.3.2.3 Continuation Retrospective Secondary Line
Patterns (cat.Ic): 790 (68), 880 (34), 970 (176), 1060 (64), 1150 (261), 1460–1470 (27)
Total number of attestations: 630 (13.1%)

In comparison with the previous two subcategories of clause patterns, sequences of two retrospective background clauses show a lot more variation in the manner in which their default functional settings are concretized in specific contexts. Though we do find chains of qatal clauses that simply open and continue a more or less ‘neutral’ secondary line of communication, in most cases such a retrospective clause chain has a specific function in the broader communication in that it provides, for example, an argument or an explanation for some mainline statements. We already referred to this when we pointed to the phenomenon of inheritance of discourse functions in §6.2.2. An additional example of qatal clauses embedded in an argumentative domain initiated by a qatal clause can be found in Ps 22.12–16, where the background section is anchored in a prohibitive mainline mother clause:520

Be not far from me!

12 Since many bulls have encompassed me, (since) strong bulls of Basan have surrounded me; (since) they have opened wide their mouths at me like a lion;

... 13 Since many bulls have encompassed me, (since) strong bulls of Basan have surrounded me; (since) they have opened wide their mouths at me like a lion;

... 15 (since) I am poured out like water, and all my bones have become out of joint; (since) my heart has become like wax, (since) it has melted within my breast; (since) my strength has dried up like a potsherd.

520 As the example shows, sequences of two or more retrospective qatal clauses differ from sequences of multiple wayyiqtol clauses in that they do not necessarily imply a certain form of succession. While the wayyiqtol clauses function to narrate series of successive events or actions, chains of qatal clauses do not concentrate on the successivity of situations, but function to simply recount a number of retrospective facts, between which there usually does not even exist a temporally or logically sequential relation.
Chains of *qatal* clauses may also appear at the start of a narrative domain. In such contexts, they often provide anterior information creating a historical framework for the events and actions recounted in the narrative. This is what happens, for example, in Ps 28.7:

\[<Su> \text{לבי} [<Pr> \text{בט}] [<Co> \text{בו}] \quad xQ\text{tX} \]
\[<Pr> \text{נעז תי} [<Cj> \text{-ו}] \quad WQ\text{t0} \]
\[<Su> \text{לבי} [<Pr> \text{יעלז} [<Cj> \text{-ו}] \quad WayX \]

7 When in him my heart had put its trust, and (when) I was helped, my heart exulted.

In §6.3.3, we will more elaborately describe the conditions under which retrospective clauses may adopt and inherit such discourse-level meanings as those illustrated by these examples. It will become clear that the most decisive factor here is the interaction between the initial retrospective clause and the mainline clause to which the retrospective clause chain is linked. The final example has shown, for instance, that there is no need for ‘agent continuity’ in order to make inheritance by *qatal* clauses of the discourse functionality of their mother *qatal* clause take place. Instead, it is just the *weqatal* clause’s position between the background *x-qatal* clause and the narrative mainline *wayyiqtol* clause which forces it to import the function of denoting anterior narrative information.

In §5.5, we already referred to the exceptional nature of the *weqatal* clause, the functionality of which is generally to a large extent affected by the values it adopts from its mother clause. Thus, it is only in the specific sequence of a retrospective *qatal* mother clause and a *weqatal* daughter clause that the *weqatal* clause by definition has to be analyzed as a copulative *qatal* clause inheriting a retrospective background function. We have observed that there are no attestations in the Psalms of sequences in which a retrospective *qatal* clause passes on its secondary-line retrospective functional values to more than one *weqatal* clause.

### 6.3.2.4 Continuation Anticipating Secondary Line

**Patterns (cat.Id):** 1500–1510 (4)
**Total number of attestations:** 4 (0.0%)

In line with the final remark made in the previous section, we observe that the rare examples of pairs consisting of two *weqatal* clauses, which can convey either antecedent background information or anticipated background information, in the Psalms always involve a continuation of an anticipating secondary line of communication.\(^{521}\) This is true both when such clause sequences are located in non-dependent domains and when they continue a series of dependent clauses, as in Ps 69.36:

\[<Su> \text{_scores יא} [<PO> \text{ירא} \text{ר} \text{ר}] \quad ZY\text{pX} \]

---

\(^{521}\) In these clause sequences, the second *qatal* form can be analyzed as a copulative *weqatal*: the copula \(ו\) is a simple marker of coordination in this context.
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[<Ob> ציון ] [<Pr> ויהי ] [<Su> להים ] [<Cj> כי ]

35 Let heaven and earth praise him,

... for God saves Zion

and rebuilds the cities of Judah,

so that his servants will dwell there

and possess it.

As the example illustrates, the clause pattern format of a discursive mainline mother clause followed by a weqatal daughter clause having a different agent than its mother clause may well be regarded as the non-volitive counterpart of the syntagm mainline clause > weyiqtol clause without ‘agent continuity’. Especially when the weqatal clause has a subject referring to an animate participant that is already introduced (as a non-agent) in its mother clause or one of the ancestor clauses, it often should be assigned a consecutive or resultative meaning.522 This observation will be elaborated upon in our discussion of sequences of the type mainline clause > weqatal clause in the next section.

6.3.3 Patterns Involving Shift in Perspective and Level of Communication

Categories II, III, IV, V, VI, VII

In many occurrences of the first two (‘mainline’) subcategories of clause patterns discussed in the previous section, the respective sequences of mother and daughter clause are part of a broader mainline section that is either preceded or followed by another secondary line of communication. The functional relation between the clause opening the mainline section and preceding or following secondary-line clauses is often a delicate one. Thus, the type of background information communicated by the secondary-line clauses may be of an argumentative nature, but may also function as a kind of explanation for the actions or events mentioned in the mainline clauses. In this section, we will discuss both clause patterns in which a mother clause conveying antecedent or argumentative information precedes a mainline daughter clause and patterns in which the roles of mother and daughter are reversed. The final subsections will deal with sequences in which there is an alternation of a discursive mainline clause and a secondary-line clause with anticipating perspective.

Interestingly, it is for the category of patterns discussed in this section, in particular, that translators often tend to provide a neutral, flat rendering. However, as will become clear in the following subsections, the data force us to provide an analysis of the verbal forms which is much

522 References to the purposive meaning of weyiqtol clauses and the resultative meaning of weqatal clauses are also made by Niccacci, who, however, does not provide any criteria that regulate the assignment of these specific meanings to the respective clauses (see §3.3.3.2.3). Cf. Niccacci, A., The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), pp.93–95; Niccacci, A., ‘Essential Hebrew Syntax’, in: E. Talstra (ed.), Narrative and Comment. Contributions presented to W. Schneider (Amsterdam: Societas Hebraica Amstelodamensis, 1995), pp.118–120.
more sophisticated. Clause sequences of the types discussed in this section are obviously used to create relief in the communication. We will therefore provide several indications of how this relief function of clauses and clause patterns could be mirrored in translations of poetic texts.

6.3.3.1 Antecedent Information > Discursive Mainline

Patterns (cat.II): 50 (36), 160 (54), 290–300 (3), 430 (31), 520 (15), 610 (101), 700 (25)
Total number of attestations: 265 (5.5%)

Patterns consisting of a retrospective secondary-line mother clause and a discursive mainline daughter clause are relatively well attested in the poetry of the Psalms. A crucial distinction to be made is that between asyndetic and syndetic clause relations. This formal distinction appears to coincide with a functional one. In asyndetic patterns, the transition between the retrospective mother and the mainline daughter is of a more resolute character: the daughter does not continue the secondary line of communication represented by the retrospective mother clause, as it frequently does in syndetic patterns, but instead usually signals a shift back to the absolute mainline of communication.

In the asyndetic sequences of a background mother clause and a mainline daughter clause, the antecedent information conveyed by the mother clause can roughly be of two types. Firstly, the information may be of an argumentative nature, in which case it is meant to support the mainline statement made in the daughter clause. Secondly, the type of antecedent information may also be characterized more abstractly as ‘given information’, which may be broadly defined as information providing a logical or temporal setting in which the daughter clause’s mainline statement is to be understood.

Only for patterns containing an imperative daughter clause is it possible to distinguish between these two types of antecedent information on the basis of linguistic observations. It is again the parameter of ‘agent continuity’ which is to be assigned a major role in this. Thus, if the two clauses have the same agent, the type of antecedent information provided by the secondary line mother clause is often that of ‘given information’, while in case of ‘agent discontinuity’, the mother clause frequently offers an argument for the commands or desires expressed in the mainline daughter clause. In addition to the examples given in §6.2.2, we present as a further illustration Ps 58.4–7, where the qatal clauses convey a series of arguments for the exhortations made in the imperative daughter clauses not continuing the mother clause’s agent:

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\text{[<Aj> שרות [<Su> שלא מicontains [<Pr> תועז [<Vo> יהוה] 7 Voct]}
\end{aligned}
\]

4 Since the wicked have gone astray from the womb, (since) the speakers of lies have erred from their birth,

7 God, break the teeth in their mouths!
Tear out the fangs of the young lion, YHWH!

and Ps 60.5–7, where the qatal clauses introduce given information that serves to explain the calls made in the subsequent imperative clauses that do continue the mother clause’s 2nd-person agent:

5 Now you have made your people suffer hard things,
   (now that) you have given us wine to drink that made us reel,
   (now that) you have set up a banner for those who fear you,
   that it may be displayed because of the truth,

6 give victory by your right hand
   and answer us!

For all other combinations of a background mother clause and a mainline daughter clause (volitive and non-volitive) the distinction between the two types of antecedent information does not appear to be linguistically marked. For these clause patterns, we propose to use the label ‘given information’ as a designator of a set of multiple information types including that of argumentative information. Illustrative examples of sequences of background mother clauses providing given information that is antecedent to statements made in one or more mainline daughter clause(s) can be found in Ps 10.17 (volitive daughter, ‘agent continuity’):

523 Sometimes, the type of antecedent information provided by the qatal clause seems to be affected somehow by the participant references used in the clause pattern. In case of an interaction between a 1st-person speaker and a 2nd-person addressee, the background information often is of a more direct relevance for the mainline statements than in clause patterns presenting a more ‘detached’ type of information about a 3rd-person participant (group). In the first category of patterns, the retrospective clause frequently has an argumentative or explanatory character (‘now that...’), while in the second pattern set, it often functions to describe a temporal or conditional framework that is required or responsible for the situation mentioned in the mainline clause (‘when...’). The reader is invited to further investigate these observations by navigating to other occurrences of the respective patterns on the website accompanying this dissertation.
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ο YHWH
you may strengthen their heart,
you may incline your ear.

In Ps 40:6 (volitive daughter, ‘agent discontinuity’):

\[[<Su>אתה \text{וישת}] \ [<Pr>רבבות] \ [<Aj>6][xQtX] \]
\[[<ap>Alef] \ [\text{והות}] \]
\[[<sp>Ob>אלים \text{ואלים}] \ [\text{시설ותי } \text{ומיתותי}] \]
\[----][WxYq0]

6 Now that you have multiplied,
YHWH, my God,
your wondrous deeds and your thoughts toward us,

... let me proclaim,
and speak!

In Ps 73:23–24 (non-volitive daughter, ‘agent continuity’):

\[[<Co>싼ה \text{סיעה}] \ [<Pr>23][ZQt0] \]
\[[<PO>\text{ המוות} \ [<Co>24][xYq0] \]
\[[<PO>\text{حكمة} \ [<Co>24][WxYq0] \]

23 Now that you have taken me by my right hand,
24 you guide me with your counsel
and afterward receive me to glory.

And in Ps 18:5–7 (non-volitive daughter, ‘agent discontinuity’):

\[[<Su>מת \text{מלעתי}] \ [<PO>6][ZQtX] \]
\[[<Su> בעצם \text{מלעתי}] \ [<PO>6][XQt1] \]
\[[<Su>מה \text{מקשומי}] \ [<PO>ZQtX] \]
\[[<Ob>\text{מות} \ [<Pr>27][xYq0] \]
\[[<Pr>\text{אסתר}] \ [<Co>\text{💃}\ [<Aj>7][WxYq0] \]

5 Now that the cords of death have encompassed me,

... 6 (now that) the cords of Sheol have entangled me,
(now that) the snares of death have confronted me,
7 in my distress I call YHWH,
and to my God I cry for help.

