

Ingressive *qwm* in Biblical Hebrew

F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp (New Haven, Connecticut)

In the past scholars have recognized that in Biblical Hebrew (BH) *qwm* is sometimes used as in (1) – (3) to focus attention on the beginning of a situation (see Speiser 1964, 163; Lambdin 1971, 238-40; O'Connor 1980, 303; Cogan and Tadmor 1988, 86; BDB s.v., 6b-c):

- (1) *wayyāqom yônâ librōaḥ taršîšâ millipnê yhwh* (Jon 1:3)
- (2) *qûm-nā' šēbâ* (Gen 27:19)
- (3) *wayyāqom yônâ wayyēlek 'el-nîñweh* (Jon 3:3)

However, no sufficiently detailed and theoretically explicit explanation of this phenomenon has as yet been offered. This paper attempts to move towards a more satisfactory explanation of such uses of *qwm* with reference to phasal aspect, an important component of the more general semantic category of aspect. It is suggested that in addition to its use as a lexical verb meaning "to arise, stand," *qwm* functions as a grammatical marker of ingressive aspect.¹ Ingressive aspect entails reference to the inception or initiation of a situation, often times focusing more specifically on either the onset of a situation or the initial temporal phase of the nucleus of a situation. It is this aspectual use of *qwm* that is represented in examples (1) – (3). I offer three kinds of evidence in support of this interpretation. First, *qwm* is both a stance and motion verb. In many languages, notably in the Semitic languages, verbs with the motional meaning "to arise, come to a standing position" frequently become grammaticalized as markers of aspect, or aspect verbs.² Second, ingressive *qwm* appears to be a complement-taking verb which selects reduced complements. This profile is consistent with that of other aspect verbs in the world's languages. Third, the ingressive use of *qwm* has the same presuppositions and implications as other ingressive aspect verbs. Each of these lines of argument is followed out below. In the main part of this paper, a contextual analysis of specific examples of ingressive *qwm* in the Hebrew Bible, guidelines for distinguishing lexical from ingressive *qwm* are set out, new or improved interpretations of passages are reported, and more precise and idiomatic translation equivalents for ingressive *qwm* are identified.³ The discussion is pursued throughout with the Hebrew tense/aspect system particularly in mind.

¹ "Ingressive aspect" is also referred to in the literature as "inchoative" or "inceptive" aspect.

² Others use "aspectuals," "aspectual auxiliaries," or "aspectualizers."

³ Wherever possible I cite translations, ancient or modern, which seem to comprehend the ingressive sense of *qwm*. In my own translations I have tried to capture the ingressive nuance of *qwm* in as idiomatic English as possible. One result of this practice is that no one English word is consistently used as a gloss for *qwm*. While English *begin* and *start* are rough equivalents to Hebrew *qwm* (and frequently used in the modern translations cited), the use of these terms to translate *qwm* is not always satisfactory; in many passages the use of *begin* or *start* as a gloss for *qwm* feels wooden and stilted, non-idiomatic.

Dynamic situations necessarily have a beginning, end, and middle. B. Comrie defines aspect as "different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation"⁴ (1976, 3). Therefore the differentiation of these phases is aspectual in that it refers to the different periods of a situation's internal temporal structure. This type of aspect may be referred to as phasal aspect (Lyons 1977, 710-11; cf. Comrie 1976, 48; Bache 1985, 10-11; Noonan 1985, 129), to distinguish it from viewpoint (*Aspekt*) and situation aspect (*Aktionsart*). Viewpoint aspect, as the terminology suggests, indicates how the speaker/writer views the internal temporal contours of a situation.⁵ On the other hand, situation aspect indicates "the intrinsic temporal qualities of a situation" (Brinton 1988, 3). This involves "types or categories of verb predication" (Mourelatos 1981, 196).⁶

Phasal aspect has usually been considered as a subcategory of situation aspect (see Bache 1985, 10-11; Smith 1991, 75-79). However, it is best to keep these two aspectual notions separate. As C. S. Smith (1991, 65-90, esp. 75-79) rightly stresses, the properties of inception, iteration, habituality, continuation, and termination entail only a shift in focus to a sub-part of a given situation. The given situation itself does not change; it remains the same (cf. Bache 1985, 11). This strongly suggests that phase and situation are distinct aspectual parameters.⁷

All three types of aspect, viewpoint, situation, and phase, should be considered in order to best understand the overall aspectual characterization of any given clause or sentence (see esp. Bache 1985; Fanning 1990; Smith 1991). The present study hopes to contribute to such an analysis by identifying one way in which the ingressive phasal component of aspectual meaning is realized in BH.

1. Motion Verbs and Aspectual Meaning

Semantically, *qwm* fits the profile of a group of verbs that often become aspect verbs. In many languages motional verbs frequently become grammaticalized as markers of aspect (see Brinton 1988, 95-162, esp. 114-32). In particular, verbs meaning "to arise, come to a standing position" are used both as main verbs with their lexical meanings intact and as aspectual verbs grammaticalizing a variety of

⁴ The term *situation* is Comrie's cover-term for referring neutrally to different types of verbal predication (1976, 13). This is how the term is used in this discussion as well.

⁵ For discussions of viewpoint aspect and references to other literature, see Comrie 1976; Bache 1982; Fanning 1990; Smith 1991.

⁶ For discussions of situation aspect and references to other literature, see Vendler 1967, 97-121; Kenny 1963; Chafe 1970, 95-104; Friedrich 1974; Comrie 1976, 41-51; Lyons 1977, 705-7, 711-12; Freed 1979, 28-29, 47-54; Mourelatos 1981; Smith 1983, 481-82; Chung and Timberlake 1985, 213-14; 1991, 27-90; Brinton 1988, 23-36; Fanning 1990, 29-50.

⁷ Intuitively, the cognitive properties associated with situation aspect, duration, punctuality, telicity, etc., seem distinct from those of inception, iteration, termination, etc. This intuition is captured in the traditional German terminology which distinguishes the phasal aspects or *Phasenaktionsarten* (Lloyd 1979, 9) from other *Aktionsarten*. Moreover, some languages have recognizable mechanisms that specifically grammaticalize the phasal constituency of a situation. For example, Modern English uses aspect verbs such as *begin*, *continue*, and *cease* and their complement structures to compositionally grammaticalize phasal aspect (see Freed 1979; Brinton 1988). For the marking of phasal aspect in languages such as Mandarin Chinese, Russian, and Navajo, see Smith (1991, 316, 387-88, 422-25).

aspectual nuances, the most common of which is inception. Some of the more striking examples of the aspectual use of this latter kind of verb are given below. The aspectual interpretation of these examples reflect specific suggestions made by students of the various languages. Emphasis is naturally given to the Semitic languages.

In the Romance languages words etymologically related to Latin *stō*, *stāre* "to stand" are often used to mark aspectual meaning. In Italian *stare* can be used to predicate the immediate future or to mark progressive aspect. In French *être* functions as a perfective auxiliary, and in Spanish *estar* marks progressive aspect.

W.A. Foley and R.D. Van Valin report that motion verbs meaning "come" and "go" are used in Yoruba to indicate ingressive aspect (1984, 211). They also note that intransitive stance verbs such as "sit", "stand", or "live," and verbs like "finish" are typical in aspect-marking constructions (1984, 210). T. Givón observes that *jak* "to rise, arrive" in verb serialization constructions grammaticalizes complete aspect in Kalam, a language spoken in Papua-New Guinea (1991, 155).

In Syriac, *qām* is used in some ways that resemble uses of *qwm* in BH. This is most apparent in the Peshiṭta, where *qām* typically mirrors MT's *qwm*. For example, note the following:

- (4) a. MT = *wayyāqom wayyēlak* (Gen 25:34)
Syr = *qām ʔezal*
b. MT = *wayyāqom ʔišāh wayyēlek ʔaḥrêhā* (Judg 19:3)
Syr = *wqām ba ʕlāh we ʔzal bātrāh*
c. MT = *wē ʔāqûmā wē ʔerděpā* (2 Sam 17:1)
Syr = *we ʔqûm ʔerdûp*

T. Nöldeke comments on such constructions. He writes that the "two verbs are often so intimately associated that the government of the one, which may not be at all that of the other, operates for the entire combination, and the object stands next to the verb to which it by no means belongs" (Nöldeke 1904, par. 336). This suggests that the two verbs are considered to be a single semantic unit (for the significance of this fact, see below). Nöldeke offers the example in (5):

- (5) *kad kawkbay šmayyā ʔnqûm wnemne ʔ* (Aphr. 199, 13)
"while he rises up and numbers the stars in heaven" (Nöldeke 1904, par. 336)⁸

In Ugaritic the verbs *nš ʔ* "to lift up" and *qwm* "to arise" are perhaps used as ingressive aspectual verbs. The verb *nš ʔ* is used once in combination with *yṭb* "to sit."

