

Quotations from 52 scholarly books referring to the Hebrew / waw (vav) as waw due to it's ancient W pronunciation (next section is dictionaries and then several scholarly articles).

*The classical name of vav is a waw. Vav-relative goes by a variety of names, waw-consecutive being quite common. Because of the frequent use of the term waw-consecutive imperfect, vav-relative imperfect is abbreviated wci in this grammar.*¹

The letter waw, װ, when used to represent a vowel sound, is called a *mater lectionis*. When it is used, the spelling is called 'full' (*plene* or מְלֵא, מְלֵא in Babylonian nomenclature); when it is not used, the spelling is *defective* (חֲסֵר).²

*Rule B. "A waw-sequential construction usually begins a new clause." In 20,691 of its 20,907 firings a new clause begins—a 99% true positive rate.*³

In Biblical Hebrew there are different sequences of verbs expressing positive commands. One sequence consists of a string of imperative forms of the type לֵךְ אֶמֶר. Sometimes the imperatives are connected by the conjunction waw, often they are not⁴

¹ Futato, M. D. (2003). *Beginning Biblical Hebrew* (p. 163). Eisenbrauns.

² Andersen, F. I., & Forbes, A. D. (1986). *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible: Dahood memorial lecture* (p. 1). Biblical Institute Press.

³ Andersen, F. I., & Forbes, A. D. (2012). *Biblical Hebrew Grammar Visualized* (M. O'Connor, C. L. Miller-Naudé, & J. A. Naudé, Eds.; p. 18). Eisenbrauns.

⁴ Fassberg, S. E. (2006). Sequences of Positive Commands in Biblical Hebrew: לֵךְ אֶמֶר, וְאֶמַּרְתָּ לָּהּ, וְאֶמַּרְתָּ לָּהּ. In A. Hurvitz (Ed.), *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives* (p. 51). The Hebrew University Magnes Press; Eisenbrauns.

One distinctive feature of LBH is the diminished employment of the use of the *waw* consecutive tense.¹²³ This diachronic shift can best be elucidated by comparing parallel texts from different chronological periods⁵

Thus, for example, the terms perfect, imperfect and *waw* consecutive imperfect are used (in place of linguistically more accurate terms) because they are used in Holladay's popular dictionary⁶

The apodosis is introduced by the conjunction *waw* (וְהָיִיתֶם לִי סִגְלָה מִכָּל הָעַמִּים), which turns apodosis and protasis into two independent clauses.

Complex hypotaxis, however, is found in Moses' explanation to the frightened Israelites (Exod. 20:20):⁷

Archaisms. Under the heading archaisms come not lexical items so much (see already criterion 3, unusual vocabulary) as grammatical elements. These would include enclitic *mem*, vocative *lamedh*, emphatic *waw* and like, but particularly, use of *yiqtol* for the past tense.⁸

In the brief discussion of diphthongal contractions, note the shift of **aw > o*. This shift argues for a diphthongal pronunciation of biblical Hebrew that does not take the modern Hebrew approach (the

LBH Late Biblical Hebrew

¹²³ See Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* II § 8 h, 39; § 9 n, 44; Driver, *Tenses* § 131, 186; Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 143; and Rabin, 'Hebrew', in *EM* 6, 70. The reluctance to use the *waw* consecutive tense can be detected as early as the Lachish letters. See Baumgartner, 'Was wir heute von der hebräischen Sprache und ihrer Geschichte wissen', 608–609. Huesman's contention that many of the occurrences of the *waw* conjunction with the perfect tense are no more than corruptions of actual infinitive absolutes has not gained wide support. John Huesman, 'The Infinite Absolute and the Waw + Perfect Problem', *Biblica* 37 (1956) 410–34; cf. 412.

⁵ Rooker, M. F. (1990). *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (Vol. 90, p. 100). JSOT Press.

⁶ Van der Merwe, C., Naudé, J., Kroeze, J., Van der Merwe, C., Naudé, J., & Kroeze, J. (1999). *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (electronic ed.). Sheffield Academic Press.

⁷ Polak, F. H. (2003). Style Is More than the Person: Sociolinguistics, Literary Culture and the Distinction between Written and Oral Narrative. In I. Young (Ed.), *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (pp. 74–75). T&T Clark.