In the introduction to this chapter, we pointed out that a verbal form’s function of denoting background can be overruled by the presence of a mainline marker in the same clause. We also
suggested that this might influence the discourse functioning of a pattern as a whole. Indeed, sequences of background mother clauses and daughter clauses containing a mainline marker are to be analyzed in a way similar to the asyndetic background > mainline patterns treated above. As an example, we present Ps 14.4 (// 53.5), where the mainline daughter clause is an interrogative qatal clause:

\[\text{[<Pr> שד] [<Su> כל-ה] [<Mo> יִדְעָה] ... [<Su> וּפִנְיָאָן] [<Pr> יהי] [<Ng> ל] [<Qu> -י] \]

\[^3\text{As they have all gone astray, as they have all alike been corrupt,}\]
\[^4\text{is it so that all those evildoers have no knowledge?}\]

On the other hand, for all types of sequences of a retrospective mother clause containing a mainline marker and a mainline daughter clause it holds that the pattern involves a simple continuation of the main level of communication and there is only a perspectival switch, as in Ps 43.2:

\[\text{[<PO> לָמָה] [<Qu> כן] ... [<Aj> ויב] [<Pr> תַּחַל] [<Co> קד] [<Qu> לָמָה] [<Ng> ל] [<Qu> -י] \]

\[^2\text{Why have you cast me off? Why go I mourning because of the oppression of the enemy?}\]

The discourse functionality to be assigned to asyndetic background > mainline patterns does not change if a pattern is embedded in a dependent linguistic subdomain. Thus, if a sequence continues a chain of clauses governed by the subordinate conjunction כי, the mother keeps providing antecedent information that supports, explains or puts into perspective the statement made in the mainline daughter clause, as can be seen in Ps 26.1:

\[\text{[<PO> משפטni] [<Vo> יהוה] [<Pr> אל] [<Su>י יַסָּתֵר] [<Cj> כי] [<Co> כна-ה] [<Cj> -י] ... [<Pr> יָמָד] [<Ng> ל] \]

\[^1\text{Vindicate me, YHWH, for now that I have walked in my integrity, and (now that) I have trusted in YHWH, I do not waver.}\]
4.4, for instance, the $x$-qatal > $X$-yiqtol sequence constitutes the object of the imperative mother clause:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[<Pr> ידוע] [<Cj> ל] }^4 \text{ Wir0} \\
&\text{[<Co> ול] [<Ob> התשד] [<Pr> יהוה] [<Cj> ב] } \text{ xqtX} \\
&\text{[<Pr> ישמע] [<Su> יהוה] } \text{ XYqt} \\
&\text{[<Co> על] [<Ps> בכראו] } \text{ InfC}
\end{align*}
\]

4 And know, that now that YHWH has set apart the godly for himself, (that) YHWH hears, when I am calling to him.

The discourse functions of mother and daughter clause also remain unchanged (i.e.: antecedent information > mainline) if the daughter clause is a verb-initial yiqtol clause which is prevented from fulfilling its default volitive function by one of the mechanisms described in the previous chapter, such as that of the multiple-duty modifier. As can be seen in Ps 22.17–18, the qatal clause in such situations still creates a framework within which the non-volitive $0$-yiqtol daughter clause inheriting the multiple-duty modifier כי is to be understood:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Su> כלבים] [<PO> סבבוני] [<Cj> כי] }^17 \text{ xqtX} \\
&\text{[<PO> הקימונים] [<Su> מעריצים] } \text{ Xqt1} \\
&\text{...}
\end{align*}
\]

17 For now that dogs have gone around me, (now that) a company of evildoers has encircled me,

18 I count all my bones.

The same type of analysis can be applied to clause patterns in which the $0$-yiqtol daughter clause imports its retrospective mother clause’s explicit subject, as in Ps 110.6:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[<Ob> על תמים ] [<Ti> מלוכם] [<Pr> מתן] [<sp> על] [<Su> אפ] }^6 \text{ Xqt1} \\
&\text{[<Co> הד] [<Pr> הד] } \text{ ZYq0} \\
&\text{[<Ob> על] [<Pr> מספר] [<sp> על] [<Ob> אפ] } \text{ ZQt0}
\end{align*}
\]

6 Now that Adonai at your right hand has shattered kings on the day of his wrath, he executes judgment among the nations, has filled them with corpses, has shattered him who is chief over the whole earth.

Let us now concentrate on syndetic sequences of a background mother clause and a mainline daughter clause opened by the conjunction ו. While background > mainline patterns containing a
weyiqtol daughter clause hardly occur in the Psalms, the number of qatal > w-X/x-yiqtol sequences is substantial, as can be seen in the frequency matrix in fig. 6.2. In these patterns, the continuity marking presence of the conjunction ו regularly appears to overrule the type of communicative discontinuity that is marked by the relief shift from background to mainline clause. Therefore, in several instances the w-X/x-yiqtol daughter clause simply carries on the secondary line of communication opened or continued by the qatal mother clause and only marks a shift from backward to zero perspective and from background to foreground within the secondary-line section. Clear examples can be found in Ps 71.17, where the eventual transition to absolute mainline is done by a prohibitive w-ל-yiqtol clause:

17 God,
as from my youth you have taught me,
and (as) I still proclaim your deeds,
18 so even to old age and grey hairs,
    God,
you should not forsake me!

and in Ps 77.3–4:

3 Now that in the day of trouble I have sought YHWH,
    (now that) in the night my hand has been stretched out,
    and (now that) she does not get tired,
...
4 let me think of God,
    and let me moan!

In many such occurrences of a qatal mother clause and a secondary-line continuing w-X/x-yiqtol clause, mother and daughter clause are parallel in that their subjects and/or predicates belong to the same semantic category. This is, for example, the case in Ps 65.14:

524 But compare Ps 55.13, where the weyiqtol clause has as its subject another participant than its X-qatal mother clause and is to be assigned a volitive (possibly purposive) meaning (see §5.3.1.2).
Now that the meadows have clothed themselves with flocks, and (now that) the valleys deck themselves with grain, let them shout yes, let them sing for joy!

However, we also encounter situations in which the pattern of qatal > w-_<X_/x>-yiqtol does in itself represent a shift from antecedent information to information belonging to the absolute mainline of communication. In order to correctly distinguish between such usages of the pattern and the more frequent usages in which the w-_<X_/x>-yiqtol clause simply continues the secondary line of communication, attention has to be paid to the broader communicative context and, in particular, to the other clause patterns in which the qatal mother clause is involved. When the qatal clause is not functionally related to another preceding or following (asyndetic) mainline clause, it can be analyzed as providing antecedent information explaining, supporting or putting into logical or temporal perspective the mainline information in the w-_<X_/x>-yiqtol daughter clause. An illustrative example of this use of a syndetic background > mainline pattern, even within a dependent domain introduced by the subordinate conjunction כי, can be found in Ps 63.8:

My soul is feasted as with marrow and fat, and my mouth praises you with joyful lips, so I sing for joy in the shadow of your wings.

When the qatal mother clause and the w-_<X_/x>-yiqtol daughter clause are lexically parallel and the w-_<X_/x>-yiqtol clause does not continue the secondary line of communication, but marks a shift back to the discursive mainline of communication, the w-_<X_/x>-yiqtol daughter clause often appears to emphasize the direct relevance in the actual communication of a situation or fact that was denoted as temporally or logically antecedent by the qatal clause. This is what happens, for instance, in the clause pattern in Ps 44.9, where the w-_<X_/x>-yiqtol clause’s function of marking direct relevance is supported by a shift from 3<sup>rd</sup>-person to 2<sup>nd</sup>-person:

In God we have boasted continually,
yes, we give thanks to your name forever!

6.3.3.2 Discursive Mainline > Antecedent Information

Patterns (cat.iii): 750–780 (39), 840–870 (12), 930–960 (198), 1020–1050 (12), 1110–1140 (73)
Total number of attestations: 334 (7.0%)

The relative order of clauses in a mother-daughter connection is an important parameter affecting the ascription of functions to the respective clauses. An interesting illustration of this is found in the contrast between the patterns discussed in the previous section and those we will treat now. While the majority, by far, of combinations of a background mother clause and a mainline daughter clause is functional in that the mother clause provides antecedent information supporting or explaining the mainline statement made in the daughter clause, this is not so obvious for reverse sequences of a mainline mother clause and a background daughter clause, in which the effect of the interaction between mother and daughter on the concretization of the discourse functions of both clauses is often minimal. In other words, the functional relation between a background mother clause and a mainline daughter clause is generally stronger than that between a mainline mother clause and a background daughter clause.

An interesting observation supporting this view concerns the distribution of functionalities in patterns of a volitive mother clause and a retrospective daughter clause. Though we do find instances in which the daughter clause provides some additional argumentation or clarification for the desire or command expressed in the mother clause, in many other attestations of these patterns the retrospective daughter clause opens a background section which is more narrowly related to one of its own mainline daughter clauses than to its volitive mainline mother clause. Besides, in roughly half of the occurrences of these patterns (161 out of 334: 48.2%), a functional interaction between mother and daughter on the basis of their clause types is rendered impossible by the fact that the retrospective daughter clause is a dependent (attributive, subordinated) clause. As we have already indicated in §6.2.2, Biblical Hebrew clearly uses the subordinate conjunction כי as a significant marker of following explanatory or argumentative meaning expressed by daughter clauses. This fact accounts both for the remarkably high number of כי-qatal daughter clauses in sequences of a mainline mother clause and a background daughter clause and for the fact that qatal daughter clauses without the subordinate conjunction do not always have to be functionally related to their mother clause, but may also open a more independent domain of communication or introduce information that is antecedent to a later (i.e.: a daughter) mainline clause.

Yet, let us provide a few examples of sequences in which the combination of a mainline mother clause and a background daughter clause is functional and represents a link between mainline information and following antecedent information. In such situations, the retrospective daughter clause can attain either of the two types of antecedent information (i.e.: argumentative and logically/temporally preceding information) we identified above. As the following examples show, the dividing line between these two functional nuances is often rather vague. However, as a general starting point, it is adequate to associate a switch in agent with the assignment of an argumentative meaning to the retrospective daughter of a volitive mother clause, as in Ps 74.3:

525 We remind the reader of the fact that in the ‘Concordance of Patterns’ such occurrences are included in the third subcategory of each pattern.
6. Discourse-level Functions of Clause Patterns in the Psalms

Direct your steps to the perpetual ruins, since the enemy has destroyed everything in the sanctuary!

while ‘agent continuity’ then coincides with the assignment of an explanatory or a ‘frameworking’ function to the daughter clause, as in Ps 7.7:

while ‘agent continuity’ then coincides with the assignment of an explanatory or a ‘frameworking’ function to the daughter clause, as in Ps 7.7:

though the presence of an argumentative nuance cannot always be denied in such cases. Take Ps 16.4, for example:

Similar types of analysis apply to sequences of a non-volitive mainline mother clause and a retrospective daughter clause. Such sequences may under certain conditions be functional in that the interaction between mother and daughter results in the assignment of more concrete discourse functions to both clauses. However, the daughter clause can just as easily be used to open a background section that is not functionally linked to the mainline statements in the mother clause. This is particularly true if the retrospective daughter clause opens a subordinate linguistic domain, thus preventing the specific sequence of verbal forms in the clause pattern from being functional at all.

If a sequence of a non-volitive mother clause and a retrospective daughter clause is functional, ‘agent discontinuity’ usually goes together with the assignment of argumentative power to the daughter clause, as it did in similar sequences involving a volitive mother clause. An illustrative example is found in Ps 31.6:

Let their pains be many, since / now that they have hastened after another [god].

4 Let their pains be many, since / now that they have hastened after another [god].
6. Discourse-level Functions of Clause Patterns in the Psalms

Into your hand I commit my spirit, since you have redeemed me, YHWH, faithful God!

However, if the retrospective daughter clause has the same subject / agent as its non-volitive mainline mother clause, it is rarely functionally related to that mother clause and instead frequently opens a more independent background section. An exception to this is constituted by those instances in which both clauses have a 2nd-person subject reference. In such cases, the daughter clause may outline a logical or temporal framework in which the mainline statement needs to be understood. An example is found in Ps 52.4–6:

You are plotting destruction, now that you have loved evil more than good, (now that) you have loved all words that devour.

Syndetic sequences of a mainline mother clause and a background daughter clause are rather scarce in the Psalms. Moreover, in such syndetic sequences the retrospective daughter clause never introduces an argumentative or explanatory type of given information. Instead, it nearly always has a more ‘neutral’ function and refers to a situation that is just ‘given’ or ‘assumed’ at the current moment of communication. This is what happens, for example, in Ps 11.5:

YHWH tests the righteous, while his soul has hated the wicked and him that loves violence.

In quite a number of cases, mother and daughter clause show strong lexical correspondences. Ps 38.12 contains such a sequence of parallel mainline mother and background daughter clauses:

526 The ‘Concordance of Patterns’ uses the label ‘paralSit>2ndR’ to indicate that the information provided by the w-X/x-qatal daughter clause in some sense runs parallel to that in the mainline mother clause, that is: the daughter clause refers to a process or event which either continues to be active at the moment of the actual communication or has given rise to a situation that is still relevant in the actual communication. This second function of denoting a parallel secondary situation shows some overlap with the ‘traditionally’ identified function of the qatal as that of indicating perfective aspect.
As a conclusion to this section, let us briefly summarize our findings in a scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Discourse function retrospective daughter clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>volitive main → (X/x)-qatal: agent continuity</td>
<td>Offer following given information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volitive main → (X/x)-qatal: agent discontinuity</td>
<td>Offer following argumentative information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-volitive main → (X/x)-qatal: agent continuity</td>
<td>Open secondary-line background section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-volitive main → (X/x)-qatal: agent discontinuity or 2nd-person agent</td>
<td>Offer following given information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-)volitive main → w-X/x-qatal agent continuity and agent discontinuity</td>
<td>Offer parallel secondary-line background information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3.3 Antecedent Information > Narrative Mainline

Patterns (cat.IV): 1280–1290 (110)
Total number of attestations: 110 (2.3%)

The sequence type consisting of a retrospective mother clause and a discursive mainline daughter clause has a narrative counterpart in which the discursive mainline daughter clause’s position is taken by a wayyiqtol clause indicating narrative mainline. This pattern is fairly well attested in the Psalms, especially at the beginning of narrative lines of communication, which may give us some indication of the discourse functions fulfilled by the respective clauses. As was true for the background > discursive mainline patterns, in the majority of the occurrences of the background > narrative mainline patterns the distribution of discourse functions is largely determined by the interaction between the two clauses making up the pattern. However, we do also find texts in which this type of pattern is embedded in a broader communicative domain that influences the process of concretization of discourse functions in this clause pattern. If the pattern constitutes an independent syntactic unit and is not part of a broader shift between levels or types of communication, the retrospective clause usually provides a specific type of information being antecedent to the narrative mainline started by the wayyiqtol daughter clause.\(^{527}\) The qatal mother clause then portrays an already existing background situation

\(^{527}\) This observation corresponds to Niccacci’s assertion that while in narrative texts the narrative line of communication usually starts with a wayyiqtol clause, this is not so in narrative sections that are embedded in discursive lines of communication. In such ‘narrative discourse sections’, according to Niccacci, the wayyiqtol clause is never initial, but always functions as a continuation form of an initial construction typical of discourse, like the (x-)qatal clause. See: Niccacci, Syntax, pp.106–109, 177–178; Niccacci, ‘Essential

---

As my friends and companions stand aloof from my plague, indeed, my kinsmen have stood afar off.