- (6) *yṭṣu.yṭb.b ap.ṭgr.*
ṭḥt.adrm.d b grn. (CTA 17.5.6-7)
He sat down at the entrance of the gate
At the foot of grain piles on the threshing floor

While the context is not as clear as one might like, there seems little justification for assuming that Danʿil raises himself up from some prone position in order to sit

⁸ In order to better capture the aspectual nuance of *qām* one might translate, "while he begins numbering the stars in heaven."

down. Rather, a simpler explanation is that here *nš*² functions as an ingressive aspect verb (see below for similar Hebrew examples).

C.H. Gordon cites several examples of *qwm* marking inception (1965, 119-20):

- (7) a. *qm. yṯ^cr w. yšlḥmnh* (CTA 3.1:4-5)
he began serving and feeding him
b. *qm. ybd. wyšr* (CTA 3.1:18)
he began chanting and singing

In both (7a) and (7b) the difference in form between *qm* and the two following verbs suggests that here one does not have to do with a simple sequence of three actions. Rather, here *qm* is a marker of ingressive aspect – as Gordon puts it, *qm* expresses "inception." The stereotypical occurrence of *bd* and *šyr* together elsewhere in Ugaritic (cf. CTA 17.6:31) offers some confirmation of the interpretation given here. That is, there seems to be a contrast between the stereotypically linked verbs *bd* and *šyr* with and without *qm*. The contrast is aspectual in nature.

F.R. Kraus notes that in Akkadian *tebûm* "to stand up" and *izuzzum* "to stand" are used in hendiadys-like constructions to express the preparation (*Vorbereitung*) or beginning phase (*Beginnphase*) of an action (1987, 39).

- (8) a. *atbeamma atalkam* (BIN 436:15)
"I departed immediately" (CAD A/1, 322, 5a)⁹
b. *itbiamma magal idbubam* (AbB Stol, 9 Nr. 40)
"He has risen and complained to me excessively" (Kraus 1987, 38)¹⁰

Note especially the occurrences of *tebûm* and *izuzzum* in the Mari prophecy texts:

- (9) a. *Innibana āpiltum itbēma kīam idbub ummāmi* (ARM X 81:4-6)
Innibana the prophetess began saying as follows
b. *aplûm ša Dagan ša Tut[tul] itbēma kīam iqbi ummāmi* (ARM XIII 23:6-8)
the prophet of Dagan of Tuttul began speaking as follows
c. *it[bēma kīam]*¹¹ *iqbi ummāmi* (ARM X 9:10¹-11¹; cf. ARM X 50:22-23; 53:5-7)
he began speaking as follows
d. *ina šuttīya Bēlet-biri izzizamma kīam iqbēm umma* (ARM X 51:8-11; cf. X 94:5¹-6¹; A.1121 + A. 2731:13-14; A. 455; see Dossin 1966, 79-80)
in my dream Bēlet-biri began speaking as follows

Scholars naturally tend to translate quite literally "to arise/stand/get up and speak" (e.g., Dossin 1966, 79-80; Malamat 1966, 215; 1987, 41, 50, n. 20; Huffmon 1968, 108, 109, 113, 114, 119, 120; Moran 1969, 24-25; Craghan 1974, 43, 46, 48). W. L. Moran even goes so far as to suggest that *tebûm* and *izuzzum* literally reflect the

⁹ The translation is not quite right. "Thereupon, he departed" would be better (cf. Lambdin 1972, 239).

¹⁰ Note that despite Kraus' explanation his translation fails to effectively capture the ingressive sense of *tebûm* in this example. One might translate more accurately, "he went ahead and complained to me excessively" or "he began complaining to me excessively."

¹¹ See Moran (1969, 50) for this restoration.

prophet's ecstatic experience. He writes, "He arose' *implies* that the professional was usually sitting, kneeling or crouching until inspiration seized him.... Here we *may imagine* him arise and, facing with the statue [of the god] towards the worshippers, become *vox dei*. For the witnesses this must have been an impressive and at times even terrifying experience" (Moran 1969, 26; cf. Noort 1977, 24-25; emphasis is mine). Nothing in any of these letters actually demands such an interpretation. Rather, examples like those cited in (8) suggest that (9a-d) would seem to be good examples of the aspectual use of *tebûm* and *izuzzum*.

M. Bar-Asher cites examples of *ʿmd* "to arise, stand" indicating the imminence of an action in Mishnaic Hebrew and Christian Palestinian Aramaic (1988, 30, n. 13):

- (10) a. *pārâ hā ʿômedet lēlēd... rāḥēl hā ʿômedet lēḥiggāzēz* (Mishna Baba Kamma IX.1)

"A cow that is about to throw a calf... and a ewe that is about to be shorn" (Bar-Asher 1988, 30, n. 13)

- b. *wkn ʿmd hygmwn² dy ʿl yth lysws mn tnynw* (CPA)

"then, the governor was about to make Jesus enter a second time" (Bar-Asher 1988, 30, n. 13)

Interestingly, *ʿmd* begins to take over the meaning of *qwm* already in the later books of the Hebrew Bible (cf. BDB, s.v. *ʿmd*, 6a-b). Therefore, the appearance of *ʿmd* as an aspectual verb in Mishnaic Hebrew and Christian Palestinian Aramaic strengthens the case for finding such uses of *qwm* in BH.

In the Neo-Aramaic dialect of Aradhin (located in Kurdistan), G. Krotkoff observes that the verb *qya:ma* "to stand" carries an inchoative connotation when it precedes another verb without a conjunction (1982, 56). He provides the following examples:

- (11) a. *u ha:dax qε:mi mε:θi bδa:nane u zari āra*¹²

"thus they bring yokes [of oxen] and plow the soil" (Krotkoff 1982, 56)

- b. *u ha:dax qīmwa:lε na:sē... dré:wa:lε qale*

"thus the people ... began to compose melodies" (Krotkoff 1982, 56)

- c. *maḏi sabab qimla yimme pišla majbú:r*

"therefore his mother was forced" (Krotkoff 1982, 56)

In Mandaic *qwm* partly replaces the inchoative verb *šmr* (Macuch 1965, 450-51):

- (12) a. *qum mut*¹³

"now die!" (Macuch 1965, 451)

- b. *qām βād eβad*

"he started to work" (Macuch 1965, 451)

- c. *qom alennī*

"let's go!" (Macuch 1965, 451)

- d. *haizak qam... uba*

¹² The transliteration is Krotkoff's.

¹³ The transliteration is Macuch's.

In the Babylonian Talmud and in Mandaic *qwm* eventually loses its final mem and becomes a proclitic particle attached to participles indicating present tense (Margolis 1910, 50, 81; Nöldeke 1875, par. 261; Macuch 1965, 433).

In colloquial Arabic *qwm* acts like a particle and indicates inchoation (Elder 1927, 6):

(13) a. $\text{ʿam } \text{ʿal lu}^{14}$

"He arose and said" (Elder 1927, 6)¹⁵

b. $\text{ʿa:m iz zubu:n } \text{ʿal lu}$

"the customer arises and says" (Elder 1927, 6)

The examples given here may suffice to illustrate the nature of the typological pattern involved: verbs with the motional meaning "to arise, stand" commonly become aspect verbs, many marking inception.¹⁶ This pattern reflects a common linguistic process of semantic change (cf. Chafe 1970, 40-50) known as grammaticalization. According to J. Kurylowicz's definition, "grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of morphemes advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status" (as cited in Heine et al. 1991, 3). The development from a lexical item to a new grammatical marker often results from what B. Heine and his associates call a "context-induced reinterpretation" (1991, 71; cf. Chafe 1970, 42). Ideally, this process consists of three developmental stages (Heine et al. 1991, 71-72), and generally involves metonymy and metaphor. In the first stage, a given linguistic form acquires an additional meaning when occurring in a specific context. This often leads to semantic ambiguity where both of the form's meanings, the original lexical meaning and the newly acquired meaning, are present (cf. Chafe 1970, 42-43). In the next stage, the lexical form is used in new contexts that are compatible with its newly acquired meaning but which rule out the original lexical meaning. In the last stage, the new meaning becomes conventionalized, and as a consequence, polysemy or homonymy may develop.

L.J. Brinton uses the concept of grammaticalization to successfully account for the development of aspect verbs in English (1988, 95-162). She explains that the selection of certain verbs as aspect verbs is "motivated by a correspondence between the motional meaning of the verb and the spatial characteristics" of aspect categories (1988, 113-14). Similarly, in the examples cited above, lexical verbs meaning "to arise" have been exploited for the expression of aspectual meaning.¹⁷

¹⁴ The transliteration is Elder's.

¹⁵ The translations of (13a) and (13b) do not adequately convey Elder's understanding of the inchoative sense of these examples, which could be better related by translating something like "he up and said" for (13a) and "the customer began saying" for (13b).

¹⁶ Egyptian may provide yet another example of the use of a verb meaning "to stand up, arise" as an aspect marker. $\text{ʿh } \text{ʿ:n}$ "to stand up, arise" occurs in a main clause with another verb (Gardiner 1973, par. 476). A. Gardiner describes this as an auxiliary construction. Gordon explicitly associates this construction with the ingressive use of *qwm* in Ugaritic (1965, 120). While this comparison is suggestive, the correctness of an ingressive interpretation of $\text{ʿh } \text{ʿ:n}$ is best left to the Egyptologists to judge.