⁸ Watson, W. G. E. (1986). *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques* (Vol. 26, p. 49). JSOT Press.

latter pronounces the *waw* as *v*; e.g., *benayw* [“his sons”] is pronounced *benav* in modern Hebrew, but should perhaps be pronounced as *benow* in biblical Hebrew—the *ow* as in the English word “now”). The whole discussion of pronunciation for biblical Hebrew proves quite fascinating as well as challenging. Many Hebraists have begun to recognize what many rabbis have been saying for centuries, that Yemenite Hebrew might be the best source for understanding the pronunciation of pre-Masoretic Hebrew (see *IBHS*, 30 fn. 90 for Morag’s work involving the Yemenite Jewish community’s pronunciation and reading of biblical Hebrew). One of the appealing aspects of the Yemenite Hebrew tradition consists of the observation that it has not been touched by the same linguistic forces that have shaped the modern pronunciation of Hebrew (European ghettos and the heavy impact of the Germanic, Polish, and Russian languages).⁹

In BH, the consecutive *waw* with perfective verb has the same semantic nuance as a preceding imperfective verb. Similarly, the consecutive *waw* with imperfective verb has the same semantic nuance as a preceding perfective verb. Less frequently in BH, in place of consecutive verbal forms, the simple conjunctive *waw* plus verbal form appears. In certain grammars (that is, idiolects) of Qumran Hebrew, the consecutive verbal forms are replaced with the corresponding simple verbal forms with conjunctive *waw*. The consecutive verbal forms at Qumran have become dramatically less frequent than the conjunctive *waw* with finite verb and, in fact, the conjunctive forms are statistically more frequent in Qumran Hebrew than in Biblical Hebrew.¹⁰

The most common Hebrew conjunction is the *waw*.¹¹

The extreme simplicity of Hebrew narrative has often been pointed out: the principle of attaching clause to clause by means of the “*waw* conversive” construction allows the narrative to flow on often for long periods uninterrupted, and, so to speak, in one continuous straight line.¹²

This progress in the sequence of time, is regularly indicated by a pregnant *and* (called *wāw consecutive*), which in itself is really only a variety of the ordinary *wāw copulative*, but which

⁹ Barrick, W. D. (2011). *Comments on Waltke and O’Connor, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (p. 3). Logos Bible Software.

BH Biblical Hebrew

BH Biblical Hebrew

¹⁰ Naudé, J. A. (2012). Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew and a Theory of Language Change and Diffusion. In C. L. Miller-Naudé & Z. Zevit (Eds.), *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (p. 76). Eisenbrauns.

¹¹ Kantenwein, L. L. (2003). *Diagrammatical analysis* (p. 68). Logos Research Systems, Inc.

¹² Gray, G. B. (1915). *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry: Considered with Special Reference to the Criticism and Interpretation of the Old Testament* (p. 52). Hodder and Stoughton.

sometimes (in the imperf.) appears with a different vocalization. Further, the tenses connected by *wāw consecutive* sometimes undergo a change in the tone and consequently are liable also to other variations.¹³

A Waw preceding a finite verbal form (qatal, yiqtol, jussive, cohortative, imperative) may have various semantic values; consequently a group consisting of Waw and of a verbal form will have different values. While retaining the basic meaning of *et* “and,” Waw can have certain concomitant nuances which our languages neglect or can only express with the addition of a word.¹⁴

Scholars of this school stress the need to go beyond the clause level, although the traditional approach had not totally ignored such a perspective, as witnessed by the very use of such terms as Waw consecutive. The term ‘macrosyntactic,’ which one meets in very many publications of this school, is an indication of their interest in the interface between grammar or syntax and stylistics or narratology.¹⁵

W^eqatal (perfect with *waw*-consecutive) in predictive and procedural materials (including instructions and law), is present, future, or imperatival. It defines the series of events or steps. These sequences refer to the present-future with or without a preceding *yiqtol* or imperative. When a series of *w^eqatal* is interrupted by a negative or disjunctive clause, the tense is maintained by *yiqtol* (Ru 3:3).¹⁶

W^eqatal (perfect with *waw*-consecutive) in predictive and procedural materials (including instructions and law), is present, future, or imperatival. It defines the series of events or steps. These sequences refer to the present-future with or without a preceding *yiqtol* or imperative. When a series of *w^eqatal* is interrupted by a negative or disjunctive clause, the tense is maintained by *yiqtol* (Ru 3:3).¹⁷

Some of the terminology used in the Masorah was taken over by the grammarians. Terms such as masculine, feminine, singular, plural, the names of the letters, the vowel and accent signs, and other

¹³ Gesenius, F. W. (1910). *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar* (E. Kautzsch & S. A. E. Cowley, Eds.; 2d English ed., p. 133). Clarendon Press.