\(^{11}\) My friends and companions stand aloof from my plague, indeed, my kinsmen have stood afar off.
constituting the starting point for the events narrated by the subsequent wayyiqtol clause(s). Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 3.6:

6 When I had laid me down, I fell asleep.

and in Ps 28.7:

7 When in him my heart had put its trust, and (when) I was helped, my heart exulted.

The pattern background clause > narrative mainline functions in a similar way if it is embedded in a linguistic subdomain consisting, for instance, of a series of dependent clauses governed by the subordinate conjunction כי, as happens twice in Ps 33.8–9:

8 Let all the earth fear YHWH, let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him!

As the examples suggest, neither the presence or absence of ‘agent continuation’ nor the presence of an explicit subject in the wayyiqtol daughter clause seems to affect the ascription of discourse functionalities to the clauses in our pattern.

We already noted that sequences of a retrospective background mother clause and a narrative mainline daughter clause may also be embedded in a larger background section that is opened by the mother clause and provides a logical or temporal framework for some following (or – more rarely – preceding) discursive mainline statements. This usage of the pattern nicely illustrates the iterative nature of the phenomenon of embedding of communicative domains. Indeed, in the poetic texts from the Psalms, narrative lines of communication usually have a type of supporting role with respect to the discursive lines of communication in which they are embedded. This supporting role may sometimes take the form of an elaborate ‘Sprosserzählung’, as in the ‘narrative’ Psalms 18 and 78, but in most cases presents itself as a compact series of wayyiqtol clauses embedded in an explanatory or argumentative discursive background section. This is the case, for instance, in Ps 40.2–4, which we already referred to in §6.3.2.2:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Now that I had waited patiently for YHWH,} \\
&\text{and (now that) he inclined to me,} \\
&\text{and (now that) he heard my cry,} \\
&\text{and (now that) he drew me up from the desolate pit,} \\
&\text{and (now that) he set my feet upon a rock,} \\
&\text{...} \\
&\text{4 and (now that) he put a new song in my mouth,} \\
&\text{...} \\
&\text{let many see it,} \\
&\text{and fear,} \\
&\text{and put their trust in YHWH!}
\end{align*}
\]

A final interesting use of the current pattern concerns those instances in which the wayyiqtol daughter clause continues its mother clause’s function of providing information that is anterior to the narrative mainline that is opened by another subsequent wayyiqtol clause. A helpful parameter enabling us to distinguish between narrative background continuing and narrative mainline opening wayyiqtol daughter clauses is that of the presence of semantic and/or syntactic parallelism. If the retrospective mother clause and its wayyiqtol daughter clause are not parallel, the daughter usually opens itself the narrative mainline of communication. In case of parallelism

\[\text{528 The term is invented by Wolfgang Schneider. See: Schneider, W., Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch. Ein Lehrbuch (München: Claudius Verlag, 1974), §48.4.5.2, p.200.}\]
between the two clauses, however, the *wayyiqtol* daughter clause often carries on its mother clause’s background function, which, in addition to the functions specified in the previous examples, may be that of providing information anterior to a narrative mainline. Ps 73.13–14 forms a good illustration in this regard:

\[
\text{[<Ob> לבקי] [<Pr> זכיתי] [<Mo> יך] 13 \text{ xQt0}}
\]
\[
\text{[<Ob> ינקות] [<Pr> ראשית] [<Cj> -ו] Way0}
\]
\[
\text{[<Ti> כל הימים] [<PC> בנות] [<Pr> זארי] [<Cj> -ו] 14 Way0}
\]

13 When surely in vain I had cleansed my heart,
and (when/though) I washed my hands in innocence,
14 I was a plagued one all day long.

As the example shows, the specific type of antecedent information provided by the retrospective mother clause and the background continuing clauses (‘when/though/because…) may be diverse and should be determined on the basis of the context rather than on the basis of linguistic observations.

The relief function of parallel *wayyiqtol* clauses is concretized less explicitly than that of *wayyiqtol* clauses opening a narrative mainline of communication, as they mark an embedded shift from background to foreground within the secondary-line domain of communication. Another example, comparable to the one in Ps 73.13-14, can be found in Ps 139.1-2, where the *qatal* clauses and the embedded *wayyiqtol* clause provide argumentative information forming the background for the interrogative *yiqtol* clause in vs.7:

\[
\text{[<Vo> יהוה] 1 \text{ Voct}}
\]
\[
\text{[<PO> קתרתינ] ZQt0}
\]
\[
\text{[<Pr> והד] [<Cj> -ו] Way0}
\]
\[
\text{[<Pr> ודע] [<Su> תאחר] 2 XQtl}
\]
\[
\text{[<PO> ושבת] InfC}
\]
\[
\text{[<PO> וقوات] [<Cj> -ו] InfC}
\]
\[
\text{[<Co> הערתך] [<Pr> ואנה] 3 \text{ xYq0}}
\]

1 YHWH, as you have searched me,
(as) yes, you knew me,
2 (as) you have known
my sitting
and my standing,
...
7 whither do I go from your spirit?

6.3.3.4 Narrative Mainline > Antecedent Information

Patterns (cat.V): 800 (1), 890 (5), 980 (15), 1070 (14), 1160 (13), 1490 (1)
Total number of attestations: 49 (1.0%)
In sequences of narrative mainline and secondary-line retrospective clauses, too, the relative order of mother and daughter clause has a decisive influence on the discourse functions adopted by them. While retrospective background mothers of narrative mainline daughters (i.e.: qatal > wayyiqtol) usually provide anterior information describing the setting in which the narrated events emerge, the function executed by these same retrospective background clauses is totally different when the roles of mother and daughter are switched (i.e.: wayyiqtol > qatal).

In most of the rare occurrences of the pattern type narrative mainline > background clause, the daughter clause is syndetically linked to its narrative mother clause. As was true for the discursive counterpart of this pattern type (yiqtol > w-x-qatal), such syndetic daughter clauses usually have a rather neutral function in that they do not introduce a very specified type of antecedent information. They do not continue the narrative succession of events, but briefly slow down the development of the narrative line, often by communicating a background situation that has a circumstantial character.\textsuperscript{529} As an example we present Ps 7.13–14, where the pattern is located in a narrative domain that is embedded in a discursive background section:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Pr> דך] [<Ob> קתות] \textsuperscript{13} xQtl
[<Po> יUILTIN] [<Cj> -ו] Way0
[<Ob> חותם] [<Cj> -ו] \textsuperscript{14} WxQt
[<Po> הכין] [<Aj> ל] [<Ob> מות] xYqt
When he has bent his bow,
and (when) he strung it,
while he has prepared his deadly weapons,
he makes his arrows fiery shafts.
\end{verbatim}

A similar type of analysis applies to sequences of wayyiqtol > w-נ-כ-qatal. The w-נ-כ-qatal clause is more than just a negative counterpart of the affirmative wayyiqtol clause, as it briefly pauses (or stops) a series of successive narrative events. Ps 37.36 can be taken as an example:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ob> ראהתי] [<Pr> רות] \textsuperscript{35} ZQt0
...[<Pr> yansב] [<Cj> -ו] Way0
...[<Po> נuebas] [<Cj> -ו] \textsuperscript{36} WxQ0
When I had seen a wicked man,
...he passed by,
...and I sought him,
but he was not found.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{529} Compare Niccacci’s comments on this construction in: Niccacci, Syntax, pp.65–66; Niccacci, ‘Analysis of Biblical Narrative’, p.179.
In asyndetic combinations of a narrative mainline mother clause and a retrospective background daughter clause, the functional connection between the two clauses usually is not so specific either. Though such a secondary line clause can be used to briefly specify a mainline action recounted in a preceding wayyiqtol clause, as in Ps 35.21,

They opened wide their mouths against me;
they have (namely) said:
“Aha aha, our eyes have seen it!”

in most cases it opens a more independent secondary line of communication within the narrative domain. The main difference between such qatal clauses and the surrounding wayyiqtol clauses is again that the first, instead of just continuing the narrative, focus on the description of a certain situation. The qatal clauses do not share the sequential character of the narrative mainline clauses, but create a pause in the narration by introducing a secondary-line situation (which does not necessarily have to temporally or logically precede the events described by the wayyiqtol mother clause). Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 64.8:

Then God shot an arrow at them,
– suddenly, their wounds have been there –
then their tongue caused them to stumble.

and in Ps 78.62–65:

When God had heard it,
he was full of wrath,
and he utterly rejected Israel,
...
and he gave his people over to the sword.

...– Fire has devoured their young men, and their maidens have not been praised.

Their priests have fallen by the word. –

Then Adonai woke as from sleep.

We conclude, then, that narrative mainline preceding retrospective background clauses are used to open the narrative by providing some anterior information, while retrospective clauses embedded in a narrative function to interrupt the succession of narrative events by the description of a certain background situation.

6.3.3.5 Discursive Mainline > Anticipating Information

Patterns (cat.VI): 1390–1450 (33)
Total number of attestations: 33 (0.7%)

In §6.3.1, we already observed that the number of weqatal clauses in our poetic corpus of the Psalms is fairly small. It will come as no surprise, then, that the same can be said of the rate of patterns containing a prospective weqatal clause. However, since these patterns do occur in our corpus (and in many poetic passages in, for example, the prophetic writings), it is required that they be discussed in this chapter, too.

In the previous chapter, we have several times characterized the weqatal clause type as an ‘empty’ clause type in that its specific (volitive or non-volitive) functionality was to a large extent determined by the functional values it adopted from its mother clause. In this section, however, we will show that a weqatal clause is not completely neutral when it comes to its default setting in terms of its discourse functions. More specifically, a weqatal clause being preceded by a discursive mainline clause may adopt that clause’s volitive or non-volitive value, but does not lose its default discourse function of conveying anticipating secondary-line information (cf. fig. 6.1).

We may define this discourse function more concretely as that of ‘denoting a logical or temporal next step’. This function is very obvious when the weqatal clause starts the apodosis of a ‘protasis apodosis construction’, as in Ps 89.31–33:

```
[<Ob> יזרע] [<Su> מְנַע] [<Pr> יִשְׁעַ] [<Cj> מֶכֶס] 31
[<Pr> בִּשְׁמָ] [<Ng> אָ] [<Co> בָּ-מָשַפֵּ] [<Cj> הוּ] WxY0
[<Pr> חָ] [<Ob> הָ] [<Cj> אָ] 32
[<Pr> מְ] [<Ng> אָ] [<Ob> בִּ] [<Cj> הוּ] WxY0
[<Pr> פֶּ] [<Aj> בֵּ] [<Ob> אוּ] [<Pr> פָּ] [<Cj> מֶכֶס] 33
```

31 If his children forsake my law and do not walk according to my ordinances,
32 if they violate my statutes and do not keep my commandments,
33 then I will punish their transgression with the rod.

As was already suggested in §6.3.2.4, the specification of this discourse function is affected by the setting of the parameter of ‘agent continuity’. If the weqatal clause has as its subject or agent
another participant than its mother clause, and especially if this participant was already introduced in the mother clause (as a non-agent), it frequently has a consecutive meaning, presenting an event or a situation as being the logical result from the event or situation introduced in the mother clause. Illustrative examples are found in Ps 41.3[Q]:

\[
egin{align*}
\text{[<Su> יַעֲשֹׂה] [<Aj> בָּאָרִי [<Pr> אָשֶׁר] [<Cj> - 1]} & \quad WQT0 \\
\text{[<PO> יָהָו] [<Cj> - ] & \quad WYq0 \\
\text{[Q]} & \quad XYqt
\end{align*}
\]

2 May YHWH protect him and keep him alive, so that he will be called blessed in the land.

and in Ps 69.36:

\[
egin{align*}
\text{[<Su> שָׁמֵם] [<PO> יָהָו] [<Aj> בָּאָרִי [<Pr> אָשֶׁר] [<Cj> -]} & \quad ZYqX \\
\text{... [<Ob> יִזְיָה] [<Pr> יְזִיעָּה] [<Su> יָהָו] [<Cj> -]} & \quad xXYq \\
\text{[<Ob> נִבְטָה] [<Pr> יְריָבָה] [<Su> יָהָו] [<Cj> -]} & \quad WYq0 \\
\text{[<Co> יִשְׂמַךְ] [<Pr> יָשָׁמ] [<Cj> - 1]} & \quad WQT0 \\
\text{[<PO> יָרָשַׁה] [<Cj> - 1]} & \quad WQT0
\end{align*}
\]

35 Let heaven and earth praise him, ... 36 for God saves Zion and rebuilds the cities of Judah, so that they will dwell there and possess it.

A *weqatal* clause can also be assigned such a resultative meaning if the clause sequence is embedded in a dependent domain, as in Ps 28.1, where the whole pattern is governed by the subordinate conjunction הַפָּן:

\[
egin{align*}
\text{[<Vo> צַוּר] [<Delete>]} & \quad Voct \\
\text{[<Aj> מָנָנִי] [<Pr> תָּמָנְיָה] [<Ng> הָלָּא]} & \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Aj> מָנָנִי] [<Pr> תָּמָנְיָה] [<Cj> -]} & \quad xYq0 \\
\text{[<Aj> מָנָנִי] [<Pr> תָּמָנְיָה] [<Cj> - 1]} & \quad WQT0 \\
\text{[<Co> בָּרָה] [<PC> יָרְזָרְיָּה]} & \quad Ptcp
\end{align*}
\]

1 My rock, be not deaf to me, so that it may not be that you are silent to me, and (as a result) I will become like those, who go down to the Pit.

530 Indeed, the *weqatal* forms occurring in these contexts can usually be identified as what is traditionally called the ‘perfect consecutive’.
In case of ‘agent continuity’, it simply marks a ‘next step’ with respect to what was said in the mainline mother clause. This is what happens in Ps 52.7:

\[
\text{[<Ti>} \text{נצ} \text{-ל}] \quad \text{[<PO>} \text{הטח} \quad \text{[<Su> וַיַּעַק} \quad \text{[<PO>} \text{יהז}]}
\]

\[
\underbrace{\text{[<Co>} \text{נְתַּן} \quad 
\text{[<PO>} \text{יִתְּך} \quad 
\text{[<Su> מְלֹא} \quad 
\text{[<PO>} \text{יָשְׁרָה} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ל}]} \quad 
\text{[<Co>} \text{מְאֹרָה} \quad 
\text{[<PO>} \text{יֵשֶׁר}] \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ל}]} \quad 
\text{[<Co>} \text{וְלְמֹשְׁך} \quad 
\text{[<PO>} \text{יסֵכ} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]}}_{WYq0}
\]

\[
\underbrace{\text{[<Pr>} \text{יָרָה} \quad 
\text{[<Su>} \text{ע} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{כְּעַס} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{יָק} \quad 
\text{[<Ob> עֶבֶדְךָ} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{ך} \quad 
\text{[<Co>} \text{זָדוֹן} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{יתם} \quad 
\text{[<Ti> ה]} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]}_{xYq0}}_{WQt0}
\]

7 But God breaks you down forever,

he snatches

and tears you from your tent,

and will then,eventually uproot you from the land of the living.

