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The so-called we-qatal conjugation in Biblical Hebrew once again

Bo Isaksson

Introduction

The we-qatal syntagm has been regarded as one of the salient syntactical features that distinguish Biblical Hebrew from the rest of the North-West Semitic dialects. There seems to be few parallel constructions in other ancient Semitic languages. The common denominator of the studies so far is that we-qatal is a verbal grammatical morpheme of its own, a verbal conjugation that is to be distinguished from the Vsuff gram.

Previous research

Joüon and Muraoka

In the standard grammar of Joüon and Muraoka (2006) the we-qatal is called “inverted perfect” and the focus is on the conjunction wə which is regarded able to change the meaning of Vsuff to that of a VprefL verb. This wə is called “Waw inversive” (J-M § 43a) or “Waw conversive” (J-M § 117a) or “energic Waw”. The we-qatal is said to have “roughly the same values as the yiqtol form, to which it adds the idea of succession” (J-M § 119a). However, Joüon and Muraoka admits that “fairly often the form is abused” (J-M § 119y). Aside from the conversive power of the conjunction, Joüon and Muraoka put much emphasis on a change in the stress of some we-qatal forms (the we-qatali pattern). The phenomenon of an additive conjunction being able to semantically convert one conjugation to another conjugation is not discussed in a cross-linguistic perspective.

S.R. Driver

Joüon and Muraoka (2006) in many respects build their view on Driver (1892), which, however, contains discussions on the nature and function of the we-qatal clause that are productive for further research.
He notes that there is a clause preceding the we-qatal clause: “To all intents and purposes the perfect, when attached to a preceding verb by means of this waw consecutive, loses its individuality: no longer maintaining an independent position, it passes under the sway of the verb to which it is connected”. “It is in order to preserve a keen sense of the subordination thus essential to the meaning of the construction that the connexion with what precedes is so jealously guarded” (Driver 1892, 118, 120-121). What in the present article is called a ‘pre-clause’ is in Driver’s treatise named “the principal verb” while the we-qatal clauses that follow are called “the subordinate verbs connected with it by γ consecutive” (Driver 1892, 123).

Schüle
Andreas Schüle (2000) has investigated the syntax of the ancient Hebrew inscriptions. His study is important because it supplies material that in most cases is contemporary with the texts of Standard Biblical Hebrew. He concludes, that the meaning of the Vsuff in the syntagm we-Vsuff should not be explained in connection with the prefixed wə.

The main difference is instead found between the use of the Vsuff in independent clauses, and its use in subordinate clauses that express “Voraussetzungen, Nebenumständen und Folgen” (2000, 130). He adduces the example MHas(7):1,4f wyqṣr ʿbdk wykl wʾsm “Da erntete dein Knecht und maß ab, während/wobei er den Speicher füllte”. As for the meaning of the we-Vsuff clause it is necessary that “die Bedeutung der Suffixkonjugation aus dem Zusammenhang mit den Sätzen erschließen, denen sie zugeordnet ist” (2000, 130). Schüle rejects the idea that Vsuff and we-Vsuff would represent two different conjugations (2000, 132). He explains the apparent deviating meaning of we-Vsuff as a retention of the archaic stative meaning. “In dieser Hinsicht steht das Althebräische dem Akkadischen näher” (than Phoenician, Aramaic and Arabic do) (2000, 132). In Schüle’s view the we-Vsuff has basically a “Stative (Konsekutiv)” meaning, and is used mainly in “a) Begleit- und Nebenumstände (Explikativ) sowie b) Folgen (Konsekutiv)”.

Cook
Cook regards the forms with “waw-conversive” or “waw-consecutive” as one of the central problems in the Biblical Hebrew verbal system.
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(2012, 77, 80). He concludes that the “stress variation is a poor diagnostic because it appears inconsistently on the wēqatal form even within a single passage” (2012, 80). Cook’s solution is to regard we-qatal as an irrealis form, and it is called simply “irrealis qatal” (2012, 304). This terminology is grounded in the correct observation that a majority of the attested cases of we-qatal describe actions in the future or have modal nuances, for example when used after an imperative or a jussive. Cook’s critique of previous opinions is to the point. He finds the standard “treatment problematic and unsatisfactory”, “because it places too much weight on the waw conjunction and word order”. He dismisses “the whole notion of a multivalent waw” (2012, 314, 315).

Cook makes use of Carlota Smith’s theory of discourse modes to explain how different discourse modes work in Biblical Hebrew, but in the end it remains unclear in his study how we-qatal became an irrealis qatal, although “its origin is found in perfective qatal”, and Cook’s conclusion that word order in Biblical Hebrew expresses modality is extremely problematic (Cook 2004, 265).1 His suggestion that we-qatal originated in “conditional clauses” is likewise problematic since the correlation between we-qatal and the coding of apodosis clauses is conspicuously weak when examining all cases of conditional clause combining, since we-qatal clauses occur within a protasis complex as well as within an apodosis complex (Cook, 2004, 265).2

Strong points in Cook’s investigation are his emphasis on the North-West Semitic perspective and a recognition of the role of grammaticalization in forming the units in the Hebrew verbal system. His definition of

---

1 Not to mention that this necessitates his conclusion that way-ystqol has word order S-V and contains an unidentified word between the way and the yiqtol part. Abbreviations used in the article: gram = verbal grammatical morpheme, Vsuff = suffix verb gram, VprefS = short prefix verb gram (‘short yiqtol’), VprefL = long prefix verb gram, VprefA = the cohortative gram, PA = participle gram, VN = verbal noun (infinitive construct), VNabs (infinitive absolute), NCI = noun clause, PrP = prepositional phrase, ADV = adverb, PREP = preposition, Snoun = subject noun, Onoun = object noun.

2 The term “conditional clauses” is inappropriate, since ‘conditional clause’ is a term that should be confined to a clause expressing a condition, whereas Cook here is discussing the apodosis part of a conditional clause combining (involving both protasis and apodosis).
‘gram’ as a “grammatical structure” rather than a strictly defined “conjugation” might be key concept in the understanding of the we-qatal type of clause (2012, 182). He also emphasizes that the we-qatal syntagm is historically formed from the normal conjunction wa and the qatal gram (2012, 119f, 208, 249). But “the perceived semantic and syntactic distinctions between qatal and wēqatal are undeniable” (2012, 210). In his view the we-qatal type of clause has developed to a gram of its own, using the definition of ‘gram’ as a grammatical structure.

Joosten
Joosten (2012, 261 ff.) emphasizes the functional identity between “weqatal” and “yiqtol”, but takes a standing against the idea of the ‘conversive waw’ (2012, 288). When he uses the term “yiqtol” he refers to the Vpref that “as a rule takes the second or third position in the clause” (2012, 263). The we-qatal is thus to be identified by the long prefix verbal gram (VprefL). While it is true, as also the older grammars say, that we-qatal clauses exhibit meanings that are close to the imperfective VprefL, Joosten disregards Driver’s observation that there is always a pre-clause to a we-qatal clause to which the we-qatal clause refers.3 He is right that a previous clause is not necessarily a “yiqtol” clause (2012, 263 note 4). Joosten observes, that, “WEQATAL occupies the first position in the clause, YIQTOL in principle a non-first position. The semantic implications of this syntactic distinction are not straightforward: the dynamics of word order in biblical Hebrew are only partly understood” (2012, 264). These are fundamental observations, but the relation between VprefL and we-Vsuff remains a “dilemma” in Joosten’s discussion. He characterizes we-qatal as “a modal form largely synonymous with YIQTOL” (2012, 288).

Andrason
Alexander Andrason’s studies on we-qatal clauses in Biblical Hebrew represent a decisive step forward (2011; 2012). He uses a comparative Semitic perspective and discusses the Hebrew verbal system using the

3 Although he notes that “YIQTOL as a rule involves short sentences with one verbal form. WEQATAL could not have been used here” (Joosten 2012, 308).
results of grammaticalization theory. Grams have a history, and the qatal gram in particular has a history conforming to the resultative path, well-known from cross-linguistic studies by Joan Bybee and Östen Dahl (Bybee et al. 1994; Bybee and Dahl 1989; Dahl 2000). As a resultative gram the qatal in Biblical Hebrew can express all the nuances that weqatal does, even the future. “In all languages – both in those which do not possess morphological homologies of the BH weqatal as well in those that developed a similar formation – the simple and non-augmented successors of the PS *qatal(a) show modal and future uses which strictly correspond to the prototypical load of the weqatal and its cognates” (2012, 14). The important idea is that the qatal gram during its history aggregated meanings that are not necessarily related to one basic idea. There is a prototypical meaning (resultative: he is gone), and there are later meanings, like anterior (he has gone away), and perfective (he went away). And in later stages all the aggregated meanings can be living usage in particular text types and situations. The resultative may give rise to an optative meaning: Cursed are you > May you be cursed! or it may be used as performative, You are arrested! It may even describe a future situation, Tomorrow I am gone.

Andrason applies grammaticalization theory even on weqatal and pushes the discussion one step further. He proposes that weqatal is part of the history of qatal. He bluntly refuses that waw is able to ‘convert’ a verb form. Andrason’s conclusion that “weqatal appears to be a contextualisation of the original simple PS *qatal(a)” is correct (2011, 23).

