

THE PARTICLE **כִּי**

BY

A. SCHOORS

Leuven

Occurring some 4000 times in the Bible, *ki* is certainly the most common particle in the Hebrew language¹⁾. It is also the word with the widest and most varied range of nuances and meanings. J. PEDERSEN calls it the most comprehensive of all Hebrew particles²⁾. Furthermore, it is used in extra-biblical texts, such as the Siloam inscription³⁾ and the Lachish letters⁴⁾, and continued to be used, albeit much less frequently, in mediaeval and modern Hebrew⁵⁾. The diminution of its use in later Hebrew, when compared to its high frequency in the Bible, is rather strange⁶⁾.

Ki in other Semitic Languages

Ki is frequently employed in other Semitic languages as well. We find it in Ugaritic and Phoenician as *k*, which in Punic developed

¹⁾ Is. iii 24 is to be excluded from this study. There *ki* is a noun meaning "branding" (cf. Arab. *kā*, cauterisation, root *קְרֹה*). Cf. B. STADE, *ZAW* 26 (1906), p. 134f. This has been contested by J. T. MILIK, *Bib* 31 (1950), p. 216, who refers to 1QIsa, which has: **כִּי תָהַת יְפֵי בָשָׂר**: "instead of beauty shame" (RSV). Cf. also F. NÖTSCHER, *VT* 1 (1951), p. 300; H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (1972), p. 136. 1QIsa, however, seems to have added **תְּמֻנָה**, when this use of **כִּי** was no longer understood. Cf. G. R. DRIVER, *JTS* 2 (1951), p. 25.—According to J. REIDER, *VT* 4 (1954), p. 294; G. R. DRIVER, *PEQ* 104 (1972), p. 64f., also in Job xxxix 27, *ki* is a noun meaning "vulture" (cf. Arab. *kay*, ibis, bustard, pelican; LXX: γέρα). But this *ki* could be the emphatic particle (cf. infra): "Is it at your command that the eagle mounts up, yea, makes his nest high?"

²⁾ J. PEDERSEN, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, I-II (1926), p. 118; cf. J. MUILENBURG, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle **כִּי** in the Old Testament", *IHUCA* 32 (1961), p. 135ff., esp. p. 136.

³⁾ Siloam, line 3.

⁴⁾ Cf. H. TORCZYNER, *The Lachish Letters* (1938), p. 201; C.-F. JEAN - J. HOFTIJZER, *DISO*, p. 118.

⁵⁾ Cf. R. ALCALAY, *The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary* (1965), p. 1014f.; E. BEN YEHUDA, *Thesaurus totius Hebraitatis*, 5, p. 2326ff.

⁶⁾ M. H. SEGAL, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (1958), p. 146: "**כִּי** is common in Mishnaic Hebrew only with **ל** as an interrogative particle, **כִּי לָ**. **כִּי** alone is preserved only in elevated diction, under the influence of BH, or in a poetical passage like MQ 25b".

into *k'*, *kh*, *kb*, *k'?*), and into *chy*, *ch* and *co* in Plautus' *Poenulus* 931, 938, 941⁸⁾. In Ugaritic the proclitic *k-* is used as an emphatic particle before the verb at the end of a clause⁹⁾, and as a conjunction introducing objective, causal, temporal or conditional clauses: "that, because, for, when, if"¹⁰⁾. According to C. H. GORDON, in *UT* 2064, 21, *k* calls for the translation "which, that", replacing the relative pronoun¹¹⁾. Phoenician *k* is frequent in the sense of "for, because", whereas in its temporal use, its use as an emphatic adverb and its use as a conjunction introducing an object clause, it is quite rarely attested¹²⁾. The Moabite inscription of Mesha also shows a few instances of *ky* (lines 4, 5, 17, 27, 28) with an exclusively causal meaning. In Ancient and Imperial Aramaic too, the only use of *ky* thus far attested is the causal one¹³⁾. Epigraphic South Arabian has a particle *k*, chiefly employed with temporal and causal meanings, and introducing object clauses. It can have a consecutive/final meaning too¹⁴⁾. Akkadian has a particle *ki/ki*, which corresponds to Hebrew *k* as

⁷⁾ Cf. J. FRIEDRICH, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik* (1951), § 109; S. SEGERT, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic* (1976), § 57.3.

⁸⁾ Cf. M. SZNYCER, *Les passages puniques en transcription latine dans le "Poenulus"* de Plaute (1967), p. 55f.; 102f.; 120f.

⁹⁾ Cf. C. H. GORDON, *UT*, § 9.17; 19.1184; K. AARTUN, *Die Partikel des Ugaritischen* (1974), p. 31f. J. AISTLEITNER, *WUS*, nr. 1272, ascribes to *k* the adverbial meaning "so", e.g. in 2 Aqht V, 15: *gm. latb. kysh*, whilst classifying other cases of emphatic *k* with the temporal conjunction, e.g. *UT* 52, 39: *il atm. kypt*.

¹⁰⁾ C. H. GORDON, *UT*, § 12.3; 19.1183; J. AISTLEITNER, *WUS*, nr. 1271. In Ugaritic the particle-conjunction *k* (*ki*) can be confounded with its non-homonymic homograph *k* (*ka*), which is a preposition corresponding to Hebrew **בְּ** and meaning "like, as" (*UT*, § 19.1182). Note also the use of *ky* with *mater lectio* in *UT* 1015, 7; 1021, 13; 2060, 17.19; 2061, 9-10. This orthograph supports the vocalisation *ki* as in Hebrew **כִּי** for the particle, in contrast to the preposition *ka*.

¹¹⁾ *UT* 2064, 21: *w. lbt. alpm. brtm k. rgmt. ly*, "and the requisition for plow oxen that you mentioned to me". Cf. *UT*, § 19.1184. But this interpretation is not the only one possible. With K. AARTUN, *loc. cit.*, we can translate: "und eine Pflugrinder-Tafel hast du mir, fürwahr, genannt" (emphatic *k*).

¹²⁾ Temporal: Ahiram 1 (uncertain; cf. H. DONNER - W. RÖLLIG, *KAI*, II, p. 3); emphatic: CIS 4, 3; Esh. 12-13; object clause: RES 1215, 7; Poen. 931; 941.—Cf. J. FRIEDRICH, *op. cit.*, § 257c; Z. S. HARRIS, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (1936), p. 64 and 109; S. SEGERT, *op. cit.*, § 67.4; C. F. JEAN - J. HOFTIJZER, *DISO*, p. 117f.

¹³⁾ Anc. Aram.: KAI 202 A, 13; 224, 22; Imp. Aram.: KAI 233, 8 (?); 266, 6; Ahiqar 95, 98, 99, 114 (?), 119, 122, 123, 132, 138, 168, 178 (?), 208; cf. C.-F. JEAN - J. HOFTIJZER, *loc. cit.*; S. SEGERT, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (1975), p. 235.

¹⁴⁾ Cf. M. HÖFNER, *Altsüdarabische Grammatik* (1943), p. 167f.; A. F. L. BEESTON, *A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian* (1962), § 54:1.

well as to *ki*¹⁵). It is used as a preposition with the basically comparative meaning "so as", as an interrogative adverb meaning "how" and as a conjunction. In the latter function it introduces temporal, conditional and objective clauses¹⁶. A specific case of objective clause is the indirect question, which may be introduced by *ki*, in such sentences as *ša'al ki-i mātu rūgātu*, "ask whether the land is distant" (VAB 2, 7, 29)¹⁷. Special attention is due to *ki* as employed in New and Late Babylonian to express an oath, either assertive or promissory. W. GESENIUS - F. BUHL and L. KÖHLER - W. BAUMGARTNER refer to Egyptian *k3*¹⁸), although the former suggest that *k3* might rather correspond to *kōh*.

Hebrew *ki* is etymologically related to *ke-*¹⁹) and thus connected to the same preposition in other Semitic tongues, such as Ugaritic, Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic (*ka*, *kamā*), Ethiopic (*kama*), Akkadian (*ki*, *kima*, *kiam*).

To sum up, we can conclude that Semitic *ki* has a range of meanings and uses, represented in most of the Semitic languages. In Phoenician, Moabite and Aramaic the causal use is preponderant, whereas it is absent from Akkadian, where the temporal, conditional and emphatic meanings are well attested. In Arabic the deictic morpheme *ka* has not developed into a distinct *k/v/* corresponding to Hebrew *ki*.

Basic Meaning

It is commonly accepted that *ki* originally is a deictic or demonstrative word, related, as we saw, to *ke* and *kōh*²⁰). It is a particle that directs the attention: "that is it points or shows the way forward"²¹.

¹⁵) W. VON SODEN, *AHw*, p. 468f.; *CAD* 8, p. 316ff.

¹⁶) W. VON SODEN, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (1952), § 116d; 162d; 172; 177c.

¹⁷) W. VON SODEN, *GAG*, § 180d.

¹⁸) W. GESENIUS - F. BUHL, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch*¹⁷ (1917), p. 341 (further GB); L. KÖHLER - W. BAUMGARTNER, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (1958), p. 431 (further *LVTL*).

¹⁹) Cf. KÖHLER-BAUMGARTNER, *LVTL*, loc. cit.