¹⁴ Joüon, P., & Muraoka, T. (2003). *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Vol. 2, p. 379). Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

¹⁵ Joüon, P., & Muraoka, T. (2006). *A grammar of biblical Hebrew* (p. xviii). Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

¹⁶ Putnam, F. C. (2002). *Hebrew Bible Insert: A Student's Guide to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew* (p. 29). Stylus Publishing.

¹⁷ Putnam, F. C. (2002). *Hebrew Bible Insert: A Student's Guide to the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew* (p. 29). Stylus Publishing.

features of the pointing ... were all used by the Masoretes and taken over by the grammarians ... Since the Masoretes compared all the occurrences of particular words, their lists formed the basis for grammatical observations on changes in vowel patterns: either conditioned changes, such as changes in forms in contextual or pausal situations, changes in words with or without *maqṣef*, with or without the definite article, or *waw* simple and *waw* consecutive, etc., or unconditioned variation in the vowel of the word.¹⁸

Blommerde recognizes the *waw* in *wělō'-'ōzēr lô* as a *waw explicativum* functioning as a relative pronoun.¹⁹

as in verse (originally this letter was pronounced as /w/ and will be spelled as *waw* in future chapters.)²⁰

Is the *yôm YHWH* past or future in the book of Joel? Deist interprets the “afterwards” in 3:1 [2:28] as implying that the *waw* consecutives in 2:18 refer to the future.²¹

“The Conditioning of Stress Position in *Waw* Consecutive Perfect Forms in Biblical Hebrew.” *Hebrew Annual Review* 9 (1985) 277–300.²²

Waw is used sometimes to emphasize the following noun or verb; just like emphatic *kî* (see below) it may be used with precative perfect (Ps 25:11) and throw the verb to the end of the clause. Examples from Job may be found in Job 4:6; 8:13; 14:20; 19:23; 28:21; 31:30; 34:20; 36:7; 39:28. A special construction with emphatic *waw* is found in Job 3:17; (13:7); 17:15; 34:28; 38:17; 38:22; 41:16; sc. a word of the first stich is repeated at the beginning of the second one, but now reinforced by emphatic *waw*,²³

¹⁸ Waltke, B. K., & O'Connor, M. P. (1990). *An introduction to biblical Hebrew syntax* (p. 33). Eisenbrauns.

¹⁹ Ceresko, A. R. (1980). *Job 29–31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic: A Translation and Philological Commentary* (p. 18). Biblical Institute Press.

²⁰ Kutz, K. V., & Josberger, R. L. (2018). *Learning Biblical Hebrew: Reading for Comprehension: An Introductory Grammar* (p. 4). Lexham Press.

²¹ Crenshaw, J. L. (2008). *Joel: a new translation with introduction and commentary* (Vol. 24C, p. 49). Yale University Press.

²² Kelley, P. H., Mynatt, D. S., & Crawford, T. G. (1998). *The Masorah of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: introduction and annotated glossary* (p. 209). William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

²³ Blommerde, A. C. M. (1969). *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job* (p. 29). Pontifical Biblical Institute.

If the letter *waw* was used, it was marked with a dot in it, i.e., the preceding consonant was followed by *shuruq*. Otherwise, *qibbuṣ* was used. The spelling of the consonantal text was hallowed and could not be adjusted as spelling systems changed.²⁴

A clause that expresses an adverse or contradictory circumstance. In English it is indicated by the coordinating conjunction “but.” In BH it is usually conveyed by a *conjunctive *waw* (וְ), less commonly by וְאִי and sometimes simply by וְ.²⁵

waw emphaticum or *emphatic waw*, the particle or *w^e* or *wa* used, not as a connecting conjunction, but rather as an emphasizing word.

waw explicativum, a technical expression which means that the particle *w^e* or *wa* explains the preceding word; in English it would usually be rendered by the relative pronoun “who” or “which.”²⁶

