



## The *wayiqtol* and the Volitive Sequence\*

Joel S. Baden  
New Haven, Connecticut

### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore afresh the use of the *wayiqtol* form in Biblical Hebrew. The particular concern of this paper is to delineate the precise meaning of the form in both volitive and indicative contexts. It is argued that this form always carries the connotation of purpose or result, regardless of its context. The paper concludes with an assessment of the impact of these data on the understanding of the volitive sequence in Biblical Hebrew.

### Keywords

imperfect with *waw*-conjunctive, Biblical Hebrew, volitive sequence

S. R. Driver, in his classic *Treatise on the Use of Tenses in Hebrew*,<sup>1</sup> notes correctly that “Exactly as the perfect with simple *waw* is in Hebrew superseded, and in fact almost banished from the language, by the imperfect with *waw* consecutive, so the impf. with simple *waw*, although not quite to the same extent, is yet in the great majority of cases superseded by the pf. with *waw* consecutive.”<sup>2</sup> One may be so bold as to say that Driver understated the case, since he included in his list of imperfects with simple *waw* a great number, in fact a large majority, of cohortatives and jussives. As it happens, the imperfect with *waw*-conjunctive, *wayiqtol*, is one of the rarest morphologies in Biblical Hebrew, for precisely the reason given by Driver: upon the advent of the “consecutive” forms, the imperfect and perfect with *waw*-conjunctive became virtually extinct. Leaving the unconverted perfect for a separate study, it is the purpose of this paper to re-examine the use of the *wayiqtol* form in Biblical Hebrew.

\*) The author wishes to express his gratitude to Prof. John Huehnergard for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper, and especially to Prof. Dennis Pardee for his support of both this paper and the author over many years.

<sup>1</sup>) (London, 1892. Repr., Grand Rapids, MI, 1998).

<sup>2</sup>) *Treatise*, p. 163f.

### Previous Scholarship

A brief glance at the major grammars of Biblical Hebrew will suffice to demonstrate the lack of uniformity among scholars in their treatment of this form. In Driver's influential book, as noted above, he does not make the distinction between the imperfect and the jussive or cohortative. Thus, although he states that the imperfect with simple waw is used "in order to express the design or purpose of a preceding act," his first example is *herep w' agidāh* (1 Sam. xv 16), in which the "imperfect" form is a marked cohortative.<sup>3</sup> J. Blau has gone even further in this regard, claiming that all apparent examples of *wəyiqtol* are in fact jussives or cohortatives: "a *yqtl* form connected by *wə* to a preceding imperative/jussive, becomes assimilated to the jussive mood (by a sort of *consecutio modorum*), thus shifting into the cohortative in the first person, and into the jussive otherwise (insofar as it can be distinguished morphologically from ordinary *yqtl*)." <sup>4</sup> It is unclear, however, where this leaves one in regard to those forms which are morphologically distinguishable as imperfects, rather than as jussives or cohortatives. Note that Blau also deals only with this form as regards its use in volitive sequences.

Gesenius does not even mention the form specifically, but seems to deal with it only under the blanket category of "imperfect". This is confusing, because he therefore states that the imperfect is sometimes used "as an expression of will... in place of the cohortative... of the imperative... or of the jussive," with the first example of the latter being *tērā'eh* in Gen. i 9;<sup>5</sup> this form, however, is more accurately *w'tērā'eh*, and is a clear example of the *wəyiqtol* form. Gesenius not only neglects to note any distinction between forms with and without the waw, but even removes the waw from his examples.

T. O. Lambdin presents *wəyiqtol* separated into volitive and indicative sequences. For volitive sequences, he claims, any volitive form followed by

<sup>3</sup> *Treatise*, p. 64. Driver's analysis is criticized by T. J. Meek in his article "Result and Purpose Clauses in Biblical Hebrew", *JQR* 46 (1955-56), pp. 40-43. Unfortunately, Meek perpetuates the problem of lumping the *wəyiqtol* with the cohortative and jussive, and compounds it by claiming that *wəqatal* is used to express result and *wəyiqtol* to express purpose. Leaving aside the obvious fact that *wəqatal* frequently does not express result (and that to define it as such is to limit severely its basic function), the explicit separation of purpose from result is impossible to prove, or even fully articulate, in Biblical Hebrew. Meek's examples are overly subjective and seem to be based more on his desire to separate result from purpose than on the verbal forms or their context.