²⁰) Thus GB; *LVTL*; F. ZORELL, *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum* (1961), p. 352; L. KÖHLER - W. BAUMGARTNER, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon* (1974), p. 448 (further *HAL*).

²¹) J. MUILENBURG, *HUCA* 32 (1961), p. 136. Cf. also T. C. VRIEZEN, "Einige Notizen zur Übersetzung des Bindeswort *ki*", *Von Ugarit nach Qumran*, *BZAW* 77 (1958), p. 266ff., esp. p. 273: "Das *ki* ist das Wort, das die Aufmerksamkeit in bestimmter Hinsicht spannt, aber in ganz formeller Weise; die Qualität, die Art, der Ton der Spannung wird bedingt durch den faktischen Zusammenhang, den der Kontext wach ruft".

"It may mean that something is now coming to which we must pay attention"²²). This is confirmed, as J. MUILENBURG rightly states, by the fact that *ki* frequently falls outside the meter: it is given special stress by standing metrically isolated while still giving force to the colon which follows²³). It is of course impossible to trace the development of the particle from its fundamental deictic use to the different functions it assumes in Biblical Hebrew. For these functions had already been established before the earliest records. Thus we must limit ourselves to a systematic survey of the different meanings and functions of *ki*. When starting from its deictic force, we first meet the so-called emphatic or asseverative *ki*, which comes closest to this original function of the particle.

Emphatic or asseverative *ki*.

Although the relative frequency of emphatic *k* in Ugaritic has recently reinforced scholarly attention to this use of *ki* in Hebrew²⁴), it was already known by such hebraists as W. GESENIUS, E. KÖNIG and P. JOÜON²⁵). Hence the somewhat hesitant wording of BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS is striking: "there seem also to be other cases in which *ki* has an intensive force, introducing a statement with emph."²⁶). This *ki* can be translated as "yea, surely, certainly", although stylistic reasons may often refrain from explicitly rendering the word. The most quoted instance is Gen. xviii 20:

זעקה סדム ועמורה כי־ירבה וחטאיהם כי כבדה מאד.

Yea, the outcry against Sodom and Gomorrah is great and their sin surely is very grave.

²²) J. PEDERSEN, loc. cit.

²³) Cf. T. H. ROBINSON, "Anacrusis in Hebrew Poetry", *Werden und Wesen des alten Testaments* (1936), p. 37ff., who mentions the particles as being capable of anacrusis, but does not quote any instance of *ki*.

²⁴) R. GORDIS, "The Asseverative Kaph in Ugaritic and Hebrew", *JAS* 63 (1943), p. 176ff.; R. T. O'CALLAGHAN, *VT* 4 (1954), p. 175; G. R. DRIVER, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (1956), p. 144, n. 17; T. J. MEEK, "Translation Problems in the OT", *JQR* 50 (1959-60), p. 53f.; C. H. W. BREKELMANS, *Res Shamra en het Oud Testament* (1962), p. 10; J. MUILENBURG, *HUCA* 32 (1961), p. 143; M. DAHOOD, *Bib* 46 (1965), p. 327.

²⁵) Cf. W. GESENIUS - E. KAUTZSCH, *Hebräische Grammatik*²⁸ (1909), § 148d (further GK); E. KÖNIG, *Historisch-comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (1897), § 351c; P. JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique* (1923), § 164d.

²⁶) F. BROWN - S. R. DRIVER - C. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon* (1907), p. 472 (further BDB).

In RSV we still find the translation "because" ²⁷⁾, although LXX and Vg left *kī* untranslated, whereas TgO has deictic *'ārē* (TgPsJ: *'ārūm*).

When in Ugaritic emphatic *kī* is used, the verb is thrown to the end of the clause ²⁸⁾. The same syntactic phenomenon sometimes appears in Biblical Hebrew ²⁹⁾. Next to the above-cited Gen. xviii 20, we can refer to 2 Sam. xxiii 5; Is. vii 9 (see below); Ps. xlvi 16; cii 11; cxviii 10-12, cxx 7 ³⁰⁾; cxxviii 2 ³¹⁾; Lam. iii 22. G. R. DRIVER adds to these examples Is. x 13. Although an emphatic *kī* is possible in this context, the traditional rendering is acceptable: "By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom, *for* I have understanding" (RSV) ³²⁾. Ps. lxxxix 2-3 can be added to the list, when we transfer *bepi* from vs. 2 to vs. 3 (cf. BHK): *bepi kī-'āmarthi*, "With my mouth I clearly admit" ³³⁾. M. DAHOOD presents a good case for an emphatic *kī* in Ps. cxliii 9, where he reads MT *'ēlykā kissitī* as *'ēlī kī kussitī*, "my God, truly am I being submerged" ³⁴⁾.

For all that, the use of emphatic *kī* is not limited to these cases having a verb at the end of the clause. There are very good examples of Hebrew sentences or clauses opening with such a *kī* and we find it even at the beginning of a literary unit. In that position, it corresponds to Arabic *yimma* ³⁵⁾. Let us quote a couple of examples:

Is. xv 1:

כִּי בְּלִיל שָׁדָךְ עַר מוֹאָב נִדְמָה

Yea, in the night when Ar was laid waste, Moab was undone (Contrast RSV; comp. BJ).

²⁷⁾ Cf. also BDB, p. 473. Contrast BJ: "Le cri contre Sodome et Gomorrhe est bien grand! Leur péché est bien grave".

²⁸⁾ C. H. GORDON, *UT*, § 9.17; G. R. DRIVER, *loc. cit.* E.g. *UT* 62 i 14-15; *lktp 'nt. ktsb*, "on the shoulders of Anat she sets him".

²⁹⁾ Cf. R. MEYER, *Hebräische Grammatik* (1972), § 91, 2. d; C. BROCKELMANN, *Hebräische Syntax* (1956), § 51: "Nachfolgendes Prädikat wird öfter durch *כִּי* hervorgehoben": R. T. O'CALLAGHAN, *loc. cit.*

³⁰⁾ C. H. W. BREKELMANS, *OTS* 15 (1969), p. 173ff., has parsed *wekī* as a double emphatic. This, of course, involves the existence of an emphatic *naw*, which, I think, cannot be doubted (cf. C. H. GORDON, *UT*, § 13.103; M. POPE, *JAOS* 73 (1953), p. 95ff.; M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III* (1970), p. 400ff.; JOÖN, § 177 l-m; R. J. WILLIAMS, *Hebrew Syntax* (1976), § 435. In any case, the *naw* is not above suspicion, since it is absent from two mss. and has no equivalent in the ancient versions.

³¹⁾ Listed by BDB, p. 473, in the group of causal *kī*.

³²⁾ So BJ; G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Jesaja I* (1966), p. 154; H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja* (1972), p. 390; A. SCHOORS, *Jesaja* (1972), p. 88.

³³⁾ M. DAHOOD, *Psalms II* (1968), p. 308ff.

³⁴⁾ M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III* (1970), p. 325.

³⁵⁾ A. SOCIN - C. BROCKELMANN, *Arabische Grammatik* (1925), § 141a; W. WRIGHT, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* 1 (1967), § 362m.

כִּי לֹא יַשְׁهַה אֱלֹהִי יְהוָה דָּבָר כִּי אֶמְגַלֵּה סְדוּר אֶל-עֲבָדָיו חֲנִיבָאִים

Surely the Lord Yahwe does nothing, without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets (RSV).

Other instances are Is. i 29; ii 6; iii 1; xv 9; xxxii 13; lxv 16; Ps. xviii 29-30; lxxvii 12; cxxxvi (refrain); Job v 2; xxviii 1; Prov. xxx 1; Ecc. vii 7. In Job xxxviii 5 and Prov. xxx 4, the emphatic *kī* has an ironical nuance: "Surely you know." ³⁶⁾ Of course, this list can be expanded, and there are cases where it is hard to ascertain whether the *kī* is emphatic or has another syntactic function. So 2 Kings xxiv 20, which most commentators interpret as a causal explanation of vs. 19: "He did what was evil... *For* because of the anger of the Lord it came to the point in Jerusalem and Judah that he cast them out from his presence" (RSV). But the *kī* can also be explained as an asseverative particle: "It was *actually* because the Lord was angry enough with Jerusalem and Judah to banish them from his presence that it came about that Zedekiah rebelled" ³⁷⁾. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS mentions Is. viii 3 as a verse that is capable of several interpretations: the *kī* could mean "surely", "no, but" or "or". The last meaning certainly is the most obvious ³⁸⁾.

In his commentary on the Psalms, M. DAHOOD has greatly enlarged the frequency of emphatic *kī* to some 83 instances in the Book of Psalms alone ³⁹⁾. This number appears to be exaggerated. The great majority of his proposals offers no improvement of the traditional, mostly causal, parsings of *kī*, or are at best uncertain ⁴⁰⁾. Some instances where his suggestion improves our understanding of the text are: Ps. lxviii 36, where reading an emphatic *kī* rules out an unintelligible suffix *-kā*; lxxi 23 ⁴¹⁾; lxxvi 11, a very difficult verse, but *kī* seems to be emphatic; lxxxv 9 ⁴²⁾; xc 7 ⁴³⁾; civ 13, where

³⁶⁾ BDB, p. 473, mentions these verses among the instances of causal *kī*, which is hard to accept. GB, p. 342, classes them with conditional *kī*.