¹⁷ Note the existence of these characteristic traits of grammaticalization. First, the source concepts, verbs meaning "to arise," are lexemes of frequent and general use which designate a basic-level category (see Heine et al. 1991, 17, 33, 35, 38-39). Second, the employment of a

The initiation of a situation is envisioned metaphorically in terms of the motional idea of someone rising or standing up to undertake an action. It is likely that the metonymic and metaphoric shift from motion verb to aspect marker was contextually induced (see below). Hebrew *qwm* "to arise, stand" is semantically analogous to the examples reviewed above, and thus, is poised for selection as an ingressive aspect verb.

2. Sentential Complementation

There is syntactic evidence which favors identifying some uses of *qwm* in BH as aspectual. Aspect verbs typically take some form of reduced complements¹⁸ (see Freed 1979; Givón 1979, 213-15, 221-22; 1991, 139, 155, 163; Foley and Van Valin 1984, 210-12; Noonan 1985, 107, 129; Hale 1991, 24). They are what M. Noonan calls "complement-taking predicates" (1985, 43). They take reduced complements because the complements have dependent time reference (Noonan 1985, 100-1, 129). As Noonan explains, complements to phasal predicates (= aspect verbs) have dependent or determined time reference "since the time reference of the... phase of an event must be the same as that of the event itself" (1985, 129). In other words, the complement of an aspect verb is dependent on the aspect verb for its temporal reference.

The use of *qwm* to focus on the initiation of a situation is restricted to three syntactic constructions, illustrated in (1)-(3), repeated here as (14a-c):

- (14) a. *wayyāqom yônâ librōah taršîšâ millipnê yhw* (Jon 1:3)
 b. *qûm-nâ³ šēbâ* (Gen 27:19)
 c. *wayyāqom yônâ wayyēlek ʿel-nîñweh* (Jon 3:3)

The syntactic constructions of interest in (14) consist of *qwm* plus an infinitive construct (a), *qwm* in a serial verb construction (b), and *qwm* in the so-called verbal hendiadys construction (c). Each of these constructions patterns typologically like a sentential complement. The infinitive construct has long been recognized as the primary reduced complement in BH (GKC par. 120a; WOC par. 36.2.3).¹⁹ It is not

verb for the expression of tense or aspect is a widely attested pattern of grammaticalization (see Heine et al. 1991, 31). Third, the verbs in question convey motional and spatial meaning. Temporal ideas are frequently rendered metaphorically in terms of such concepts (see Heine et al. 1991, 28, 31, 36). Fourth, the newly emergent grammatical concepts, the aspectual markers, are encoded in nonlexical forms such as auxiliaries, particles, and clitics (see Heine et al. 1991, 28). In most of the examples cited above, the process of grammaticalization has resulted in the formation of aspectual auxiliaries. However, because distinguishing between auxiliaries and lexical verbs often proves problematic (see García 1967, 853-70; Ross 1969; Steele 1978; Steele et al. 1981; Givón 1972, 29-50; Brinton 1988, 67-73), especially with intransitive verbs, the extent of grammaticalization can be difficult to gauge. Nonetheless, the cliticization of *qwm* in the Babylonian Talmud and Mandaic, the use of *qwm* as a particle in colloquial Arabic, the incongruence of form between *qwm* and its complements in Ugaritic, and the auxiliary status of *être* and *estar* in French and Spanish are easily identified as grammaticalized nonlexical entities.

¹⁸ A reduced complement is "any complement type that has fewer syntactic and inflectional possibilities than an indicative main clause" (Noonan 1985, 73).

¹⁹ Noonan understands infinitives to be "verb-like entities that do not bear syntactic relations to their notional subject" (1985, 57).

marked for tense/aspect, person, number, or gender as are finite verbs, and the subject of the infinitive construct is coreferential with the subject of the main verb, and thus is deleted (equi-deletion). The infinitive complement is the prototypical sentential complement (Noonan 1985, 56-62).

Serial verb constructions are frequently used in complementation as well (Noonan 1985, 55-56). The following features are characteristic of verb serialization constructions (Noonan 1985, 55, 76-77):

1. They consist of a single grammatical subject noun phrase and series of verb phrases.
2. The verbs in each verb phrase are fully and identically inflected.
3. No marker of coordination or subordination links the verb phrases.
4. They contain a single assertion.

Note that serial verb complements resemble infinitive complements in that they lack overt subject noun phrases (Noonan 1985, 59), hence they also may be described as reduced complements.²⁰

According to this definition (14b) exemplifies the typical characteristics of verb serialization. That is, there is no marker of coordination and the construction consists of two identically inflected finite verbs, which agree in tense/aspect and which have only one co-referential subject. From the unlikelihood (see below) of a literal translation of (14b) "Rise up, sit down" one can further deduce that only one assertion is being made.

Unlike infinitive and serial complements, the verbal hendiadys construction of (14c) is not found in Noonan's (1985) inventory of complement types. Nevertheless, this construction would also seem to qualify as a sentential complement. There are three pieces of evidence which support this claim. First, verbal hendiadys function interchangeably with infinitive and serial complements in BH (see Lambdin 1972, 238-40). Such an overlap in function is characteristic of infinitives and serial constructions more generally. Both infinitive and serial complements are used to mark aspect and tense in many languages, interchangeably, with no significant difference in meaning marked by the one or the other (see Hale 1991, 24; Givón 1991, 139).

Second, constructions involving verbal hendiadys have many of the same characteristics as infinitive and serial complements. For example, the verbs in hendiadys constructions are identical in inflection, as is the case in serial constructions; they agree in person, number, gender, and tense/aspect.²¹ And like both infinitive and serial verb constructions, the hendiadys construction has only one overt noun phrase and its two verbs form one semantic unit. The first verb qualifies the meaning of the second verb, which carries the principle idea of the construction. The presence of only a single overt subject noun phrase suggests that the second verb in hendiadys construction is reduced.

The final piece of evidence is comparative in nature and comes from a Modern English construction which appears to be very similar to the hendiadys construction of BH. Like verbal hendiadys, the English construction consists of two identically

²⁰ Verb serialization and parataxis share a number of common features, but they also have important distinctions.

²¹ Exceptions arise in cases of "conjunct agreement" (cf. GKC par. 146f), e.g., Ezra 3:2.

inflected verbs combined by a conjunction. The English construction has been termed "fake" (Carden and Pesetsky 1977) or "pseudo" (Quirk et al. 1985) coordination, because the conjunction *and* does not seem to function as a true marker of coordination. Rather, the fake-*and* appears to function as a quasi-complementizer, marking a complement structure (Carden and Pesetsky 1977, 82, 85-87, 89-90). Some examples of this fake-*and* construction are listed in (15):

- (15) a. I'll try and come tomorrow.
 b. They sat and talked about the good old times.
 c. Don't just stand there and grin.
 d. He went and complained about us.
 e. They've gone and upset her again.
 f. Run and tell him to come here at once.
 g. Why did you go and do a silly thing like that?
 (examples from Quirk et al. 1985, par. 13.98)

R. Quirk et al. (1985, par. 13.98) and G. Carden and D. Pesetsky (1977, 82) observe that only a small class of verbs may precede the *and* (e.g., try, stop, go, come, hurry up, run, sit, and stand), while the class of verbs which may fill the slot after the *and* is theoretically open. This same situation holds with the most common verbal hendiadys in BH: membership in the class of verbs which occupies the first verbal slot is restricted to a small group of verbs (e.g., *qwm*, *hlk*, *hēhēl*, *šwb*, *yôšp*, and *killâ*), but any verb may theoretically be placed in the second slot after the *waw*.²²

The fake-*and* construction is roughly equivalent to the use of the same verbs with other sentential complements; namely, a *to*-infinitive or gerund (Quirk et al. 1985, par. 13.98), and a serial verb construction (Carden and Pesetsky's "double-verb construction," 1977, 82):

- | | | |
|---------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| (16) a. | he went and complained | = he went to complain |
| b. | I'll try and come | = I'll try to come |
| c. | run and tell him | = run to tell him |
| d. | they sat and talked | = they sat talking |
| e. | come and live | = come live |
| f. | go and visit | = go visit |
| g. | run and get | = run get |

As already mentioned, the hendiadys construction in BH also functions in the same context as other sentential complements. Note further that narrative hendiadys constructions are often mirrored in dialogue by serial constructions in the imperative:

- (17) a. *wayyāqom wayyēlek šārēpatâ* (1 Kgs 17:10)
 b. *qûm lēk šārēpatâ* (1 Kgs 17:9)
 (18) a. *wēnāqûmâ wēna'āleh bêt-ʾēl* (Gen 35:3)
 b. *qûm ʿēlēh bêt-ʾēl* (Gen 35:1)

²² Comment about verbal hendiadys in this paper is confined to the narrower class of verbal hendiadys treated by T.O. Lambdin (1971, 238-40; cf. GKC par. 120a-h; Joüon 1947, 177a-e). The chief distinction which sets this narrower class of hendiadys apart is the restricted membership in the first verbal slot. In the other hendiadys constructions membership is not restricted. Nothing that has been or will be said in what follows pertains necessarily to these other hendiadys constructions.