<sup>4</sup> *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (2nd ed. Wiesbaden, 1993), p. 87.

<sup>5</sup> GKC §107n.

either the imperfect with non-converting waw or the cohortative expresses purpose or result.<sup>6</sup> The confusion here is the lack of distinction between the unusual imperfect with simple waw and the cohortative (which always takes simple waw). This confusion is further highlighted, in Lambdin's presentation, by his definition of the more common volitive sequence volitive + volitive as carrying no translational value beyond simple continued volitivity.<sup>7</sup> This means that volitive + cohortative can now fall into two possible volitive sequences. As for indicative sequences, Lambdin seems to suggest that one only finds *wəyiqtol* following another imperfect, but neglects to provide any examples of this sequence. As for its meaning, these can either be "a simple listing of clauses without an explicit expression of logical or temporal consecution," or as "an analog of the imperative + *wə* + cohortative sequence, in which the second clause is best translated as a purpose or result clause."<sup>8</sup> Without any examples or textual references for the first possibility, it is difficult to judge Lambdin's claim; as for the second, it is certainly clearer, although it is interesting that in revisiting his own definition of the volitive sequence, Lambdin neglects to include the *wəyiqtol*.

There are, as can be seen even from this brief overview, a welter of remaining questions regarding the *wəyiqtol* form. There is uncertainty as to whether

<sup>6</sup> *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1971), p. 119 (§107c). Lambdin's scheme is followed almost exactly by Seow (*A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* [Nashville, 1995]), with unfortunate simplifications. Seow presents the volitive sequence with *wəyiqtol* as follows: "If the imperative is followed by an imperfect or cohortative, the latter begins a purpose or result clause... Like the imperative, the jussive may be followed by an imperfect or cohortative" (p. 145). The most striking problem with this definition is that it neglects to mention the salient feature of this sequence, which is the waw-conjunctive, rather than waw-consecutive, preceding the imperfect.

<sup>7</sup> Lambdin (*Introduction*, p. 118f.) describes it as "imperative + imperative", which has led to much confusion among students, but he does preface the description of the sequences by stating that "the sequences involving one are usually similar to or the same as sequences involving the others," which I take to mean that "imperative + imperative" really stands only as the most frequent example of the broader category "volitive + volitive". Again, Seow increases the problems in his presentation of this sequence. Seow's definition: "A series of imperatives or imperatival phrases may occur... in such a sequence, the imperatives... may or may not be consequence to one another" (p. 145). This is virtually identical to Lambdin's description of this sequence, except that Seow does not qualify it by noting that not only imperatives, but also jussives and cohortatives, work this way as well. Furthermore, by defining this sequence so restrictively, there is no place in Seow's scheme for any sequence beginning with a cohortative, nor is there a place for any sequence ending with cohortative other than as a purpose or result clause.

<sup>8</sup> *Introduction*, p. 280 (§197).

it is distinct morphologically from the jussive or cohortative; whether it is distinct grammatically from forms without the waw; and, for nearly everyone, whether it is distinct syntactically from the cohortative or other "indirect" volitives. These uncertainties lead most scholars in one of two directions: either too little distinction is made between forms, as in Driver and Gesenius; or a subjective distinction is made, as can be seen most clearly in Waltke and O'Connor's *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*.<sup>9</sup> Here they define the use of the imperfect with simple waw in indicative as opposed to volitive sequences: "[In indicative contexts] the conjunction does not mark *wəyiqtl* as successive or subordinate; it is rather an unmarked connector . . . After a volitional (cohortative, imperative, jussive) form *wəyiqtl* has a consequential force."<sup>10</sup> These opposing usages are then defended with textual examples, which reveal the subjective nature of this distinction. For volitive sequences, the example is given of Jud. ix 7: "Listen (*šim'û*) to me, citizens of Shechem, so that God may listen (*w'yisma'*) to you." It is unclear why, morpho-syntactically, this should be different from the first example they give of an indicative sequence: "You will pray (*tu'tir*) to him, and he will hear you (*w'yisma'ekka*) (Job xxii 27)."<sup>11</sup> The verb is identical; the context is similar; yet the translation is different. The rationale behind this, beyond the desire to create an artificial distinction between volitive and indicative contexts, is difficult to discern. It seems that one could easily exchange the two translations without dramatically affecting the meaning of the verse. For this reason, in order to defend the translations suggested by Waltke and O'Connor, one would have to insist that every *wəyiqtol* in a volitive context must be translated as connoting purpose or result, and every *wəyiqtol* in an indicative context must be translated as simply continued imperfectivity. As shall be seen below, the evidence prevents one from making such a claim.