In order to more clearly express the weqatal clause’s marking of a ‘next step’ in the translation, more sophisticated constructions can be used. Consider, for instance, the following renderings of two yiqtol > weqatal sequences in Ps 112.10:

\[
\text{[<Pr>} \text{רֵאָה} \quad 
\text{[<Su>} \text{ע} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{כָּעַס} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{ךָּס} \quad 
\text{[<Ob> עֶבֶדְךָ} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{ך} \quad 
\text{[<Co>} \text{זָדוֹן} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Pr>} \text{יתם} \quad 
\text{[<Ti> ה]} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]}_{xYq0}}_{WQt0}
\]

10 When the wicked man sees it,

he will be angry.

He gnashes his teeth

and will then melt away.

Weqatal clauses can also continue a type of posteriority that in the mother clause was marked by adverbial elements, like the modifier ז in Ps 19.14:

\[
\text{[<PO>} \text{מִשְׁתַּחַת} \quad 
\text{[<Co>} \text{נַקְנָי} \quad 
\text{[<Ob> עֶבֶדְךָ} \quad 
\text{[<Pr> יִשְׁתַּחַת} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Ob> מִזְמוֹר} \quad 
\text{[<Pr> תְּשַׁלְּחָה} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Ob> נְשָׁעָה} \quad 
\text{[<Pr> נָשְׁתַּחַת} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Ob> בָּפֶל} \quad 
\text{[<Pr> נָקָנֶית} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]} \quad 
\text{[<Pr> יָבְשָׂע} \quad 
\text{[<Ti> זָא} \quad 
\text{[<Cj>} \text{-ו}]}_{xYq0}}_{WQt0}
\]

13 From hidden faults you must clear me,

14 also from presumptuous sins you must keep back your servant!

... Then I am blameless

and then I will be innocent of great transgression.

6.3.3.6 Anticipating Information > Discursive Mainline

Patterns (cat.VII): 540 (1), 630 (1), 720 (3)
Total number of attestations: 5 (0.1%)
In the Psalms, we only found five cases of a sequence of a secondary line prospective mother clause and a mainline daughter clause. Asyndetic clause connections of this type (without the daughter clause being a dependent clause) are fully absent, while from the possible syndetic connections only the variants *weqatal* > *w-* *x*- *yiqtol* and *weqatal* > *w-x-yiqtol* are attested. In these rare prospective line > discursive mainline sequences, the *w-x-yiqtol* clauses generally appear to mark a switch to discursive foreground within the line of anticipatory communication and are thus being used to highlight certain anticipated events. By means of the *w-x-yiqtol* clause Biblical Hebrew, instead of simply introducing another anticipated situation, marks a situation as being of direct relevance for the actual communication. If the two clauses are semantically parallel, as in Ps 89.24:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[<Co> בוש] [<Su> ויש] [<Pr> על] [<Ng> בכל] \text{ 23}} \quad \text{yxqX} \\
&\text{[<PO> וב] [<Su> על] [<Pr> בצ] [<Cj> -]} \text{ 24}} \quad \text{wxY0} \\
&\text{[<Ob> עם] [<Aj> ב] [<Pr> כי] [<Cj> -]}} \quad \text{wxY0} \\
\end{align*}
\]

23 The enemy does not outwit him and the wicked does not humble him.
24 Then I will crush his foes before him - yes, I strike down those who hate him!

It is interesting to observe that *w-X/x-yiqtol* clauses are mainly found at the conclusion of such prospective lines of communication. It may be assumed, then, that they do not only close the secondary line of anticipatory communication, but also restart the absolute mainline of communication. An example is found in Ps 1.3:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[<PC> עץ] [<Pr> היה] [<Cj> -]} \text{ 3}} \quad \text{Wqt0} \\
&\text{[<Co> יהיה] [<Pr> על] [<Cj> -]} \quad \text{Ptcp} \\
&\text{[<Ob> בה] [<Cj> -]}} \quad \text{wxYq} \\
&\text{[<Pr> אשר] [<Re> אם] [<Cj> -]}} \quad \text{xq0} \\
\end{align*}
\]

3 Then he will be like a tree who/which is planted by streams of water.

... Yes, all that he does, is successful.

---

531 Our analysis of this construction leaves more room for consistency than the type of analysis provided by Niccacci, who interprets *w-x-yiqtol* clauses that are embedded in a series of *weqatal* clauses as background clauses, being the discursive counterparts of the narrative background *w-x-qatal* clause. At the same time, Niccacci considers such ‘background’ *w-x-yiqtol* clauses to be emphatic constructions. He does not link, however, this ‘emphatic function’ to the *yiqtol* form’s default function of expressing discursive mainline communication. Compare: Niccacci, *Syntax*, pp.32–33, 83, 86; Niccacci, ‘Essential Hebrew Syntax’, pp.119–120.
It should be noted that prospective line continuing \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clauses differ from the surrounding \textit{weqatal} clauses in that they do not impose a certain type of sequentiaility on the events and actions that are communicated. The \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clauses do not represent a logical or temporal next step, but rather mark a shift back to foreground communication. This is also true for \textit{w-x-yiqtol} clauses containing a negation, as can be seen in the last two lines in Ps 89.31–34:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ob> יתורתי] [<Su> בני] [<Cj> אם] \textsuperscript{31} xYqX
[<Pr> ל العلي] [<Co> המשפתי] [<Cj> -ו] WxY0
[<Pr> חקתי] [<Ob> العلي] [<Cj> אם] \textsuperscript{32} xYq0
[<Pr> ישמתי] [<Ng> לא] [<Ob> месте] [<Cj> -ו] WxY0
[<Ob> משמע] [<Aj> ב-שבט] [<Pr> פקודתי] [<Cj> -ו] WQt0
...
[<Co> מ-עמי] [<Pr> אפרי] [<Ng> לא] [<Cj> -ו] \textsuperscript{34} WxY0
[<Ob> אשורה] [<Pr> ב-אモノות] [<Ng> לא] [<Cj> -ו] WxY0
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{31} If his children forsake my law
and do not walk according to my ordinances,
\textsuperscript{32} if they violate my statutes
and do not keep my commandments,
\textsuperscript{33} then I will punish their transgression with the rod,
\textsuperscript{34} but my steadfast love I do not remove from him,
and I do not allow my faithfulness to fail.

\section*{6.3.4 Patterns Involving Shift in Type of Communication}

\textit{Categories VIII, IX}

\subsection*{6.3.4.1 Discursive Mainline > Narrative Mainline}

Patterns (cat.VIII): 1220–1270 (39)
Total number of attestations: 39 (0.8%)

Sequences involving a shift from a discursive mainline of communication to a narrative type of mainline communication are rather scarce in the Psalms, but their attestation is beyond doubt. In grammars and translations, clause sequences of this category are interpreted and rendered in strongly different ways, though the general tendency seems to be one of ignoring the formal differences between the two clauses and just analyzing the \textit{wayyiqtol} clauses as simply adopting the functional values of their mother clause.\textsuperscript{532} However, this approach ignores the formal markers present in the text and does not reckon with any functional effects of such markers in its reading of the text.

In contrast with these general tendencies, we assume the alternations of discursive and narrative clauses to be an inherent part of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system, which should not be ignored. As a starting point for our analyses we take the view that the function of the \textit{wayyiqtol} daughter

\textsuperscript{532} Compare also our exposition of the treatment of ‘narrative’ 0-yiqtol clauses by grammars and other studies in §5.3.3.1.
clause in patterns of the current category is to be identified as that of opening a new, narrative domain of communication. Such a narrative domain can be a rather elaborate narrative line of communication. Usually, such independent narrative domains start with the type of \textit{qatal > wayyiqtol} sequence discussed in §6.3.3.3, in which the retrospective mother clause describes the background (often temporal) setting of the events and actions narrated in the following \textit{wayyiqtol} clauses. However, such ‘framework providing’ background clauses are not required and a narrative section can immediately start with a mainline clause, too. In most cases, such a narrative opening mainline clause contains an explicit subject and thus has the form of a \textit{wayyiqtol-X (wayX)} clause. Such an explicit subject can well be regarded as an additional marker of the shift to a new type and domain of communication, in particular when it refers to a new participant. An illustrative example can be found in Ps 64.8:

\begin{verbatim}
[<PO> ירהו] [<Mo> פתאם] \$4\$ xYq0
[<Pr> ייוא] [<Ng> א] [<Cj> -0] WxY0

\ldots

[<Ob> תמי] [<Su> אלהים] [<PO> דבר] [<Cj> -0] \$8\$ WayX

\ldots

[<Su> קולו] [<Co> כלים] [<PO> כרא] [<Cj> -0] \$9\$ WayX

\ldots

[<Su> מעה] [<Pr> ידיד] [<Cj> -0] \$10\$ WayX
[<Ob> מצו] [<Cj> -0]
Way0
\end{verbatim}

\$5\$ Suddenly they shoot at him, while they do not fear.

\$8\$ When God shot an arrow at them, their tongue caused them to stumble, and all men feared and declared the work of God.

and in Ps 18.7–10, where the narrative domain is opened by two coordinated \textit{wayyiqtol} clauses sharing the explicit subject given in the second clause:

\begin{verbatim}
[<Ob> הנה] [<Pr> אקאה] [<sp<Aj> לד / ציר] \$7\$ xYq0
[<Pr> אשא] [<Co> אל ילח] [<Cj> -0] WxYq
[<Ob> כלא] [<Aj> הוחל] [<Pr> שמע] \$9\$ ZYq0
[<Co> בה] [<Pr> מעה] [<sp>Su> ל-חזן] [<Cj> -0] WXYq
[<Pr> תמע] [<Cj> -0] \$8\$ Way0
[<Su> הארץ] [<Pr> בחית] [<Cj> -0] WayX

\ldots

[<Ob> שמע] [<Pr> יי] [<Cj> -0] \$10\$ Way0
\end{verbatim}
in my distress I call YHWH,  
and to my God I cry for help. 
May he hear my voice from his temple,  
and may my cry to him reach his ears.  
When the earth reeled,  
and rocked,  
he bowed the heavens,  
and came down.

The examples show that the transition from discursive mainline to narrative mainline does not by definition coincide with a temporal shift, that is: the situation and events recounted by the *wayyiqtol* clause do not necessarily precede the situation communicated in the discursive mainline mother clause. It may be, for instance, that in the two sample texts we provided, the *yiqtol* clauses function in a way that is somehow similar to the *yiqtol* clauses that are embedded in a narrative section: they may refer to events that have already taken place at the time of communication (the verbal form does not give information about this), but their main function is to mark the discursive mode of communication and the direct relevance of the information for the current communication. The shift from discursive to narrative communication in the examples thus should not be interpreted temporally, but rather corresponds to a transition from a more involved type of communication, in which the audience is directly addressed and the events described are presented as directly relevant for the actual communication, to a more ‘detached’ type of communication, in which the main purpose of the speaker is that of providing information by referring to historical events.

Occasionally, the transition from discursive to narrative communication can be associated with a switch from fairly general statements to more concrete references to actual actions or events. This is most obvious in those instances in which the discursive and narrative clauses refer to parallel situations. The narrative domain opened by the *wayyiqtol* daughter clause then appears to serve as a specific (historical) example or illustration of a fact or truth communicated in the discursive mainline mother clause. An example is found in Ps 55.6–7:

6 Fear and trembling come upon me.  
When (once) horror overwhelmed me,  
I said:  
“O that  
I had wings like a dove!”

A comparable type of analysis is applicable to more isolated *wayyiqtol* clauses providing a brief, interrupting narrative remark. Such interruptive clauses, too, may mark a switch from factual or general statements to the recounting of a concrete event or situation. Sometimes, the narrative
comment serves the function of providing a kind of explanatory illustration of the discursive mainline statement made in the mother clause. In the wayyiqtol clause, the speaker then briefly recounts a situation in order to support the legitimacy or correctness of the claim or assertion expressed in the discursive mother clause. Such a ‘clarifying’ role can be adopted by the wayyiqtol clause both when the pattern is located in a non-dependent linguistic domain, as in Ps 3.5:

6 I cry aloud to YHWH;
He (namely) answered me from his holy hill.

and when it is embedded in a dependent linguistic subdomain, as in Ps 18.23–24:

23 For all his ordinances are before me, and his statutes I do not put away from me,
24 I was (namely) blameless before him, and I kept myself from guilt.

533 The same explanatory function may be assigned to the wayyiqtol clause in Ps 42.6. Though one should not ignore the parallels in Ps 42.12 and 43.5, in which the question expressed by the x-yiqtol mother clause is continued by a discursive mainline w-x-yiqtol mother instead of a narrative wayyiqtol clause, it is not necessary to adopt the suggestion made by the editors of the BHS to follow the small number of manuscripts that, instead of the wayyiqtol clause, have here a w-x-yiqtol clause which is identical to the w-x-yiqtol clauses attested in the parallel texts. Instead of overlooking the difference in the type of the daughter clause, one may well propose a different interpretation of the clause sequence in Ps 42.6, in which the wayyiqtol clause is assumed to represent a narrative continuation of its mother clause’s question:

6 Why are you cast down, my soul, and were you disquieted in me?

A less probable, but equally possible, interpretation regards the wayyiqtol clause as providing a brief narrative remark which serves as a sort of justification of the preceding question:

6 Why are you cast down, my soul?
You were (namely) disquieted in me.
However, whether or not the wayyiqtol clause indeed has such a ‘clarifying’ role is not linguistically marked, but is largely an issue of contextual interpretation. From a syntactic point of view, however, it should be concluded that the clause patterns discussed in this section always entail a shift from an involved mode of communication to a more ‘detached’ one.