The problem occurs when Andrason in accordance with traditional Hebrew grammars supposes weqatal to be a separate verbal grammatical morpheme. Andrason even admits that “the element -qatal – an integral part of the weqatal – must have the same resultative roots”

Andrason is not the first to use grammaticalization theory to explain the Biblical Hebrew verbal system. The first was probably Andersen (2000), but Andrason makes full use of the theory. Biblical Hebrew is regarded as a fully normal human language that is expected to behave according to patterns well-known among the languages of the world.
Bo Isaksson (2012, 3). He proposes that, at some point in the history of Hebrew we-qatal has developed to a new gram, “the originally autonomous segments having fused into a new conjugation” (2012, 4). Although this is what other scholars maintain as well, there are some problematic points to consider. If the we-qatal syntagm has merged to a conjugation weqatal, then we would expect that this weqatal could be preceded by another ‘free’ conjunction. We would expect that there occur in Biblical Hebrew clauses like we-weqatal, or kī weqatal, or āšer weqatal. But this never happens. There is no example that weqatal is preceded by a conjunction. We-qatal behaves syntactically as if the wə in the syntagm were a conjunction we.5

In order to make his conclusion sound reliable Andrason calls the simple conjunction wa “the coordinative-consecutive (and thus semantically contingent) conjunction *wa” (2012, 3). This is a mistake. The conjunction wa is not simply coordinative, but may introduce non-main clauses as well (Isaksson 2009, 117). And this wa is not in itself in any way consecutive. There is no evidence that wa is a consecutive conjunction.6

Another problematic point in Andrason’s study is that he disregards the clauses that Driver calls ‘the principal verb’ and in the present article are called ‘pre-clauses’. There is always a pre-clause to the following we-qatal clauses, and this is consistently ignored by Andrason, who adduces his examples as independent usages of an independent conjugation. This is a weakness that Andrason shares with many

---

5 It is the same problem with wayyiqtol. The grammars propose that this is a conjugation of its own, but there is no example of a wayyiqtol preceded by another ‘free’ conjunction. No clause kī wayyiqtol is attested. There is a restriction of word order, yes. But that does not mean that wayyiqtol is a gram of its own in Biblical Hebrew.

6 It may certainly introduce a result-clause as a we-qatal introducing an apodosis shows, but this does not mean that wa in itself marks consecutive events. Everyone who has seen a historical remark in Hebrew narrative prose coded by a noun clause with a fronted wa in a biblical narrative knows that. A historical background comment is not ‘consecutive’.
other treatments of we-qatal clauses, but it is nevertheless misleading. Andrason maintains that weqatal as a grammatical morpheme has “the

7 Andrason adduces some 30 examples of the “gram” we-qatal. In all of them there is a pre-clause. The examples (9) – (11) below are specifically adduced by Andrason as proofs of a “semantically independent – and not a contingent – gram” we-qatal (Andrason 2011, 12). Here follow all his examples with contextual clause linking analysis, in which a protasis is enclosed by parentheses. (1) is Gen. 18:26 (Andrason 2011, 2) with the linking (“im-VprefL) + we-Vsuff ‘(If I find fifty righteous people in the city of Sodom), I will spare the whole place for their sake.’ (NIV). (2) is Genesis 17:19-21 (Andrason 2011, 11) PA + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff]; PrP-Vsuff + [hinnē-Vsuff + [we-Vsuff]] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Onoun-VprefL] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Onoun-VprefL] + REL. (3) is Judg. 6:15-16 (Andrason 2011, 11) ʾkt-VprefL! + [we-Vsuff] future time. (4) is Gen. 28:20-21 (Andrason 2011, 12) (im-VprefL! + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff]) + we-Vsuff + [we-Onoun-VprefL] + [we-Onoun-VprefL]. (5) is 2 Samuel 15:33-36 (Andrason 2011, 12) (im-Vsuff) + we-Vsuff; (we- im-VprefL! + we-Vsuff) + we-Vsuff; [NCl] + we-haya + [Onoun-VprefL!]; [NCl] + we-Vsuff. (6) is 1 Samuel 11:3 (Andrason 2011, 12) (im-NCl-PA) + we-Vsuff. (7) is Gen. 2:24 (Andrason 2011, 12) ADV-VprefL + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff. (8) is Gen. 26:21-22 (Andrason 2011, 12) ʾkt-Vsuff + [we-Vsuff]. (9) is Amos 9:13-15 (Andrason 2011, 12) ʾhinnē-Onoun-PA + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Onoun-VprefL] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff]. (9) is Gen. 2:24 (Andrason 2011, 12) hinnē-Onoun-PA + we-Vsuff. (7) is Gen. 2:24 (Andrason 2011, 12) ADV-VprefL + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff. (8) is Gen. 26:21-22 (Andrason 2011, 12) ʾkt-Vsuff + [we-Vsuff]. (9) is Amos 9:13-15 (Andrason 2011, 12) ʾhinnē-Onoun-PA + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Onoun-VprefL] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff]. (10) is Exod. 16:6-7 (Andrason 2011, 13) [NCl-ADV] + we-Vsuff + [kī-Snoun-Vsuff] + [NCl-ADV] + we-Vsuff. (11) is Isa. 10:33–11:1 (Andrason 2011, 13) hinnē-NCl-PA ... + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Snoun-Vp prefL] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Snoun-Vp prefL]. (12) is Josh. 23:16 (Andrason 2011, 13) (PREP-VN + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff]) + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff. (13) is Exod. 19:5-6 (Andrason 2011, 13) (im-VNabs-Vp refL + we-Vsuff) + we-Vsuff. (14) is Num. 13:17-20 (Andrason 2011, 13) IMP + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff]. (15) is Ruth 2:7 (Andrason 2011, 14) VPrefA + [we-Vsuff]. (16) is 1 Sam. 10:1-4 (Andrason 2011, 14) regards only verse 4 which begins with we-Vsuff) (PREP-VN) + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + . . . + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + [PA] + [PA] + [PA] + [PA] + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff. (17) is 2 Kgs 5:6 (Andrason 2011, 14) (PREP-VN) + hinnē-Vsuff + we-Vsuff. (18) is 1 Sam. 17:32 (Andrason 2011, 14) al-Vp refS + [0-Snoun-Vp refL + we-Vsuff]. (19) is Amos 5:18-20 (Andrason 2011, 14) CONJ-Vp refL! + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff. (20) is Exod. 20:9 (Andrason 2011, 14) ADV-Vp refL + we-Vsuff ‘Six days you shall labor and at that do all your work’). (21) is Gen. 24:2-4 (Andrason 2011, 14) ʾkt-Vp refL + we-Vsuff. (22) is Exod. 34:33-35 (Andrason 2011, 15) (PREP-VN)-Vp refL! + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + kī-Vsuff] + we-Vsuff. (23) is Exod. 18:25-26
meaning of consecution” (2012, 1). But consecution is not a meaning, it is a clausal relation. A clause cannot be ‘consecutive’ without being linked to a preceding clause.

The articles by Andrason on the Hebrew verbal grams represent a significant step forward in the understanding of the Hebrew verbal system. The virtue of his investigation of we-Vsuff is his emphasis on the grammaticalization process as well as the importance of the comparative Semitic perspective. Andrason recognizes that we-Vsuff is a syntagm with genetic roots in the Vsuff ‘gram’ (grammatical morpheme). He has also recognized that its functions must be sought in a Hebrew innovation process since there are no (or very few) traces of a cognate construction (wa and Vsuff in a consecutive function) in other

(Andrason 2011, 15) 25wa-VprefS + wa-VprefS + 26[we-Vsuff + [Ø-Onoun-VprefL!]] + [we-Onoun-VprefL!]); a we-qatal clause that breaks the storyline and is qualified by two VprefL clauses that are in some sense circumstantial to the we-qatal. (24) is 2 Sam. 19:17-19 (Andrason 2011, 16) wa-VprefS + wa-VprefS + [NCI] + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff. (25) is Amos 7:4-5 (Andrason 2011, 16) hinnē-PA + [wa-VprefS + [we-Vsuff]]. (26) is 2 Sam. 13:19 (Andrason 2011, 16) wa-VprefS + [VNabs + [we-Vsuff]] ‘she went away [with a repeated walking [and at that she cried]]’. (27) is 1 Sam. 7:15-17 (Andrason 2011, 16) wa-VprefS + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff]. (28) is Num. 24:17-19 (Andrason 2012, 15) Ø-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + ... + we-Vsuff; archaic poetry. (29) is 2 Kgs 7:3-4 (Andrason 2012, 16) (im-Vsuff) + [NCI-PpP] + we-Vsuff, and (im-Vsuff) + we-Vsuff, and (im-VprefL) + Ø-VprefS, and (im-VprefL) + we-Vsuff. (30) is Gen. 26:10 (Andrason 2012, 16) NCI + [Ø-ADV-Vsuff + [we-Vsuff]] ‘What is this <you have done to us>? [For one of the people might easily have lain with your wife, [and at that you would have brought guilt upon us]]’.

A clause cannot be ‘consecutive’ without being linked to a preceding clause or clause complex. But the terminology ‘consecutive clause’ is not without merit. “Konsekutivsatz” is defined by Bußmann in such a way: “K. erläutern die Folgen, die sich aus dem im Hauptsatz bezeichneten Geschehen ergeben” (2002, 368). So where there is a consecutive clause there is also a ‘Hauptsatz’ (main clause). This does not mean that the we-qatal clauses should always be analysed as ‘non-main’. In many instances they are focal clauses and represent the core of the text (‘main-line’).

So in one sense Andrason is a revolutionary with an important message. In another perspective he maintains the traditional views and is dependent on the grammatical descriptions offered in current grammars.
We-qatal conjugation in BH

Semitic languages. So it is time to finally leave the ‘conversion’ theory (wa does not convert anything). It is time to discard the view that we-Vsuff is “equivalent to” a ‘yiqtol’. In this sense Andrason’s in-depth discussion of the we-Vsuff syntagm is an improvement of older positions often found in the Hebrew grammars.10

**Theses of the present article**

There are three main theories concerning the development and use of the Biblical Hebrew we-qatal (we-Vsuff).11 The first theory is aspectual and derives we-Vsuff directly from Old Canaanite stative qatala (thus Schüle 2000). The second theory regards we-Vsuff as a basically modal form (thus Joosten and Cook). The third theory is syntactic and regards the initial waw as ‘convertive’ and the ‘converted tense’ we-qatal as formed in analogy with the pair qatal/wayyiqtol (in which the wa is said to ‘convert’ the yiqtol to a qatal). In the latter view, we-qatal is a ‘converted’ yiqtol.