P. Joüon, with particular reference to hendiadys constructed with *yôšip* and *šwb*, observes no noticeable semantic difference between the constructions with and those without the *waw* (1947, par. 177b; for examples of other verbs, see Lambdin 1972, 239; GKC par. 120g). Moreover, the Peshiřta renders Hebrew hendiadys both with and without the *waw*, without any apparent reason for the distinction (*contra* Muraoka 1987, par. 98; see the examples cited above in [4]). Thus, the comparison between the verbal hendiadys construction in BH and the fake coordination construction in Modern English is illuminating. The Modern English fake-*and* construction provides a good parallel to the use of the Hebrew hendiadys construction in complementation. In fact, one may even wish to refer to the verbal hendiadys construction involving *qwm* and other related verbs as "fake-*waw*" complementation.²³

To summarize, the hendiadys/fake-*waw* construction appears to be semantically, grammatically, and functionally equivalent to infinitive and serial complements, it shares key characteristics with these other complement constructions, and it very much resembles a similar construction in Modern English which is used in complementation. Therefore, all three of the syntactic constructions in which ingressive *qwm* appears behave like reduced sentential complements. This syntactic distribution corresponds rather nicely with the fact that aspect verbs typically take some form of reduced complements, further strengthening the hypothesis that *qwm* has been grammaticalized as an ingressive aspect verb in BH. That these complements are dependent on the aspect verb for their temporal reference would also explain why in the three Hebrew constructions just reviewed the chief idea is carried by the complement verb instead of *qwm*. The complement verb is not notionally or logically dependent on *qwm*. Rather, it is aspectually dependent on *qwm*.

As corroboration of this analysis, one may note that the better known ingressive aspect verb in BH, *hēḥēl* "to begin" (see Saydon 1954, 46-50), takes the same range of complements as does *qwm*. Note the examples in (19):

- (19) a. *yô'āb ben-šerūyā hēḥēl limnôt wēlō' killā* (1 Chron 27:24)
 "Joab the son of Zeruah began to count them, but did not finish" (NRSV)
- b. *hāḥēl rāš* (Deut 2:24)
 "Begin to occupy it" (NEB)

²³ It may well be the case that both the infinitive and serial verb complements developed historically from the fake-*waw* construction. Carden and Pesetsky understand a similar process as having taken place in English (1977, 89-90). Likewise, K. Hale sees similar constructions (clause chaining, complementation, and verb serialization) in the Misumalpan languages as distinct but related (1991, 2; see also Young and Givón 1990, esp. 230-39 on Ngābére). Givón's theory of what he calls "the diachronic process of syntacticization" whereby loose, conjoined, paratactic constructions develop over time into tight, subordinated, syntactic constructions (1979, 208, 222) also suggests the likelihood of such a development in BH. Hendiadys-like constructions consisting of two loosely conjoined clauses, the second of which exhibited subject anaphora under coreference, would have developed over time into tighter, syntactic constructions, namely infinitive, serial, and fake-*waw* constructions. Unfortunately, the precise nature of this historical development must remain a matter of speculation because the biblical data do not allow one to isolate the specific developmental stages in the process.

- c. *hēhēllū zērubābēl... wayya ʿāmīdū ʿet-halwiyyim...* (Ezra 3:8)
 "(In the second year...) Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel and ... all who had come from the captivity to Jerusalem, as their first step appointed Levites..." (NJV; cf. Saydon 1954, 49)
- d. *wayyāḥel nōaḥ ʾiš hā ʾādāmā wayyiṭṭa ʿ kārem* (Gen 9:20)
 Noah, a man of the soil, began planting a vineyard²⁴

3. Contextual Analysis

The preceding sections have been directed toward laying the theoretical, comparative, and typological groundwork for understanding the use of *qwm* as an ingressive aspect verb in BH. What remains is to provide empirical evidence for such a use. A variety of criteria may be used to identify instances where there is a high probability that *qwm* is being used aspectually. The first set of criteria is concerned specifically with disambiguating fake-*waw* complementation structures from the superficially similar conjoined, narrative clauses, the staple of narrative prose in BH. The cross-linguistic patterning of sentential complements provides a means by which one can distinguish with some degree of reliability between these complement and narrative structures. The following criteria function as a rough first step toward identifying fake-*waw* complement structures:

1. They will consist of two identically inflected verbs joined by a *waw*.
2. There will be only one subject noun phrase in the surface structure, the subject of both verbs being coreferential.
3. The two verbs function as a single semantic unit where the main idea of the sentence is indicated by the second verb, and in cases involving phasal aspect, the specific aspectual nuance by the first verb.
4. There are certain locality restrictions which constrain the placement and sequence of the two verbs.²⁵ In aspectual complementation, the aspect verb must precede its complement and only the subject(s) can intervene between the aspect verb and its complement.

The combination of these criteria and an appreciation of the use of *qwm* as a lexical verb enables one to correctly distinguish between the lexical and aspectual uses of *qwm* in many superficially similar constructions. All of the examples of ingressive *qwm* discussed below satisfy these criteria.

Another set of diagnostics that may be used to identify cases of ingressive *qwm* more generally follow from discussions by A.F. Freed (1979, 3-10) and Givón (1972, 29-50). They both note that aspect verbs entail certain presuppositions and

²⁴ Gen 9:20 is admittedly difficult. The verse is usually taken by modern scholars to mean that Noah was the first to plant a vineyard (cf. Saydon 1954, 46-47; *NRSV*; *NJV*). However, in every other instance where *hēhēl* takes a complement the interpretation of *hēhēl* as an ingressive aspect verb makes good sense. There is no apparent reason to interpret *hēhēl* in this passage differently; it is comprehensible when *hēhēl* is understood as an ingressive aspect verb. The *NEB*'s translation, while not completely satisfactory, is better than most: "Noah, a man of the soil, began the planting of vineyards."

²⁵ The syntagmatic variability of grammaticalized elements is typically more restricted than their lexical counterparts (Heine et al. 1991, 19). This is especially characteristic of tense and aspect auxiliaries (see Steele 1978, 14).

implications or consequences. Givón aptly calls this a "time axis." Presuppositions refer to the time prior to the situation, and implications, to the time following (Givón 1972, 32). Ingressive aspect verbs do not presuppose the prior commencing of the event named in the sentential complement but usually²⁶ require its ensuing occurrence as a necessary consequence (Givón 1972, 33; Freed 1979, 70-73; Brinton 1988, 79). Context must be used to verify whether these presuppositions and implications hold for any given case. Of course, contexts explicitly mentioning such presuppositions and implications cannot be expected to accompany every occurrence of ingressive *qwm* in the Hebrew Bible. However, a sufficient number do exist, enabling confirmation of *qwm*'s function as an ingressive aspect verb.

Finally, since beginnings occur at points in time ingressive aspect verbs refer to punctual situations, and thus are compatible with momentaneous adverbials (Brinton 1988, 112), but incompatible with achievement situations in their single event reading (Brinton 1988, 84-86). Therefore, the presence of momentaneous adverbials may be counted as supporting an ingressive reading of *qwm*, whereas the possibility of only a single event reading for achievements necessarily disqualifies an ingressive reading of *qwm*.

With these criteria in mind, I turn to a contextual analysis of specific cases of ingressive *qwm*. The analysis begins by illustrating some of the seminal stages in the semantic development of ingressive *qwm*.²⁷ These stages conform more or less to the stages which characterize context-induced reinterpretations as discussed by Heine et al. *qwm* is frequently used lexically to introduce some specific deed, especially when this involves arising out of a sitting or lying position. Some examples of this use of *qwm* involving complement structures are given in (20):

- (20) a. *wšššm qāmū ʿāmādū* (Job 29:8)²⁸
 "(when I took my seat in the square...) the aged rose up and stood" (NRSV)
- b. *ḥāšōt-laylā ʾāqūm lēhōdōt lāk* (Ps 119:62)
 "At midnight I rise to praise you" (NRSV)
- c. *wayyāqom liqrā ʾtām* (Gen 19:1; see also 1 Kgs 2:19)
 "(as Lot was sitting in the gateway...) he rose to greet them" (NJV)
- d. *wā ʾāqūm babbōqer lēhênîq ʾet-bēnî* (1 Kgs 3:21)
 "when I rose in the morning to nurse my son" (NRSV)
- e. *ʾāqūmā nā ʾwa ʾšōbēbā bā ʿîr* (Cant 3:2)

²⁶ The use of ingressive aspect verbs need not entail the subsequent occurrence of a situation if the aspect verb focuses on the onset of the situation (see below).

²⁷ It should be observed that different phases in the semantic development of ingressive *qwm* could coexist. That is, the identification of a particular example as representative of a developmental phase says nothing necessarily about the historical location of that example; just because example A reflects an earlier developmental stage than example B does not necessarily imply that A historically precedes B. The phases identified below are developmental in nature, not historical.

²⁸ Whether this reflects a serial complement or simply a paratactic construction is of course open to question.