We thus have here a double-duty curse, addressed to the mountains of Gilboa and the upland fields. In וְשָׂדֵי the ו can be parsed as vocative *waw*, while the construct chain שָׂדֵי תְרוֹמַת / הָרִי בַּגְּלִבְעַה recalls the parallelism of UT 52:62–63, *ʿsr šmm wdg bym*, “birds of heaven and fish from the sea.” There would be no need to emend בַּגְּלִבְעַה to הַגְּלִבְעַה. This solution is very good, since it requires no change in the MT and completely fits the context. Still, the parallelism of the verse with 1 Aqht:44–45, as proposed by Ginsberg, remains very impressive.²⁷

²⁴ Eisenbraun, J. (2010). Publisher’s Foreword. In M. O’Connor & C. L. Miller (Eds.), *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew: An Introduction* (p. 67). Eisenbrauns.

BH Biblical Hebrew

* An asterisk before a term or phrase indicates that it appears elsewhere in the book as a separate entry. Within an entry, only the first occurrence of a term or phrase is cross-referenced. When two related terms occur with the same phrase, the more specific term or phrase is crossreferenced.

²⁵ Murphy, T. J. (2003). In *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of Biblical Hebrew* (p. 21). InterVarsity Press.

²⁶ Dahood, M., S. J. (2008). *Psalms III: 101-150: Introduction, translation, and notes with an Appendix: The Grammar of the Psalter* (Vol. 17A, p. xv). Yale University Press.

UT Ugaritic text according to the enumeration of C. H. Gordon in *UT*.

MT Masoretic Text

²⁷ Fisher, L. R., Knutson, F. B., & Morgan, D. F., eds. (1972). *Ras Shamra parallels: The texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*. (Vol. 1, p. 58). Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

the *yodhs* in each of the five possible examples from Psalms may be explained as having arisen due to the erroneous resolution of a *waw* grapheme.²⁸

And what we said of the common characteristics of the various forms of literary H not being backed by spoken H that they all reflect different mixtures of the preceding periods of H, especially of BH and RH, as well as the influence of the vernaculars, also applies to IH, although it is backed now by H as mother tongue: IH too is an amalgamated language, some sort of *Mischsprache*. Its morphology, no doubt the most characteristic part of any language, is based, in the main, on BH, yet reflects also RH influence (as the disappearance of conversive *waw*, the use of *šel*, and the formation of geminate verbs according to the pattern of regular verbs; in these cases, the trend toward simplification was also instrumental). Yet not only is IH a fusion of elements from several previous layers, but is still, theoretically at least, open toward its ancient layers and freely draws upon them (see Z. Ben-Hayyim, *Leshonenu La'am* 4, fascs. 2–3 [1952–53], pp. 143ff.), as if the various strata of H were arranged side by side (in contradistinction to languages that have developed “naturally” and have, therefore, their layers stratified, so to speak, one above the other, so that there is no productive derivation from older strata). The impact of various vernaculars on preceding forms of H is paralleled in the case of IH by the influence of Standard Average European: in the first stages, especially Yiddish and Russian, but also French and German exerted their influence, later English journalese has become more prominent, making IH more and more a European tongue in matters of phraseology.²⁹

In true acrostics the alphabet used can vary: certain letters can be omitted or transposed. Professor William Johnstone has argued that *pe* replaced *waw* at some stage in the Hebrew alphabet.³⁰

The Voluntative with Waw

59. IN the present chapter we have to examine the use of the imperfect when combined, in its capacity as a voluntative, with the simple or *weak* ׀ (with *shwa'* וִיקְטֹל, וְאָסֵלָח: when the first letter of the verb has *shwa'* likewise, we obtain, of course, the forms וְיִדְבֵּר, וְיִתֵּה, וְיִאֲגַדְלָה: these must be carefully distinguished from וִיקְטֹל, וְאָסֵלָח, וְיִדְבֵּר, וְיִתֵּה, וְיִאֲגַדְלָה). Inasmuch as the particular signification it then assumes depends upon its being, not a *mere* imperfect, but a

²⁸ Althann, R. (1997). *Studies in Northwest Semitic* (p. 69). Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

²⁹ Blau, J. (1998). *Topics in Hebrew and Semitic Linguistics* (pp. 15–16). Magnes Press.