The present article adheres to none of these theories. Its starting point is the fact that some time between the Old Canaanite of the Amarna texts and the attested Biblical Hebrew texts, including those of archaic poetry, what could be called Proto-Hebrew lost its short final vowels. This had far-reaching consequences for the Hebrew verbal system. The old long prefix form yaqṭulu (VprefL) came to merge with the old short prefix form yaqṭul (VprefS) in most of the verbal paradigms. We know the effects of such a development since it is observable in the

---

10 If a methodological lesson is to be taught by our discussion of Andrason’s articles, it is that examples of verbal usages must be seen in a textual context, which he all too often fails to do. In a text every verb constitutes the predicate of a clause, and this clause is most often linked to other clauses. In order for an example of verbal usage to be convincingly examined it must be analysed within a complete semantic unit, such as the whole quotation of a direct speech – most of Andrason’s examples are from direct speech. Since the direct speech quotations presented in dialogues often constitute small complete Hebrew propositions, they are a store-house of reliable syntactic examples of Biblical Hebrew clause linking. If there are clausal relations in a direct quotation they are to be found within the pragmatically easy-to-detect (but in the text non-existent) ‘quotation marks’.

11 For this overview I am indebted to Notarius (2008, 51-52).
modern spoken Arabic dialects, which all represent the neo-Arabic language type in contrast to the classical Arabic system which has preserved the *yaqtulu/yuqtul* distinction.

In Proto-Hebrew this nearly complete merging of the morphology of the two conjugations gave rise to several strategies in order to maintain clarity and avoid confusion. The principal strategy was word order. The short prefix form (VprefS) was confined to clause-initial position and the long prefix form (VprefL) was used in other positions of the clause. This is a pattern that is observable even in the earliest texts of the Old Testament (Isaksson 2014b; 2015b).\(^{12}\)

When VprefL became obsolete in frontal position there was a need for an alternative encoding of a corresponding syndetic clause without a topicalized clausal element. *With* a topicalized object or subject or adverb or prepositional phrase the old syntax was still acceptable without causing confusion (the so-called ‘X-yiqtol’ or ‘X-VprefL’ pattern). A X-VprefL clause did not cause confusion, because the verb did not occupy initial position in the clause.

My thesis is that the we-Vsuff clause came to be used in cases when a VprefL clause could not be used, in cases when a topicalized element should not be used. This means in cases when the verb should be placed in clause-initial position. The clause type we-VprefL could not be used anymore, because it was perceived as a we-VprefS clause. In came (gradually) instead the we-Vsuff clause. This is the reason why the we-Vsuff clause increasingly came to ‘take over’ the semantic field of the VprefL.

The we-Vsuff was not negated because there was already an acceptable ‘old’ clause with the corresponding negated meaning, that is, the

---

\(^{12}\)There are exceptions to this rule, that do not lead to confusion between the forms. One exception is negative clauses. Modal *ʾal*-VprefS could, without confusion, be used in non-initial position, and indicative *lō*-VprefS was discarded. This means that a *lō*-yiqtol phrase always shows a long yiqtol.
We-\textit{lō}-VprefL clause.\textsuperscript{13} We-\textit{lō}-VprefL is the corresponding negative to we-Vsuff.

My thesis is that we-Vsuff was never created as a conjugation in a strict morphological sense of the word. We-Vsuff was a clause type that existed already in Amarna Canaanite. The ‘innovation’ is the increase of its semantic field, its intrusion into the functional field of the VprefL gram, and the frequency of this semantic spectrum. And with such meanings it began to develop an independent character, began to be regarded a gram of its own with the peculiar capacity of remaining a syndetic construction (the waw was always perceived as a normal waw).

My thesis is also that we-Vsuff is an ‘addition’ clause, built-up by the normal conjunction \textit{wa} and the normal gram Vsuff. The old conjunction \textit{wa} signifies an accompanying action. A clause with \textit{wa} depends in a certain specific sense on a preceding clause, which in this article is called the ‘pre-clause’. In English, a prototypical addition can be signaled by the English adverb ‘thereat’. An example with past time reference is \textit{I have seen John and he smoked a cigar} (Isaksson 2015c). In this English clause combining, the second clause is an addition, it can be formulated \textit{and thereat he smoked a cigar}. The action in the second clause accompanies the first, it presupposes the first clause, and it takes over the temporal reference of the first clause (Isaksson 2015c, 184-189). The semantic flexibility of the Vsuff gram made it possible for the corresponding addition clause we-Vsuff to widen its semantic field to the functions of the corresponding obsolete addition clause we-VprefL: future, modal, result, habitual action.

The aim of this article is to show that the we-Vsuff (‘we-qatal’) clause is an old type of clause with new innovative meanings. And that its basic function is that of an addition, an accompanying action (and meanings derived from that).

It follows from what has been said that there is nothing mystical with the Biblical Hebrew we-qatal clause type. The we-qatal syntagm is not

\textsuperscript{13} I owe this idea to Ambjörn Sjörs, see his dissertation (2015).
a new conjugation, but an old clause type that has acquired a wider semantic scope and that has come to be perceived as a ‘gram’ of its own in Standard Biblical Hebrew.

Discussion of some significant examples

According to the latest discussions of we-Vsuff clauses it is possible to discern a diachronic development of the we-qatal syntagm in Biblical Hebrew. Tania Notarius concludes in her recent analysis of archaic Biblical poetry that there “is an almost complete lack of the conditional, purposive, or future sequential use of וְקַּטַּל (Notarius 2013, 288). This is only to be expected. If parallel constructions are nearly absent in other Central Semitic languages, then we should expect to see at least traces of an internal development within Biblical Hebrew itself. An example of we-qatal clauses in archaic poetry is found in (1).

(1) Pattern: Ø-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

(What I see for them is not yet, What I behold will not be soon): A star is risen from Jacob, thereby a scepter comes forth from Israel; It smashes the brow of Moab, destroys all children of Seth. Edom becomes a possession, Yea, Seir a possession of its enemies’ (Num. 24:17-18).

This famous prophecy of Balaam is commonly held to be a piece of archaic poetry and is not easily compatible with what we usually perceive to be normal usage of we-qatal clauses. The introductory Vpref clauses (not quoted in the Hebrew text) sets the temporal reference point to some time in the future. The heart of the prophecy then turns to an asyndetic Vsuff clause. The listener perceives that the shift to a suffix verb raises the intenseness of the prophetic event by presenting it as something definite, a resultative meaning situated in the future: ‘a
star is risen from Jacob’. The V-suff clause dāraḵ raises the imagination of the listener by stating that the action already occurs in the vision of the prophet. This prophetic future is a well-known phenomenon in prophetic speech, but it is conspicuous that the following we-qatal clauses seem to have the same meaning as the initial asyndetic dāraḵ. This passage could then be seen as a confirmation of Notarius’ observation. There are some observations to be made from the example: 1) the Ø-Vsuff clause and the we-Vsuff clauses have the same temporal reference and have the same verbal aspect. 2) the we-Vsuff clauses follow after an initial asyndetic clause, dāraḵ. 3) there is no other variation in word-order, no subject or object is put before the verb. 4) If we-Vsuff in this context is just a ‘coordinated qatal’, then the series of five we-Vsuff clauses is quite spectacular: it is as if the poet wanted to avoid other positions of the verb. 5) Finally, it is possible to interpret the we-Vsuff clauses as having a semantic relation to the initial asyndetic Vsuff dāraḵ: the we-Vsuff clauses can be construed as coding something additive to the initial statement: a scepter is risen from Israel. The we-Vsuff clauses describe further details that are connected with this future event. It is not possible to interpret all we-Vsuff clauses as result clauses, some may be, but not all. If there is a consequence-result meaning in some of the we-Vsuff clauses this must be inferred from an analysis of the context, it is not explicitly coded by the we-Vsuff clauses themselves. The same holds for an interpretation of temporal succession. Some of the we-Vsuff clauses can be pressed to express temporal succession, but not all of them. So far this is a very early example of we-Vsuff clauses. We shall now turn to a late example.

Jan Joosten in his recent The verbal system of Biblical Hebrew (2012, 16-17) supplies an example of a ‘copulative’ we-qatal.

(2) Pattern: (quotation) + we-Vsuff + we-NEG-Vsuff; (cf Judg. 19:8)

"........"

וֹלְאָם הֶחֱרָ֣שְיוֹהָ֔ו לִֽא־עָנָ֥וּ אָ֖תְו ְ ְ

‘“....” But the people were silent and did not say a word in reply’ (2 Kings 18:36; TNK).
The we-Vsuff clause in this passage comes directly after a long speech by the commander of the Assyrian army outside the walls of Jerusalem. This coding, of what looks like a narrative thread, by a we-Vsuff clause appears to Joosten to be non-classical Hebrew syntax. You would possibly have expected a wayyiqtol syntagm here. It is hard to interpret this wo-hehärššā with some of the usual functions of the we-qatal syntagm: it is certainly not modal, it is not future, it is not purposive, it is not a result clause, and it is hardly either habitual action. The people on the walls kept silent not as a reaction to the speech but on the command of king Hiskia. But what can be stated about the we-Vsuff clause is that it certainly is an action that accompanies the speech of the Assyrian commander: they kept silent.

In view of the diachronic extremes in the usage of the we-Vsuff type of clause, it is reasonable to suppose that we-Vsuff went through a diachronic development from the earliest stage represented by the archaic poetry, a stage which in this respect resembles the earliest Northwest Semitic inscriptions, including the Aramaic ones. Then the we-Vsuff clause took over some accompanying action usages from the VprefL gram and developed an exceptionally broad semantic spectrum including modal meanings, future, and habituality. The end stage constituted a return to the ‘normal’ Vsuff meanings in addition position, that is, additive wo plus the Vsuff gram. It is reasonable to suppose that this renewed additive narrative we-Vsuff should be understood in the light of the gradual displacement of narrative wayyiqtol by the qatal and the we-Vsuff syntagms.

In the rest of this article I intend to discuss the usage of we-Vsuff in Standard Biblical Hebrew, especially in Genesis. Example (3) is an instance of a conditional clause linking (COND).