The great muddle of definitions and descriptions of *wəyiqtol* presented here provides not only the impetus to review the data, but also the guidelines for how (or how not) to proceed with this venture.

<sup>9</sup> (Winona Lake, IN, 1990).

<sup>10</sup> *Syntax*, p. 562f.

<sup>11</sup> Note that Waltke and O'Connor also fail to distinguish between marked imperfect forms and forms which might well be jussive, as in these examples.

### Methodological Considerations

To start, one must not fall into the same trap as did Driver in his analysis of this form. By combining imperfect, jussive, and cohortative forms into one category, Driver effectively blurred the unique issue of the *wəyiqtol*. When the jussive or cohortative are preceded by a simple waw, it is not particularly noteworthy; these forms cannot be converted, so they only take the waw-conjunctive. In order to study effectively the use of the *wəyiqtol*, one must be careful to separate imperfects from jussives and cohortatives.

To that end, it is imperative that only forms which are morphologically distinguishable as imperfects be used for this study. Thus one is restricted to the three classes of verbs which show a morphological distinction between the imperfect and the jussive: 1) II-weak verbs, in which the imperfect should be *w'yāqūm*, and the jussive *w'yāqom*; 2) hiphil verbs, in which the imperfect should be *w'yašmīd*, and the jussive *w'yašmēd*; 3) III-weak verbs, in which the imperfect should be *w'yibneh*, and the jussive *w'yibn*. In all of these cases, only singular forms are permissible, as the plural suffixes mask the morphological distinctions,<sup>12</sup> and in the case of the III-weak verbs, only second- and third-person forms can be used, because in the first person the final h of the root can double as the h of the cohortative, thus making it indistinguishable from the imperfect.<sup>13</sup>

With these tight controls in place, only eleven unambiguous examples of the *wəyiqtol* remain in the entire corpus from Gen. to 2 Kgs.<sup>14</sup> Though the exclusion of ambiguous forms may make this an artificial and deceptively low number, one should in general be inclined to believe that morphologically ambiguous forms are jussives, rather than imperfects; of those forms which are distinguishable, only the eleven presented below are marked imperfects, whereas 48 are marked jussives. Thus one is not distorting the data too much by dealing only with marked imperfects.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The sole exception to this is the plural form *w'yirā'ūn* in Deut. xiii 12 (see below), which is marked as indicative by the paragogic nun. This is the only example of a *wəyiqtolūn* form in biblical prose.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. GKC §751.

<sup>14</sup> Compare this with the 1287 examples cited by F. T. Kelly, "The Imperfect with Simple Waw in Hebrew", *JBL* 39 (1920), pp. 1-23, which is directly dependent on Driver's lack of distinction between the *wəyiqtol* and the indirect volitives.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. H. Orlinsky, "On the Cohortative and Jussive after an Imperative or Interjection in Biblical Hebrew", *JQR* 31 (1940-41), pp. 371-382; 32 (1941-42), pp. 191-205, 273-77. Orlinsky attempts to prove that the *wəyiqtol* form never originally existed after the imperative, and that any examples of it (he counts 13) are text-critical errors for original cohortatives or jussives. Although