"(Upon my bed at night...) I will rise now and go about the city"
(*NRSV*)

f. *wayyāqūmū ləšahēq* (Exod 32:6)

"(they...) then rose to dance" (*NJV*)

In each of these examples there is no positive contextual evidence to support an aspectual reading. To the contrary, each of the contexts, implicitly or explicitly, notes how the subject rises from a sitting or lying position in order to undertake a specific action. Nonetheless, the notion that one rises to begin an action is embryonic in all of these. Once the motional idea of rising is explicitly connected with the temporal idea of beginning, then the stage is set for *qwm* to be understood as an ingressive aspect verb.

There are at least two examples where this shift can actually be seen taking place. In (21) and (22) contextual support for an aspectual reading of *qwm* coincides with implicit or explicit mention of the subject's rising from some type of prone position. In other words, both motional and aspectual interpretations are possible. This represents the first stage of grammaticalization.

(21) *wattāqom ləlaqqēt...* (Ruth 2:15)

"When she got up to glean (...Boaz gave the men orders... [v. 17]

So Ruth gleaned in the field till evening)" (*NEB*; cf. *NRSV*; *NJV*)

The context of Ruth 2 makes an ingressive interpretation of (21) very likely. Ruth begins gleaning in v. 3. In v. 14 Boaz invites her to sit down and have a meal. In v. 15 she starts gleaning again, and in v. 17 it is reported that she gleaned until evening. Thus, the presuppositions and implications of (21) are those of an ingressive aspect verb: she was not gleaning prior to v. 15 (she was eating) and she was in the process of gleaning after v. 15.

Note, however, that in v. 14 the narrator reports that Ruth sat down to eat. As explained above, *qwm* is typically used with its lexical meaning intact to describe someone's getting up from a sitting position. This then casts some suspicion on the ingressive interpretation of (21). If W.L. Chafe (1970, 42-43), Brinton (1988, 114), and Heine et al. (1991, 71-72) are correct, however, the semantic ambiguity of (21) is precisely what one expects: the spatial and aspect meaning co-exist. This co-existence is captured nicely by the translations of the *NEB*, *NRSV*, and *NJV*. Moreover, this would be the type of context which would naturally induce an aspectual reanalysis: the notion of getting up to glean corresponds with the idea of beginning to glean; one must physically get up in order to begin gleaning.

(22) *qamtî ʔānî liptōaḥ ləḏōdî* (Cant 5:5)

as I started to open to my beloved

The context again supports an ingressive reading in (22). In the woman's dream her lover knocks at the door and commands her to open (*piṭḥî*) it (Cant 5:2). It is only in v. 6 that the woman states that she opened the door: "I opened (*pātaḥtî*) to my beloved." From this it may be surmised that the door is closed prior to the statement in v. 5, and remains closed until v. 6. These presuppositions and implications accord well with an ingressive reading of v. 5.

However, that the woman is presumably asleep when her lover knocks on the door suggests that a lexical reading of *qwm* in v. 5 may be realistically anticipated. The sense of such an interpretation would be that she arose from her bed for the

purpose of opening the door for her beloved. Such an interpretation also corresponds to the passage's presuppositions and implications. Yet one minor incongruity remains under this interpretation. The report that the woman's hands and fingers drip²⁹ myrrh on the door bolt at the end of v. 5 suggests that she is already at the door with her hands on the bolt. If the first part of the verse only states that she got up in order to open the door, then there is an interval unaccounted for between her getting up and dripping myrrh on the bolt. If, on the other hand, an ingressive reading is understood, this interval disappears. The woman is already at the door at the beginning of v. 5. Ingressive *qwm* in this instance describes the onset of the woman's opening of the door.

Freed observes that events potentially may consist of an onset, nucleus, and coda (1979, 30). The onset of an event or situation, as defined by Freed, is "a temporal segment which takes place PRIOR to the initial temporal part of the nucleus of that event" (1979, 31). The onset of an event does not necessarily imply the subsequent occurrence of the event. She points out that one difference between the English ingressive aspect verbs *begin* and *start* is that *begin* is more restricted than *start* (1979, 69). *Start* may refer to the onset of an event as well as to the initial temporal segment of the event's nucleus, whereas *begin* may only refer to the latter (1979, 71). Cant 5:5 gives good sense when interpreted as referring to the onset of the woman's opening of the door: "As I started³⁰ to open to my beloved, my hands dripped with myrrh and my fingers with liquid myrrh on the handles of the bolt."

There are a handful of occurrences of *qwm* with complements whose meanings expressly contradict the notion of rising, thus disqualifying an understanding of *qwm* with the lexical meaning "to arise." This reflects Heine and company's second stage. These examples provide striking confirmation that the type of aspectual reanalysis as postulated above did in fact take place in BH, and they furnish unambiguous evidence that ingressive *qwm* imparts grammatical rather than lexical meaning.³¹ Consequently, (23) – (29) also are the best candidates to be identified as ingressive aspect verbs.

- (23) *wayyāqom hammelek wayyēšeb baššā^car* (2 Sam 19:9)
so the king took his seat in the gateway
- (24) *qūm-nā³ šēbâ* (Gen 27:19)
"now sit up" (NRSV)
- (25) *wayyāqom ʔabrāhām wayyištaḥû* (Gen 23:7)
"Thereupon Abraham bowed low to the people of the land" (NJV)
- (26) *wattāqom wattištaḥû ʔappayim ʔāršâ* (1 Sam 25:41)
she set about bowing with her face to the ground
- (27) *wattāqom haššē^c ʔrâ wattiškab^c immô* (Gen 19:35)
the younger one lay down with him
- (28) *hitna^c ʔyî mē^c ʔpār / qūmî šēbî yērûšālāim* (Isa 52:2)

²⁹ Precisely where the myrrh comes from is unclear (see Pope 1977, 521; Murphy 1990, 165, 171).

³⁰ In light of Freed's analysis *start* is used here to highlight the sense of *qwm* as designating the onset of a situation. However, *start* need not be restricted to this one sense when translating *qwm* and clearly is not in many of the modern translations cited in this paper.

³¹ Brinton reaches a similar conclusion about English aspect verbs (1988, 75-76).

- Shake off the dust, / get back on the throne,³² O Jerusalem!
 (29) *wəqām kol-hā^cām wəhištaḥāwū³³* (Exod 33:10)
 all the people would set about bowing

The only way to read (23) – (29) literally, as most modern translators do, is to assume that in each case the subject must be getting up from a sitting, lying, or otherwise prone position. However, such an assumption is not explicit in any of these texts, nor is it demanded in order for the text to make sense. In (24) one might legitimately suppose that Isaac is lying on his deathbed when Jacob commands him to sit up. But even here *qwm* is being used aspectually. It is only "coincidental" in a sense that the literal meaning of *qwm* corresponds with the notion of "to commence sitting from a lying position". This is shown by (23) where the idea is clearly to "sit down". In English "sit up" and "sit down" are phrasal verbs which can indicate ingressive aspect (cf. Brinton 1988, 243-46).³⁴

In (24), (25), and (29) the LXX renders *qwm* with the pleonastic participle: ἀναστὰς κάθισον (Gen 27:19), ἀναστὰς ... προσεκύνησεν (Gen 23:7), and στάντες ... προσεκύνησαν (Exod 33:10). This suggests that the translator(s) felt that the two verbs were not on a par semantically, that they did not represent two independent actions (see Blass, Debrunner, and Funk 1961, par. 419).

Note further that *NJV*'s translation of (25) seems to capture the ingressive meaning. Lambdin suggests the translation "then, thereupon" as a way of rendering *qwm*, because *qwm* gives "a slight emphasis to the fact that some activity is about to begin" (1972, 239).

While generally ignored by modern translators, the ingressive interpretation of (27) was recognized from a very early time. The LXX, V and S all translate this passage ingressively: καὶ εἰσελθούσα ἡ νεωτέρα ἐκοιμήθη μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς "and the younger one entered into bed with her father" (LXX); *ingressaque minor filia dormivit cum eo* "the younger daughter began to sleep with him" (V); *w^clt z^cwrt^z wdmkt^c mh* "and the younger one began to lie down with him" (S). These versions otherwise consistently translate *qwm* quite literally (Gk. ἀνίστημι "to stand, rise," Lat. *surgo* or *consurgo* "to stand, rise," and Syr. *qm* "to arise"). In (27), however, they

³² Here one could perhaps capture the aspectual nuance more literally (and more awkwardly) by translating "begin to sit enthroned." However, this would not be good idiomatic English, since English usually employs phrasal verbs to indicate the ingressive aspect of sitting. Hence, the circumlocution "get back on the throne."

³³ The disagreement in verb forms, one singular and the other plural, results from different interpretations of the mass noun *kol-hā^cām*. With *wəqām*, *kol-hā^cām* is understood as an undifferentiated whole, and hence the singular verb form. With *wəhištaḥāwū*, on the other hand, *kol-hā^cām* is interpreted as consisting of an infinite number of individual people, and hence the plural verb form. The phrase ^zš^z ^zpetah^z ^zohölô "each at the opening of their tent" nicely points up this differentiation. Thus, this disagreement in form does not disqualify the use of *qwm* as an aspect verb.