(3) Pattern: (im-VprefL + [we-Vsuff]) + we-vsuff;

"(אֶפְּרָבָה שֶׁפֶר אֲלֵי הַמַּחֲנֶה הַשָּׁוָּאֶל הַמַּחֲנֶה הַאַחַת) וּוּוּה הֳָָּיָָּׁ֛ה מַחֲנֶה פָּלֶֽיֶהְזָ‍אָלִישּׁו (אֱלֹהֵי הָמוֹת הֳָָּיָָּׁ֛ה מַחֲנֶה פָּלֶֽיֶהְזּ) (If Esau comes to the one camp and attacks it), then the camp that is left will escape." (Gen. 32:9; ESV).

Basically, a COND-linking consists of two parts, the protasis and the apodosis. Usually, conditional clause linkings are more complicated
than in (3), but this example permits some basic observations. The example constitutes one finished direct speech. We do not run the risk of quoting out of a complicated clause complex, the utterance consists of only those three clauses. Because of its simplicity we can analyse it with more confidence. My observations are:

1. It is not evident that the linking consists of one subordinated clause and one main clause. A condition is stated, of course, and there is a consequence that is valid if the condition is fulfilled. But also consequence clauses are usually classified as subordinate. There is no clear main line in this utterance. On the contrary there seems to be two non-main sections, one conditional and one consequential. The whole utterance, the whole message, is a condition and a possible consequence. So a conditional clause combining may contain an important insight, and this insight is contained in both the protasis and the apodosis. None is meaningful without the other. Admittedly, there is a difference of focality. The consequence clause, the apodosis, is a ‘focal clause’ in Dixon’s cross-linguistic semantic scheme and the condition is semantically speaking the supporting clause (Dixon 2009, 6).

2. The apodosis is a we-Vsuff clause (wa-hāyā) but it has not a clear modal nuance, no compelling meaning. The apodosis is just a consequence clause.

3. The most important observation in (3), however, is that the protasis consists of a complex of two clauses, of which the second is a we-Vsuff clause, we-hikkāhū. We must stop here, and examine the clausal relations within the protasis. What is the relation between the VprefL in the protasis and the we-Vsuff in the same protasis? Since we-hikkāhū is not an apodosis, what does it express? It is possible to think of we-hikkāhū as expressing a temporal succession: if Esau comes to the camp and then attacks it. But this is not the most natural interpretation. The function of the we-hikkāhū in the protasis is to add another condition. The condition becomes more specific by the we-Vsuff

---

14 The terms ‘focal clause’ and ‘supporting clause’ refer to the semantics of a clause linking, whereas ‘main clause’ and ‘non-main clause’ refer to the syntactic coding.
clause: The condition contains two specific events: if Esau arrives, and also attacks the camp. So why is there a shift of ‘tenses’ at all in the protasis? Because there is a specific semantic relation between the VprefL and the we-Vsuff clause: something is added, and there is no need to topicalize a clausal element by a clause-initial position.

4. But one intriguing observation from example (3) remains to be done. In example (3) there is no specific syntactic marking of the apodosis. There are admittedly two we-Vsuff clauses in the example, but only one is contained in the apodosis, or codes the apodosis, the other codes an addition and is contained in the protasis. We must conclude that in this direct speech quotation, only the protasis is syntactically marked, it is marked by the conjunction ʾim. We cannot, from the syntactic coding alone, conclude where the apodosis begins. The beginning of the apodosis must be inferred from the pragmatic and semantic context, and, possibly, from intonation.\textsuperscript{15}

Another important example of a we-Vsuff addition is (4).

(4) Pattern: we-Snoun-Vsuff + [we-Vsuff];

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{כָּנָּו הַיָּוְהָיָוְּאֶת־מַקֶּנֶּאָו} & \text{[וְהֶחֱרַיַּעֲקַבֶּנֶּאָו בָּאָמָּא]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘But his sons were with his livestock in the field, so Jacob held his peace until they came.’ (Gen. 34:5; ESV).

Example (4) shows another instance of an indicative statement of fact followed by a we-Vsuff clause. In contrast to example (3) it is not taken from direct speech. Both clauses are part of a background information explaining why Jacob did not react directly when his daughter had been righth. There is an initial real world situation (Jacob’s sons were not at home) and an accompanying action added to this situation (Jacob did not react) coded by a we-Vsuff clause. In this context the accompanying action receives a nuance of result: ‘so Jacob

\textsuperscript{15} It is quite possible that the change of accent in some we-qatal clauses (to the we-\textit{najatī́} pattern) is the residue of an intonation signal of a consequence clause (beginning of apodosis).
held his peace’. In the example the we-Vsuff clause expresses a non-modal past tense. The we-Vsuff clause is indicative, and possibly also has a nuance of continuous action. The next example with two we-Vsuff clauses is a little more complicated.

(5) Pattern: Snoun-PA + kī-NCl + we-Snoun-PA + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff];

אֲדֹנִי יִדְעֵי אֲכִילָה
וּדְפַקְוּם אֲחֵד
וַּמְתָכוֹל־הַצָּאן
׃

‘My lord knows that the children are tender and that the ewes and cows with me are nursing their young. So if they are driven hard just one day, all the animals will die.’ (Gen. 33:13).

In example (5), in the direct speech of Jacob, two clauses dependent on the conjunction kī describe facts that he expects Esau to know: that the children are tender (NCl) and that the ewes and cows are nursing their young (we-Snoun-PA). This is a statement of fact and the two we-Vsuff clauses that follow are related to the latter situation with the nursing ewes and cows. Taken as a whole the two we-Vsuff clauses are possible additional actions to the nursing situation. They describe two accompanying actions, but these actions are only potential. It is something that may happen, an action that is feared to accompany the nursing of the young. The we-Vsuff clauses describe two possible accompanying action. Which means that if they are driven hard they will die. In their mutual relation, the first we-Vsuff clause can be interpreted as a protasis and the second as an apodosis. In this case we

16 This kind of semantic inference is very common in cross-linguistic perspective, as in the English example of an addition with result nuance, [Mary left John]sc and he went into a monastery (Dixon 2009, 28).

17 BHS suggests a reading with wa-Vpref$ ישֶׁרָם$ instead.

18 There is an exegetical problem involved here, in that most translators interpret the participle ʿālōṯ as being an attribute to the preceding nouns (‘the ewes and cows that are nursing’) in spite of the fact that the participle lacks determination. I interpret the participle instead as the predicate of the noun clause, parallel with rakkîm in the previous clause.
see that neither the protasis nor the apodosis is specifically marked as such and that their mutual relation must be inferred from the context. Why is it then that the protasis in this case is not coded in the usual way with *ʾim* and VprefL? I suggest that the reason for coding the protasis as we-Vsuff is that both clauses together express an addition to the ewes and cows nursing the young: may be they are driven hard a certain day and then die. Instances like this with two we-Vsuff clauses are often quoted in isolation as proofs of an independent use of the we-Vsuff syntagm. But we-Vsuff clauses should never be quoted out of context. They are always dependent on a pre-clause or a pre-clause complex. Example (5) is an irrealis case which indicates that the we-Vsuff is neutral in this respect. It may express indicative action or modal meanings. A modal meaning is found in example (6).

(6) Pattern: PrP-VprefL! + we-Vsuff + ‗...‘;

‘You are to say the same thing to Esau when you meet him. And be sure to say,”Your servant Jacob is coming behind us.”’ (Gen. 32:20-21; NIB).

Example (6) shows how Jacob’s command, coded by a VprefL verb, is followed by a we-Vsuff clause. This is a very common construction of clauses in a command or an instruction: first a long yiqtol and then a we-Vsuff clause. It is not a conditional linking, but also here the basic pattern is repeated: the we-Vsuff clause is used after another initial clause. How are we to define the clausal relation between the VprefL and the we-Vsuff clause? It is certainly not one of temporal succession. The main obligation is stated already with the VprefL clause. Rather, the we-Vsuff clause is a clause coding an addition that should accompany the previous action-command. They should be sure to say thereat, that Jacob is coming behind.

The same kind of addition meaning is found in (7):

(7) Pattern: VprefL! + we-Vsuff;

‘The same kind of addition meaning is found in (7):’
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‘I will surely make you prosper and will make your descendants like the sand of the sea’ (Gen. 32:13; NIB).

In example (7) the we-Vsuff clause is preceded by an emphatic VprefL clause (the emphasis being coded by an inf. abs.). The yiqtol clause expresses a more general statement and the we-Vsuff clause expresses an accompanying action. The temporal reference is future time.

In the following examples, we-Vsuff clauses are discussed more systematically, according to the type and meaning of the pre-clause.

A. VprefL + we-Vsuff (future)

The most frequent type of pre-clause is probably the VprefL clause. VprefL clauses often express future action or habitual action, and this is the reason why we-Vsuff clauses so often also express future or habitual meanings.

Future meaning: promises and prophecies

Promises and prophecies are typical contexts in which we-Vsuff clauses code actions accompanying an initial VprefL clause. There is no need to give many examples of this kind of linking. Here only a few are shown.19

(8) Pattern: ʾal-VprefS + [Ø-Snoun-VprefL + we-Vsuff]; future

אַל־י פ ָ֥לְל ב־אָדַָּ֖םְעָּּ֑יוְ עַּב ד ךְֵ֣י ל ֵ֔ךְְו נ ל חַַּ֖םְע ם־הַּפ ל ש ת ָ֥יְהַּזִֶֽה

‘Let no man's heart fail because of him; [for thy servant will go and thereat fight with this Philistine]’ (1 Sam. 17:32).

In example (8) the initial negated jussive uttered by the young and bold David is followed by a long prefix verb clause with a fronted subject noun (ʼâbdoḵā ṿêleḵ). That the yiqtol is long is signaled by the word order (‘X-VprefL’). The function of the asyndetic VprefL clause

19 Other instances are Gen. 24:40, 32:13, 32:43, 2 Kgs 3:18.
is to express the *reason* for the confidence formulated in the jussive clause. What concerns us here is the we-Vsuff clause, *we-nilham ....* It is semantically connected to the VprefL clause and codes an action that will accompany David’s going forward. He will fight. Syntactically, the two clauses are of equal status, but as is often the case when a VprefL verb like *yēlek* codes a motion, the we-Vsuff clause receives the nuance of motion purpose in Dixon’s sense: “the Supporting clause describes some motion which is undertaken to facilitate the event of the Focal clause” (Dixon 2009, 45). Semantically speaking, the we-Vsuff clause is the focal clause and the VprefL clause (*ʻabdal yēlek*) is a supporting clause. In a case like this it would be correct to translate the passage ‘for thy servant will go [to fight with this Philistine]’, although this is not expressly coded in the syntax.