The *wayiqtol* form, in short, is exceedingly rare. This should not be unexpected, considering the acknowledged fact that its very existence is something of a historical-grammatical anomaly. One of the underlying assumptions of this paper is that because the form is so uncommon and does not fit into the standard verbal system, it must be associated with a specific meaning or usage. Among the works of the scholars presented in the previous section, only one unique usage is assigned to the *wayiqtol* form: purpose or result. Simple continued imperfectivity (in indicative contexts), an alternative suggested by Lambdin and Waltke and O'Connor, can be accomplished by using the much more common *waqatal*,<sup>16</sup> and while Driver and others claim that the "indirect volitives" can also connote purpose or result, everyone agrees that they do not necessarily do so; they frequently do no more than continue the volitivity of the preceding verb. It is therefore the working thesis here that the *wayiqtol* form is the highly marked morphology used to connote purpose or result.

### Textual Analysis

Let us briefly examine each of the eleven instances of *wayiqtol* individually. Because one of the aims here is to determine if any distinction can be made between *wayiqtol* in indicative versus volitive contexts, they will be presented undifferentiated, simply in order of appearance. It should be repeated at the outset that the assumption throughout is that the *wayiqtol* form always and explicitly connotes purpose or result. The translations below reflect this assumption.

*Gen. i 9.* "Let the water below the sky be gathered (*yiqqāwū*) into one area, so that the dry land may appear (*w'tērā'eh*)."<sup>17</sup> Most translations render the verb in question "and let the dry land appear", as if the form were a jussive.<sup>17</sup> In this case, however, the final *h* marks the verb as imperfect. This is the parade example of *wayiqtol* in a volitive sequence. Though the initial verb (*yiqqāwū*) is not marked as a jussive (because of the plural ending), it is universally understood as such.

*Ex. ii 7.* "Shall I go (*ha'ēlēk*) and call for you a nursing-woman from among the Hebrew women, that she might suckle (*w'tēniq*) the child for you?" Here the context is interrogative; all translations render this verse similarly.

he may tend to stretch the evidence at times to make his case, his instinct to avoid the *wayiqtol* form was surely sound.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Lambdin, *Introduction*, p. 108; Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, p. 527.

<sup>17</sup> Notably the ESV, JPS, KJV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, and NJB; the only major translations to render the verb as here are the NJPS (in contrast to its earlier version) and the NAB.

*Deut. xiii 12.* "All Israel will hear (*yis'm'ū*) and (as a result) will be afraid (*w'yirā'ūm*)." The paragogic nun marks this form as an imperfect. The context is indicative and imperfective. The meaning is best understood as resultative, rather than as a simple continuation of the imperfect, as virtually all translations have it. This phrase occurs, with changes of subject, four times in Deuteronomy (xiii 12, xvii 13, xix 20, and xxi 21; this is the only time that the paragogic nun is used). Every example is used in the context of removing evil from the midst of the community by putting a sinner to death. Because the community will hear (*yis'm'ū*) such a terrible report of the execution of the sinner, they will, as a consequence, be afraid (*w'yirā'ūm*), and avoid the same sins themselves.

*Judg. xix 11.* "Let us turn aside (*l'kāh-nā w'nāsūrāh*) to this city of the Jebusites that we might spend the night (*w'nālīm*) there." This, along with 2 Kgs. iv 10, is the most ambiguous of all the examples. All the major translations take this form as an unmarked cohortative, and translate accordingly: "and let us spend the night there". Though this is a possibility, it should be noted that it is very uncommon for a verb to have an unambiguously imperfect form but a cohortative meaning.<sup>18</sup> One should therefore understand this form as a *wayiqtol* both in morphology and meaning. That the purpose of turning aside is to spend the night is evident even in the more common translations, but the use of the rare *wayiqtol* form as opposed to the cohortative (which is attested in Ct. vii 12) must have been a conscious choice on the part of the author, and should be recognized as such.