### 6.3.4.2 Narrative Mainline > Discursive Mainline

Patterns (cat.IX): 170 (25), 440 (2), 530 (4), 620 (9), 710 (14)
Total number of attestations: 54 (1.1%)

While most of the sequences belonging to the category we treated in the previous subsection involved the embedding of a narrative clause or a series of narrative clauses within a discursive domain, in the narrative mainline > discursive mainline patterns discussed in this section it is usually the discursive mainline daughter clause that has an embedded position. The difference in the relative position of the narrative and the discursive clauses can be related to a functional distinction at the level of pragmatics. Thus, like the function of many isolated wayyiqtol daughter clauses in the patterns of the previous section can be interpreted in terms of their contribution to the discursive mainline of communication – i.e.: recounting some events in order to somehow explain or illustrate the claim or assertion made in the discursive mother clause – the discourse function of narrative line interrupting discursive clauses, too, is affected by their embeddedness in a narrative domain.

In the previous chapter, we noticed that verb-initial yiqtol clauses embedded in a narrative domain do not execute their default volitive function, but mark a switch to a more involved mode of communication. Indeed, by including discursive mainline clauses into a narrative domain, Biblical Hebrew signals a shift to a direct addressing of the author’s audience. As was already suggested in §5.3.3.1, a yiqtol clause’s discourse function of marking a shift to a non-narrative mode of communication can have diverse pragmatic realizations, which depend on the type of connection between narrative mother and discursive daughter clause (asyndetic vs. syndetic) and on the position of the verbal form in the daughter clause. Thus, in asyndetic sequences of a narrative clause and an embedded verb-initial yiqtol clause, the discursive daughter clause marks certain events in the narrative as being of direct relevance in the actual communication. The actual pragmatic effect of this is usually that these events are highlighted or receive a certain kind of emphasis. An illustrative example can be found in Ps 69.13, where the daughter clause contains an explicit subject and represents an obvious discursive interruption of the narrative mainline which is taken up again by the elliptic clause atom following the 0-yiqtol clause:

```
[<PO> כלתני] [<Su> ביתך קנ ת] [<Cj> כי] 10 xXQt
[<Co> עלי] [<Pr> נפלו] [<Su> ו פיך פות] [<Cj> - ו] WXQt
```

534 We use the English simple present form to represent the highlighting effect of yiqtol clauses that are embedded in narrative contexts. Our use of the present tense for the rendering of such yiqtol clauses comes close to the use of the ‘historical present’ (praesens historicum) in other classical and modern languages. It does not mark an event or action as belonging to the present time axis, but rather has the effect of interrupting the less involved narrative mode of communication in order to draw the audience’s attention to a specific part of the story. Cf. Schneider, Grammatik, §48.4.3.2, p.196: ‘Dieser Gebrauch des Imperfekts (...) entspricht dem deutschen und lateinischen “praesens historicum.”’
For when zeal for your house had consumed me, and (when) the insults of those who insult you had fallen on me,
I wept with the fasting of my soul, and it became my reproach,
and I made sackcloth my clothing and became a byword to them
– indeed, those who sit in the gate talk of me! –
and a song of drunkards.

Similar sequences with an *x*-yiqtol daughter instead of a verb-initial yiqtol daughter occur less often in the Psalms. Such sequences often involve a sequence of a narrative mainline clause and a dependent *x*-yiqtol clause, as in Ps 30.13:

When you had loosed my sackcloth, you girded me with gladness,
so that my soul would/may praise you, and would/may not be silent.

The use of a yiqtol form in such dependent clauses embedded in a narrative domain sometimes seems to serve the function of expressing certain modal connotations, though the number of attestations of this pattern in our data is too low to draw more general conclusions at this point.\(^{535}\)

\[^{535}\text{Another example of a possibly modal dependent yiqtol clause in a narrative context is attested in Ps 7.16:}\]

However, since such a modal interpretation looks somewhat artificial here, one might better explain this exceptional use of the yiqtol form as being caused by the poetic tendency to use asyndetic verb-initial (and
If the *x-*yiqtol daughter clause is not a dependent clause, its function still seems to be slightly different from that of narrative line continuing *0-yiqtol* clauses. Instead of referring to and highlighting a concrete event or action and thereby representing a vivid continuation of the narrative domain, such *x-*yiqtol clauses mostly interrupt the narrative line of communication by introducing a more general kind of evaluative remark, as in Ps 106.40–43.

More numerous than such rare sequences of a *wayyiqtol* mother clause and an *x-*yiqtol daughter clause are the syndetic sequences of *wayyiqtol* and *w-X/x-*yiqtol clauses. The pragmatic and discourse functions attained by the clauses in this type of pattern closely resemble those distributed in the previous patterns. The *w-x-*yiqtol clause does not simply continue the narrative functionality of its *wayyiqtol* mother clause, but rather signals a shift to a discursive mode of communication. It presents a situation or an event which is often closely linked or even parallel to what was communicated in the narrative mother clause, and at the same time stresses the direct relevance of this situation or event for the actual communication, that is: it draws the actual audience’s attention to a specific fact. At the level of pragmatics, the *w-x-*yiqtol clause can be used both to highlight specific historical events in a narrative (as does *0-yiqtol*) and to emphasize a more general fact or situation (as does *x-*yiqtol).

In many cases, the *w-x-*yiqtol daughter clause is semantically parallel to its *wayyiqtol* mother clause, as in Ps 8.5–6:

---

especially *0-yiqtol* clauses as attributive clauses. Could it be that this syntactic use of the *0-yiqtol* clause here overrules the default discourse functions of the verbal *yiqtol* form?
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What is man,
that you are mindful of him,
and the son of man,
that you care for him,
and (that) you made him little less than God,
and (that) yes/indeed, you crown him with glory and honour,

and in Ps 78.36:

Then they flattered him with their mouths,
yes, indeed, they lie to him with their tongues!
while their heart has not been steadfast toward him.

However, this type of parallelism is not always required, as can be seen in Ps 44.10:

Yes, when you had cast us off,
you brought us to dishonour
- and, indeed, you even do not go out with our armies!

and in Ps 107.28–29:

Then he commanded,
and raised the stormy wind, 
and it lifted up its waves.

28 Then they cried to YHWH in their trouble, 
- and, indeed, from their distress he delivers them, 
29 he makes the storm to be still! – 
The waves of the sea were hushed, 
30 and they were glad.

If the \(w-x\)-yiqtol clause appears at the end of a narrative domain, it regularly represents the conclusion of that narrative domain and anticipates a switch back to the absolute mainline of discursive communication. More specifically, the \(w-x\)-yiqtol clause then points to a switch from the narrative type of communication present in the preceding clauses to the discursive type of communication characterizing the absolute mainline of communication, which is indeed restarted in what follows. An example can be found in Ps 28.7:

7 YHWH is my strength and my shield. 
When in him my heart had put its trust, 
and (when) I was helped, 
my heart exulted, 
yes, with my song I give thanks to him! 
8 YHWH is the strength of his people.

In a similar way, a \(w-x\)-yiqtol daughter clause can function as a kind of highlighted conclusion to the series of events narrated in its \(wayyiqtol\) ancestor clauses, as is the case in Ps 78.27–28:

27 He rained flesh upon them like dust, 
... 
28 and let it fall in the midst of their camp, all around their habitations, 
29 and they ate, 
and were well filled, 
- indeed, thus he gives them what they craved! –
6.

Discourse-level Functions of Clause Patterns in the Psalms

6.3.5 Patterns with Nominal and Participle Clauses

In the clause patterns discussed in the previous sections, the assignment of discourse functions was to a major extent determined by the default functional settings marked by the finite verbal forms used in the clauses. However, we did not pay attention to patterns involving the use of a non-verbal or a participle clause. In principle, these clauses (in particular the nominal clause) indeed fall beyond the scope of our search for an adequate description of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system.

Yet, in this section, we will briefly comment on the discourse functions of the verbless clause, mainly with the aim to show that there is no need to invent new types of functionality for these clauses, but that it is possible to account for many of their usages in the Psalms by means of the functional categories introduced above.

It is mainly because of their frequent use in discursive mainline domains of communication (see fig. 6.2) that one might assume the default discourse function of nominal and participle clauses to be that of expressing main level discursive communication. Indeed, the function of conveying discursive mainline information is well attested in clause sequences consisting of two participle clauses or two nominal clauses, of which especially the second has an extraordinarily high frequency rate in the Psalms (247 out of all 4805 patterns attested in the Psalms: 5.1%).

However, the final discourse function of these clauses cannot always be seen as merely a concretization of such a discursive mainline default discourse function. On the basis of examples to be provided, we therefore hypothesize that the nominal and participle clauses are, in themselves, neutral with regard to the mode and level of communication they express. The functional aspect of indicating a narrative or a discursive mainline or secondary line of communication is not intrinsic to the nominal or participle clause itself, but is to be deferred from the broader communicative context and the clause patterns in which the clause is embedded.

This all suggests that, to a higher degree than the other clause types, the functional values of nominal and participle clauses are affected by the linguistic context and, in particular, the specific clause pattern in which they are embedded.

The following sections each discuss a specific usage of nominal and participle clauses. Since nominal and participle are surprisingly similar in their functioning at discourse level, we will not discuss them separately, but instead offer examples of both clause types in each section.

6.3.5.1 Nominal/Participle Clause > Daughter Clause


Total number of attestations: 917 (19.1%).

Since in most cases the discourse functionality adopted by a nominal or participle mother clause is not affected by its interaction with a daughter clause, the majority of the patterns referenced by the pattern numbers at the beginning of this subsection involves a simple transition from discursive mainline to the default functional values of the daughter clause type. Thus, if the daughter clause is a retrospective clause, it usually simply opens a retrospective background section. All in all, clause sequences with a nominal or participle mother clause in general can be
ascribed the same discourse functions as similar clause sequences with a non-volitive mainline mother clause.

There are, however, a small number of exceptions to this, the most important of which concerns clause patterns consisting of a participle or nominal mother clause and a volitive daughter clause. Contrary to what is true for most corresponding clause patterns with a non-volitive daughter clause, in this specific type of clause sequences the participle and nominal mother clauses usually do not attain the function of expressing discursive mainline information, but instead provide information that is antecedent to the request, command or desire communicated in the volitive daughter clause. In other words, in this category of clause patterns, the discourse function of participle and nominal clauses comes close to that of retrospective background mother clauses, as they present a kind of background framework in which the mainline statement made in the volitive daughter clause is to be understood. More concretely, the participle or nominal mother clause often offers an argument or explanation for the daughter clause’s volitive claim.

Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 4.7 (participle > imperative):

```
[<PC> ריבס [Su> אמרום] 7 Ptcp
[<Ob> ים [Pr> [Co> טוב [PO> ינו [Su> מי [VO> יהוה XYqt ZIm0
[<Co> עלינו [Pr> ישה [Co>Aaron נד [Su> מי [WYq0

<Pr> נס [Cj> עון [Pr> עלינק [Su> נב [CO> נד [Su> מי [WYq0

7 Since many are saying,
   “Who shows us some good?”
   lift up the light of your countenance upon us,
   YHWH!
```

in Ps 2.7–8 (nominal clause > imperative), where the argumentative section opened by the nominal clause is continued by a retrospective qatal clause:

```
[<Su> אוחה [PC> בני] 7 NmCl
[<PO> בני [Ti> ואת [Su> יתוה [XxQt
[<Co> שני [Pr> מתי [ZIm0
[<Ob> יתוה [Ob> צאן [Pr> יתוה [Cj> עון [WYq0

7 As you are my son,
(as) it is I who have begotten you today,
ask of me,
so that I may make the nations your heritage.
```