³⁷⁾ T. J. MEEK, *JQR* 50 (1959-60), p. 47f.

³⁸⁾ Cf. BDB, p. 474; A. SCHOORS, *Jesaja* (1972), p. 80.

³⁹⁾ Cf. M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III* (1970), p. 402ff. for a listing of the instances where he suggests an emphatic *kī*.

⁴⁰⁾ I think the following instances can be left out: with postposition of the verb: Ps. liv 7; lvi 13; lxx 10.18; lx 4; xc 4; cix 23; without postposition of the verb: Ps. lxiii 2; lxxxv 3; cii 5.14; cxvi 1-2; cxix 161; cxxxviii 2; *kī* introducing a whole sentence: Ps. xvi 8; xxii 29; xxvi 1; lxvi 6; lxxxix 18; cxix 43.111; cxxv 3.

⁴¹⁾ "My lips will shout for joy, *when* I sing praises to you" (RSV), is rather flat, when compared to DAHOOD's: "My lips will resound with joy—indeed will I sing to you—".

⁴²⁾ Cf. J. VAN DER PLOEG, *Psalmen II* (1974), p. 73.

⁴³⁾ Cf. H. J. KRAUS, *Psalmen II* (1966), p. 627; J. VAN DER PLOEG, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

reading an emphatic *ki* frees us from an embarrassing change of person: *ki tisba' hā'āres*, “the earth is fully imbued”⁴⁴⁾; cxvi 16; cxxxv 5; cxxxix 4; cxli 5⁴⁵⁾. DAHOOD rightly illuminates some instances where *ki* emphasizes a special part of the clause, such as a pronoun or a noun, although here again the larger part of his new proposals are superfluous or incorrect⁴⁶⁾. Ps. x 14 has *rā'itā ki'-attā*, “you have seen yourself”, where *ki* emphasizes the pronoun *'attā*. Also Ps. cxxxix 13 should be mentioned here, although DAHOOD lists it with *ki* introducing a whole sentence: *ki-'attā qānitā kilyōtāy*, “yes, you created my reins yourself”. In Ps. lxviii 29, MT *sīwā' 'elōheykā 'uzzēkā*⁴⁷⁾ should be read *sāwēb 'elōhay ki-'uzzēkā*, “Send, my God, your strength”, where *ki* emphasizes the noun *'uzzēkā*. DAHOOD goes so far in his distinctions as to make special entries of emphatic *ki* with precative perfect and emphatic *ki* with jussive. Among the former category only Ps. iii 8 deserves to be retained:

קומה יהוה והשענו אלה ב-הכית את-כל-איבי לחי שוי רשותם שברת.

The imperatives *qūmā* and *kōšēnī* call for a precative perfect in *hikkītā* and *shibartā*. When reading *'et* as *'attā*, we obtain a very satisfactory translation: “Rise up, O Yahwe, save me, my God! O that you yourself would smite all my foes on the jaw! Smash the teeth of the wicked!”⁴⁸⁾ In Ps. lxiii 8, *hāyītā* is not precative; still *ki* could be emphatic, although other interpretations such as causal *ki* or an object clause are quite acceptable too⁴⁹⁾. As to emphatic *ki* with jussive, the two instances, Ps. xvii 6 and lxxxvi 7, permit a causal interpretation.

⁴⁴⁾ This suggestion keeps its value, even if one does not accept the Phoenician third person suffix -y in consonantal *m'fy*. From *m'fyw* a *waw* could easily be dropped.

⁴⁵⁾ Ps. cxxxv 5; cxxxix 4; cxli 5: cf. also H. J. KRAUS, *in loco*; cxxxv 5: cf. also J. VAN DER PLOEG, *in loco*; cxxxix 4: cf. RSV.

⁴⁶⁾ The following instances are not to be retained: with pronouns: Ps. xxxix 10; lxi 6; lxxxii 8; lxxxvi 17; xci 3; cxlviii 5; with substantives: Ps. lxi 10.18; lxxvii 15; lxxx 17; with prepositions: Ps. lxxxvi 3-4.

⁴⁷⁾ Cf. LXX: ἐντελαθό θεος τῇ δυνάμει σου; Tg: קִידּוֹן עַשׂוֹן אֱלֹהָא; Pesh: פְּנֵס אֲמָלָא גָּמָךְ. None, however, of these versions has the possessive of the first person with “God”.

⁴⁸⁾ Cf. M. DAHOOD, *Psalms I*, p. 15 and 19f. The emphatic meaning of *ki* is not proved in Ps. ix 5; lvi 14; lxi 4; lxxi 24.

⁴⁹⁾ H. J. KRAUS, *op. cit.*, p. 440, reads an emphatic particle; RSV translates: “for thou hast been my help”; according to BJ and J. VAN DER PLOEG, *op. cit.*, I, p. 368, *ki* introduces the object clause depending on *zēkārtikā* and *'egeb-bāk*.

R. GORDIS has observed that in Ugaritic the preposition *k* (= “like”) is a proclitic, and hence it is not separated from the word it modifies, whereas the conjunction *ki* (= Heb. *ki*) does occur with the word-divider, though not invariably. He further states that in all extant uses of *k* as an emphatic, it is never separated from its verb. Hence he deduces a presumption, though not a certainty, that the emphatic *k* is a proclitic and not a distinct word, and hence equivalent to the Hebrew prefix and not to the vocable. This brings him to the conclusion that, next to the clear use of *ki* as an emphatic, Hebrew uses the proclitic *kaph* also for asseverative purposes, and that generally at the end of the clause⁵⁰⁾. This use had already been remarked by DAVID KIMHI, who described this *kaph* as *קְפָה האמיתות*, which the later grammarians rendered as *kaph veritatis*. GORDIS cites a series of biblical passages, where this *kaph* affords a better exegesis. E.g. Is. xxix 2:

זהיקותי לאריאל והיתה תאונה ואניה והיתה לי כאריאל

I shall afflict Ariel, and there will be wailing and lamentation, and it shall indeed be an Ariel (= kearth of God) to me.

Lam. i 20:

מחוץ שכלה-חרב בבית כמות

Without, the sword bereaved; within, there was death⁵¹⁾.

The other instances are Num. xi 1; Is. x 13⁵²⁾; Hos. iv 4; v 10; Ob. 11; Ps. cxix 9⁵³⁾; cxxii 3; Prov. xvi 27⁵⁴⁾; Job iii 5; Ecc. x 5⁵⁵⁾; Neh. vii 2⁵⁶⁾.

In his conclusion, GORDIS explicitly states that emphatic *kaph* is used before substantives, as against *ki*, which modifies verbs or an entire clause. This, however, is in opposition to his argument that in Ugaritic, emphatic *k* is never separated from its verb and thus presents itself as a proclitic. Yet, UT 2060, 17-20 has twice *ky* (*scriptio*

⁵⁰⁾ R. GORDIS, *JAO* 63 (1943), p. 176f.

⁵¹⁾ Cf. also T. F. McDANIEL, *Bbl* 49 (1968), p. 211.

⁵²⁾ “I shall bring low even the mightiest of the inhabitants”. A different rendering which is certainly as good: “I bring down, like a mighty one (= with force), those who sit on thrones”. Cf. RSV; A. SCHOORS, *Jesaja*, p. 88; G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 154; J. KOENIG, *Bible de la Pléiade* II (1961), p. 36.

⁵³⁾ The ancient versions do not translate the *kaph*. Rhythmic balance suggests however to read: “How can a young man be pure (*yizkelet*)? By guarding his path according to your word”. Cf. M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III*, p. 174.

⁵⁴⁾ There is no reason to abandon the traditional interpretation of Ps. cxxii 3 and Prov. xvi 27.

⁵⁵⁾ The *kaph* can have its traditional meaning “like”, as admitted by GORDIS himself.

⁵⁶⁾ Cf. JOÜON, § 133g.

1. Since *eff* emphasizes the verb or the whole sentence, it is no wonder that it regularly occurs in oaths, where, according to R. J. Williams, the assertive use of *eff* originated as.

E.g. 1 Sam. xx 3: **נָתַן פְּנֵי תְּזִבְּחֶנָּה** **לֹא תִּמְצָרֶנָּה**

As Yahweh lives and as your soul lives, hece is but a step between me and death.

2 Sam. xii 5: **נְתִין מִצְבָּחָת וְנִזְבְּחָת בְּכָל מִצְבָּחָה**

As Yahwe lives and as your soul lives, hece is but a step between me and death.

As Yahwe lives, the man who has done this deserts to die.

Other clear instances are Gen. xlii 16; 1 Sam. xxvi 16; 2 Sam. ii 27; 1 Kings xviii 15; 1 Sam. xix 18; Jeet. xxi 24. After *badilla h*, „far be it from me“, it occurs in 1 Sam. iii 30. Also after the formula *kod yd asdeq tsibtim wekab ywsh*, the curse, which is a specific kind of oath, is marked by *ez*; e.g., in 1 Sam. xvi 44; 2 Sam. iii 9; 1 Kings ii 23; Ruth i 17^{ss}). Quite naturally, in the context an oath is often substituted for the verb *wiθa*, „With God we can render witness“, as in „a fool-rabbi sent you ready, here sent to the sun, your master, (saying) that there is no God in your house“. K. Aarne, op. cit., p. 46f., analyzes *ez* as partitive, with an emphatic *te*.