*1 Sam. xii 3.* "Testify (*'nū*) against me before YHWH and before his anointed one—whose ox have I taken, whose ass have I taken, whom have I wronged, whom have I oppressed, from whom have I taken (*lāqahit*) a bribe so that I would hide (*w'a'lim*) my eyes—that I might return (*w'āsīb*) them to you." This verse contains two examples of the *wayiqtol* form. The first is *w'a'lim*, which is subordinate to the immediately preceding verb, *lāqahit*, and is part of a series of interrogatives. The purpose of a bribe is to persuade the judge to hide his eyes, or subvert justice. The second *wayiqtol* is *w'āsīb*. It is

<sup>18</sup> There are numerous examples of III-*b* or III-*'* verbs, or verbs with suffixes, which could be either imperfect or cohortative, but which are clearly intended to have cohortative meaning according to their context. There are also some forms which do not fall into these categories and lack the cohortative ending, but which could theoretically be jussive (such as *w'ektob* in Deut. x 2). (The example of Judg. xix 11 above cannot be jussive, because of the *hiqeq-yod*.) Recognizing the remarkable scarcity of the first-person jussive, it remains the aim here to be as restrictive as possible, using only forms which can only be imperfects. Within these limits, it is difficult to find even one wholly defensible example of a marked imperfect form with a necessarily cohortative meaning.

less clear on which verb this form follows. Theoretically, it could belong with what immediately precedes it ("From whom have I taken a bribe... I will return it to you"), in which case it could not have any sense of purpose or result. It is more probable, however, that it belongs with the initial imperative, "nû" ("Testify against me... so that I may return it to you"). In this understanding, the purpose of testifying is that any illegally taken goods (listed in the interrogative clauses between the imperative and the *wayiqtol*) might be returned. It is worth observing that the LXX makes this explicit, by repeating the imperative "testify against me" immediately before *w'āšīb*. This single verse contains two *wayiqtol* forms in two contexts: one interrogative and one volitive.

2 Sam. xix 38. "Let your servant return (*yāšob-nā*) that I might die (*w'āmu*) in my own city." The context here is volitive, with a marked jussive as the main verb. The translation is virtually universal.

1 Kgs. xii 9 (//2 Chr. x 9). "What do you advise (*nō'āšīm*), that we might answer (*w'nāšīb*) this people...?" Here the context is interrogative, and the main clause is participial. Though many translations smooth over this syntax by rendering the *wayiqtol* here as essentially an infinitive ("How do you advise us to answer...?" [e.g., NJB]) or an independent interrogative ("What do you advise? How should we answer...?" [e.g., NIV]), the more unwieldy translation given above is probably more accurate to the Hebrew.<sup>19</sup>

1 Kgs. xv 19. "Break (*hāpērāh*) your treaty with Baasha, king of Israel, so that he will withdraw (*w'ya'leh*) from me." Another volitive, this time an imperative, stands as the main verb, and again one finds a universally similar translation.

2 Kgs. iv 10. "Let us make (*nā'seh*) a small walled roof-chamber so that we can set (*w'nāšīm*) for him there a bed, a table, a chair, and a lampstand." This example is directly equivalent to that of Judg. xix 11. The major translations all render this verse "Let us make... and let us set". Again, however, the use of *wayiqtol* rather than the cohortative (which is attested twice: 1 Kgs. xx 31; Isa. xli 22) should be significant.

2 Kgs. vi 17. "Open (*p'qah*) his eyes so that he may see (*w'yir'eh*). The context here is volitive, with the *wayiqtol* form subordinate to the imperative. Most translations agree on this rendering of the verse (surprisingly, the NJPS translation takes this as a jussive, "and let him see", though the *h* marks it as an imperfect).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the KJV translation: "What counsel give ye that we may answer this people", which similarly captures the syntax.

In these ten verses, the eleven unambiguous instances of the *wayiqtol* are exhausted. Having begun the above analysis with the assumption that the *wayiqtol* is always to be translated as meaning purpose or result, two observations may be made: 1) In none of these examples is one required to understand the form as something other than purpose or result; though it may not be every translator's first choice, it is never an impossibility. 2) More importantly, in fact crucially, this is the only meaning that can apply equally well to all examples. Though one example might be rendered as a jussive, and another as a cohortative, and a third as a simple imperfect, according to the desires of the translator, none of these meanings can be extrapolated over all eleven examples as a rule. This can be accomplished only with the meaning of purpose or result.