An example with continuous action in the future is found in the story about Jacob and Laban in Paddan Aram (9).

(9) Pattern: VprefL + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff];

\[\text{אמֶלֶל הִכָּלְכָל הָלֵם ... וְעִמְּנָהָה בַּיְצָּדָה יֵבְוֹומָּחַר} \]

‘I will go through the flock and pick out ... [and that will thereat be my wages]. [And thereat I will let my integrity stand as witness against me in the future]’ (Gen. 30:32-33).

In example (9) Jacob expresses his intention to go through the flock and pick out the speckled or spotted, and that will be his wages. And thereat his honesty will witness for him. The two we-Vsuff clauses receives their future and intentional meanings from the initial VprefL clause. Since the VprefL clause has also a continuous meaning, something Jacob will go on doing during possibly a whole day, this continuous meaning is also perceived in the we-Vsuff clauses.

A promise has always a future meaning, and this is the case in example (10).

---

20 It is significant here that the clause is asyndetic (Isaksson 2014b, 129, 132, 134; 2015a), but this is not the topic of the present article.
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(10) Pattern: Onoun-VprefL + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

והָּאָֹ֗רֶץְ «אֲשִֶ֤רְאַּתָּהְַ֙ש כ ֵ֣בְעָּלֵֶ֔יהְָּ » לֵךְ אָֹּ֗בְהָּל לְרַַ֖לָּהְוּ בָּֽקָרְאַּתָּהְַ֙ש כ רַַ֖לָּהְוּ בָּֽקַּּעֲפֵַּ֣רְהָּאֵָּ֔רֶץְוּפָּרַּצ תְָָּׁ֛יָָּ֥מָּהְ

‘I will give you and your descendants the land on which you are lying. And thereat your descendants will be like the dust of the earth, and you will spread out to the west and to the east, to the north and to the south. And all peoples on earth will be blessed through you and your offspring.’ (Gen. 28:13b-14).

In (10) the promise of a homeland is uttered to Jacob by the Lord in a dream. The we-Vsuff clauses express actions that will accompany the fulfillment of this promise. His descendant will be like the dust of the earth, he will spread out and he will be a blessing to all people. The VprefL clause and three we-Vsuff clauses are of equal status. Another promise is found in (11).

(11) Pattern: VNabs-VprefL + we-VNabs-VprefL + [we-VprefS] + [we-Vsuff + [CONJ-Vsuff]];

בָּרֵ֣ךְְאֲבָּרֶכְּוִּ֣הְאִֶֽת־זַּר עֲךְַ֙כְּכֹמַּיְוָּנֶָ֑ג בָּהְו נ ב רֲכָ֥וְּב ךְָ֛כָּּל־מ ש פ ח ָ֥תְהָּאֲדָּמַָּ֖הְוּב זַּר עִֶֽך

‘I will bless you so abundantly, and I will multiply your offspring as the stars of heaven and as the sand that is on the seashore [that your offspring will possess the gate of his enemies]. [And thereat all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in your offspring, because you have obeyed my voice].’ (Gen. 22:17-18).

In (11) two promises are expressed by VprefL clauses. Confronted with this example we need to ask why the biblical author did not switch to we-Vsuff clauses directly after the first yiqtol. The VprefL clauses are seemingly of equal status and both concern the offspring. The Lord will bless Abraham and multiply his descendants. After the

21 I am aware that the Vpref clauses may be cohortatives. The example also contains a we-Vpref clause that should be interpreted as a modal purposive we-VprefS clause according to J-M § 116 (in spite of the fact that most translators render it with ‘and’ as a third promise).
two in first person there is a switch to the third person and a we-
VprefS clause with purpose nuance (J-M § 116). After three prefix
verb clauses comes a switch to the we-Vsuff wə-hitbərāḵā, and this
clause concerns the nations of the earth. The nations of the earth will
thereat be blessed, or call themselves blessed, in Abraham’s offspring.
The example illustrates that the shift to a we-Vsuff clause is not done
automatically after the first VprefL clause. The two initial VprefL
clauses, blessing and multiplying, are given equal emphasis by the
constructions with clause-initial infinitive absolutes. The we-Vsuff
clause is semantically less marked.

(12) Pattern: (IMP+IMP) + we-Snoun-VprefL + [we-VprefS + we-
VprefS] + [we-Vsuff];

‘then God Almighty will bless you [to make you fruitful and multiply
you]; [and thereat/so you will become a company of peoples]’ (Gen.
28:2-3).

Example (12) is not supplied to discuss whether the three Vpref are
long or short – in my analysis the first is long\(^\text{22}\) – but to illustrate how
a we-Vsuff clause after three other clauses in a promise may come to
express result nuances in a translation. The additive meaning ‘and
thereat you will become a company of peoples’ receives in this con-
text a nuance of a consequence-result or purpose clause, ‘so that you
become ...’.

Habitual meaning

Habitual meaning is also a well-known property of some we-Vsuff
clauses, but in such cases the habitual action is usually signaled in the
initial clause and the context.

\(^{22}\) I take the following Vpref clauses as modal purpose clauses of the third person
in accord with J-M § 116.
(13) Pattern: kī-PrP-VprefL + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

‘for out of that well the flocks were watered ... and thereat all the flocks were gathered there, the shepherds rolled the stone from the mouth of the well and watered the sheep, and put the stone back in its place over the mouth of the well.’ (Gen. 29:2-3).

Example (13) illustrates how a habitual action is described first by an initial VprefL clause with habitual meaning (‘they used to be watered’). After this comes a series of no less than four accompanying actions that amounts to an elaboration: we are informed of the procedure of the watering (thereat the flocks were gathered, etc.). Since the general setting is narrative the temporal reference of the we-Vsuff clauses becomes past time.

A well-known passage with habitual action is the one about the giants on earth in ancient times (14). Also in this text a we-Vsuff clause codes an accompanying action.

(14) Pattern: Snoun-Vsuff + [CONJ-VprefL + we-Vsuff];

‘The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, [when the sons of God came in to the daughters of man and they thereat bore children to them]’ (Gen. 6:4).

The we-Vsuff clause (wa-yālāḏā lā-hem) in example (14) is an accompanying action to the VprefL clause with the verb yāḥō ī, which expresses a habitual action in the distant past. Because of this, we-Vsuff takes over the meaning of habituality with past reference. The we-Vsuff clause about the daughters of man bearing children to the giants is an accompanying action to the previous action that the giants came in to the daughters. In such an instance, the we-Vsuff clause easily takes a nuance of consequence-result (‘temporal linking’ in additions, Dixon 2009, 28).
Part of a possible consequence scenario

Dixon’s possible consequence means that the supporting clause is typically unsatisfactory, and this is often in Biblical Hebrew coded by the conjunction *pen* and a long yiqtol clause. Example (15) is the case when Jacob fears his brother Esau’s revenge.

(15) Pattern: IMP + *ki*-NC1-PA + [*pen*-VprefL + we-Vsuff];

ַפֶ֣ן־יָ֣בֵוֹאְו ה כֵַּּ֔נ יְא ַ֖םְעַּּל־בָּנ ִֽים

‘Please deliver me from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau, for I fear him, [that he may come and thereat attack me, the mothers with the children].’ (Gen. 32:12).

The possible consequence is introduced by the *pen* particle and VprefL (the typical syntax) ‘that he may come’. Then another action is introduced which accompanies the first, coded by a we-Vsuff clause, Esau is supposed to attack Jacob with mothers and children.

Another possible consequence scenario is likewise connected with Jacob, but now it concerns his father Isaac who might unmask the theatre planned by his mother Rebecka (16).

(16) Pattern: ADV-VprefL + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

אֵֽלּיְי מֻש ַ֙נ יְַ֙אָב ֵ֔יְו הָּי ָ֥ית יְב ע ינַָּ֖יוְכּ מ תַּע ת ָ֑עְַּו ה ב את ְָ֥

‘Perhaps my father will feel me, and thereat I shall seem to be mocking him, and will bring a curse upon myself and not a blessing.’ (Gen. 27:12).

The possible scenario in (16) is introduced by the VprefL clause ʾūlay ʾomuṣṣēnî. It is then elaborated by two we-Vsuff clauses which express actions that might accompany his father’s touching him.

Instructional discourse

Instructional discourse is a hot topic in Hebrew text linguistics and we-Vsuff clauses are used extensively in instruction and procedure. A simple example is (17).
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(17) Pattern: ADV-VprefL + we-Vsuff;

‘Six days you shall labor and thereat do all your work’ (Exod. 20:9).

The initial commandment is complemented by another commandment, coding an action that should accompany the first. The we-Vsuff clause is a commandment in this context, but it is not something that is expected to occur after the six days, it is performed during the six days. Nor is the we-Vsuff clause a consequence or purpose clause. It just means that during the six days all work must be done.

Performative pre-clause

A we-Vsuff clause may follow after a performative action, in this instance coded by a VprefL clause (archaic poetry):

(18) Pattern: kī-VprefL + we-Vsuff;

‘For I lift up my hand to heaven and thereat I swear, “As I live forever”’ (Deut. 32:40).

In this example the lifting of the hand in an oath is accompanied by the saying of the phrase ‘As I live forever’. The we-Vsuff clause does not express a sequential action that is performed after the lifting of the hand, but an action that accompanies the lifting. The saying and the lifting can be simultaneous, of course, but simultaneousness is not the important idea here, only that the saying of the oath accompanies, is connected with, the lifting of God’s hand. We can easily observe in this example that we-Vsuff does not express a consequence: the saying is not the result of the lifting of the hand. On the other hand there is a clear semantic connection between the two actions. The few examples of we-Vsuff clauses with meanings close to a VprefL might indicate that the end of the psalm is a later addition (Isaksson 2015b).
A parable story

A parable story is encountered in Amos 5. It is a parable of the misery met with on the day of the Lord:

(19) Pattern: CONJ-VprefL! + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

‘As when a man flees from a lion, and thereat a bear meets him, and he goes home, leans his hand against the wall, and a snake bites him’ (Amos 5:19).