³⁴ Brinton herself stresses that phrasal verbs seem to function primarily to express the goal or endpoint of a situation (1988, 163-99). While this is clearly often the case, one cannot rule out the ingressive nuance given by some phrasal verbs. This has been recognized by variety of scholars, whose opinions are conveniently gathered by Brinton in her Appendix B (1988, 243-46). Phrasal verbs are frequently used in their ingressive reading to gloss *qwm* and its complement in this paper.

translate with ingressive verbs (Gk. εἰσελθοῦσα "she entered, went into," Lat. *ingressaque* "she began," and Syr. ʿlt "she began, entered"), thus showing a consciousness of the aspectual use of *qwm*.

In (28) many would emend MT's šēbî to read šēbiyyāh as in 52:2b (so *BHS*; *NRSV*). However, the bicolon is cast in 2+3 meter (as is 52:1a), the second colon consisting of *qūmî šēbî yērūšālāim*. The occurrence of καί in LXX perhaps supports this understanding: ἐκτίναξαι τὸν χοῦν καὶ ἀνάστηθι χάρισον Ἱερουσαλημ. The structure of the verse also provides some confirmation of this interpretation. Isa 52:1a-b mirrors 52:2a-b. 52:1a is cast in 2+3 meter and the simple name Zion appears as the last element in the second colon. 52:1b consists of a bicolon with three words in the first colon and the equivalent of a full colon epithet in the second colon ("Jerusalem, the holy city"). The same structure emerges in 52:2. 52:2a is cast in 2+3 meter and the simple name Jerusalem appears as the last element in the second colon. 52:2b consists of a bicolon with three words in the first colon and a full colon epithet in the second colon ("Captive, Daughter of Zion;" for a fuller treatment of this verse, see Dobbs-Allsopp 1993, 152-53).

The grammaticalization of *qwm* appears not to have developed far enough to result in polysemy or homonymy (stage three of Heine et al.), although some conventionalized uses of ingressive *qwm* may exist. Unfortunately, the examples that might be cited do not have contextual support. Nevertheless, the examples in (20) – (29) clearly demonstrate the presence in the Hebrew Bible of stages in the development of ingressive *qwm* which are characteristic of the process of grammaticalization. (20) illustrates cases where lexical *qwm* takes a complement. In (21) and (22) lexical and aspectual readings co-exist. (23) – (29) exemplify examples in which only the aspectual reading is available.³⁵

What follows is a series of contextual analyses of other instances where there is a high probability that *qwm* is being used aspectually.

- (30) *waʿātalyâ ʿēm ʾāhazyāhû wrāʾatâ kî mēt bēnāh wattāqom wattēʾabbēd ʾēt kol-zeraʿ hammamlākâ...* (2 Kgs 11:1)

"As soon as Athaliah mother of Ahaziah saw that her son was dead, she set out to destroy all the royal line (...But Jehosheba daughter of King Joram, sister of Ahaziah, took Ahaziah's son Joash and stole him away from among the princes who were being murdered... and [he] was not put to death)" (*NEB*)

The implication of (30) is not that Athaliah "promptly killed off all who were of royal stock," as the *NJV* translates. Rather, the following verses clearly state that Joash, Ahaziah's son, was not put to death. That (30) introduces a new episode makes it certain that Athaliah had not previously been killing off the princes. Therefore, the *NEB*'s translation seems preferable. "Set out" is another phrasal verb in English indicating inception. M. Cogan and H. Tadmor postulate a similar understanding of *qwm* in this verse (1988, 124, esp. 86).

- (31) *wattāqom hîʾwēkallōtēhā wattāšob miššēdē mōʾab* (Ruth 1:6)

³⁵ A strictly linear development need not be reconstructed, since, as Brinton argues, once *qwm* occurs with complements, the aspectual reanalysis may take place any time thereafter (1988, 114; cf. Givón 1991, 178).

"She started out with her daughters-in-law to return from the country of Moab (...But Naomi said to her two daughters-in-law, 'Turn back, each of you to her mother's house')" (*NJV*; cf. *NRSV*, *NEB*)

This is the first we are told of Naomi's journey. That in v. 8 Naomi tells her daughters-in-law to return to their own mothers before they have finished the journey implies that (31) reports only that they had just begun to return, or had only undertaken the onset of the return journey, but not that they had in fact returned.

- (32) *wayyāqom yônâ librōah taršîšâ millipnê yhw̄h* (Jon 1:3)
 "Jonah, however, started out to flee to Tarshish from the LORD's service. (...He went down to Joppa and found a ship going to Tarshish)" (*NJV*; cf. *NEB*)

The well known story about Jonah provides a striking example of ingressive *qwm*. The immediate context in v. 3 confirms that the natural implication of (32) is that Jonah has only begun the initial phase of fleeing to Tarshish. He goes to Joppa and boards a ship heading for Tarshish. However, Jonah never makes it to Tarshish. He is thrown overboard, swallowed by a big fish, and eventually goes to Nineveh as originally instructed by Yahweh. (32) cannot be interpreted as a simple statement of fact that Jonah went to Tarshish. J.M. Sasson recognizes what he calls *qwm*'s use as an auxiliary in this passage, though his understanding does not correspond exactly to the aspectual meaning argued for in this paper (1990, 77, esp. 69-70).

- (33) *...wayyāqom lāleket...* (Judg 19:5)
...wayyāqom hā'îš lāleket... (Judg 19:7)
...wayyāqom hā'îš lāleket... (Judg 19:9)

"Early in the morning of the fourth day, *he started to leave*; but the girl's father said to his son-in-law, 'Eat something to give you strength, then you can leave.' So the two of them sat down and they feasted together. Then the girl's father said to the man, 'Won't you stay overnight and enjoy yourself.' *The man started to leave*, but his father-in-law kept urging him until he turned back and spent the night there....Then the man, his concubine, and his attendant *started to leave*. His father-in-law, the girl's father, said to him, '...spend the night here...' But the man refused to stay the night" (*NJV*)

(33) contains indisputable examples of ingressive *qwm*. Each time the man starts to leave his father-in-law tries to prevent him from going. Note that in Judg 19:5 the man in all probability never begins the actual activity of leaving. What is being referred to is the onset of leaving. Thus, the *NJV*'s choice of *start* in (33) as a gloss for *qwm* is very appropriate.

- (34) a. *wayyāqom yēhōšūa' wēkol-ʿam hammilḥāmâ laʿālôt hāʿāy*
 (Josh 8:3)
 "So Joshua and all the fighting men set out to go up against Ai (...Joshua chose thirty thousand warriors...[v. 9] So Joshua sent them out; and they went to the place of the ambush...)" (*NRSV*)
 b. *wayyāqom bālāq ben-sippôr melek mōʿāb wayyillāhem*
bēyisrāʿel (Josh 24:9)

"Then King Balak son of Zippor of Moab set out to fight against Israel (...He sent and invited Balaam son of Beor to curse you...)"
(*NRSV*)

The *NJV* translates (34a) "So Joshua... prepared for the march on Ai" and (34b) "Thereupon Balak... made ready to attack Israel." These somewhat odd translations reveal the uneasiness that one feels about a straightforward literal translation of these passages. Both refer to the onset of the event. The context of (34a) supports such a conclusion. Before the initial segment of the event Joshua chooses his soldiers and tells them the plan of attack. Only then do they leave for the ambush site.

The context of (34b) is not as clear. However, the Balaam tradition of Num 22-24 knows of no actual battle between Balak and Israel (cf. Judg 11:25). Assuming a literal interpretation of *qwm*, R.G. Boling and G.E. Wright are compelled to try to explain this apparent incongruity. They state that either there is an outright contradiction in the various textual sources of the Balaam tradition, or else the reference to Balak is made humorously, interpreting Balak's desire to curse Israel as a belligerent act of war (1982, 536). Both explanations are unnecessary if *qwm* is understood as a marker of ingressive aspect. The *NRSV* captures the ingressive sense of both passages by translating *qwm* with "set out." One could translate *qwm* equally well using *start*.

- (35) a. *wayyāqūmū ... la^c ʾālôt libnôt ʾet-bêt yhw̄h* (Ezra 1:5)
"So the chiefs of the clans of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and Levites, all whose spirit had been roused by God, got ready to go up to build the House of the LORD that is in Jerusalem"
(*NJV*; cf. *NRSV*)
- b. *wayyāqom ... wayyibnū³⁶ ʾet-mizbaḥ ʾēlōhē yisrā ʾēl* (Ezra 3:2)
"Then Jeshua son of Jozadak, with his fellow priests, and Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel with his kin set out to build the altar of the God of Israel" (*NRSV*)

In both (35a) and (35b) the complements are separated from *qwm* by unusually long subject phrases. The contexts of both of these passages strongly suggest ingressive readings. (35a) reports only the onset of the journey to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem. The subsequent occurrence of the journey does not immediately follow. Vv. 6-11 report the preparation undertaken as the people start their journey. Thus, the translations by both the *NJV* and *NRSV* are appropriate.