³⁰ Watson, W. G. E. (1994). *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse* (Vol. 170, p. 90). Sheffield Academic Press.

voluntative, it is important to recollect what was remarked in § 44, that the voluntative force may be really present even though the corresponding modal form does not meet the eye.³¹

On the pleonastic *waw* see P. Wernberg-Møller in *JSS* 3 (1958) 321–326, and L. Prijs in *Biblische Zeitschrift* 8 (1964) 104–109. On II Sam. 3:38, *kî šar w^egādôl nāpal*, “For a truly great prince has fallen”, see M. Dahood in *Gregorianum* 43 (1962) 65 ff. In Ps. 89:20 the detection of a pleonastic *waw* entails a new stichometric division: *’āz dibbartā b^ehāzôn laḥ^asîdekā wattō’mer*, “Once you spoke in a vision, to your faithful ones indeed you said”.³²

When the predicate is an adjective or participle, it is often used with *waw* to express a state contemporaneous with the time of the action of the main verb (§141b)³³

The tenses with consecutive *waw* (*wayyqtl*, *weqtl*) are used whenever the syntactic environment permits the use of *waw copulative*; otherwise the simple tenses (*qtl*, *yqtl*) [are used].³⁴

If the *waw* adds no temporal (tense or aspect) meaning, then the difference between verbs with *waw* and verbs without *waw* cannot be a semantic one. But apparently it is, for the forms with the *waw* are generally seen as ‘reversing’ the values the ‘tenses’ normally have. To reconcile the two, we must assume that the forms without the *waw* and those with it do not in fact differ in semantics, but the only way this is possible is if the ‘tense’ forms do not differ from one another in meaning to begin with.³⁵

For this definition to be valid it should also be specified that in Hebrew a finite verbal form is predicate when it comes first in the clause. When, instead, it is preceded by an element of any kind (other than WAW) the verbal form is not the predicate and therefore the clause is nominal (CNC)...³⁶

³¹ Driver, S. R. (1892). *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions* (p. 64). Oxford University Press.

JSS

Journal of Semitic Studies

³² Dahood, M., J. (1989). *Ugaritic-Hebrew philology: marginal notes on recent publications* (p. 40). Biblical Institute Press.

³³ Miller, C. L. (1999). *The verbless clause in Biblical Hebrew: linguistic approaches* (Vol. 1, pp. 254–255). Eisenbrauns.

³⁴ Moshavi, A. (2010). *Word Order in the Biblical Hebrew Finite Clause: A Syntactic and Pragmatic Analysis of Preposing* (M. O’Connor & C. L. Miller, Eds.; p. 13). Eisenbrauns.

³⁵ Cook, J. A. (2012). *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expression of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew* (C. L. Miller-Naudé & J. Naudé, Eds.; Vol. 7, pp. 81–82). Eisenbrauns.

³⁶ Dawson, D. A. (1994). *Text-linguistics and biblical Hebrew* (Vol. 177, p. 37). Sheffield Academic Press.

This is a compound word consisting of **עַם**, 'nation', preceded by **וְ**, a conjunctive waw with enclitic mem, used as an emphasizing conjunction.⁸⁷ The word should read, 'indeed a nation'. The poetic repetition of the introduction to the chapter adds emphasis to the climax.³⁷

It was seen above that Saadia explains **אִפְּוֹנָה** as a form of the Hebrew verb **פָּנָה** ('to turn'), and thinks that it means 'wherever I go' (though it is not clear what account he would give of the waw).³⁸

Qatal in narrative prose is, in fact, not a true narrative form. It cannot begin a narrative nor, within a narrative, should it be regarded, in spite of the oft quoted rule in the Grammars, as an alternative to wayyiqtol used when, due to the vagaries of word order, another word or phrase happens to come between waw and the verb. Rather, waw consecutive yiqtol carries forward the story line while qatal marks a pause at any point along that line to enable a different kind of statement to be made; and the changed word order is an integral element of such different kinds of statement.³⁹

G.A. Rendsburg, 'Eblaite Ū-MA and Hebrew WM-', in C.H. Gordon, G.A. Rendsburg and N.H. Winter (eds.), *Eblaitica: Essays on the Eblaite Archives and Eblaite Language* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), pp. 38–39. C. Wallace, 'Wm—in Nehemiah 5:11', in Gordon *et al.* (eds.), *Eblaitica*, p. 31. The connection of this construction to the Eblaite language was first pointed out by C.H. Gordon. See his *Forgotten Scripts* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 171; also *idem*, 'The "Waw Conversive"', pp. 87–90.