It is also noteworthy that, contra Waltke and O'Connor, the connotation of purpose or result is not dependent on the volitive or indicative nature of the main clause. The *wayiqtol* form can and should be rendered as purpose or result regardless. The examples above are taken from volitive, interrogative, and imperfect contexts, without changing the meaning of the form. There are surely others, indistinguishable morphologically from jussives or cohortatives, that would increase the variety of contexts in which the *wayiqtol* is found.<sup>20</sup>

### Volitive Sequences Reassessed

If the *wayiqtol* form is the marked morphology for connoting purpose or result, what effect, if any, does this have on the identification and understanding of volitive sequences as a group? As was noted above, according to Driver, the idea of purpose belongs to not only *wayiqtol*, but cohortatives and jussives as well. Gesenius says the same, though he breaks up his examples into separate categories for the cohortative and jussive.<sup>21</sup> Lambdin, as already shown,

<sup>20</sup> In searching for these one might note, however, that every unambiguous example of the *wayiqtol* is found in direct discourse. As it happens, there are not even any morphologically ambiguous examples of *wayiqtol* found outside of direct discourse. This may be another piece of supporting evidence for the claim, found in C. H. van der Merwe, J. A. Naude, and J. H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield, 1999), that "one might expect narrations to be syntactically 'impoverished' and to concentrate on events in the past. They would thus have a relatively small variety of syntactic constructions. As opposed to that, dialogue, which often involves all the temporal spheres, is usually syntactically 'rich'" (p. 164f.). Indeed, it is exceptionally rare to find any expression of purpose or result (using *ba'būr*, e.g.) in purely narrative biblical passages.

<sup>21</sup> GKC §108d, 109f.

restricts purpose/result to the *wayiqtol* and the cohortative only. Again, however, for all these scholars, the jussive or cohortative can, depending on the context, have no more force than a simple continuation of volitivity. In other words, it is implicitly up to the individual reader to determine how to translate an indirect volitive.

The necessity of such an approach is made clearest in the analysis of Joüon-Muraoka.<sup>22</sup> For the indirect volitives, three basic possibilities are offered: consecution ("Do X... and then Y"), purpose ("Do X... so that Y"), and as simple continuation of volitivity ("Do X... and do Y").<sup>23</sup> For both the jussive and the cohortative, and, for that matter, the imperative as well, Joüon-Muraoka provide numerous examples of both consecution and purpose or result. They state the problem quite plainly:

The distinction between 'purpose' and 'consecution' cannot always be sharply drawn, since one is dealing with an intended effect or result, and the syntagm under discussion is not used to express a thought such as "Noah drank excessively so that he could hardly find his way about." Furthermore, it is hardly possible to demonstrate that a sentence such as Gen. 27:4 [which they have already translated as 'Bring it to me so that I may eat it'] does not mean 'Bring it to me, and let me eat it,' in other words, with the second verb retaining its original, genuine volitive force, and the Waw being merely juxtaposing.<sup>24</sup>

The issue is clear: when a volitive is followed by another volitive, it is impossible, based purely on the morpho-syntax, to determine whether the second form, the indirect volitive, is to be understood as simply continuing the volitivity of the first, expressing some sort of consecution, or expressing purpose or result.

This has a damning effect on Lambdin's schematization of the volitive sequences. In his view, volitive + volitive represents simple continued volitivity; volitive + *waqatal* represents consecution; and volitive + *wayiqtol* (or

<sup>22</sup> *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome, 1996).

<sup>23</sup> *Grammar*, p. 381ff. Joüon-Muraoka do not consider this last possibility to be a true indirect volitive. They distinguish between direct and indirect volitives on the basis of the type of waw used: either "purely juxtaposing" or "expressing the notion of purpose or consecution". Of course, as there is no formal difference between these two purported waws, it is impossible to determine which is meant except by context. So whether one accepts the idea that there are different waws or not, the result is the same: the translator must make the decision as to which he is faced with.