in Ps 57.8 (participle > 0-yiqtol):

```
[<Su> נבז [PC> לך] 8 Ptcp
[<Vo> אחיתא] Voct
[<Su> נבז [PC> לך] Ptcp
[<Pr> אשתה] ZYq0
[<Pr> גמרה [Cj> עון [WYq0

8 Since my heart is being fixed,
God,
(since) my heart is being fixed,
let me sing
and make melody!

and in Ps 63.2 (nominal clause > 0-yiqtol):

\[
\text{[<Vo> אלהים}^{2} \text{ Voct } \\
\text{[<Su> אל] NmC1 } \\
\text{[<PC> אשרד] ZYq0 }
\]

2 God,
since you are my God,
let me seek you!

It should be noted that this type of analysis does not apply if the daughter clause’s default volitive function is not realized. Thus, if a 0-yiqtol daughter clause imports its nominal mother clause’s explicit subject and, with that, loses its volitive meaning (cf. §5.3.2), the nominal mother clause no longer offers antecedent information, but simply fulfills its default function of denoting a non-volitive mainline of communication. This is what happens in Ps 19.6:

\[
\text{[<PC> כי-בתהנ] [<Cj>-ו] NmCl } \\
\text{[<Co> אם] ZYq0 } \\
\text{[<PC> ויש] ZYq0 } \\
\text{[<Aj> כת-נבר] ZYq0 } \\
\text{[<Ob> כתר] InfC }
\]

6 And he is like a bridegroom,
who leaves his chamber,
rejoices like a strong man,
in order to run his path.

Nominal and participle mother clauses also provide antecedent information if their daughter clause is an interrogative clause or contains another type of mainline marker, such as a deictic particle. Two examples of this are attested in Ps 27.1:

\[
\text{[<PC> doença-ו-שיש] NmC1 } \\
\text{[<Pr> ארדה] xYq0 } \\
\text{[<PC> ומניית] NmC1 } \\
\text{[<Pr> אמת] xYq0 }
\]

1 As YHWH is my light and my salvation,
whom do I fear?
As YHWH is the stronghold of my life,
of whom am I afraid?

Another pattern is constituted by sequences of a nominal mother clause and a negative x-yiqtol daughter clause. Take, for instance, Ps 62.3 (// 62.7):
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Since he only is my rock and my salvation, (since) he is my salvation, I am not greatly moved.

Here, and in other sequences of nominal clause > negative *x-yiqtol*, the nominal clause expresses antecedent information providing an argument for the negative mainline statement made in the daughter clause.

We would like to emphasize again that this particular function of introducing information that is antecedent to a mainline statement expressed in the daughter clause is only to be ascribed to nominal and participle clauses that have a volitive, a mainline negative or a mainline-marker containing daughter clause. In all other types of clause patterns, the nominal or participle mother clause usually conveys discursive mainline information.

### 6.3.5.2 Mother Clause > Nominal/Participle Clause

Total number of attestations: 930 (19.4%)

In the next subsections, we briefly illustrate how different communicative contexts result in the adoption of different types of discourse functions by nominal and participle daughter clauses. In many situations, a nominal or participle clause indicates discursive mainline, but in others it becomes clear that the expression of discursive mainline cannot simply be regarded as a default 536

An exception to these argumentative patterns is constituted by idiomatic nominal clauses of the type ... אשיר ('Happy is...'). These clauses always belong to the discursive mainline of communication, as can, for instance, be seen in Ps 127.5, where the nominal clause has a negative mainline daughter:

\[
[\text{<Su> אֶשְׁרִי נְדָבָר}] \quad \text{NmCl}
\]
\[
[\text{<Co> גַּם אַתָּה אֱסִפְּתָה}] \quad \text{xQt0}
\]
\[
[\text{<Pr> וְקָם}] \quad \text{xYq0}
\]

Happy is the man, who has filled his quiver with them. He is not put to shame.

and in Ps 65.5, where the nominal clause is the mother of a volitive daughter clause:

\[
[\text{<PC> אֶשְׁרִי}] \quad \text{NmCl}
\]
\[
[\text{<Pr> תַּחְבָּר}] \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]
\[
[\text{<Cj> וִיתַקְרֵב}] \quad \text{NYq0}
\]
\[
[\text{<Ob> וֵיתַשְׁרִיד}] \quad \text{ZYq0}
\]

Happy is he, whom you choose and bring near. Let him dwell in your courts!
function of verbless clauses. Instead, the intrinsic functionality of the verbless clause is, as we stated above, an ‘empty’ one, and the actual functions attained by nominal and participle clauses are largely determined by their mother and daughter clauses.

It should also be noted that for many types of patterns containing a participle daughter clause the number of sequences with dependent (in particular attributive) participle daughter clauses (109 out of a total of 281 patterns: 38.8%) is relatively high and sometimes even outnumbers the number of sequences with independent participle daughter clauses.

6.3.5.2.1 Continuation of a Discursive Mainline Mother Clause

Patterns (cat.Ia): 1560–1590 (73), 1650–1680 (231)
Total number of attestations: 304 (6.3%)

It is evident that nominal and participle clauses continuing a discursive mainline mother clause usually just execute the function of providing zero perspective, main level information. Numerous examples of this can be found in our online ‘Concordance of Patterns’.

An interesting observation to be made in this regard is that in none of the patterns can the nominal or participle clause be said to introduce by default a type of information that is antecedent to the statement made in a mainline mother clause. This is another indication of the fact that the relative order of mother and daughter clause has consequences for the discourse functions of both clauses. Thus, when the clause sequence consists of a nominal or participle clause and a volitive daughter clause, the mother clause almost by definition provides antecedent information supporting or explaining the daughter clause’s volitional statement. However, in case of the reverse order of a volitive mother clause and a nominal or participle daughter clause, a functional relation between the two clauses can only be observed if clear markers of continuity are present. Thus, if there are no changes in the set of participants, a nominal or participle daughter clause regularly provides argumentative or explanatory information that supports the command made in an imperative mother clause. Illustrative examples are attested in Ps 31.24 (imperative > participle):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Ob> יָהְנַה]} & \quad \text{ZIm0} \\
\text{[<Pr> חַלֹּת]} & \quad \text{Voct} \\
\text{[<Vo> אַמָּנוֹנָה]} & \quad \text{Ptcp} \\
\text{[<Su> יָהְנַה]} & \quad \text{[<PC> נָשָּׁת]} \\
\text{[<Ob> וְּעַל]} & \quad \text{Nphi} \\
\text{[<Pr> מַלּוֹם]} & \quad \text{Ptcp} \\
\end{align*}
\]

24 Love YHWH, all you his saints, since YHWH is preserving the faithful and is abundantly requiting him who acts haughtily.

in Ps 62.9 (imperative > nominal clause):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Ti> עִתִּי]} & \quad \text{ZIm0} \\
\text{[<Co> בַּ-כָּלַּה עַשָּׁה]} & \quad \text{Voct} \\
\text{[<Pr> בְּ-הָלָּה]} & \quad \text{ZIm0} \\
\text{[<Ob> שָׁפָר]} & \quad \text{Ptcp} \\
\text{[<Co> לָכֵּנָּה]} & \quad \text{[<Pr> לְ-מַכְּמוֹנָה]} \\
\text{[<sp>PC> לָהָוָּה]} & \quad \text{NmCl} \\
\end{align*}
\]

9 Trust in him at all times,
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people,  
pour out your heart before him,  
since God is a refuge for us.

and in Ps 60.13 (imperative > 1 + nominal clause):

\[ <sp><Ob> צ-מ עז ת / עזת ו-מצר | <Co> ל | <Pr> ובהו \]  
\[ <Su> התנשאת | <PC> ישן | <Cj> -1 \]  

\[ ZIm0 \]  
\[ NmCl \]  

13 Grant us help against the foe,  
since vain is the help of man.

However, even in patterns in which there is such a high level of continuity in the set of participants, it is not guaranteed that the nominal or participle daughter clause adopts the function of providing antecedent information. Instead, it can also simply continue the mother clause’s reference to a discursive mainline of communication, as in Ps 57.6:

\[ <Co> להים [על-ה-שמה] 6 \]  
\[ <Pr> ואלהים \]  
\[ <Vo> להים \]  
\[ <Su> בכבודך [על כל ה-אור] \]  

\[ ZIm0 \]  
\[ Voct \]  
\[ NmCl \]  

6 Be exalted above the heavens,  
God!  
Over all the earth is your glory.

If a nominal or participle clause follows a non-imperative volitive (or non-volitive) mainline clause, it never provides any type of antecedent information, but instead just continues the discursive main level communication. Representative texts are found in Ps 34.2:

\[ <Ti>عملות [ב-אני],ヴה | <Ob> יהוה | <Pr> במתי \]  
\[ <PC> התלמה | <Su> תפני | <Ti> תמיד \]  

\[ ZYq0 \]  
\[ NmCl \]  

2 Let me bless YHWH at all times,  
his praise is continually in my mouth.

and in Ps 60.8–9:

\[ <Pr> עם-ם | <Ob> כל | <Pr> עם [גמז | <Cj> -1] \]  
\[ <Su> עם | <PC> טל | <Cj> -1 \]  

\[ ZYq0 \]  
\[ ZYq0 \]  
\[ WxYq \]  
\[ NmCl \]  
\[ NmCl \]  

8 Let me exult,

\[ <Su> עם | <PC> ל | <Cj> -1 \]

537 Since there are no linguistic clues, but only contextual clues for the distinction between argumentative nominal daughter clauses and mainline nominal daughter clauses with an imperative mother, our computer program assigns the discourse function of ‘continuing mainline’ to all of these nominal clauses, as can be seen in the ‘Concordance of Patterns’.
let me divide up Shechem
and portion out the valley of Succoth!

Gilead is mine,
and Manasseh is mine.

6.3.5.2.2 Continuation of a Narrative Mainline Mother Clause

Patterns (cat.V): 1610 (4), 1700 (13)
Total number of attestations: 17 (0.4%)

Attestations of independent participle or nominal clauses anchored in a narrative mother clause are quite scarce in the Psalms. In most cases, the clauses are syndetically linked and the nominal or participle daughter clause appears to introduce a secondary circumstance, thereby briefly interrupting the series of sequential actions or events recounted by the surrounding *wayyiqtol* clauses. Illustrative examples can be found in Ps 18:10:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Ob>] ימים} & \quad \text{[<Pr>] יד} & \quad \text{[<Cj>] ו} & \quad \text{Way0} \\
\text{[<Pr>] יד} & \quad \text{[<Cj>] ו} & \quad \text{Way0} \\
\text{[<PC>] גליו} & \quad \text{[<Su>] ע פל} & \quad \text{[<Cj>] ו} & \quad \text{NmCl}
\end{align*}
\]

10 He bowed the heavens,
and came down,
while thick darkness was under his feet.

and in Ps 73:14–16:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[<Ob>] לבבי} & \quad \text{[<Pr>] זכיתי} & \quad \text{[<Mo>] יכ} & \quad \text{xQt0} \\
\text{[<Ob>] נמי} & \quad \text{[<Co>] נמי} & \quad \text{[<Pr>] אורות} & \quad \text{[<Cj>] ו} & \quad \text{Way0} \\
\text{[<Ti>] יום} & \quad \text{[<PC>] נגש} & \quad \text{[<Pr>] אורי} & \quad \text{[<Cj>] ו} & \quad \text{Way0} \\
\text{[<PC>] הכותתי} & \quad \text{[<Su>] ל-בררש} & \quad \text{[<Cj>] ו} & \quad \text{NmCl} \\
\text{[<PC>] ב ים} & \quad \text{[<Su>] תוכ תי} & \quad \text{[<Cj>] ו} & \quad \text{NmCl}
\end{align*}
\]

13 When surely in vain I had cleansed my heart,
and (when/though) I washed my hands in innocence,

14 I was a plagued one all day long,
while my chastisement was until the morning,

16 and I thought
how to understand this,
(though) it was in my eyes a wearisome task.

Like narrative line interrupting *qatal* clauses, these nominal and participle daughter clauses temporarily pause the succession of narrative events and describe a non-sequential situation. We
assume that in such narrative domains of communication the nominal or participle clause’s actual function is that of denoting narrative secondary-line of communication.\(^{538}\)

6.3.5.2.3 Continuation of a Retrospective Secondary-Line Mother Clause

Patterns (cat.II): 1600 (35), 1690 (114)
Total number of attestations: 149 (3.1%)

Nominal and participle clauses that continue a retrospective mother clause should, in first instance, be analyzed as fulfilling the discourse function of denoting discursive mainline of communication. Contrary to what is true for the patterns of discursive antecedent information > discursive mainline information we discussed in §6.3.3.1, the relation between a retrospective mother clause and a nominal or participle daughter clause rarely affects the concretization of both clauses’ discourse functions. Only if the nominal or participle daughter clause contains a mainline marker, such as an interrogative pronoun, the retrospective mother clause introduces a specific type of antecedent information, as in Ps 119.81–84:

\[
\begin{align*}
&[<Su> נפש] [<Co> ל-קדש] [<Pr> כלת] 81 ZQTX \\
&[<Pr> ל-דרכ] [<Co> הלהי] \times QT0 \\
&[<Co> ל-אמרת] [<Su> דע] [<Pr> כל] 82 ZQTX \\
&[<Co> ק-מע] [<PC> צ] 84 NmCl \\
&[<Ob> משפט] [<Cj> ו-דרי] [<Pr> חתעה] [<Qu> מתי] \times Yq0 \\
&[<Su> ק-מע] \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{81}\) Now that my soul has languished for your salvation, (now that) I have put my hope in your word,
\(^{82}\) (now that) my eyes have failed for your word,
\(^{84}\) how many are the days of your servant, when do you judge those who persecute me?

The discourse function of nominal or participle clauses is, however, very different from that of indicating mainline communication if they are embedded in an encompassing background section providing argumentation or another type of ‘given’ information for one or more discursive mainline clauses. In such situations, nominal and participle clauses adopt and continue the mother clause’s function of denoting a type of antecedent information. We find examples of these types of clause patterns in Ps 58.4–7 (qatal > nominal clause):

\[
\begin{align*}
&[<Aj> י-רשע] [<Su> כ-רתה] 4 ZQTX \\
&[<Su> לברך] [<Pr> מ-כונ] 4 ZQTX \\
&[<Su> ל-מע] [<Sp> <Su> י-מע] [<PC> כ-itioner מחמש] 5 NmCl
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{538}\) This observation lines up with our earlier assumption that nominal and participle clauses are, in themselves, neutral with respect to the mode and level of communication they express. Their functional values in terms of both the type and the level of communication they indicate, should always be deferred from the broader communicative context (and, in particular, from the clause chain) in which they are embedded.
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Since the wicked have gone astray from the womb,
(since) the speakers of lies have erred from their birth,
(since) their venom is like the venom of a serpent,
(since) they are like a deaf adder,
that stops its ear,

God,
break the teeth in their mouths!
Tear out the fangs of the young lion,
YHWH!

in Ps 33.6–8 (qatal > participle):

Since by the word of YHWH the heavens have been made,
(since) he is gathering the waters of the sea as in a bottle,
(since) he is putting the deeps in storehouses,
let all the earth fear YHWH,
let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him!

and in Ps 71.7–8 (qatal > nominal clause):

Now that I have been as a portent to many,
and (now that) you are my strong refuge,
let my mouth be filled with your praise!
Sequences of a prospective weqatal mother clause and a nominal or participle daughter clause are virtually absent in the Psalms, which, in the light of the low frequency rate of the weqatal clause, is not a very surprising observation. An exceptional example is found in Ps 37.10, where the nominal clause seems to continue the reference to an anticipated reality. While the weqatal clause is used to describe a specific anticipated event, the nominal clause refers to a more general anticipated situation:

Yet a little while,
and the wicked is no more;
then you will look well at his place,
but he will not be there.

6.4 Summary and General Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter (and of chapters 4 and 5) has been to show that Biblical Hebrew poetry’s use of verbal forms and clause types is not as arbitrary as is suggested by most of the grammars, commentaries, studies and Bible translations examined in the first three chapters. It has become obvious that more room is created for a systematic analysis of the verbs in poetic texts if the Hebrew verbal system is not defined in terms of the traditional verbal categories of tense, aspect and mood, but instead as a system of clause relations, in which there is an interaction between the position of a verbal form within its clause, the mechanisms of inheritance and blocking, and a clause’s functioning within a specific domain of discourse.

This final chapter, in particular, has revealed the importance of taking into account the wider communicative context of the clause chain and the discursive domain for an adequate analysis of a clause’s functional values. It is possible to consistently assign default discourse-level functions to clauses and clause pairs, but the actual realization of these default values fully depends on the larger syntactic patterns in which the clauses and clause pairs stand and on the communicative domain to which the syntactic patterns belong.