³⁶ The discrepancy between the singular and plural verb forms results from what in linguistics is generally called "left conjunct agreement." For example, in Spanish "when the subject is postverbal and coordinate, the verb can agree with the left conjunct alone" (Judith Aissen and Jeffrey Runner, "Spanish Left Conjunct Agreement," an unpublished manuscript). In BH the phenomenon is of course reversed, i.e. right conjunct agreement. When the subject is postverbal and coordinate, the verb can agree with the right conjunct alone. Thus *wayyāqom* in Ezra 3:2 agrees specifically with the right conjunct, *yēšūa^c ben-yōšādāq*, whereas *wayyibnū* agrees with the whole coordinate subject (for BH, see provisionally the grammars and the data reviewed in Ratner 1990, 238-51). Due to the different word orders and directions of writing represented by the world's languages, perhaps it would be best to refer to this phenomenon more neutrally as simply "conjunct agreement."

Ezra 3:8 and 5:2 report the actual beginning of the rebuilding. Note that in 5:2, which is in Aramaic, the ingressive reading is certain because of the use of *šārîw* (Pael Perfect 3mp "they began").

That (35b) does not report the altar's having been built, but refers only to the initiation of the altar's building, may be inferred from v. 3 where the actual setting up of the altar is related.

- (36) *qûm bālāq ušāmā^c / ha^cʾāzînâ^c ʿāday bēnō šippōr* (Num 23:18)
Listen up, O Balak / Give ear unto me³⁷, son of Zippor

Both the context and the poetry suggest that *qwm* is here used aspectually. Num 23:17 specifically states that when Balaam found Balak, "he was standing beside his burnt offerings with the officials of Moab." Thus, it would be redundant for Balaam to order Balak to rise when he was already standing. One may object that the poetry and prose most likely come from different hands, and therefore there is no need for complete congruence to exist between the two. Even if this be granted, the parallelism, which is specifically between "listen" and "hear," suggests that the putative redactor was cognizant of his context.

- (37) a. *wayyō^c mēru nāqûm ūbānînu* (Neh 2:18)
"Then they said, 'Let us start building!'" (NRSV; cf. NJV, NEB)
b. *wa^c ʾanaḥnu^c ʿābādāyw nāqûm ūbānînu* (Neh 2:20)
"and we his servants are going to start building" (NRSV; cf. NJV, NEB)

The surrounding narrative suggests that ingressive *qwm* is present in (37a-b). The purpose of Nehemiah's journey is to rebuild Jerusalem (Neh 2:1-8). When he informs the Jews of this they respond by saying, "Let us start building!" (Neh 2:18). Nehemiah then informs the officials of their resolve (Neh 2:20). The actual rebuilding does not begin until Nehemiah 3. In these examples note the use of the so-called converted perfects with the preceding imperfects.

- (38) *wēqamtā wēdibbartā ʾālêhem* (Jer 1:17)
go ahead and speak to them

There is no explicit contextual support for an ingressive reading of (38). Yet one may call attention to the use of *tebûm* and *izuzzum* in Akkadian, especially in the Mari prophecy texts, in favor of an ingressive interpretation of *qwm* in this passage. Moreover, in the first colon of Jer 1:17, Jeremiah is instructed "to gird up his loins." The literal sense of this phrase is to prepare one's garments for doing some type of physical activity such as running or fighting (1 Kgs 18:46; Isa 5:27; see Holladay 1986, 43). However, the phrase can also be used metaphorically to indicate preparation for verbal argument (Job 38:3; 40:7; see Holladay 1986, 44). Interestingly, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson show that the concept "argument" is conceptualized metaphorically in terms of waging war (1980, 4-6).³⁸ This corresponds rather well to the allusions to holy war in Jer 1:17-19 recognized by W.L. Holladay (1986, 31, 43-45), among others. Therefore, there would seem to be at least some circumstantial evidence pointing towards the conventionalized usage of ingressive *qwm* in (38).

³⁷ Or "to the witness" with LXX (μάρτυς).

³⁸ Lakoff and Johnson's observation is made chiefly with modern American culture in mind. However, there is no reason why it cannot apply to other cultures as well.

Ingressive *qwm* frequently takes *hlk* as a complement when the commencement of a journey is related. The *NEB* often translates the combination of *qwm* and *hlk* as "set out" or "set off", as in (39a-c):

- (39) a. *wayyāqom wayyēlek ʿel-hammāqôm* (Gen 22:3)
 "and set out for the place" (*NEB*)
 b. *wayyāqom wayyēlek ʿel-ʿāram nahārayim* (Gen 24:10)
 "he set out for Aram-naharaim" (*NEB*)
 c. *wayyāqom wayyēlek hebrônâ* (2 Sam 15:9)
 "so he set off for Hebron" (*NEB*)
 d. *wayyāqom yônâ wayyēlek ʿel-nînéveh* (Jon 3:3)
 and Jonah set out for Nineveh (see Sasson 1990, 227, esp. 69-70)
 (cf. Gen 22:19; 1 Sam 16:13; 23:24; 2 Sam 14:23; 17:23)

Freed makes an interesting observation that is relevant at this point. She notes that every event as referred to by the language does not necessarily need to consist of an onset, nucleus, and coda. The language may only refer to one of these segments at a time (1979, 30-31). Thus, one may propose that in instances like (39a-d) reference to the commencement of the journey frequently implies the journey's completion as well. These would be examples of synecdoche wherein reference to the whole is made by reference to a part (cf. Taylor 1989, 122-23, 127-30).

Note further that the LXX translates (39a-c) with the pleonastic participle: ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη (Gen 22:3; 24:10; 2 Sam 15:9). In reference specifically to Gen 22:3, E.A. Speiser notes that *qwm* in hendiadys "indicates the start or speed of action" (1964, 163).

In fact (39a-d) may be abbreviated forms of a fuller formula where the narrator also reports the arrival at a given destination by *bw*² plus a preposition (²*el*, ^c*ad*, or ^{lě}-) and the name of the destination, or simply *bw*² plus the destination with the directive *heh*. While writing about ingressive verbs in English, H. Poutsma makes the following observation: "Although primarily indicating the initial stage of a process these verbs are often accompanied by an adjunct or sentence implying that the process has developed into a certain result" (1926, 288). He gives the example in (40):

- (40) Some sickened and sank down by the way (1926, 288)

The examples cited in (41) appear to be analogous:

- (41) a. *wayyāqom wayyēlek wayyābō² ʿad-nōkaḥ yēbûs* (Judg 19:10)
 b. *wattāqom ʿēšet yārob ʿām wattēlek wattābō² tiršātâ* (1 Kgs 14:17)
 c. *wayyāqom wayyēlek ... wayyābō² dāwid nōbeh* (1 Sam 21:1-2)
 d. *wayyāqom wayyēlek šārēpatâ wayyābō² ʿel-petaḥ hā ʿîr* (1 Kgs 17:10)
 e. *wayyāqom wayyābō² wayyēlek šōmērôn* (2 Kgs 10:12)
 f. *wayyāqom hā ʿîš wayyēlek limqômô wayyābō² ʿel-bêtô* (Judg 19:29-30)

One can translate each of these as "He set out {to GN} and arrived at GN." This may be a narrative device to indicate movement from place A to place B (cf. Alter

1981, 65; Bar-Efrat 1989, 130-31). The transition is represented by synecdoche, by explicit mention of only the beginning and the end of the journey.

Some support for this interpretation is found in (42):

- (42) wayyāqûmû bannešep lābô^ʔ ʔel-maḥāneh ʔaram wayyābô^ʔ ſad-qššeh maḥāneh ʔaram wēhinnēh ʔen-šām ʔiš (2 Kgs 7:5)
 "They set out at twilight for the Aramean camp; but when they came to the edge of the Aramean camp, there was no one there" (NJV)

Here no doubt the NJV's translation is correct. The use of *bw*^ʔ twice makes plain the contrast between *qwm* + *bw*^ʔ and *bw*^ʔ by itself. It is highly unlikely that both clauses would be used to indicate the arrival at the Aramean camp (cf. Cogan and Tadmor 1988, 82).

The passages given in (43) consist of examples in which a momentaneous adverbial is present, but the presuppositions and implications characteristic of ingressive aspect are not explicit in these contexts.

- (43) a. wayyāqûmû wayyānûsû bannešep (2 Kgs 7:7)
 "They started to flee at dusk" (Cogan and Tadmor 1988, 77)
 b. wayyāqom dāwid wayyibrah bayyôm-hahû^ʔ mippēnē šāʔûl wayyābô^ʔ ʔel-ʔākīš melek gat (1 Sam 21:11)
 "That day, David went on his way eluding Saul, and came to Achish king of Gath" (NEB)
 c. wēʔāqûmâ wēʔerdēpâ ʔaḥrê dāwid hallaylâ (2 Sam 17:1)
 "Let me... set out tonight in pursuit of David" (NJV)
 d. ʔattâ tāqûm tēraḥēm šiyyôn / kî ʔēt lēḥennāh / kî bāʔ mō ʔēd (Ps 102:14)
 You will begin to have compassion on Zion, /
 for it is time to be gracious to her, /
 the appointed time has come.
 e. qûmî rōnî ballaylā / lēroʔš ʔašmūrôt (Lam 2:19)
 Cry out at night, / at the beginning of each watch.