<sup>24</sup> *Grammar*, p. 382n.

cohortative) represents purpose or result. Joüon-Muraoka make clear that in fact volitive + volitive can represent all three of these meanings, at the discretion of the translator.

One can resolve these opposing viewpoints, however, when one recognizes the equivalence between volitive and narrative sequences. In volitive sequences, the least marked form is volitive + volitive; this is by far the most common, and can have the widest variety of meanings. In indicative sequences, the least marked form is the simple narrative sequence *qatal* + *wayyiqtol*, or its continuation, *wayyiqtol* + *wayyiqtol*. Though the basic meaning of this indicative sequence is obviously "he did this... and he did that", over the course of the biblical text the demands of narrative logic require that the full spectrum of possible translations be employed. As Lambdin puts it,

Because every Hebrew narrative, then, contains a series of clauses beginning with 'and' plus a verb, it is obviously impossible to translate literally and have acceptable English. The student should make generous use of subordinating constructions, such as adverbial clauses and participial modifiers, in his English translation, taking care only to preserve the proper logical or temporal sequence of the Hebrew.<sup>25</sup>

The basically unmarked sequence in indicative contexts, then, can and should be translated in a variety of ways, according to the context. The same is true, by analogy, of the unmarked volitive sequences, volitive + volitive.

Further parallels can be drawn between indicative and volitive sequences. If the unmarked sequence can, as expected, have the widest variety of usages, then one should expect a diminishing variety in the more highly marked forms. And this is precisely what is found. In both indicative and volitive sequences, X + *waqatal* has a connotation of consecution in the great majority of examples.<sup>26</sup> And similarly, and most importantly for this paper, in both indicative and volitive sequences, as demonstrated above, the highly marked X + *wayiqtol* always and explicitly connotes purpose or result.

The volitive sequence, therefore, is a three-tiered system, constructed in order of frequency. The first tier is the simple, unmarked sequence, volitive + volitive. The basic meaning of this sequence is simple continued volitivity, and it can and perhaps should be translated as such most often. Because it is

<sup>25</sup> *Introduction*, p. 108.

<sup>26</sup> As observed by Lambdin: "Explicit consecution is expressed by this sequence, which is the analog of the *imperfect* + *perfect* narrative sequence" (p. 119).

unmarked, however, it can, like the indicative sequence *wayyiqtol* + *wayyiqtol*, take on a variety of meanings based on the logic of the context. Among those meanings are the notions of consecution and purpose or result.<sup>27</sup> But these meanings are not inherent in the morpho-syntax; they are entirely dependent on the context. The second tier is volitive + *wəqatal*, which, like its indicative counterpart, is marked for consecution. The third tier, and the most highly marked, is volitive + *wəyiqtol*, which, again like its indicative counterpart, always and explicitly connotes purpose or result.

The application of these observations to the study of the Hebrew Bible may be quite broad. Most importantly, the re-analysis of the volitive + volitive sequence above requires that both translators and readers be aware that virtually any translation of this sequence with more force than simple continued volitivity represents a conscious exegetical choice on the part of the translator. Such choices are, for the most part, entirely obvious in their contextual basis, sometimes verging on necessity. But there are passages for which multiple choices are equally possible, and in such circumstances, the translator should be expected to defend his choice on exegetical grounds.

---

<sup>27</sup> This potential range of translation is the basis of Lambdin's problematic inclusion of the cohortative with *wəyiqtol* in the sequence meaning purpose or result. In fact, as other scholars have shown, the jussive and the imperative can be used equally well at times to represent purpose or result; in all three cases, this meaning is not a function of the morpho-syntax (and therefore should not be included in a schematization of the volitive sequences), but is rather a result of the context and the translator's choice.

Remarkably, virtually this exact definition was arrived at by Kelly in his 1920 article, in which he articulated three possible meanings for the "imperfect with simple waw": coordinate (i.e., simple continued volitivity), ones which may be translated "then" (i.e., consecution), and purpose or result (p. 3). Had Kelly removed the *wəyiqtol* form from his scheme, rather than making it out to be the basic form from which the indirect volitives derived, he would have reached the same conclusions as this paper.