82) UT 2060, 17-20: *lhi. akl. k* (18) *lhi. m. fsp. (19) b'ak. k* (20) *b'ak.*

83) R. J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax, § 449.

84) Jeloen, § 165a; W. Reddihough, Das Buch Ruth—Das Hebe Land—Die Klage—Kinder, KAT XAU I-3 (1962), p. 41.

85) „With an emphatic *te*.“ K. Aarne, op. cit., p. 46f., analyzes *ez* as partitive, with an emphatic *te*.

86) „he swore that . . .“ (Gen. xxxi 16; 1 Kings i 17; 1 Sam. xii 23; Jeet. xxi 5; „he swore that . . .“ KAT XAU I-3 (1962), p. 41.

87) „With an emphatic *te*.“ K. Aarne, op. cit., p. 46f., analyzes *ez* as partitive, with an emphatic *te*.

We meet take same syntactic situation in Gen. iii 5; xvi 15; xlvi 8; Ex. vi 10; xxii 24; xxxvii 13; Num. xxxvii 79; Deut. iv 26; v 3; viii 3; ix 5; xiii 10; 2 Sam. xx 21; 1 Kings xxi 15; I Kings 22; Am. viii 14⁷⁴). Another instance is Hos. i 6 if, along with H. W. Wolff, we understand *et-nadot*, *et-ta*, *labbem* as „but I will take it (viz., pity away from them”⁷⁵). The more common feature is here *et im*⁷⁶). Accordinging to Jelouon, the adversative use of *et* is probably derived from its causal meaning, originating in contexts where „for” is used practically equivalent of „but”, as in Gen. xvi 15: „As for Sarai her name”. He derives the adversative force of *et* „from its acceptitive meaning. This connection he illustrates with Ex. xi 9: „Do not eat any of it raw or boiled with water, unless (= but) the meat is scalded”. As to the latter opinion, the quoted example is not very convincing. Both meanings of *et* *im* are cognate in the sense that one meaning is the more generical one, the exception being a specific subcategory. When an alternative is expressed after negative clause, we have the simple adversative meaning of *et* „im

You will not take a wife for my son from the daughters of the Canaanites
but a wife from among your own people (Gen. xxvii, 46).
After I have established your kingdom over Israel for ever". After a question in job iii 11-13,
"Why did I not die at birth (= if I had)..., then now (if, atta) I
would be lying quiet...". (Other instances are Job vi 21; xiii 19).
3. After a negative clause, if it has alternative force, which is a
specific case of its associative function [3]. It corresponds to German
"sondernd", Latin *sed*, and is to be translated by "but, on the contrary".
E.g., Gen. xxvii, 4: ... *בָּתְנֵךְ* ... *בָּתְנֵךְ* *תִּשְׁאַל* *מִן* *הָעָם* *אֲשֶׁר*
... *בָּתְנֵךְ* *תִּשְׁאַל* *מִן* *הָעָם* *אֲשֶׁר* *בָּתְנֵךְ* *תִּשְׁאַל* *מִן* *הָעָם* *אֲשֶׁר*

In this position, the combined parties *et alia* and *et seqq.* are more common. We find *et alia* in the apodoses after *ut* in 2 Sam. xvi 29; 1 Sam. xvi 30; *job vi 2-3*; after *ut* in Gen. xxxi 42; xliii 10 and 7 Gen. xlii 14-15; xxxii 23-26. It is striking that the use after *im* is limited to *Job*, whereas in narrative prose the particle occurs only in connection with *in* and *ut*. Brown-Driver-Briggs doubts the specific function of *et alia* in the apodoses, since in 2 Sam. ii 27; xix 7, the *et* may be merely resumptive of the *et rectitamen* which precedes ⁷⁰). In ii 27, the first *et* is emphatic, since in *Job xi 15* ⁷¹) and xxi 26, the *et* is not at all resumptive of a apodosis and compare it to the above mentioned texts, the more so when we take into consideration its position at the head of the sentence it is not *rectitamen*; the fifth *et* is hardly resumptive of it, since in *Job xi 15* ⁷²) and compare it to the above mentioned texts, the more so when we take into consideration its position at the head of the sentence it is not *rectitamen*; the fifth *et* is hardly resumptive of it, which introduces an object clause subordinate to *yadda*, in which xix 7 introduces *et* in the apodosis is akin to it. The fourth *et* in that the second *et* in the apodosis is akin to it. The fourth *et* in introduction brings an oath, as appears from the formula *bag ha'atolim*, so that the condition is not formally expressed but is implicitly present in a preceding *et*.

Some times the condition is not formally expressed but is implicitly present in a preceding sentence, as in 1 Sam. xiii 13: "You have not presented in a preceding sentence, as in 1 Sam. xiii 13: "You have not some critics, who read here *et*; e.g., BHK; R. Meier, § 122, 5, b.

69) Cf. E. Petersen, § 167s; GK, § 71 (1959), p. 160.

70) BD, p. 472b; cf. Johnson, loc. cit.

71) GB, p. 342, explain this as causal.

If you will not believe, surely you shall not be established (RSV) ⁶⁸.

13. viii 9: **מִזְמָרָה נַחַת** = **מִזְמָרָה נַחַת** דס.

2. Another specific use of emphatic *et* is to be found in the apologetics of conditional sentences ⁶⁹). A well known example is 1 Kings 17 and 1 Kings 30.

20. Another specific use of emphatic *et* is to be found in the apologetics of conditional sentences ⁶⁹). A well known example is Gen. xxi 16-17 and 1 Kings 30.

my Lord, are my eyes”⁸⁹). The same contrast between the wickeδ and the poor is marked with *אֲ* in P’s, ix 19⁹⁰). In I Kings viii 27, *אֲלָמֹודָם* introduces, in the form of a question, the speaker’s own objection: “But will God indeed dwell on the earth?”⁹¹) To the question, “If you, O Yahwe, should mark the iniquities, who could stand?”, the psalmist reacts with: “(You do not mark the iniquities) but there is forgiveness with you” (P’s, cxxx 3-4). After the unaccomplished wish: “Would (my) son that we had died in Egypt”, which implies a negation, follows: “but you brought us out into this wilderness” (Ex. xvi 3)⁹²), In Gen. xi 14 the adversative force is weak, since there is not even an implicit negation in the preceding sentence; therefore some commentators suggest, wrote gloriy it seems, to replace *אֲ* by *אָ*. When Naomi tries to send her daughters-in-law back to their country, they just reply: *אֲתָה מְשַׁחֵךְ פָּנֶיךָ*, “No, but we will return with you to your people” (Ruth i 10)⁹³. A contrasting reply of this kind is more regularly introduced by *אֲ*, as in Gen. xii 12, where Joseph returns to his brothers, who assert their honesty: “No, but you have come to see the weakness of the land”. Other examples can be found in Gen. xviii 15; xix 2; Jos. v 14; 2 Sam. xvi 18; xxiv 24; 1 Kings ii 30; iii 22-23; Is. xxx 16.

As a nominating particle

By far the most common function of *אֲ* is that of a subordinating conjunction. In this function it can introduce several kinds of subordinate clauses, with which we have now to deal. At the level of ordinary clauses, with which we have now to deal. At the level of conditional clauses, *if* we retain the meaning noun clauses like Greek *εἰ*⁹⁴). In p. 454. H. J. Kravcs, *Psalms III*, p. 308; J. van der Ploeg, *Psalmen II*, 89) Cf. RSV; NL, Dahood, *Psalms* II, p. 927, translates: „Ja, auf dich, Herr, Jahre, sind gerichtet meine Augen!“

there is no adverbial clause: the three *אֲ*s mark respectively a causal, an objective and a conditional clause. According to F. Zorell, *Bih* 14 (1933), p. 468, we should read *לְ* instead of *בְּ* and understand it as a variant of *בְּ*. But the adverbial meaning of *אֲ* is no adverbial clause: the three *אֲ*s mark respectively a causal, but no matter-of-course effectives of the Philitines... Cf. Koehler-

5, p. 2334. 56) Williams, § 451.

scripts read *אֲלִי*, p. 448. But Ortlund Kettner and some of masoretic manuscripts read *אֲלִי* instead of *לְ*. Cf. Bauckelman, § 134b; F. I. Andersen, *op. cit.*, 184. 78) Cf. Bauckelman, § 134b; F. I. Andersen, *op. cit.*, 171. 79) Reading with *וְ* instead of *לְ* is very close to the alternative: “no marriage presents but only a hundred flocks”.

77) In 1 Sam. xviii 25, *אֲ* seems to have an exceptive force: “The king desires threshes = one threshes”; cf. A. Schoors, *Essay*, p. 171. 78) In the other hand, in this case the exceptive meaning comes very close to the alternative: “no marriage presents but only a hundred flocks”.