The misery of the day of the Lord is exemplified with a day when everything goes wrong, all is misfortune. When we examine the we-Vsuff clauses it is impossible to find out a causal relation between the we-Vsuff clauses. We could compare with a legal ‘case’. This is the case with the day of the Lord. The initial clause that sets the tone is a distinctively long prefix verb. All the misfortunes on that day are added to the first one without syntactical distinction. It is a day of misfortune when all bad things happen on the same day. The we-Vsuff clauses are additions and semantically dependent in the sense that they all refer to the same bad day introduced by the VprefL clause.

B. Cohortative+we-Vsuff (modal)

Modality is one of the possible nuances of we-Vsuff clauses and one way of taking over a modal meaning is by being preceded by a cohortative clause.

(20) Pattern: VprefA + we-Vsuff;

‘let us make a covenant, you and I. And let it be a witness between you and me.’ (Gen. 31:44).

In (20) the modal tone in the cohortative is taken over by the we-Vsuff clause. Not all covenants are concluded with an ʿēḏ, but this is: a witness will accompany the making of this covenant. When they have agreed, Jacob goes without further ado to a stone and sets it up for a
pillar. That would be the witness of the covenant. So the we-haya is something additional to be done in the covenant action. Let us make a covenant, and thereat let the covenant be visible in the form of an 'ēḏ, a massēḥā. Another example of a cohortative pre-clause is found in (21).

(21) Pattern: IMP + we-VprefA + we-VprefA + [we-Vsuff ] + we-VprefA;

ניקי הלך במקלחת ושהשלחתו במקרו הרחקה המר

‘Come now, let us kill him and throw him into one of the pits. [Thereat we say that a fierce animal has devoured him]. Let us see what will then become of his dreams!’ (Gen. 37:20).

In (21) the main action is the corporate modal intention to kill Joseph. This modality is coded by an imperative and two cohortative clauses. But an accompanying action is coded by the we-Vsuff clause expressing intention to conceal the main action. The we-Vsuff action does not express the purpose of the killing. It is not a result of the main action, and it is not a follow-up. The act of saying that a wild animal has devoured him is an action that is intended to accompany the main action of killing Joseph, in order to assure them freedom of punishment, to assure them not to be unmasked. This ‘thereat’ is not a simple attendant circumstance (‘while...’), but an action that accompanies the action of killing in the future.

Another example of instruction with cohortative is (22).

(22) Pattern: we-IMP + we-VprefA + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff];

לך והקחלו יום טוב עליך מחוות אימים קארא איו אתו אסף ירא אדוני [הכהן]

I disregard in this instance that the we-VprefA clauses express a purpose in the first person, J-M § 116.
'bring me two good young goats, so that I may prepare from them delicious food for your father, such as he loves. [And thereat you shall bring it to your father] [and he shall eat].' (Gen. 27:9-10).

In (22) the accompanying action is physically something that comes after the preparing of the food. Although sequentiality is not specifically coded by the we-Vsuff clause it is inferred here.

C. IMP + we-Vsuff

An imperative clause is fairly often followed by a we-Vsuff clause, but this is by no means a rule. It is rather more common that imperative clauses are concatenated.

A somewhat complex clause structure is found in the instruction for Noah’s Ark (23), which involves one imperative, one long prefix verb and one we-Vsuff clause.

(23) Pattern: IMP + [Ø-Onoun-VprefL] + we-Vsuff;

‘Make yourself an ark of gopher wood making rooms in the ark, and thereat you shall cover it inside and out with pitch.’ (Gen. 6:14).

The main general command in (23) is coded by an imperative, ‘make yourself an ark’. This general command is supplied with details by an asyndetic circumstantial VprefL clause ‘making rooms for the ark’. What concerns us for the moment is the we-Vsuff clause, which is not about the rooms referred to in the VprefL clause but qualifies the imperative and concerns the whole ark: the ark should be covered inside and out with pitch. It is an action that should accompany the building of the ark (but the VprefL and the we-Vsuff may also be interpreted as two equal status clauses that together form a circumstantial complex related to the IMP main clause). The next example (24) shows three concatenated imperative clauses and a single we-Vsuff clause.

(24) Pattern: 3×IMP + [we-Vsuff];
We-qatal conjugation in BH

‘Now therefore, my son, obey my voice. Arise, flee to Laban my brother in Haran, [and stay with him a while]’ (Gen. 27:43-44; ESV).

In (24) we can once again observe how a we-Vsuff clause takes over the temporal and modal meaning of the previous clauses. In this case the we-Vsuff clause receives the tone of a commandment or instruction: ‘and thereat stay with him’. This conspicuous syntax, with three imperatives and a final we-Vsuff conveys meaning to the text. The three imperatives all concern Jacobs move to Haran. The we-Vsuff clause concerns what he should do when having arrived. It is an action that should accompany his arrival, the last imperative: ‘thereat you shall stay with him a while’.

Example (24) is a simple illustration how instructional discourse with one or several or many we-Vsuff clauses works: first an initial imperative or jussive or other type of command or advice, and then a series of we-Vsuff clauses that states which actions that should accompany the initial ones.\textsuperscript{24} Another example is (25).

\textbf{(25) Pattern: IMP + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff];}

וחתםְאתהְ [ְ] ושלחְלהםְמהרה [ְ] ولקחתְמשםְשמן [ְ] עתְבאְביתהְאלישבְבןְאשיהוְ [ְ] בחתםך

‘And now: go into the house of ʾElyāšīb, the son of ʾEšyāhū [and take thereat from there a pitcher with oil] [and send to them hastily] [and seal it with your own seal]’ (Arad(6):17,3).

(25) is a letter from Tell Arad in which the writer commands Naḥūm to enter the house of Elyašīb and thereat take oil etcetera. Renz and Röllig (1995 I, 361) comments on this type of we-Vsuff clauses in the Hebrew inscriptions and concludes that “Syntaktisch dürfte der mit Prf. und w- eingeleitete Satz zum folgenden Hauptsatz einen Umstandssatz darstellen”. No, it is not directly circumstantial, although Renz and Röllig are right when they feel that there is a special connection between the we-Vsuff clauses and the previous command in the

\textsuperscript{24} A similar example with a move (IMP) and a we-qatal clause coding an accompanying action to be performed at arrival is Gen. 16:9.
letters. It is an addition, an accompanying action. The letter gives instructions what to do when Naḥūm has fulfilled the command of entering the house.

D. Vsuff + we-Vsuff (anterior)

A we-Vsuff clause may follow a Vsuff clause, sometimes with habitual meaning in the past, sometimes without habitual action. A non-habitual meaning is found in (26).

(26) Pattern: ki-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

Now Esau saw that Isaac had blessed Jacob and thereat had sent him away to Paddan-aram to take a wife from there.’ (Gen. 28:6).

The we-Vsuff clause in this verse is connected to the fact that Isaac had blessed Jacob. The we-Vsuff clause forms part of the clause complex that describes what Esau came to realize as a brother of Jacob. The sending of Jacob to Paddan Aram was an action that accompanied the blessing. None of the clauses signifies repeated action. It is one action in the past. What differs between the two clauses is that the we-Vsuff clause codes an action that accompanies the blessing. The we-Vsuff clause is indicative and additive in relation to the Vsuff clause. The sending of Jacob is not the purpose of the blessing, nor is it the result of the blessing. It is just an accompanying action.

Example (27) from 2 Kgs is similar to the letters found among the Arad ostraca:

(27) Pattern: hinnē-Vsuff + [we-Vsuff];

‘With this letter I am sending my servant Naaman to you, [and thereat you shall cure him of his leprosy].’ (2 Kgs 5:6).

As in the Arad letter above we-Vsuff (wa-āṣapiō) signifies an accompanying action. But in this case the preceding action is not an imperative but a suffix verb clause which could be interpreted as a performative in letter style, or possibly a simple anterior, ‘I have sent
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Naaman to you’. This time the we-Vsuff clause does not take over the temporal reference of the preceding clause, but is interpreted by the reader as a command. The accompanying action wa-āṣap̄ā cannot just be an anterior – that would not make sense. We infer that it is meant as an obligation. In this instance the we-Vsuff receives a modal meaning, and shows the intrusion of the we-Vsuff clause type into the semantic field of the VprefL gram even when the pre-clause has not a meaning close to a VprefL clause.

A habitual action is encountered in (28).

(28) Pattern: we-Snoun-Vsuff + [we-Vsuff];

"אֶת הַחֵל ָ֥ףְאֶת־מַש כֻּר ת ַ֖יְעֲשֵֶ֣רֶתְמ נ ָ֑ים"

‘yet your father has cheated me [and thereat changed my wages ten times]’ (Gen. 31:7).

In this example the we-Vsuff clause has a habitual meaning, which is signaled by the adverbial expression ‘ten times’. Also this example shows that a we-Vsuff may take on meanings that are not explicit in the pre-clause.

We get an illustration of the accompanying actions coded by we-Vsuff clauses in the Deir ‘Allā inscription (29), which is usually classified as Aramaic, but by some scholars South-Canaanite or Ammonite:

(29) Pattern: Snoun-Vsuff+[w-Vsuff] + [w-Vsuff];

"אֶל הָשִׁיאַדְוִי 6 מִצְאַב שֶדָּיִים מֵעָבִד אֶל־עָשָּׁר לֵשׁ[שׁ ]"

‘The gods gathered together; [and thereat the Shaddayin took their places as the assembly] [and they said to the Sh …]’ (KAI 5 312 I:6).