A central goal in this chapter has been to indicate the consistent nature of such concretizations of a clause’s default functions. A summarized overview of these concretizations of discourse functions in all types of clause patterns attested in the Psalms is provided in the matrix in fig. 6.4.

In comparison to the matrices presented earlier in this chapter, this final matrix differs in several ways. Thus, we have supplied in the matrix in fig. 6.4 a separate column for patterns containing an interrogative daughter clause, since in such patterns, and in similar patterns with a daughter clause that contains a mainline marker (see §6.3.3.1), the presence of the mainline marking interrogative pronoun is more decisive for the distribution of discourse functions than the daughter clause’s clause type. Similarly, the matrix for some types of daughter clauses offers a distinction between affirmative and negative clauses, as the presence of a negation may, as we have seen, affect the concretization of discourse functions in a specific pattern. Finally, it should be noted that, as we did in fig. 6.3, we have again excluded from our matrix the category of
patterns containing a dependent daughter clause, since, as has repeatedly been made clear in this chapter, the transition from one linguistic domain to another renders the process of concretization of default discourse functions by interaction between mother and daughter impossible.

The first part of each of the code labels used in fig. 6.4 corresponds to the code labels used in the matrix in fig. 6.3 and again represents the type of communicative switch, if any, present in the clause pattern. The additional letters in the code labels define a subcategory which represents the precise actualization of the general category’s settings in this specific clause pattern. For example, the code Ia (which was already attested in fig. 6.3) indicates that the pattern belongs to the category of clauses in which there is no shift in type, level or perspective of communication (I) and that the pattern falls into the subcategory of clause sequences involving a continuation of discursive mainline (la). The exact meanings of the other codes are explained in the accompanying codes list.

The assignment of discourse functions in the matrix has largely been based on the assumption that mother and daughter clauses fulfill their default functions in terms of volitivity and indication of communication level. The overriding of such default functions by mechanisms of inheritance and blocking can be easily accounted for by referring the reader to other patterns. Thus, the distribution of discourse functions in clause patterns with a volitive (w-)X/x-yiqtol mother or daughter clause is similar to that in patterns with, respectively, a 0-yiqtol mother or daughter clause. The same is true for clause patterns in which the syntactical marking of non-volitive functionality is overruled by morphological marking of volitive meaning. The other way around, patterns containing verb-initial yiqtol clauses whose volitive default function is blocked, are to be analyzed in a way similar to identical patterns containing non-verb-initial (instead of non-volitive verb-initial) yiqtol clauses.

All in all, we have been able to define a clear constellation of categories each representing a specific type of functional shift in terms of the default discourse functions fulfilled by a pattern’s clauses. Moreover, we generally need only a small set of parameters and classes of functional connotations in order to provide a consistent analysis for each of the patterns belonging to a particular category. It has also become clear that a clause pattern’s embeddedness in a specific communicative domain indeed affects the discourse functions adopted by the clauses in that pattern, but it has generally proven to be possible to identify a consistent and well-defined set of possible contexts in which a given type of pattern could be used.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Emphasizes internal subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Emphasizes external objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Statements of fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>I am going to the temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>Having gone to the temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>On his way to the temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>To go to the temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>Going to the temple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive of Purpose</td>
<td>To go to the temple.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polemical</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptive</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causative</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>The king went to war.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>This is a historical account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>This is a command for action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>This is a statement of belief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>This is a directive for action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>This is a rule for behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>This is an appeal for action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>This is an expression of feeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performative</td>
<td>This is an act of action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>This is the beginning of a new sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>This is the middle of a sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>This is the end of a sentence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'and'</td>
<td>This is a conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'or'</td>
<td>This is an alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'but'</td>
<td>This is a contrast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'yet'</td>
<td>This is a concession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'however'</td>
<td>This is a qualification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>This is the primary clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>This is a dependent clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>This is a relative clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating accompaniment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessive</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating consequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating possession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive of Purpose</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Functions of Clause Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>This is a simple sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>This is a complex sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>This is a compound sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound-Complex</td>
<td>This is a compound-complex sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound-Complex with Dependent Clauses</td>
<td>This is a compound-complex sentence with dependent clauses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex with Dependent Clauses</td>
<td>This is a complex sentence with dependent clauses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Functions of Discourse Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'and'</td>
<td>This is a conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'or'</td>
<td>This is an alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'but'</td>
<td>This is a contrast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'yet'</td>
<td>This is a concession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'however'</td>
<td>This is a qualification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discourse Functions of Discourse Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>This is the primary clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>This is a dependent clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>This is a relative clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating accompaniment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessive</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating consequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerund</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating possession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive of Purpose</td>
<td>This is a clause indicating motivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and Conclusions

The present study has shown that it is indeed possible to systematically account for the use of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry by taking into account the roles of clause-level syntax and of syntactic patterns attested at higher levels than that of the individual clause. In this final part, let us briefly summarize our findings.

In the first chapter, we have paid ample attention to the questionable attitude in Old Testament Studies with regard to Hebrew’s use of the verb. We have shown that the dominant role that was initially awarded to literary and rhetorical analysis by Sir Robert Lowth has been preserved for centuries and that Lowth’s views even nowadays function as central guidelines for most Hebraists studying the Hebrew Bible’s poetic texts. Linguistic analysis, if conducted at all, has never been able to exchange its merely instrumental function for a more independent and systematic one. As a result, the language attested in poetic texts, including its use of verbal forms, has rarely been subject of thorough linguistic studies. Instead, poetry’s verbal functions have usually been identified as exceptional and divergent or have even been simply neglected.

The consequences of this approach can be seen in the present-day chaos in the renderings of verbal forms in poetic passages by Bible translations and commentaries.

In the second chapter, we observed that the lack of consistency in the assignment of functionalities to Hebrew’s verbal forms does not only regard the use of the verb in poetry, but also that in prose. A survey of recent grammars and studies on the Hebrew verbal system has revealed another problematic tendency, namely the inclination to analyze the Hebrew verb in terms of the verbal categories that are attested in the native languages of the scholars themselves. Consequently, Hebraists are usually forced to assume, or sometimes even invent, a wide range of (unrelated) functions fulfilled by a single form. In addition, most studies explicitly or implicitly (by focusing only on problematic cases, for instance) claim that the verbal system regulating the use of verbal forms in Hebrew prose is not shared by Hebrew poetry.

The findings presented in the first two chapters suggest that the main problem underlying the low degree of linguistic system found in Biblical Hebrew poetry’s use of the verb is of a methodological nature. Therefore, a methodological paradigm shift has been proposed in the third chapter. Instead of focusing on the individual verbal form and its clause, we favoured a text-linguistic approach in which grammatical analysis is not restricted to the linguistic unit of the sentence, but also includes the identification and analysis of higher-level patterns and communication processes in a text. We decided to continue the formalist-distributionalist type of text-linguistic research conducted by Schneider, Niccacci and Talstra and took some of their views as a starting point for our own analyses.

Before moving on to the higher textual levels, we first investigated in the fourth chapter to which extent clause-level syntactic analysis could help us to consistently assign specific functions to Hebrew’s verbal forms. We concluded that in yiqtol clauses clause-level syntax and morphology cooperate in marking default volitive and non-volitive functionalities. In most cases, the functional values marked by the syntax and morphology overlapped, but sometimes they did not. For those cases, we have been able to identify a hierarchical ordering of markings in which volitive morphological marking (as cohortative or jussive) takes initial position. If volitive morphological marking is not realized, clause-level syntax (yiqtol form in initial position marks volitivity; yiqtol form in non-initial position marks non-volitivity) is decisive, even if the clause contains an explicit non-jussive or non-cohortative form.
Summary and Conclusions

Yet, the Hebrew Bible, particularly its poetic literature, contains a considerable number of yiqtol clauses that cannot fully be accounted for by the clause-level categories of morphology and clause-internal syntax. Thus, we have encountered numerous non-volitive verb-initial yiqtol clauses and volitive (w-)x-yiqtol clauses. In the fifth chapter we proved that these problematic cases could be explained by assuming the activation of higher-level processes of inheritance and blocking. In this chapter, we elaborately discussed all pairs of a mother and a daughter clause in which these processes affect the assignment of (non)volitive functionality to the verbal forms. For each of the pattern types, we defined the parameters determining whether or not the process of inheritance or blocking was activated and provided numerous sample texts to illustrate our findings. We also paid attention to the recursive character of the inheritance and blocking processes and thus showed it to be required to take into account not only the individual pair of mother and daughter clause, but also the longer chain of clauses in which a specific clause pair is located, since mechanisms of inheritance and blocking operating earlier in the chain may also affect the assignment of functionality to clauses further down in the chain. At the end of the chapter, we stressed that it is exactly at this point of verbal patterns and higher-level processes that prose and poetry differ in their preferences with regard to the use of the Hebrew verbal system. Most of the patterns and processes examined in this chapter were attested much more often in the poetic texts of our corpus than in the prosaic ones. At the same time, all attestations of a given pattern (whether in prose or in poetry) could be analyzed in a single, consistent manner, which revealed the presence of a single verbal system.

The final chapter was entirely dedicated to the functioning of Hebrew’s verbal forms and clause types at the level of the whole discourse. Inspired by the work of Schneider, we started with the identification of several default communicative functions of the different verbal forms in terms of the type, level and perspective of communication they indicated. Subsequently, we investigated how these default functions were concretized in the specific clause sequences attested in the Book of Psalms. We elaborately examined how in each type of clause patterns the distribution of discourse functionalities was affected by several parameters including transitions between communicative domains and the degree of subject and participant continuation between mother and daughter clause. In the end, we were able to identify a structured and well-defined set of functional categories that each represented a specific type of functional shift in terms of the default discourse functions fulfilled by the verbal forms attested in a clause pattern.

All in all, we conclude that though the alternation of verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew poetry indeed has a far less monotonous nature than that in prosaic, particularly narrative, texts, it should not be characterized as ‘unsystematic’ or ‘arbitrary’. Instead, by combining the three types of clause level, clause pattern level and discourse level analysis in the way illustrated in the final three chapters, a clear verbal system can be defined which is shared by all Biblical Hebrew texts and is explored to its full extent in the poetic books. This verbal system is not to be defined in terms of the traditional verbal categories of tense, aspect and mood, but should be seen as a system of clause relations, in which there is an interaction between the position of a verbal form within its clause, the mechanisms of inheritance and blocking, and a clause’s functioning within a specific domain of discourse.