The LXX again translates *qwm* in (43d) with the pleonastic participle: ἀναστὰς οἰκτιρήσεις (Ps 101:14). The phrasal verb "cry out" conveys the ingressive nuance in (43e).

There remain numerous examples of *qwm* which conform to the basic constraints of an ingressive aspect verb, but where the context in which they occur does not contribute to such an identification. The textual evidence cited is sufficient, however, to show that *qwm* is used to predicate inception in BH; this usage of *qwm* is best explained by reference to the semantic category of phasal aspect.

The recognition of ingressive *qwm* allows for a more precise description of the aspectual system in BH. In particular, it calls greater attention to the significance of phasal aspect in BH, an aspectual parameter that has been insufficiently appreciated. Such recognition has practical consequences as well. In a good many cases reproducing the surface structure of the original Hebrew in translation is misleading. One can better capture the ingressive sense of *qwm* and provide a more idiomatic translation by rendering *qwm* into English with either a comparable

ingressive aspectual verb (*begin, start*), an appropriate phrasal verb (*set out, sit up, lay down*), or by some other means.

References

- Alter, R. 1981. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bache, C. 1982. "Aspect and Aktionsart: Towards a Semantic Distinction." *Journal of Linguistics* 18: 57-72.
- Idem. 1985. *Verbal Aspect: A General Theory and Its Application to Present-Day English*. Odense: Odense University.
- Bar-Asher, M. 1988. "Le syro-palestinien – études grammaticales." *Journal Asiatique* 276: 27-59.
- Bar-Efrat, S. 1989. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. JSOTSS 70. Sheffield: Almond.
- Boling, R.G., and G.E. Wright. 1982. *Joshua*. AB 6. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Brinton, L.J. 1988. *The Development of English Aspectual Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Brown, F., S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs. 1951. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon. (BDB)
- Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R.W. Funk. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Carlson, L. 1981. "Aspect and Quantification." In *Tense and Aspect*, eds. P.J. Tedeschi and A. Zaene. Pp. 31-64. *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 14. New York: Academic.
- Chafe, W.L. 1970. *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Chung, S., and A. Timberlake. 1985. "Tense, Aspect, and Mood." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, vol. 3, ed. T. Shopen. Pp. 202-258. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Cogan, M., and H. Tadmor. 1988. *II Kings*. AB 11. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Craghan, J.F. 1974. "The ARM X 'Prophetic' Texts: Their Media, Style, and Structure." *JANESCU* 6: 39-57.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, F.W. 1993. *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*. *BibOr* 44. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Dossin, G. 1966. *La divination en Mésopotamie ancienne et dans les régions voisines*. XIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Paris.
- Elder, E.E. 1927. *Egyptian Colloquial Arabic Reader*. London: Oxford University.
- Fanning, B.M. 1990. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Foley, W.A., and R.D. Van Valin. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. London: Cambridge University.
- Freed, A.F. 1979. *The Semantics of English Aspectual Complementation*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Friedrich, P. 1974. "On Aspect Theory and Homeric Aspect." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 40, 4, 2: 1-44.
- García, E. C. 1967. "Auxiliaries and the Criterion of Simplicity," *Language* 43: 853-70.
- Gardiner, A. 1973. *Egyptian Grammar*. 3d ed. London: Oxford University.
- Givón, T. 1972. "Forward Implications, Backward Presuppositions, and the Time Axis of Verbs." In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 4/1, ed. J.P. Kimball. Pp. 29-50. New York: Seminar.
- Idem. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic.
- Idem. 1991. "Some Substantive Issues Concerning Verb Serialization: Grammatical vs. Cognitive Packaging." In *Serial Verbs: Grammatical, Comparative and Cognitive Approaches*, ed. C. Lefebvre. Pp. 137-85. SLS 8. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gordon, C.H. 1965. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

- Hale, K. 1991. "Misumalpan Verb Sequencing Constructions." In *Serial Verbs: Grammatical, Comparative and Cognitive Approaches*, ed. C. Lefebvre. Pp. 1-36. SLS 8. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine, B., et al. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Hillers, D.R. 1972. *Lamentations*. AB 7A. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Holladay, W.L. 1986. *Jeremiah 1. Hermeneia*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Joüon, P. 1947. *Grammaire de l'hebreu biblique*. 2d ed. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Kautzsch, F., and A.E. Cowley. 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon. (GKC)
- Kenny, A. 1963. *Action, Emotion, and Will*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kraus, F.R. 1987. *Sonderformen akkadischer Parataxe: Die Koppelungen*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing.
- Krotkoff, G. 1982. *A Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Kurdistan: Texts, Grammar, and Vocabulary*. AOS 64. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Lambdin, T.O. 1971. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Lloyd, A.L. 1979. *Anatomy of the Verb: The Gothic Verb as a Model for a Unified Theory of Aspect, Actional Types, and Verbal Velocity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Macuch, R. 1965. *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Malamat, A. 1987. "A Forerunner of Biblical Prophecy: The Mari Documents." In *Ancient Israelite Religion*, eds. P.D. Miller, Jr., P.D. Hanson, and S.D. McBride. Pp. 33-52. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Margolis, M. L. 1910. *Lehrbuch der aramäischen Sprache des babylonischen Talmuds*. München: C. H. Beck'sche.
- Moran, W.L. 1969. "New Evidence from Mari on the History of Prophecy." *Bib* 50: 15-56.
- Mourelatos, A. P. D. 1981. "Events, Processes, and States." In *Tense and Aspect*, eds. P.J. Tedeschi and A. Zaenen. Pp. 191-212. *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 14. New York: Academic.
- Muraoka, T. 1987. *Classical Syriac for Hebraists*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Murphy, R.E. 1990. *The Song of Songs*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nöldeke, T. 1875. *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Idem. 1904. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Trans. J. Crichton. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Noonan, M. 1985. "Complementation." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Complex Structures*, vol. 2, ed. T. Shopen. Pp. 42-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Noort, E. 1977. *Untersuchungen zum Gottesbescheid in Mari*. AOAT 202. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- O'Connor, M. 1980. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Pope, M.H. 1977. *Song of Songs*. AB 7C. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Poutsma, H. 1926. *A Grammar of the Late Modern English*. Vol. II. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.
- Ratner, R. 1990. "The 'Feminine Takes Precedence' Syntagm and Job 19,15." *ZAW* 102: 238-51.
- Ross, J.R. 1969. "Auxiliaries as Main Verbs." In *Studies in Philosophical Linguistics*, vol. 1, ed. W. Todd. Pp. 77-102. Evanston: Great Expectations.
- Quirk, R., et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Sasson, J.M. 1990. *Jonah*. AB 24B. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Saydon, P.P. 1954. "The Inceptive Imperfect in Hebrew and the Verb *hēhēl* 'To Begin.'" *Bib* 35: 43-50.
- Smith, C.S. 1983. "A Theory of Aspectual Choice," *Language* 59/3: 479-501.

- Idem. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Speiser, E.A. 1964. *Genesis*. AB 1. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Steele, S. 1978. "The Category AUX as a Language Universal." In *Universals of Human Language*, vol 3, ed. J.H. Greenberg. Pp. 7-45. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Steele, S., et al. 1981 *An Encyclopedia of AUX*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs, 5. Cambridge: MIT.
- Taylor, J.R. 1989. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Vendler, Z. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. New York: Cornell University.
- Verkuyl, H.K. 1972. *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Waltke, B.K. and M. O'Connor. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. (WOC)
- Young, P.D. and T. Givón. 1990. "The Puzzle of Ngäbére Auxiliaries: Grammatical Reconstruction in Chibchan and Misumalpan." In *Studies in Typology and Diachrony*, eds. W. Croft, K. Denning, and S. Kemmer. Pp. 209-43. TSL 20. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Abstract:

The present paper suggests that in addition to its use as a lexical verb meaning "to arise, stand," *qwm* functions as a grammatical marker of ingressive aspect in Biblical Hebrew, focusing attention on the inception or initiation of a situation. The paper is both theoretically explicit and empirically based, and provides a full panoply of comparative Semitic and general linguistic support for this interpretation. Specifically, three kinds of evidence are offered. First, *qwm* is both a stance and motion verb. In many languages, notably in the Semitic languages, verbs with the motional meaning "to arise, come to a standing position" frequently become grammaticalized as markers of aspect, or aspect verbs. Second, ingressive *qwm* appears to be a complement-taking verb which selects reduced complements. This profile is consistent with that of other aspect verbs in the world's languages. Third, the ingressive use of *qwm* has the same presuppositions and implications as other ingressive aspect verbs. Each of these lines of argument is followed out in the paper.

Address of the author:

Ass.Prof. F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp PhD, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, P.O.Box 208236, New Haven / CT 06520-8236, U.S.A.