Opposes to it his own attitude: “(Not so am I) but on you, Yahwe where after having described the destiny of the wicked, the psalmist we are slim all the day long”. The same applies to vs. 8 in Ps. cxli 5-8, an adversary particle in vs. 23: “If we had forgotten the name of our God... would not God discover this?... Nay, for your sake an adversary particle in vs. 23: “If we will first study a group of tunications which R. J. Williams has aptly called „the nominalizing *אֲ*“, i.e. the particle introducing noun clauses like Greek *εἰ*⁹⁵). In Hebrew, it is no longer possible to ascertain which meaning biblical Hebrew, with which we have now to deal. At the level of ordinary clauses, with which we have now to deal. At the level of conjunction, in this function it can introduce several kinds of sub-

In Gen. xxi 16, the adversative *אֲ* is elicited by the negation which is implicated in the rhetorical question of vs. 14: “Is there any portion or inheritance left to us in our father’s house?... (No) but all the property which God has taken away from our father belongs to us...”

Can a man be profitable to God? (No) but he who is wise is profitable to himself (cf. Mic. vi 3-4).

Job xxi 2:

בְּזָהָב תְּזַהֵּר יְמֹנָה יְמֹנָה יְמֹנָה יְמֹנָה יְמֹנָה

negation:

Sometimes the negation is only implicit as e.g. in a rhetorical question: the affirmation of the opposite: not this because/but that. Count that the negation of a fact can be explained and justified by years old”⁹⁶. This is quite understandable when we take into account that lives but a few days... for/but the child shall die a hundred years old in Is. lxv 20: “No more shall die in it an infant hard to distinguish adversative and causal use, as in the quoted violence from the aggressive use of the particle. Yet, it is sometimes aversive *אֲ*, which in the case is reinforced with pleneastic *וּ*. The simple *אֲ*, which in the case is reinforced with pleneastic *וּ*. The meaning of *אֲוּ* is directly derived from the adversative force of the exceptive meaning is obviouς *וּ*. So the adversative mechanism seems to have a logical priority. On the other hand, the adversative specific case that is opposed to this general negative statement, then signifies and the next clause introduced by *אֲ* expresses a

99) BBB, 3, 471, nr 1, a. Kotherr-Baumgartner, HAL, p. 449, nr 14, cites
Cotton, xxi 18 as the only instance of a final *er* (Lat. *u*). This nr 14 thus should
be omitted and the reference added to nr 5.
10) Accidence to Köhler-Baumgartner, LWT, p. 432, in job xxii 12, the
subject of the *-e*-class is a genitive dependent on the object of the governing
noun. It is indeed possible to translate: „See that the highest stars are lofy”;
however, it is preferable to render: „He (God) sees the high stars, however
they may be”, taking *er* as a concessive particle and reading *LWT* or *HAL*.
11) I know that artef my death you will surely act corruptly!
12) According to Köhler-Baumgartner, HAL and LXX and Pesh.

ՀԱՅ ԽՈՎ ՇԱԿ ԸՆ-ԼՈՒՄ ԿԱՐԱ

Other instances can be found in Gen. vi. 2; xiii. 10; xlix. 15; Ex. ii. 2; xxii. 22; 1 Sam. xvii. 8; 1 Kings v. 17; xx. 41; 1 S. iii. 10; Ps. xxxv. 19; Job xxxi. 26; B.C. ii. 24. In Gen. xxi. 14 the prophetic *ba’alatza* is represented by *bb*, in the object clause. As we can see in Deut. xxxi. 29, not only the subject of the object clause but also my member of it, such as an adjunct of time, may be anticipated in the governing clause:

“**לְאֵת קָדוֹשׁ** **נִזְמַן** **כָּלִיל**”

A well-known feature, which we meet already in the first verses of the Bible, consists in making the subject of the object clause the object of the prepositional phrase:

When the object clause is introduced by an adversative clause, the verb
go up and rear an altar to Yahwe on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite
can be repeated as in Jer. xxvi 15: *yada*, *id est*, *et in-memittim*, *at item*
et-ket-an nayr atitem noterim dilekem, *at item*, *Knouw for certain* that if you
put me to death, you will bring innocent blood upon yourselves".
This second *et*, however, can be explained as the emphatic *et* stressed in
the apodosis of a conditional sentence.

And he (Gad) said to him: "Go up, cast an altar to Yahwe on the threshing
floor of Aranayah the Jebusite;".

1 Chron. xxi 18: **דָּבַר נָא שְׁלֵמָה וְעַל כָּל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תְּמִימָה תְּמִימָה תְּמִימָה תְּמִימָה**

The angel of Yahwe commanded Gad to set up the altar to Yahwe on the threshing floor of Aranayah the Jebusite.

tenses, as in *sob xxvii 10; xxviii 20*. However, the more classic way of expression is here a direct quotation of the order given where the command in indirect speech is generally of a later period. The evolution in this respect can best be illustrated with 1 Chron. xxi 18 in contrast with its source, 2 Sam. xxvi 18 (90):

Other instances are: after verbs of perception: Gen. i. 10, iii. 6; vi. 5; xiiii. 14; xxix. 33; xxviii. 5; Ex. iv. 31; xx. 22; Jos. viii. 21; 1 Sam. xxxi. 7; 2 Sam. x. 19; xvi. 23; 1 Kings v. 15; xxi. 18; xxix. 12; 1 Sam. x. 6; Jos. xxii. 34 (*et alia*); Ex. iv. 5 (*be emti*); after verbs of repeating or enjoyment: Gen. vii. 7; Is. xiiii. 23; Ps. lxxviii. 35; Job xxxxvi. 24; xxxix. 15; after verbs of knowing: Gen. xlii. 10, xliii. 18; Ps. xlxx. 17 ⁸⁹; Even a command in indirect speech after the verb *anuar* can be formulated with *ki* and an imperfective construction: Zorelli, p. 353, nr II, 5: "Particula quae sententiam complectitur et velut dilectionis, p. 473, explains *ki* with verbs of rejoicing as causal *ki*, which cannot be excluded.

⁸⁸ BD, p. 188, *WATTS*, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁸⁹ The verb *ce* after verbs of fearing is classified by BDB, p. 473, with the causal *ki*. This is a possible explanation, since the *ki-clause* expresses the reason why the subject is afraid. Nevertheless, in Hebrew the verb *N* is transitive, as appears from its use with the *nata accusative* *N*. We thus should understand the *ki* as nominalizing the object clause, in effect introducing the object clause: *N* *ki* *then means* "to fear the fact that...".

and I have was sorry that he had made man on the earth.

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԿԱՌԱՎԱՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

1774-1775. — *Leucanthemum vulgare* L. (Fig. 1).

Who told you that you were naked?

Gen. iii 11:

And the wife of Uriah heard that Uriah was dead.

WAGS YOU WILL USE ON YOUR

10. *What is the best way to manage your time effectively?*

this use, so that a few examples must suffice. 2 Sam. xi 26;

means necessary and hardly possible to mention all the instances of

believing, remembering and forgetting, regretting, etc. It is by no

of an object clause after verbs of seeing, hearing, saying, knowing,

1. The best known use of *key* in this function is the one at the head

for a subject or an object is related to the main verb [87].

its clause to the main verb exactly as a simple noun or pronoun used

of its clause, standing as it were in apposition to it, and thus it relates

original demonstrative force of the particle: it sums up the meaning

According to J. W. Watts, this function can be explained from the

tendres it, as it were, declinable, just like the particle *after* 86). AC-

the words of F. Zorell, it is a particle that compacts the clause and

To these can be added Gen. xi 14; Povr. xxxi 35; xxviii 26; xlvi 5 (99); Hos. xiii 9 (100); Mal. iii 14; Psal. xliii 18. Following BROCKELMANN we can classify Gen. xi 32 here, although the sentence is very compact. Even if the common translation, "The doubling of Pharaoh's dream means that . . ." suggests an object clause, the latter has no verb on which it depends, and thus, in the Hebrew text, the syntactic condition has more of a subject clause or even a predicate in a nominal sentence. This is illustrated also by such translations as presented by BROCKELMANN and E. DCHRAINE (111). A good example of subject clause that is often disregarded, is Is. viii 8. It is generally accepted that Is. 8-9 is about the devices of Ahaz' enemies. Verses 8-9 shall not stand . . ." is clear that vs. 8-9 are the subject of vs. 7. "It is completed with the implicit thought: "The head of Judah is Jerusalem is Rezin, etc." This reason being unsatisfying, it is generally agreed that the head of Jerusalem is the head of Damascus and the head of Damascus is Rezin, etc. Some peculiar cases of subject clauses with verbs introduced, Meyer as well as BROCKELMANN quote with reference to Gen. xxxi 35 and xlvi 5 with causal *et*.

(109) BDib. p. 473, dasses Gen. xxxi 35 and xlvi 5 with causal *et*.
(110) BROCKELMANN, loc. cit.: "Und da dußt, dass der Traum sich bei Pharaon nicht wahr".
(111) BROCKELMANN, loc. cit.: "Si es ist dem Verderben, Israel, dass deine Hilfe weimal wiederholte, war es klar, dass er von Gott kam". E. DCHRAINE, Bible chose est décide de la part de l'Élohim".
la Pfeilach 1, p. 140: "Si le songe a été deux fois répété à Pharaon, c'est que ce qui s'écrit au commencement de l'histoire, p. 103E. Vs. 9a and has been inscribed afterwards at the word 'long place'.

Is it any pleasure to Shaddai if you are righteous, or is it gain to him if you make your ways blameless? (RSV).