In order to show that this system is not just an abstract or imaginative product of speculation, but is indeed a consistent set of grammatical rules regulating the use of verbal forms in concrete texts, we have not only included numerous quotations in our dissertation, but have also granted the reader the opportunity to see the system in action in each of the 150 Psalms on the website.
that is a complement to this thesis. The reader is strongly recommended to visit this website. I myself have increasingly become impressed by the high level of consistency attested in the Biblical Hebrew poetry’s use of the verbal forms. It is my desire that, with this dissertation and its companion website, the reader will be able to share this experience!
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Het Systeem
achter het Werkwoordgebruik in de Bijbels Hebreeuwse Poëzie

Het in deze dissertatie beschreven onderzoek vindt haar vertrekpunt in de sterke mate van variatie die men aantreft in door hedendaagse commentaren, grammatica’s en Bijbelvertalingen geboden analyses en vertalingen van de Hebreeuwse werkwoordsvormen uit de poëtische teksten in de Hebreeuwse Bijbel. Er zijn weinig terreinen in de discipline van het Oudtestamentisch onderzoek waarop het gebrek aan consensus zo nadrukkelijk aanwezig is als op het terrein van het Bijbels Hebreeuwse werkwoordssysteem.

In hoofdstuk 1 wordt beschreven hoe de onzekerheid van Oudtestamentici en vertalers met betrekking tot het gebruik van het werkwoord in de Hebreeuwse poëzie haar oorsprong vindt in een eeuwenoud probleem van methodologische aard. Toen professor Robert Lowth uit Oxford halverwege de 18e eeuw een eerste poging ondernam tot een systematische bestudering van het werk van de Bijbelse poëten, introduceerde hij meerdere ideeën die tot ver in de 20ste eeuw zouden functioneren als een ‘standaardbeschrijving’ van de Hebreeuwse poëzie. In het werk van Lowth en zijn vele opvolgers werd een centrale rol toegekend aan literaire en retorische analyse. Tot op de dag van vandaag geldt dat een taalkundige analyse van de poëtische teksten ten hoogste een instrumentele functie krijgt toebedeeld, bijvoorbeeld door de zoektocht naar regelmatigheden in de aantallen van syntactische eenheden in te schakelen als hulpmiddel bij het afbakenen van de literaire eenheden in een tekst. Deze focus op literaire en retorische analysemethoden blijft Oudtestamentici en vertalers stimuleren het dikwijls ondoorgrondelijke gebruik van de werkwoordsvormen in de Bijbels Hebreeuwse poëzie af te doen als een uitdrukkingsvorm van poëtische vrijheid en van literaire overwegingen, of deze zelfs simpelweg volledig te negeren. Deze ‘strategie’ is duidelijk naar voren gekomen in de analyses van commentaren, Bijbelvertalingen en grammatica’s die in het eerste hoofdstuk gepresenteerd zijn.

Het gebrek aan zowel onderlinge als interne consistentie in de interpretatie van de Hebreeuwse werkwoordsvormen uit de poëtische teksten was onmiskenbaar aanwezig.

In hoofdstuk 2 is aandacht besteed aan de bredere studie van het Bijbels Hebreeuwse werkwoordssysteem in het algemeen. We hebben gezien dat er in de loop der tijd een enorme hoeveelheid aan alternatieve theorieën met betrekking tot de functies van de Hebreeuwse werkwoordsvormen is aangeleverd, die ieder hun problematische kanten kenden. Zo bleek in veel gevallen de toevoeging van lange lijsten met ‘uitzonderlijke gebruikswijzen’ onvermijdelijk. Hoewel de meeste studies vooral een reflectie vormden van de dominante interesse- en aandachtsgebieden in hun respectievelijke tijdsperioden, zoals een concentratie op de doeltaal of een groeiend historisch-cultureel bewustzijn, is de grote variëteit aan geboden ‘oplossingen’ voor het probleem van het Hebreeuwse werkwoord tot op de dag van vandaag bewaard gebleven. Opnieuw viel op dat het aantal serieuze pogingen om tot een systematische beschrijving van het werkwoordgebruik in de Bijbels Hebreeuwse poëzie te komen nog altijd bedroevend laag is. Problematisch is bovendien dat dergelijke zeldzame studies juist de moeilijk te verklaren gebruikswijzen van werkwoordsvormen als uitgangspunt nemen en daarmee de indruk dat er inderdaad geen taalkundig systeem ten grondslag zou liggen aan het poëtische werkwoordgebruik alleen maar in stand houden, bijvoorbeeld door nieuwe functionaliteiten te introduceren die buiten de poëzie helemaal niet geattesteed zijn.
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Al met al bleek de behoefte aan een methodologische omslag groot. In hoofdstuk 3 is daarom een benadering geïntroduceerd die ruimte schept voor een innovatieve en meer systematische analyse van het gebruik van de werkwoordsvormen in de Bijbels Hebreeuwse poëzie. Allereerst werd een algemene beschrijving gegeven van de opkomst en de rol van de tekstlinguïstische benadering in de discipline van de bestudering van het Oude Testament. Vertegenwoordigers van deze benadering, die vanaf de jaren ’70 van de vorige eeuw een langzame, doch geleidelijke opmars heeft gekend onder Oudtestamentici, delen de centrale opvatting dat iedere tekst, ongeacht haar genre, in eerste instantie moet worden bestudeerd als een vorm van talige communicatie waarin bepaalde taalkundige patronen te detecteren zijn. Het hoofdstuk werd vervolgd met een uitgebreide beschrijving van tekstlinguïstische studies naar het gebruik van het werkwoord in prozaïsche en poëtische teksten uit de Hebreeuwse Bijbel. We identificeerden in deze studies twee stromingen. Enerzijds waren er de functionalisten, die een algemeen functioneel model als vertrekpunt nemen en dat vervolgens gebruiken om patronen en functionaliteiten in de Hebreeuwse teksten te detecteren en analyseren. Belangrijke vertegenwoordigers waren Robert Longacre en Richard Dawson, die een ‘discours-modulaire grammatica’ voorstelden, waarin vele verschillende subtypen van communicatie werden onderscheiden, die ieder gekarakteriseerd werden door een unieke toekenning van specifieke functies aan bepaalde werkwoordsvormen. Anderzijds waren er de formalisten, die pleitten voor een benadering waarin de tekst zelf als uitgangspunt wordt genomen en waarin geprobeerd wordt functionele analyses te baseren op patronen en structuren die in de tekst zelf zijn geïdentificeerd. Als belangrijke vertegenwoordigers werden Wolfgang Schneider, Alviero Niccacci en Eep Talstra genoemd. Zij bouwden allen voort op het werk van de Duitse taalkundige Harald Weinrich, die voor verschillende talen een werkwoordsysteem beschreef dat bestond uit de drie dimensies van communicatietype (narratief vs. discursief), communicatieniveau (mainline vs. background) en perspectief (terugblikkend vs. neutraal vs. vooruitblikkend). De genoemde formalisten hebben aangetoond hoe een beschrijving van het Hebreeuwse werkwoordsysteem in termen van deze drie dimensies meer ruimte biedt voor consistentie dan traditionele beschrijvingen in termen van tijd, aspect en modaliteit. In het laatste deel van het derde hoofdstuk presenteerden we de aannames en ideeën die, op grond van de geboden evaluaties van het werk van de genoemde personen, in deze dissertatie zouden worden overgenomen en verder zouden worden uitgewerkt. Ook werd hier aandacht besteed aan de gebruikte onderzoeksmethoden en –instrumenten.

In hoofdstuk 4 hebben we aandacht besteed aan de morfologische en syntactische markering van deontische modaliteit. Er is uitgelegd dat de traditionele categorieën van tijd, aspect en modaliteit weliswaar geen sturende rol spelen in het Hebreeuwse werkwoordsysteem, maar dat de laatste categorie van modaliteit – of, specifieker gezegd, een subcategorie daarvan, namelijk deontische modaliteit – wel degelijk gemanoeuvreerd kan worden door de werkwoordsvorm en door zijn positie in de zin. Dit laatste inzicht werd al, bij het op minder systematische wijze, geïntroduceerd door de eerder genoemde Alviero Niccacci. We toonden aan dat het Bijbels Hebreeuws gebruik maakt van een interessant en gereguleerd samenspel tussen morfologie en syntaxis op zinsniveau om te komen tot een systematische markering van deontisch modale, d.w.z. volitieve, functionaliteit in zinnen met een imperfectumvorm (yiqtol-zinnen). Wanneer de werkwoordsvorm in deze yiqtol-zinnen aan het begin van de zin staat, markeert dit syntactische patroon een volitieve functionaliteit. Andersom markeert het zinstype waarin de yiqtol-vorm geen initiële positie inneemt, een niet-volitieve functionaliteit, tenzij de yiqtol-vorm morfologisch
als cohortatief of jussief gemarkeerd is, wat overigens vrij zelden het geval bleek te zijn. In proza bleek het mogelijk met deze eenvoudige combinatie van een morfologische en een syntactische component nagenoeg alle voorkomens van de yiqtol-vorm systematisch te analyseren. In de Hebreeuwse poëzie troffen we echter nog een substantieel aantal zinnen aan waarop de geboden analyse niet van toepassing bleek te zijn.

Juist deze ‘afwijkende’ gevallen brachten ons tot een innovatieve stap in de studie van het Hebreeuwse werkwoordsysteem. We ontdekten in hoofdstuk 5 dat de functionaliteit van werkwoordvormen en zinstypen niet alleen door syntactische patronen op zinsniveau beïnvloed wordt, maar ook door syntactische patronen die dit niveau overstijgen. Specifieke combinaties van moeder- en dochterzinnen bleken, onder nauwkeurig te definiëren voorwaarden als subjectcontinuatie en de aan- of afwezigheid van expliciete subjecten, mechanismes van overerving en blokkering te activeren die bepalend waren voor de concrete functionaliteit van de dochterzin. De in hoofdstuk 4 op basis van morfologie en syntaxis op zinsniveau geïdentificeerde default functies van zinstypen met een yiqtol-vorm bleken in dergelijke opeenvolgingen van een moederzin en een yiqtol-dochterzin ondergeschikt te zijn aan geërfde functies. Andersoortige blokkades, zoals van de moederzin overgenomen conjuncties, vraagwoorden en expliciete subjecten (de zogenaamde ‘multiple-duty modifiers’), konden bovendien yiqtol-zinnen met de werkwoordvorm in initiële positie ervan weerhouden een volitiële functionaliteit aan te nemen door een impliciete herdefiniëring van het zinstype van de betreffende clauses (als \((w-)<x/X>-yiqtol\) te vereisen. Op vergelijkbare wijze zorgde ook de inbedding van 0-yiqtol clauses in narratieve (ingeleid door wayyiqtols) en prospectieve (ingeleid door \(היהו\) domeinen ervoor dat aan deze clauses geen volitiële functionaliteit kon worden toegekend. We voorzagen in dit vijfde hoofdstuk in een uitgebreide beschrijving van alle typen patronen van moeder- en dochterzinnen waarin de (niet-)volitiële functionaliteit van de dochterzin bepaald werd door haar relatie met een moederzin. Er werden vele voorbeelden gegeven uit prozaïsche en poëtische teksten uit de Hebreeuwse Bijbel om aan te tonen dat de pijler van syntactische patronen tussen zinnen een noodzakelijke uitbreiding vormt op het gehele Bijbels Hebreeuwse werkwoordsysteem. Bovendien werd aangetoond dat de mechanismen van overerving en blokkering recursief van aard zijn, wat wil zeggen dat moederzinnen die door middel van overerving of blokkering invloed uitoefenen op de functionaliteit van hun dochterzinnen op hun beurt zelf weer onderhevig kunnen zijn aan beïnvloeding door (groot)moederzinnen bij het aannemen van een specifieke functionaliteit. Om die reden bleek het noodzakelijk om allereerst de volledige ketens van zinnen in een tekst te identificeren door een syntactische hiërarchie van die tekst te maken en vervolgens die ketens van boven naar beneden, van ‘oermoeder’ naar ‘achterkleinkind’, te doorlopen om zo de iteratieve werking van overervings- en blokkeringsprocessen correct te kunnen identificeren. In de slotparagraaf van het vijfde hoofdstuk werd beschreven hoe niet alleen yiqtol-zinnen, maar ook zinnen met een weqatal-vorm door voorafgaande zinnen uit dezelfde zinsketen beïnvloed kunnen worden in het aannemen van hun uiteindelijke functionaliteit.

In hoofdstuk 6 keerden we terug naar de door tekstlinguïsten als Schneider en Talstra verdedigde toekenning van driedimensionale (communicatiertype, communicatienniveau, perspectief) paradigmatische functies aan werkwoordvormen en lieten we zien hoe ook hieraan een syntagmatische component kon en moest worden toegevoegd om tot een systematische analyse van het Bijbels Hebreeuwse werkwoordsysteem te kunnen komen. De specifieke realisatie van de tekstlinguïstische basisfuncties van de verschillende werkwoordvormen bleek opnieuw in sterke
mate te worden bepaald door syntactische patronen op het zinsoverstijgende niveau van de hele tekst. In concretere termen kon worden geconcludeerd dat de daadwerkelijke functionaliteit van een werkwoordsvorm en de zin waarin hij zich bevindt voor het grootste deel afhangt van de positie van een zin in de tekst en van de specifieke hiërarchische verbindingen die een zin aangaat met haar moeder- en dochterzinnen. In het zesde hoofdstuk is een overzicht gegeven van alle mogelijke zinsverbindingen die in de Psalmen worden aangetroffen (inclusief hun aantallen) en van de concretiseringen van basisfuncties die in deze specifieke zinsverbindingen plaatsvinden. Het bleek hierbij mogelijk een beperkt aantal parameters te definiëren – zoals continuatie van het subject, de aanwezigheid van mainline markers, etc. – die bepalend waren voor de toekenning van concrete functies aan de zinnen die deel uitmaken van de bestudeerde zinsverbindingen. De werking van deze parameters en hun invloed op de toedeling van concrete functionaliteiten aan zinnen en zinsverbindingen werd geïllustreerd aan de hand van talrijke tekstvoorbeelden. Op deze wijze werd duidelijk hoe de Hebreeuwse werkwoordsvormen en zinstypen in de Psalmen op systematische wijze door de auteurs worden ingezet om de communicatie helder te structuren in argumentatieve, toelichtende en mainline-onderdelen.

Al met al kunnen we concluderen dat de afwisseling van werkwoordsvormen in de Bijbels Hebreeuwse poëzie weliswaar veel minder monotoon van aard is dan het geval is in veel prozaïsche teksten, maar dat het onacceptabel is het poëtische gebruik van het Hebreeuws werkwoord als ‘onsystematisch’ of ‘volstrekt willekeurig’ te karakteriseren. Door onze identificatie van regelmatigheden in de relatie tussen syntactische patronen op zins- en tekstniveau enerzijds en het functioneren van werkwoordsvormen en zinstypen anderzijds is een taalsysteem blootgelegd dat door alle genres in het Bijbels Hebreeuws wordt gedeeld en naa name in de poëzie ten volle wordt benut. Het Bijbels Hebreeuws werkwoordssysteem moet niet worden gedefinieerd in de traditionele categorieën van tijd, aspect en modaliteit, maar veeleer als een systeem van zinstypen en zinsverbindingen, waarin een interactie plaatsvindt tussen de positie van een werkwoord in de zin, de mechanismen van overerving en blokkering, en de functionele bijdrage die een zin levert aan de ontwikkeling van het communicatieve discours.

In de talrijke citaten uit verschillende boeken van de Hebreeuwse Bijbel vindt de lezer iets terug van de experimenten die aan de gepresenteerde theorie ten grondslag liggen. Meer inzicht in deze experimenten en in de praktische werking van het beschreven systeem in concrete teksten wordt verschaf op de website

http://nbviewer.ipython.org/github/ETCBC/Biblical_Hebrew_Analysis/blob/master/PhD/Introduction.ipynb,

die een onlosmakelijke toevoeging op deze dissertatie vormt. Op deze website zijn uitgebreide analyses en vertalingen van alle 150 psalmen te vinden die automatisch zijn gegenereerd door software dat door de onderzoeker zelf is ontwikkeld. Ook worden hier beknopte beschrijvingen geboden van de verschillende onderdelen van onze theorie en gehanteerde methodes. Ten slotte bevat de website een elektronische concordantie van alle in de Psalmen geattesteerde zinsverbindingen, inclusief de analyses daarvan. Naar deze concordantie wordt in de dissertatie zeer regelmatig verwezen, bijvoorbeeld in de vorm van de patroonnummers die in de besprekingen van specifieke zinsverbindingen in de hoofdstukken 5 en 6 worden genoemd. Via de door hen gerepresenteerde vruchtbare combinatie van theorie en praktijk zullen de dissertatie en de website de lezer in staat te stellen zich te overtuigen van de sterke mate van consistentie in het gebruik van de werkwoordsvormen in de Bijbels Hebreeuwse poëzie.