³⁷ Gottlieb, M. L. and C. (1998). Isaiah 18: The Egyptian Nexus. In M. Lubetski, C. Gottlieb, & S. Keller (Eds.), *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World: A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (Vol. 273, p. 382). Sheffield Academic Press.

³⁸ Emerton, J. A. (2004). Some Problems in Psalm 88:16. In C. McCarthy & J. F. Healey (Eds.), *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays: Studies in Honour of Kevin J. Cathcart* (p. 100). T&T Clark.

³⁹ J.C.L. Gibson. (1993). The Anatomy of Hebrew Narrative Poetry. In A. Graeme Auld (Ed.), *Understanding Poets and Prophets: Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson* (Vol. 152, p. 145). Sheffield Academic Press.

This is a compound word consisting of **עַם**, 'nation', preceded by **וְ**, a conjunctive waw with enclitic mem, used as an emphasizing conjunction.⁸⁷ The word should read, 'indeed a nation'. The poetic repetition of the introduction to the chapter adds emphasis to the climax.⁴⁰

It is often argued that support for this view is found in the special blessing of Gen. 1:28 in which humanity is directed to have dominion, as also in the possible translation of 1:26 'let us make humanity ... and let them have dominion' (simple *waw* joining two co-ordinate jussives), which would suggest that being the image and having dominion are separate.⁴¹

It all began with the first *waw* consecutives of the book, in 1:2–3. There Job was said to be a perfect man 'and' there were born to him the perfect family, of seven sons and three daughters, 'and' his flocks—which is to say, his wealth—became enormous, 'and' he became the greatest of all the sons of the East. This is no mere temporal sequence; this is the sequence of logic, of the way things ought to be. Someone should invent a grammatical term for it, the *waw theologiae contractualis*, or the *waw retributionis*.⁴²

Much more significantly, Psalm 25 entirely omits the *waw*-line. While suggestions have been made to recover or restore such a line by detaching the third colon of the *he*-line, emending the text slightly (by adding a *waw* at the beginning of the colon), and thereby supposedly restoring the original pattern of the poem, at best such a procedure is a makeshift—no textual evidence supports such an emendation.⁴³

It is not a cohortative form, nor is it prefixed by a *waw*. It does not, therefore, continue the sequence of verbs and does not function as they are intended to function, namely, indicating what Yahweh intends to do out of the command to go. The first four verbs, as well as the

G.A. Rendsburg, 'Eblaite Ū-MA and Hebrew WM-', in C.H. Gordon, G.A. Rendsburg and N.H. Winter (eds.), *Eblaitica: Essays on the Eblaite Archives and Eblaite Language* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), pp. 38–39. C. Wallace, 'Wm—in Nehemiah 5:11', in Gordon *et al.* (eds.), *Eblaitica*, p. 31. The connection of this construction to the Eblaite language was first pointed out by C.H. Gordon. See his *Forgotten Scripts* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 171; also *idem*, 'The "Waw Conversive"', pp. 87–90.

⁴⁰ Gottlieb, M. L. and C. (1998). Isaiah 18: The Egyptian Nexus. In M. Lubetski, C. Gottlieb, & S. Keller (Eds.), *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World: A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (Vol. 273, p. 382). Sheffield Academic Press.

⁴¹ Clines, D. J. A. (1998). *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays, 1967–1998* (Vol. 293, p. 490). Sheffield Academic Press.

⁴² Clines, D. J. A. (1998). *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays, 1967–1998* (Vol. 293, p. 811). Sheffield Academic Press.

⁴³ Freedman, D. N. (1992). Patterns in Psalms 25 and 34. In E. Ulrich & J. Wright (Eds.), *Priests, prophets, and scribes: essays on the formation and heritage of Second Temple Judaism in honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp* (Vol. 149, p. 126). Sheffield Academic Press.

imperative *wehyēh*, indicate the purpose of the command in v. 1, as form and clause construction demonstrate. They are all cohortative forms with the prefixed waw and governed by the original imperative. As form and clause construction further reveal, however, the verb *’ō’ōr* does not indicate purpose. It is an unambiguous imperfect without prefixed waw, not cohortative with prefixed waw.⁴⁴

