During the previous symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) and Ben Sira (Strasbourg, 2006), I devoted some thoughts to existential clauses with the particles בִּאֵין and בְּיָשָׁם followed by a prepositional phrase (PP) and a noun phrase (NP). In that contribution,¹ I argued that the default order of this clause type is NP–PP when the PP is nominal, and PP–NP when the PP is pronominal. More importantly, I demonstrated that a number of factors may cause a deviation from this default order. These factors include, among others: 1) the length and complexity of the constituents, with longer constituents tending to move to the back; 2) the semantics of certain clauses; and 3) the pragmatic functions (topic and focus) of clause constituents.

Building on these findings, as well as on other previous work I have done on constituent order in some chapters of the biblical book of Job,² I turn in the present contribution to clauses with the verb היה in the Hebrew of the DSS. I will ask, on the one hand, what default constituent orders can be discerned in this clause type, and on the other, what factors influence this order. The choice of this particular clause type is motivated by three observations. First, the verb היה functions both as a copula and as an independent verb of existence. Studies in general linguistics have demonstrated that these two functions are typologically quite different, which raises a question as to the influence of the respective functions of the verb on the word order of the clauses in which it occurs. Second, clauses with copular היה are intrinsically interesting, since semantically speaking, they

are nominal,\textsuperscript{3} while syntactically speaking, they are verbal, as they contain a conjugated verb. It is legitimate to ask, therefore, to what extent this double nature affects the constituent order in the clause. A third reason for submitting this clause type to further inquiry is the lack of specific attention to its constituent order in grammars and other scholarly works, in contrast to the wide scholarly interest in the constituent order of both verbal and nominal (including tripartite) clauses. This lack of attention is all the more surprising given the unusual features just mentioned.\textsuperscript{4}

The scope of the present contribution will be limited to those clauses in which the verb הוה is used either used as a verb of existence or as a copula governing a subject and a (pro)nominal, adjectival, or prepositional predicate. Excluded are clauses in which the copula הוה is followed by the preposition –ל with an infinitive expressing purpose or—very commonly in the Hebrew of the DSS—obligation.\textsuperscript{5} Clauses in which the copula is followed by a participle—the so-called periphrastic construction—are not dealt with either. One could object to the latter omission by arguing that also in the case of הוה + participle, the verb is used as a copula followed by a predicate, which happens to take the form of a participle. Nevertheless, there are a number of good reasons not to include the clause type here. The first reason is that the use of this construction in the DSS has been discussed extensively by Muraoka, with whose conclusions I can only agree.\textsuperscript{6} A second, more fundamental reason to distinguish between הוה as a copula and הוה in the periphrastic construction lies in the observed constituent order itself. As Muraoka and others before him have correctly observed, the copula הוה always precedes the participle.\textsuperscript{7} Moreover, I have found that no other constituent than the subject alone can come between

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{3} Joüon–Muraoka §154m: “The verb הוה is used in the weak sense of to be as a copula, when it is desired to specify the temporal sphere of a nominal clause…” (emphasis mine).
\item \textsuperscript{4} In this respect, it is regrettable that M. Baasten decided not to include this clause type in his recent doctorate on nominal clauses in Qumran Hebrew: M.F.J. Baasten, “The Non-Verbal Clause in Qumran Hebrew” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Leiden, 2006), 25.
\item \textsuperscript{5} See E. Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 70–72. See, e.g., iQH* 166: והי אלמדהו.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Muraoka, “The Participle,” 200. Muraoka notes one exception, viz., iQ19 35:13, but in this case the participle is passive.
\end{itemize}