ԱԱԳՀ ՀԱՅԵ, Տ, ԿԵԼԴ ՀՅԲ-ՖՏԱ Հ-ԱԿԲ ԼԼԵՒ

It is better that you help us from the city.

ወደ ደ-ሆኑ-ሳ-ሳ-ሳ (፩)

syntactic category, should be deleted from grammars and dictionaries.

3. Akin to the object clause is the *subject clause*. Although an initiative with *lamed* or an asyndetic clause can be used here, there are also a number of clear instances of a *ki-clause* being subject to a nominal predicate, e.g. 2 Sam. xvii 3:

¹⁰⁸ Cf. GK, § 157b. R. Meyer, § 114, 3: „Hier liegt offenkundig keine sub-ordinativedendre, sondern eine betonende Funktion der von Haas aus deiktischen Justifikationen: „Joseph is still alive and, what is more, he (**§ 171–172**) rules over Egypt“.

The same function can be illustrated with Gen. xxxix 32-33; Ex. ii 10, 1 Chron. iv 9 (10⁶) as well as with Gen. iv 25; xxxi 31; xl 51-52; Ex. xviii 4, where the verb of saying is lacking (10⁶). A seeming *adversative* (that you will take these seven lambs?) Abraham replies: ((They mean) that you are these seven lambs?") The question "What are these seven lambs?" is answered in Gen. xxi 30 can be explained from the context: to the question "What are these seven lambs?" Abraham replies: ((They mean) that you will take these seven lambs?") In Sam. i 16, x 19 and Ruth i 10, Zorrell classes the particle *ak!*, as we have seen. The ancient versions too have here understood *ak!* as adversative or at least *explicative* (10⁷). The somewhat puzzling connection of 1 Kings xx 5-6 with their double *ak* he cleverly explains as follows: "When I sent to you a message, saying: Deliver me your silver . . . (it means *that* (Ex), when (in) I send my servants to you tomorrow, they will search . . ." Both *ak's* are nominalizing, the former marking the subject clause; the latter the predicate: "That I do so . . . means *that* . . ." Emphatic *ak* Zorrell finds in Gen. xxxvii 35; Jos. ii 24; 1 Kings i 13. The last instance we have already mentioned that *ak* at the head of a direct quotation has often the nuance of an assertive particle. This statement should be generalized and I agree with R. Meyeer that *ak* introducing direct speech has no subordinating function, but has the emphatic force of the orthoginally deictic particle *108*. The *ak retitutum*, as a specific feature of the language, is characterized by its emphatic force of the former two varieties, an assertive *ak* certainly increases the expressive force of the sentence; in Gen. xxxvii 35 even an adversative nuance cannot be excluded.

of questions are not introduced by a specific interrogative particle.
Other elliptic sentence-structures, where the main clause is compacted in a
particle or adverb and the subject clause denoted by *et*, occur in
Deut. xxxii 30 (*im-lo* *et*, *oyeb* *et*) unless the contents of *et*, "By this
cause *et* *lo*-*ja'at*, *oyeb* *et*) unfold the contents of *et*, "By this
know that you are pleased with me, in that my enemy does not
triumph over me" (cf. xlii 5; vii 10; job xiii 16).
5. They appear also as a genitive depending on a noun or a pre-
position so that *et* added to the preposition converts it in a sub-
ordination to the preposition combining *et* can be used in
4. Noun clauses introduced with a nominalizing *et* can be used in
proposition with a demonstrative pronoun ¹²⁹. So in Ps. xli 12, the
cause *et* *lo*-*ja'at*, *oyeb* *et*) unfolds the contents of *et*, "By this
know that you are pleased with me, in that my enemy does not
triumph over me", Ruth ii 21 (*gam* *et*, it also happened
that . . .) ¹²⁹.
5. The apper also over me", (cf. xlii 5; vii 10; job xiii 16).
6. Prepositions are combined with causal clauses *et* in order to bring out the
relationship between the clauses. However, although *et* very often
with the above-mentioned prepositions formally introduces a noun
as a causal conjunction, as we shall see further on, the *et* combined
possibility to use *et* instead of *et* in the same combinations,
as is well remarked by WILLIAMS ¹²¹. This is borne out by
the possible causality *et* is based upon us (= Israel) because our God is not
Did not these evils come upon us (= Israel) because our God is not
among us? (cf. Jud. iii 12; Num. xi 20).
Deut. xxxi 17: *sh'm n'yav'et z'ne'et z'sip'et h'ya p'ru'et b'a y'm*
Because the doughters of Zion are haughy . . . (cf. Num. xi 20).
Is. iii 16: *l'm n'tz'et z'v'et*
Deut. xxxi 17:
sh'm n'yav'et z'ne'et z'sip'et h'ya p'ru'et b'a y'm
Because the doughters of Zion are haughy . . . (cf. Num. xi 20).
The conjunctions *tapa'at* *et* and *oyeb* *et* ¹²⁹) with perfect tense add
to the causal meaning a nuance of distribution, be it punishment
or reward.

by way of her *as* (Gen. xxvi 8; xlii 21) 13). But the parallelism of other constructions with *way of*, such as *way of b + in him . . . way of* or *way of it because of it*, make it far more acceptable that *as* here introduces a temporal protasis. Thus Gen. xxvi 8 should be translated: „When he had been there a long time, Abimelech looked out of the window . . . „ and Melzer himself adopts the same translation for Gen. vi 1 (n^a). Sentence headed by *because of it* are in fact complicit interrogative nominal sentences having a *as*-clause as subject: e.g. 2 Sam. ix 1: „Is it so that there is still any one left?“ although also introduced with *as*, require an affirmative just like the *why*-questions in 1 Sam. x 1; 2 Sam. xiii 28. The same structure we find in a question introduced with *as* in Gen. iii 1. When an interrogative sentence opens with *as*, we can translate „when . . .“ has an assertive force: „how much more“ or „how much less“ when the preceding context is negative (n^b). In these cases it can again be parsed as a compact sentence, introduced by *as*everative *as* and the subject of which is a *as*-clause. So Ptov. xi 31 is to be understood: „If the righteous is recompensed on earth, it is indeed so that the wicked and the sinner (are)“ (cf. xvii 11; xvi 7; xix 7,10; Deut. xxxi 27; 1 Sam. xxi 6; 2 Sam. xvi 1; Kings viii 27; Job ix 14; Gen. xxxi 20; Is. xxxvi 17); lv 6, a stylistic device to express that the reading *as* seems to be more original than *in* 2 Kings xviii 34, n^c. Thus the reading *as* seems to be more original than *in* 2 Kings xviii 34, n^d. Cf. the dictioanies s.v., n^e.

265

A narrative of instances cut off an endless list: Gen. ii 3.5.23; iii 19.20; vi 7.12.13; viii 9; xxxx 13; xxxii 12; xl 49; Ex. xx 25; 1 Sam. viii 6; ii 17; vi 19; 2 Sam. xix 3; Kings xviii 27; Is. i 2.30; iii 11; v 24; vii 22.24; viii 10; xiiii 6; xxviii 21; xlix 19 (anacoluthon); iijer. i 6.15; jsoel i 12.13; 15; Ps. i 12; vi 11; iij 16; jsoh vi 4; viii 9; xx 19. However, this distinction is a master of translation but it is grammatically irrelevant and most of the *As*'s following the main clause, can be rendered as „because” as well. A special subtlety we find in Zorelli's lexicon, who distinguishes between *et* in main clauses, which should be translated as „for” (*nam*, *etiam*), and a causal particle in subordinate clauses, meaning „because” (*quia*), in which the main clause begins he distinguishing cases between causal clauses preceding and following

A special kind of causal *if* we have after *parabiles* and related forms, where a *if*-clause expresses the reality which induced to telling the parable. So e.g. in Is. v. 7, the parable of the vineyard is concluded with: „For the vineyard of Yahwe of hosts is the house of Israel, etc.” (cf. II 184). The explicative *if* developing the reason why a certain name is given or should be given, is of the same nature: „Call his name Jezzreel, for . . . (= in order to signify that) (Hos. i 4.6.9). Also the explanation of a symbolic action belongs to this sphere (e.g. Hos. i 2) 133). This case is generalized by Brown-DRIVER-BRIGGS: „The causal relation expressed by *if* is sometimes subjective, in poetry, and not apparent without careful study of a passage” 136). So Is. iii 8: „For Jerusalem has stumbled and juchah has fallen”, justifies the foregoing statement pronounced by a single man: „I will not be a healer . . . you shall not make me leader of the people!”. Is. xxviii 8 could give the proof of the intoxication required in vs. 7, but the *if*-here might as well have an emphatic function, the certainty that the folly of idolatry will soon be recognized. In Job 21, the *if*-clause „For now I shall lie in the earth”, justifies the urgency of the question: „Why do you not pardon my transgressions?” If God does not forgive him now, it will be too late very soon.