In (29) it is admittedly hard to make reliable conclusions about the context. But we can observe that the syntax of a Vsuff clause and several following w-Vsuff clauses is found also here. It is a conspicuous syntax, and the word order cannot be just by accident. After an initial Vsuff (the pre-clause) follow w-Vsuff clauses also in this dialect, and they seem to code single accompanying actions within a narrative framework. In this language, the w-Vsuff clauses have the same past perfective meaning as the initial Vsuff clause.
E. 'im and apodosis we-Vsuff (conditional clause linking)

Conditional clause linking is often presented as an affair between just two clauses. The linguistic reality is not that simple, which is illustrated by an example from Genesis 28.

(30) Pattern: (ʾim-VprefL + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff) + we-Vsuff;

‘(If God will be with me, and thereat watches over me on this journey I am undertaking and gives me food to eat and clothes to wear and I return safely to my father’s household), thereat the Lord will be my God’ (Gen. 28:20-21).

In (30) Jacob is making a vow to the Lord, and the vow is done with several requirements or qualifications. The ʾim-clause with its VprefL yihye, is followed by three we-Vsuff clauses within the protasis that form part of the provisions that Jacob formulates in order to be willing to enter a covenant with the Lord. The initial ‘If God will be with me’ is further qualified by specified events that should accompany God’s being with Jacob: if God will be with me, and thereat watches over me, and thereat gives me food and clothes and I thereat return safely to my father’s household .... Only the last we-Vsuff clause contains the resulting clause, but this apodosis is not specifically marked as such, it is just another we-Vsuff clause. It is as if the apodosis did not need to be marked; it was enough just to mark its function by some special emphasis or intonation: thereat, with these conditions fulfilled, the Lord will become my God.25 It seems that our English ‘If ... then ... ‘ clausal pattern is not needed in Hebrew. There was no need to specifically mark the apodosis.

A simple example of the same semantic coding is (31), where the apodosis also can be interpreted as expressing an accompanying action.

25 A similar example is Exod. 19:5.
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(31) Pattern: (ʾim-Vsuffix) + we-Vsuffix;

‘(If you go with me), you will thereat be a burden to me’ (2 Sam. 15:33).

In (31) David speaks to Hushai that he should return to Absalom instead of staying with him. The apodosis could of course be translated as ‘then you will become a burden to me’, but exactly that is not coded. The we-Vsuffix clause also here expresses an accompanying action: thereat you will become a burden to me.

F. Indicative VprefS + we-Vsuffix

The we-Vsuffix clause coding an accompanying action may follow also a VprefS clause with indicative meaning, and a good example is (32):

(32) Pattern: wa-VprefS + “...” + [we-Vsuffix];

‘Abraham said, “I will swear.” [And thereat Abraham complained to Abimelech about a well of water that Abimelech’s servants had seized]’ (Gen. 21:24-25).

In the context of (32) Abraham is about to enter a covenant with king Abimelek. But he has a complaint, so when he utters the words ʾānōḵī ʾissāḇēaʾ, he does it, not with the expected performative suffix verb, but with a futural imperfective VprefL meaning ‘I will swear’ (thus ESV). It is as if he wanted to say, I will soon swear, but first I must complain about a problem with a well. If you are about to enter a covenant or swear an oath it is best to make the complaints first, clear the problems, and after that make the oath. So it is feasible to translate the we-Vsuffix clause: ‘thereat Abraham complained to Abimelech ...’. The we-Vsuffix clause is a clause connected with the initial wayyiqtol clause wayyōmer ʿAbīrahām, and the we-Vsuffix clause is definitely past tense.

26 Similarly 2 Sam. 15:34. When the protasis expresses just a general possibility, real or unreal, the Vsuffix gram may be used.
it is one action, it is not habitual, it is not future, it is not modal. So it is not surprising that BHS and Westermann (1981) and Gesenius-Kautzsch’ grammar (§ 112tt) suggest an emendation to a wayqitot clause, without sufficient reason. But in Standard Biblical Hebrew a narrative we-Vsuff signals a background clause, as in 1 Sam. 1:4. In (32) the we-Vsuff may signal a continuous action.

A famous example of a we-Vsuff clause is (33).

(33) Pattern: wa-VprefS + "..." + [we-Vsuff + {wa-VprefS}];

וַַ֣יָָּֽאמֶרֵ֔וְֹלֵ֖"כּ ָ֥הְ יֶַ֖הְזַּֽר עִֶֽך"׃ְ
וַַ֣יָָּֽאַ֖מֶּן הֶאֱמ ַֽ֖בִַּֽיהוָָּ֑הְ

‘Then he said to him, “So shall your offspring be.” [And thereat he believed the LORD, {and thus he counted it to him as righteousness}].’ (Gen. 15:5-6).

In (33) we encounter the same shift from an utterance to a we-Vsuff clause, as we observed in (32). The syntax is only slightly more complicated and the we-Vsuff clause is continued by a wayyiqtol clause. The we-Vsuff clause is strictly speaking related to and connected to the wayyōmer clause with its direct speech. God said to Abraham: ‘Thus will your offspring be’. Saying this is a one moment event, it is past time and it is perfective aspect. As in (32) the we-Vsuff clause is a background statement about the belief of Abraham.27

The wayyiqtol clause way-yahşahēhā is not our main concern in this paper, but we can see that it is closely connected with the we-Vsuff clause. It is Abraham’s faith that makes God count this to him as righteousness. Wayyiqtol clauses often (but not always) express a temporal succession, and this temporal linking in the context receives a nuance of consequence-result. As a result (or reward) of Abraham believing the Lord, God counted it to him as righteousness (Dixon 2009, 28).

A simple and straightforward perfective we-Vsuff referring to a single past action is (34).

27 This we-qatal is regarded anomalous by Joüon and Muraoka (2006 § 119z).
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(34) Pattern: wa-VprefS + [we-Vsuff];

‘Then his servant brought her out, [and thereat he bolted the door after her]’ (2 Sam. 13:18).

In (34) Amnon’s servant brings Tamar out of the house after that Amnon has riped his sister. And as an accompanying action the servant bolts the door after her. The we-Vsuff is regarded by many grammars as anomalous (J-M § 119z; Ges-K § 112tt; though the same switch is found in Judg. 3:23). The switch to a we-Vsuff clause signals an action in the background of the narrative.

A subtle example of a switch from wayyiqtol to we-Vsuff clause is encountered in (35).

(35) Pattern: wa-VprefS + wa-VprefS + [we-haya-PrP];

‘Yet again she bore a son, and she called his name Shelah. [But thereat Judah was in Chezib when she bore him].’ (Gen. 38:5).

In (35) Judah’s wife bears a son and gives the new-born baby a name. We are then told of an accompanying action pertaining to another geographical place: thereat Judah was in Chezib, when she bore him. So Judah was not there and could not take part in the name-giving as he did with his first son. This has been regarded as an anomalous case of we-haya (Ges-K § 112uu), but it is not anomalous. It is just a background clause with a we-Vsuff clause.

G. Jussive VprefS + we-Vsuff

A we-Vsuff clause may follow a VprefS with jussive meaning. An example is found in the prayer of Solomon.

28 Many translations have caught this relation between the clauses, ESV ‘Yet again she bore a son, and she called his name Shelah. Judah was in Chezib when she bore him’, ZUR ‘Juda aber befand sich in Kesib, als sie ihn gebar’.
In (36), in the long and complicated prayer of king Solomon, the beginning of the supplication is a short yiqtol yēʾāmɛn-nāʾ, with jussive meaning. The prayer goes on with we-Vsuff clauses that receive a modal meaning, with wished for actions that Solomon prays should accompany his confirmation of his words: please may your words be confirmed and may you thereat give attention to the prayer of your servant, and may you thereat listen to the pleas of your servant.

H. Participle + we-Vsuff

A we-Vsuff clause may express an accompanying action also to participle clauses. In this section I will give some examples of participle clauses with an accompanying action being coded by one or more we-Vsuff clauses.

(37) Pattern: PA + 10×we-Vsuff;
‘Behold, the days are coming, declares the LORD,
and then the plowman shall overtake the reaper and the treader of
grapes him who sows the seed;
and then the mountains shall drip sweet wine, – all the hills flowing
with it –,
and I will restore the fortunes of my people Israel,
and they shall rebuild the ruined cities
and inhabit them and plant vineyards and drink their wine,
and they shall make gardens and eat their fruit.
and I will plant them upon their land’ (Amos 9:13–15 after ESV).

In (37) Amos’ long prophecy about the day of the Lord is introduced
by a participle clause expressing that something is about to come.
Whatever the exact meaning of this clause, it is certainly temporal.
The expression יָמִים is temporal, and the participle indicates some-
thing about to occur in the near future. After this introductory clause
there follow ten we-Vsuff clauses which describe the events and ac-
tions that are foretold to accompany the day of the Lord. In a temporal
context like this, a translation ‘and thereat’ is not the most appropriate
rendering. When time is the prime idea in the pre-clause a translation
‘and then’ meaning ‘at that time’, or as ESV formulates it, ‘Behold, the
days are coming,’ declares the LORD. "when the plowman shall
overtake the reaper’, etc. The question of a main line must be an-
swered in favour of the we-Vsuff chain of clauses. There is, as is usu-
al, a pre-clause, in this case היה יָמִים בָּֽיָמִים, but the focal clauses
are the we-Vsuff clauses and they should be regarded a main line in
this prophecy.\textsuperscript{29}

This kind of shift from a PA clause to a we-Vsuff clause is found also
in the Blessing of Moses (38).

\textsuperscript{29} A similar prophecy with we-qatal clauses is found in Amos 4:2.
In (38) Moses likens Gad to a lion lying down at the prey. The rest of the action is coded by a we-Vsuff clause. It is easy to perceive that the two clauses are semantically connected in some way. I lion is lying down eating from the prey. CJB has tried to express this connection with a circumstantial clause, and in this pragmatic setting a circumstantial clause amounts to practically the same thing as an accompanying action: ‘he lies there like a lion, [and tears thereat arm and scalp]’. Syntactically it is an addition, not a circumstantial clause.