Firstly, in the *plene* spelling of the word,⁴ the waw appears some times *before* the *aleph*; cf. 1QIsa^a 16.6, 56.12 (מִוֹאֵד), and 47.6, 9; 52.13; 64.8, 11, attesting to the far more frequent form מִוֹאֵדֶה which occurs also in 11QT (56.19, and 11QPs^a (104.1; 119.41, 43, 96, 107, 138; 139.14; 142.7; 145.3); in a few cases, however, the waw is ‘correctly’ placed *after* the *aleph* (cf. e.g. מִוֹאֵדֶה in 1QIsa^a 38.17), reflecting presumably the scribe’s knowledge of the etymologically correct form of the word. The measure of inconsistency appearing in these orthographic variations is best explained by assuming that the *aleph* was not, in fact, pronounced in this and a number of similar words in which the glottal stop appears in medial position.⁴⁵

The size of the letters is mostly 0.3 × 0.3 cm. Some of the larger ones, like final *mem*, attain a width of 0.4, and the thin letters *waw*, *yod* and final *nun* of 0.1 cm. Letters are visibly separated by the fraction of a millimeter, with a space of 0.2 cm separating one word from the next.⁴⁶

One clear example of an orthographic variant occurs in Isa. 19:11. 4QIsa^b reads פִּרְעֹה while 4QIsa^c includes a waw as vowel letter: פִּרְעֹוֹה.⁴⁷

A good proportion of the errors—whether originating with Sperber as editor or with the printers—involved the letters *wāw* and *yôdh*, and could charitably be regarded as second-order offences. But even *yôdh* can be crucial to the correct understanding of a word or sentence, as in Zech. 3:3 which, as I have argued elsewhere, preserves a rare occurrence of the *qṭyl l-* syntagma

⁴⁴ Miller, P. D. (2000). Syntax and Theology in. In *Israelite Religion and Biblical Theology: Collected Essays* (Vol. 267, p. 494). Sheffield Academic Press.

The word is spelt without a waw once in 1QM (12.12); see Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford, 1962, p. 252, and once in 1QIsa^a (31.1).

⁴⁵ Wernberg-Møller, P. (1990). Two Biblical Hebrew Adverbs in the Dialect of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In P. R. Davies & R. T. White (Eds.), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (Vol. 100, p. 21). JSOT Press.

⁴⁶ Talmon, S. (1998). Fragments of a Deuteronomy Scroll from Masada: Deuteronomy 33:17–34:6 (1043/A–D). In M. Lubetski, C. Gottlieb, & S. Keller (Eds.), *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World: A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (Vol. 273, p. 154). Sheffield Academic Press.

⁴⁷ Brooke, G. J. (2001). The Qumran Pesharim and the Text of Isaiah in the Cave 4 Manuscripts. In A. Rapoport-Albert & G. Greenberg (Eds.), *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (Vol. 333, p. 308). Sheffield Academic Press.

highlighted by E.Y. Kutscher as an Old Persian calque in Eastern Aramaic and a criterion for distinguishing between Eastern and Western Aramaic.⁴⁸

This is the letter waw. It is found at the beginning of l. 9 and it occurs again at the beginning of this very word *wsp*. In other words, the word begins and ends with a waw. The word should be read as *wspw*, not *wspr*. That makes the final waw a third person plural verbal ending, similar to what is found with *ʿhzw* in l. 5.⁴⁹

Line 2: the first letter is obscure. *šade*, *waw* and *qof* were suggested, but in any case the form is exceptional and appear to be an error by the scribe. If he intended to write a *šade*, then the word can be read as *šava* (army). The second word can be read 'z', though the 'ayin is somewhat problematic: a faint line (seen in the photograph) may be a leg of a letter like *bet*.⁵⁰

The leather is thin, well-prepared and creamy tan in color. Deterioration is evident in several places (for example, ll. 13–14 of col. II). Random dots are scattered over the fragments; for instance, in col. I 4 one dot is within the *he* of *הוּ* and another lies above the *waw* of *וּ*.⁵¹

Augustin R. Müller's "Die Freiheit, ein Und zu gebrauchen. Zur hebräischen Konjunktion w" also invokes anthropology by engaging in a fierce argument about what linguistic forms say about culture. It is a polemic against H.-P. Müller's study of "Non-junctive uses" of the Hebrew conjunction *waw* (ZAH 1994). Here Müller produces an interesting catalogue of biblical expressions involving *waw* that cannot be translated with the usual German conjunction "und."⁵²

⁴⁸ Gordon, R. P. (1994). Alexander Sperber and the Study of the Targums. In D. R. G. Beattie & M. J. McNamara (Eds.), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (Vol. 166, p. 99). JSOT Press.