duded with: "For the vineyard of Yahwe of hosts is the house of Israel, etc." (cf. II 3) 134). The explosive effect developing the reason why a certain name is given or should be given, is of the same nature: "Call his name Jezebel, for . . . (= in order to signify that) (Hos. I 46.9). Also the application of a symbolic action belongs to this sphere (e.g., Hos. I 2) 133). This case is generalized by Brown-Driver-Briggs: "The causal relation expressed by *as* is sometimes subtle, esp. in poetry, and does not appear without careful study of a passage". So I. S. ill 8: "For Jerusalem has stumbled and fallen", etc. (136). In poetry, and not apparent without carefull study of a passage, the causal relation expressed by *as* here might as well have an emphatic function, in vs. 7, but the *as* here might as well have an emphatic function, certaintly that the reason for the exhortation of vs. 6, viz. the certainty that the folly of idolatry will soon be recognized. In Job 21, the *as*-clause, "For now I shall lie in the earth", justifies the ungenery of the question: "Why do you not pardon my transgres-sions?" If God does not forgive him now, it will be too late very

I have done nothing that they should put me into the disgrace
known example is Gen. xl 15: 7123 נְאַזְנָבֵן מִלְאָמָר נְאַזְנָבֵן
nature follows a very limited number of instances where a *fit* of this
here are a very negative cause instead of an interrogative. The best

What Joseph did was not such that he should be empitisoned (cf. Job xii 2). Ps. xlii 19-20 can be paraphrased: "Our attitude was not such that you should have broken us . . ." In Num. xi 29, the consecutive *eff-clause* follows after a desiderative clause introduced by *mi-gittin* 28. Technically speaking, this is an interrogative clause. The *eff-clause* here explains the clause *kol, am yiqba maf'ten*, which syntactically is the object of *mittan*: that the whole nation is prophet, means that Yahwe pours his spirit on them: "Would that all Yahwe's people were prophets, that (*eff*) Yahwe would put his spirit upon them," (ASV).

1. *Causal clusters*. The best known use of *as if* is that of a subordinating clause that introduces a causal cluster.

1. *Causal clauses*. The best known use of *as* is that of a subordinating conjunction introducing a causal clause [2]. There is no reason to follow J. W. Watts, when he says that *as* here seems to carry the meaning of the other particles with which it is often combined (as, an, *egypt*, *tadifer*) rather than a distinct meaning of its own [39]. As a matter of fact, simple causal *as* is much more frequently used than the combinations with other particles. Lost dictionaries distinguish between the meaning "because", *Germ. wenn*, and "for", *Germ. denn*, according to the position of the causal clause before or after the main clause [3]. E.g.

Gen. iii 14: **הַמְּבָנִים־בָּם** מֵהֶם תַּלְאָ נָתַן מִצְמָה כְּזֶה
Gen. viii 14: **בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹד** מֵהֶם תַּלְאָ נָתַן מִצְמָה כְּזֶה
Is. xxviii 15; Ps. xcii 14; Job xx 20).
Because you have done this, you are cursed among all beasts (cf. v. 17;
Gen. v 24: **בְּנֵי־עַמּוֹד** מֵהֶם תַּלְאָ נָתַן מִצְמָה כְּזֶה
Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him (RSV).

122) *WILLIAMS*, § 547.
123) *JECON*, § 170d; *WATTS*, p. 126f.; *MAYER*, § 120, 2, a, who refers to
124) *WATTS*, p. 127.
125) *GB*, p. 342, nr 2; *BDB*, p. 473; *Koehler-Baumgartner*, *LWT*, p. 432,
126) *HAL*, p. 448, nr 11, 12.
127) *WILHELM*, § 9-10; *HAL*, p. 448, nr 11, 12.

[88] KROTHER-BUAGAFENTER, LUTT, p. 42, nr 11; HAL, p. 448, nr II, 3.
 [89] C.G. ZORELL, „Einfache Bezeichnungen für die einzelnen Teile der Variante T. Verteilen (1962), p. 99.
 [90] FRANKENBERG, „Studie über die Variante T. Verteilen (1962), p. 99.
 [91] E. DHOERAE, *Bijdrage de la Philologie 1* (1962), p. 741; „varia im Habs-
 scheen“, *Studie bijdrage tot de taalkunde 1*, note 3; JONSEN, § 170h, note 2; R.
 WYS, „RSV here renders the nuance of *al-kän* with ‘far truly’“.

When Israel was a child, I loved him (rem. *www.apodoses*).

Ը. ԷՐԵ ՀԱՆԿ ԽԱՉՄԱՆ

JOS. XI 1:

2. Temporal clauses. The fact that logicians have to warn us against this faulty reasoning „post hoc ergo propter hoc“, shows at least the temporal circumstance sometimes is closer to the causal one. So there is a transition from causal *to* temporal *to*. In some cases it is hard to decide whether the *to* is causal or temporal. P.s. xxxii 3, e.g. can be translated as: „When I declared not (my sin), my body wasted away“ (Kraus, VAN DER Plöger) or „Because I was silent, my bones wasted away“ (RSV). But there are an impressive number of instances where *ef* clearly has a temporal meaning. The temporal clause can precede or follow the main clause and it can be nominal or verbal. An example of a nominal clause is to be found in

season existing since a long time is only now found out" (199). This statement certaintly is too strong and not correct with regard to all the occurrences. From the literal meaning "for therefore, *deutusque, quondamquidem*" it appears that the composite particle is only between the season and the main statement is evident. It can often be translated as "since, whereas, *iamsmuch as*", French "*puisque*", German "*wiehl nun enmada*" (19). So e.g. Gen. xviii 45; "Let a little water be brought, and wash your feet, etc., etc. . . , since you have come to your servant" (cf. xxviii 26; Num. xvi 43; Jud. vi 22 H); 2 Sam. xviii 20 (Q). It is striking that half of the occurrences of *et al-ken* are connected with an emphatic volatile, stressed with the particle *ndu*, or *"al-ndu"* (Gen. xii 8; xxviii 10 (1a); Num. x 31; Gen. xxxviii 4). The clause introduced with *et al-ken* here offers the reason which makes it completeiy clear why the wish expressed in the main clause should be executed. In Jer. xxix 28, the same effect is obtained with the question of vs. 27 followed by the *et al-ken* clause: "Why have you not rebuked Jeirmiah. . . ? For (*et al-ken*) he has sent us a letter in Babylon. . . ." That means: "You should have rebuked Jeirmiah," since he has sent it.

soon [37]. Job xxvii-8-10 explain why in v. 7, Job wishes his enemy the lot of the wicked: because it is so hopeless. In other instances the *aff* recycles not to the verse which immediately precedes, but to several, as in 1s. xxi, where the vss. 6ff. are the ground of the description in the vss. 1-5. More examples can be found with the authors just mentioned. But the texts they cite are often plain causal sentences, with noting of the supposed subtlety, and in a number of cases the *aff* is not causal at all, but emphatic or adversative and so on.

Gen. xiii 21: **בָּנֵנְהָא-תַּחֲנֹן תִּלְבָדְנָה-לְאַנְדָּס-לְמַלְאָכָה**
And when we came to the lodging place we opened our sacks.
Furtherer: vi 1; xix 26; xxvi 1; xlvi 24; Jud. i 28; xvi 16; 2 Sam. vi
3; vii 1; xix 26; job 5.
Of **וְהַזְּגָה אֶת**: Gen. xii 12: **תְּאַתְּ תְּהִנֵּן תְּלַבְּדָנָה תְּאַתְּ כְּלָמָדָה**
When the Egyptians see you, they will say, "This is his wife".

With temporal *at*, the subject is often put before *et* for the sake of distinctness and emphasis (*Ms.*), as in Is. xxvii 18; Nic. v 4; Ps. 121, xii 48.

3. *Conditional clauses*. Again the border line between temporal and conditional clauses is somewhat vague, a circumstance which appears also in European language, where they can be marked by the same subordinating conjunction „when“, German, wenn, Dutch *wanneer*. In a number of contexts it is hard to ascertain whether the *if*-clause is temporal or conditional, and we should leave this question undecided, also in the translation. E.g., „When Pharaoh says to you, Prove yourselves by working a miracle, then you shall say to Aaron . . .“ (Ex. viii 9; cf. Gen. xlvi 33; Deut. vi 20; Job vii 13; etc.). Although *ifm* is the most usual conditional particle, *if* is quite common in this position¹⁷³. Its conditional use corresponds to both that of *if* in Akkadian and of *if* in Ugaritic¹⁷⁴.

We find conditional *if* followed by a verb in the perfect tense in Num. v 20, where it perfectly corresponds to „*im* in vs. 19. Other instances of conditional *if* with perfective tense are Ez. iii 19; xxxii 9; Ps. xxi 12. With a participle, expressing an imminent future, it occurs in such as in anderen Fallen—den Bedingung als solche anziegen, sondern lediglich—wie anders, „die sich die Bedingung als solche anziegen, sondern lediglich—wie züber sein Wesen auszusagen“. Sometimes *im* may introduce a conditional one. Cf. Søren, § 166;

173) Cf. W. von Soden, *GA*, § 121, 3 (e.g. UT 56, 2, C. H. Gordon, § 123; J. Assmann, *WZL*, nr 121, 3 (e.g. UT 56, 17, 21, 23).

174) Cf. Van Leeuwen, OT 18 (1973), p. 47f.

175) For the temporal clause with *ad if*, cf. supra p. 262.

176) DBB, p. 473.

A special group of nominal clauses are those where the predicate is a participle. The latter can be used to point out the repetitive or descriptive character of the verb as well as to suggest an imminent future (*futurum instantis*). The former occurs in Jer. xlii 19:

An example of *futurum instantis* we find in Num. xxxiii 51-52:

When we burned incense to the queen of heaven. . . was it without ouribus and approval that we made?