I. Noun clause + we-Vsuff

If participle clauses can function as pre-clauses to one or several we-Vsuff clauses it is only to expect that a we-Vsuff clause may express accompanying action also in addition to a noun clause. A straightforward example is (39):

(39) Pattern: (ʾal-VprefS +) kī-NCl + [we-Vsuff] + [we-Vsuff];

‘(Fear not,) for I am with you [and I will thereat bless you] [and multiply your offspring for my servant Abraham's sake]’ (Gen. 26:24).

In (39) the kī-clause describes a reason why Isaac should not be afraid. The main reason is that God will be with Isaac. But there are some important actions that will accompany God’s presence in Isaac’s future life: ‘thereat I will bless you, and I will multiply you’. The we-Vsuff clauses receives a futural meaning because the pragmatic setting is a promise.30

In the next example (40) the switch to a we-Vsuff clause instead codes a rhetorical question.

30 Similar examples are Gen. 28:15 and Deut. 32:35.
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(40) Pattern: INT-kī-NCl + we-Vsuff;

‘When you are my kinsman, should you therefore serve me for nothing?’ (Gen. 29:15).

In (40) Laban asks Jacob, why he should serve him for nothing just because he is his brother. The initial interrogative particle does not concern the noun clause, because Laban does not question their family relation. The question mark concerns the we-Vsuff clause (or the whole linking). The kī particle could be interpreted as a conjunction ‘because’ or ‘when’. In that case the clause should be analysed as non-main, a reason clause or a temporal clause. The kī particle may also be taken as an adverb ‘indeed’, ‘certainly’. Be that as it may, the NCl describes a situation, a fact of life: ‘you are my kinsman’. And the we-Vsuff clause describes an action that accompanies the previous one with a question mark: ‘should you therefore serve me for nothing’. The we-Vsuff seems to express a main clause, and its pre-clause may be either an explicitly marked subordinate clause or just a setting for the more important we-Vsuff clause (the focal clause). Still the same pattern holds for the we-Vsuff clause: it follows after a pre-clause, and it describes an action that accompanies the state described by the preceding NCl clause.

A more elaborate linking of we-Vsuff clauses after a noun clause is found in (41).

(41) Pattern: NCl + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

‘My numbers are few, and therefore they gather themselves against me and attack me, and I shall be destroyed, both I and my household’ (Gen. 34:30).

In (41) the clause complex begins with a pre-clause describing the real world of Jacob, a statement of fact: Jacob and his family are few in number. Then comes three we-Vsuff clauses that express Jacob’s expectation of actions that he fears will accompany the initial statement of fact. It is not prophetic, it is not a command, it is just some-
thing Jacob fears might happen. We could translate this ‘and thereat they will gather together ...’, but this accompanying action is in this pragmatic context an effect of the initial situation, and the we-Vsuff clauses are better rendered by an introductory ‘and therefore’. Most translators render the we-Vsuff clauses with a conditional clause linking: ‘if they gather themselves against me and attack me, I shall be destroyed, both I and my household’ (thus ESV), but such a conditional linking is not specifically coded in the Hebrew. The rendering does suit the English language very well, and it could be argued that such a conditional linking is understood (but syntactically unmarked) in the context.\textsuperscript{31}

The next example (42) concerns a legal case, a type of text that we find also in Leviticus.

(42) Pattern: NP + we-Vsuff + [Ø-Onoun-Vsuff]:

\textit{The uncircumcised male, whose foreskin has not been circumcised -- that person must be cut off from his people [since he has broken the covenant].} (Gen. 17:14).

In (42) we encounter the typical situation of a male person who is not circumcised. It is a legal case. It is the case with the uncircumcised man. We could interpret this phrase with Brockelmann as an ‘eingliedrige Nominalsats’ (1956, § 13). It is an imagined situation when there appears an uncircumcised man. Even if the phrase is short, as is typical for legal language, it is a predication, it is a clause.\textsuperscript{32} And after this pre-clause comes the familiar we-Vsuff clause coding the action that should accompany the legal case with the uncircumcised man: ‘thereat that person must be cut off’. We could of course trans-

\textsuperscript{31} It is significant that the LXX only translates the we-qatal clauses with the future tense without any other marking of relations (καὶ συναχθέντες ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ συγκόψουσίν με καὶ ἐκτριβήσομαι ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ οἶκός μου).

\textsuperscript{32} With C. Lehmann (1988) I define a clause as a syntagm containing one predication (Isaksson et al. 2009, 5).
late: ‘an uncircumcised man should be cut off’, and that would give good meaning and possibly accord well with English legal language. But this is not the way classical Hebrew codes the case. First we have the case, and then by we-Vsuff clauses is stated the punishment which should or must accompany that case.33

An even more compressed pre-clause is found in (43).

(43) Pattern: [NP] + we-Vsuff + [NP] + we-Vsuff;

‘[It is evening] and thereat/then you will know that the LORD brought you out of Egypt;

[it is morning time] and thereat/then you will see the glory of the Lord’ (Exod. 16:6-7).

(43) is an example which is often adduced in the discussion of we-Vsuff clauses (for example Andrason 2011, 13). Also in this case the we-Vsuff clause follows after another syntagm of text, but how are we to account for the words ʿɛrɛḇ and boqɛr? All the examples we have seen so far consist of we-Vsuff clauses that are preceded by a clause. So we should expect a predication also here. Can ʿɛrɛḇ be a predication? Carl Brockelmann in Hebräische Syntax (1956 § 13a) analyses this ʿɛrɛḇ as a case of ‘Eingliedrige Nominalsätze’ and he translates the clause “es ist Abend”. Likewise he translates boqɛr in the passage as “es ist Morgen”. It is an unusual construction indeed, but it also expresses a fateful moment. The people of Israel have grumbled against Moses, and the Lord is intent on testing their loyalty. In this moment Moses utters these words to the grumbling Israelites. The pre-clauses function as temporal clauses and the we-Vsuff clauses must be regarded as main line clauses. It is reasonable to render this clause

33 The Ø-Onoun-Vsuff clause is not our concern here, but it can be interpreted as a circumstantial clause which in the context gives the reason for the punishment (‘since he has ...’ (Isaksson 2015c).
linking by an English ‘At evening you shall know that it was the LORD who brought you out of the land of Egypt’ (thus ESV), but this rendering, which certainly is good English, should not make us believe that the Hebrew text shows the same syntax. In such cases, when the pre-clause has clear temporal meaning, the most natural translation of the we-Vsuff clause is with an initial ‘then’, ‘at that time’ (instead of the general ‘thereat’).

This kind of clause linking with an initial noun phrase coding a predication that becomes the starting point for an accompanying action clause, could be illustrated by the English Monday morning, and I must go to work. In this example the adverbial expression should not be analysed as being ‘embedded’ in the main result clause. Instead the adverbial phrase has to be re-analysed as a separate clause, as in ‘(It is) Monday morning, and (so) I must go to work’. As an action accompanying the fact that it is Monday morning, I must go to work. A correct understanding of the English example requires knowledge of the pragmatic setting, and so does the Hebrew example.

We-Vsuff clauses following an infinite clause is shown in (44).

(44) Pattern: Vsuff + [PREP-VN] + we-Vsuff + we-Vsuff;

‘The LORD herewith anoints you ruler over His own people. [When you leave me today], you will meet two men near the tomb of Rachel in the territory of Benjamin, at Zelzah, and they will tell you that ...’ (1 Sam. 10:1-2; TNK)

(44) is an utterance of Samuel when he anoints Saul as king over Israel. This moment is coded by a Vsuff clause (ḥālō kā maṣāḥākā, etc.). After this initial performative utterance, Samuel instructs Saul about the future steps to be taken. At the same time it is a prophecy about the events that will happen to Saul in the near future. The prophecy begins with an infinitive (verbal noun) clause with an initial preposition. It is an infinite construction but it is a predication: ‘at your going out from me today’. This is a temporal clause, and the Hebrew codes it as separate from the following we-Vsuff clauses. In the usual way
the we-Vsuff clauses code actions that will accompany the initial pre-clause: ‘At your going from me, you will thereat meet two men, and they will tell you ...’. The infinitive clause should not be taken as signalling simultaneous action. It is not at the same time as you leave me, but ‘when you have left me today’. In a clause linking like this the we-Vsuff clauses constitute the syntactic main line and are semantically focal clauses. But this should not give rise to an analysis that the infinitival pre-clause must be a constituent in the following we-Vsuff clause. In Hebrew, a non-main clause is often a separate clause linked to a main clause and the we-Vsuff clauses are syndetic.

Conclusions

- We-Vsuff is a clause type with a fixed word order and with specialized meanings and functions that are partly taken over from the VprefL gram which became unlawful in clause-initial position. The we-Vsuff clause came to replace the *we-VprefL clause in Biblical Hebrew syntax.
- There is no example of a conjunction placed before the we-Vsuff clause: no we-wqatal, no kî we-qatal. A we-Vsuff clause is itself a syndetic clause with a normal conjunction we.
- A we-Vsuff clause always follows some type of pre-clause.
- It seems that the pre-clause can be of any clause type (except we-Vsuff), even an infinite clause.
- We-Vsuff is used for the purpose of expressing actions that accompany the action or state described by the pre-clause. Such clauses are ‘additions’ in Dixon’s sense (Dixon 2009, 26-30). What makes we-Vsuff an addition is the initial element we, which was perceived as the normal conjunction we in Biblical Hebrew.
- Classifying we-Vsuff as a conjugation of its own disregards the fact that we-Vsuff is a syndetic formation. It is more appropriate to designate it as a ‘gram’ in the sense of a grammatical structure (Cook 2012, 182; Bybee et al. 1994, 2).
• Accompanying actions are not necessarily temporally sequential to the previous action, so the term ‘consecutive’ is not appropriate for we-Vsuff clauses. We-Vsuff clauses often take over the temporal meaning and modality from the previous action. We-Vsuff clauses often form chains of clauses that follow the pre-clause.

• The ‘pre-clause’ can be a main clause, but rather often (for example in procedural discourse), it is more accurate to analyse the we-Vsuff clause(s) as representing a main line.
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