⁴⁹ Kaltner, J., & Stulman, L., eds. (2004). *Inspired Speech: Prophecy in the Ancient Near East Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffmon* (p. 92). T&T Clark.

⁵⁰ Mazar, A. (2001). *Studies in the archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan* (Vol. 331, p. 305). Sheffield Academic Press.

⁵¹ Ulrich, E. (1992). Ezra and Qoheleth Manuscripts from Qumran (4QEzra, 4QQoh A, B). In E. Ulrich & J. Wright (Eds.), *Priests, prophets, and scribes: essays on the formation and heritage of Second Temple Judaism in honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp* (Vol. 149, p. 142). Sheffield Academic Press.

⁵² Sanders, S. L. (2002–2003). Review of Sachverhalt und Zeitbezug: Semitistische und alttestamentliche Studien Adolf Denz zum 65. Geburtstag Edited by Rüdiger Bartelmus and Norbert Nebes. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures: Volume 4*, 4(8), 9.

Dictionaries:

The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Beth-Waw, vol. 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 660 pp.⁵³

Journal articles:

‘“Holy Waw”? A Case of Contrasting Methodologies’, *Or* 22, pp. 415–16.

‘The Accentual Shift in the Perfect with the *Waw* Consecutive’, *JBL* 57, pp. 319–25.⁵⁴

Smith, M.S., ‘The *Waw*-Consecutive at Qumran’, *ZAW* 4 (1991), pp. 161–64.

‘The “*Waw* Conversive”: From Eblaite to Hebrew’, *The American Academy for Jewish Research* 50, pp. 87–90.

Blake, F. R. (1944). The Hebrew *Waw* Conversive. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 63(3), 271–295.

Berry, G. R. (1903). *Waw* Consecutive with the Perfect in Hebrew. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 22(1), 60–69.

Blake, F. R. (1946). The Form of Verbs after *Waw* in Hebrew. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 65(1), 51–57.

Rubinstein, A. (1963). THE ANOMALOUS PERFECT WITH *WAW*-CONJUNCTIVE IN BIBLICAL HEBREW. *Biblica*, 44(1), 62–69.

⁵³ Clines, D. J. A. (1998). *On the Way to the Postmodern: Old Testament Essays, 1967–1998* (Vol. 293, p. 612). Sheffield Academic Press.

Or Orientalia

JBL Journal of Biblical Literature

⁵⁴ Lubetski, M., Gottlieb, C., & Keller, S., eds. (1998). *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World: A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (Vol. 273, p. 546). Sheffield Academic Press.

ZAW Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Muraoka, T., & Rogland, M. (1998). The waw Consecutive in Old Aramaic? A Rejoinder to Victor Sasson. *Vetus Testamentum*, 48(1), 99–104.

Pope, M. (1953). “Pleonastic” Wāw before Nouns in Ugaritic and Hebrew. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 73(2), 95–98.

Sheehan, J. F. X. (1971). Egypto-Semitic Elucidation of the Waw Conversive. *Biblica*, 52(1), 39–43.

Sheehan, J. F. X. (1970). Conversive Waw and Accentual Shift. *Biblica*, 51(4), 545–548.

DeCaen, V. (2001). The Morphosyntactic Argument for the waw Consecutive in Old Aramaic. *Vetus Testamentum*, 51(3), 381–385.

Baden, J. S. (2008). The Wāyiqtol and the Volitive Sequence. *Vetus Testamentum*, 58(2), 147–158.

Wikander, O. (2010). The Hebrew Consecutive *Wāw* as a North West Semitic “Augment”: A Typological Comparison with Indo-European. *Vetus Testamentum*, 60(2), 260–270.

Revell, E. J. (1984). Stress and the WAW “Consecutive” in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 104(3), 437–444.

Gordon, C. H. (1983). The “Waw Conversive”: From Eblaite to Hebrew. *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 50, 87–90.

Baker, D. W. (1980). Further Examples of the waw explicativum. *Vetus Testamentum*, 30(2), 129–136