When you pass over the Jordan into the land of Canaan, then you shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land (cf. xxxii 2; Deut. xi 31; xvi 9).

When you Joshua sent them away to their homes, he blessed them (rem. xxii 7):

When Joshua sent them away to their homes, he blessed them (rem. xxii 7; Zech. vii 5; Job xxxix 11); Prov. xxxii 22. E.g., Jos. vii 18; Zech. viii 4; Ps. viii 4; xlii 19b; lxxxi 21; cl 1; cxxxii 5; Job xxxvii 4).

When they have a dispute, they come to me and I decide (cf. Is. i 12; Zech. viii 6; Mal. i 8; Ps. viii 4; xlii 19b; lxxxi 21; cl 1; cxxxii 5; Job xxxvii 4).

Very commonly the temporal protasis is introduced with *wayehi* + aff., which however is less frequent than *wayehi kasher ot wayehi* aff. + suffixive. The protasis in the future will correspondingly be infinitive, whereas of past, when the *wayehi* does not have consecutive force. In such cases are: of *wayehi kasher*:

When the prophet came to me and I decided (cf. Ex. xviii 16; Num. xxii 21; Deut. xii 31; Ps. viii 4; xlii 19; xxxii 18).

(RSV), (CE, xxvii 41; xxxi 49; xxxii 18).

When you till the ground, it shall no longer yield to you its strength when you till the ground, it shall no longer yield to you its strength (RSV).

where: Ex., xxi 7-11.18-19.20-21.22-23.28-32; xxii 6-7.9.12-13.14-15.16; Lev. i-2.5.8; Num. xxvi 1-11.5.7.; lv 2-3.13.22¹⁵³.27.32.; v 1¹⁵³.3-5.7.11.; xii 2.3-10.14.; ii 1.4¹⁵³.5.7.; the general rule are marked by *kt* (contrasted Ex. xxi 2-5, dealing with the same matter). When used in causistic laws, *kt* often follows in second position after the subject of the conditional clause: *addam kt* (Lev. i-2; Num. xii 14), *kt kt* (Lev. xii 40; xii 20; Num. xxvii 8; xxviii 3), *ktita kt* (Lev. xii 2; Num. xxx 4); *kt kt* *ktita kt* (Lev. xii 29.38), *nefes ktita kt* (Lev. ii 1; iv 2; v 1.15.21), *nega ktita kt* (Lev. xii 9), *basar kt* before the subject¹⁵⁵. According to W. Zimmerli this use belongs to sacredotial law, whereas in "civil" causistic law, the *kt* is placed before the subject¹⁵⁶. The "sacerdotal" construction occurs in a number of verses of Ezekiel (iii 19; xii 9; xvii 5.18.21; xxixii 2.6.9), which is consonant to the sacerdotal character of his prophecies.

4. *Causitive clauses*. From conditional to concessive clauses it is but one step, as appears in all languages where the same or related particles are used for both (Latin *si - et*!). So in Hebrew *im*¹⁵⁶ as well as in all languages where the same or related clauses, especially hypothetical ones, can be considered as a specific category of the conditional clause, it is no wonder that some of the clauses are parsed as concessive by some authors, whereas others class them with the conditional ones¹⁵⁷. What is less understood is the fact that Zorell in his lexicon does not mention the con-

cessive *et*.

Two decades ago T. C. Virtzen wrote an article on *kt*, which was mainly devoted to the concessive meaning of this particle¹⁵⁸. The cities Gen. 1.17; Ex. xiii 17; Jer. iv 30; xxxi 5; xlvi 23; Nltc. vii 8; Ps. xlii 19; Is. ii 6; Iy 10; Ruth i 12-13. All these examples are derived from the article on *kt*, which was mainly devoted to the concessive meaning of this particle¹⁵⁸.

here special cases.

152) Here the *3m* is replaced by *3d_z*.

153) This fit interchanges with *3s*, *2*.

154) CC, VAN LEEUWEN, *PT* 18 (1973), p. 18E; GB, p. 372; BD, p. 473;

155) GOTHIER-BALMAGARTER, *HAL*, p. 449.

156) W. ZIJNEMERL, *Ergonomie* (1969), p. 303.

157) So we can see that the use of *BD* is only poorly attested.

158) T. C. VRIESZER, 'Eine Note zur Übersezung des Bindeswort *af*', *Von Ugarit nach Umarra*, BZA 77 (1958), p. 266f.

159) Cf. VAN LEEUWEN, *OTJ* 18 (1973), p. 27f., who states that the use of *BD* is explained as is concessive *BD*, which is to be contrasted.

160) Cf. VAN LEEUWEN, *OTJ* 18 (1973), p. 27f., who states that the use of *BD* is concessive *BD*, which is to be contrasted.

119) *Jofoton*, § 167i compared to § 171b; *Wittiams*, § 446.
120) Cf. *Watts*, p. 133f.; *BDB*, p. 743, nr. 2, b; *Koehler-Baumgartner*, LVT,
p. 432f., nr. 19; *HAL*, p. 449, nr. II, 11; *Jofoton*, § 167i.

A specific case of conditional *ai* consists in its use in casuistic laws. It may be previously remarked that conditional *ai* is employed very frequently in laws of a casuistic type (if . . . then): Ex. xxi 14,33,35,37; xxi 4,5; Deut. xii 13; xvi 24-25; xv 7,12; xvii 2,6. But in the casuistic stipulations, there is often a distinction between *ai* and *im*, in this sense that *ai* introduces the general case followed by its general rule, whereas the special cases are marked by *im*. In Ex. xxi 2-5, the stipulations open with the general statement: "When (if) you buy a Hebrew slave, he shall serve six years . . ." Then follow four special cases: "If (im) he comes in single . . . If (im) he comes in married . . . if (im) his master gives him a wife and she bears him sons . . . But if (im) the slave plainly says: I love my master . . ." The structure is particularly attested in the Book of Covenant (*Bundesbuch*) but also in the sacrificial prescriptions of Leviticus and elsewhere.

Other instances can be found in Gen. iv 24; Ex. i 10; Deut. iv 25; vi 25; vii 17; xvi 21; xxvii 13; 1 Sam. xx 12; 2 Kings iv 29; 1 Sam. viii 19; xxxii 21; Jer. xxxvii 15; Zech. viii 6; Job xix 28; Prov. iv 8; 2 Kings xviii 22; Is. xxxxi 7; Jer. xii 22). You mention Jer. xlix 16; II 53 and Wuitzias quotes Ruth i 12 as examples of an unreal condition, followed by the dismissal of it in the main clause (Lev. xxv 20; 2 Kings xviii 22; Is. xxxxi 7; Jer. xii 22). You make no reference to the fixed formula *is eti to' ma'* (c.q. *to' merru*), marking sort of an object, followed by the dismissal of it in the main clause (Ex. ii 10; Deut. xv 25; Num. x 32; Deut. xv 16). The absence of *wagħihi* in this position protasis may be introduced by *wieħda kien*, followed by the imperfect conditions (*l-ikarr hal-hukka*)¹⁵⁰. Just as with temporal *kif* the conditional with the exclusion of less probable (only *'im*) and contrary to fact only conditions that are taken for granted or that are more probable, concessive clauses in these verses¹⁵¹. As a matter of fact, *ki* marks concessive clauses in these verses¹⁵². But both authors accept the possibility of a condition marked by *ki*, but both authors accept the possibility of a condition marked by *ki*, following the frequency of co-usage with *wagħihi* in this position.

in 2 Sam xix 8: "If you do not go out, not a man will stay with you
this night". But the vast majority of conditional *if*-clauses have a
verb in imperfect tense: e.g.

Other texts which Vriezen could have mentioned are: Jer. xvi 12¹⁷³; xlii 16; i 11; iii 53; Ez. xi 16; Hos. xiii 15; Ps. xxvii 10; xxxvii 24¹⁷⁴; cxxi 83; Prov. vi 35. Quite often the consecutive force of some clauses is strengthened by adding *gam* before *et*: Is. i 15; Hos. viii 10; ix 16; Ps. xxii 4. In Ecc. iv 14, we have *et gam* introducing the consecutive clause 175).

169) Cf. RSV; J. KEGEING, *Bible de la Pléiade* 2, p. 152. Most probably a negation stopped out and should be added in accordance with LXX and Vg. So B.; C. WESTERMANN, *Das Buch Jesaja*, Kap. 40-66 (1966), p. 106; K. ELLIGER, *jesaja I* (1974), p. 360f.; A. SCHÖNIG, *I am God your Salvation* (1973), p. 190. Most authorities hold that *אַתֶּן* is a later addition to the original text.

170) Cf. RSV; B.; W. RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

171) Cf. RSV; B.; W. RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

172) Cf. RSV; B.; E. DHOARNE, *Bible de la Pléiade* 1, p. 1240; M. H. POPE, *Job 14-20* (1963) Cf. RSV; B.; E. DHOARNE, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 126.

169^o Cf. supra p. 260.

170^o The most common translation is: "To the Lord our God belowing mercy and forgiveness; because we have rebelled against him" (RSV). But if the idea of God's punishment belongs to God because it is against him, then the word "against" refers to unforgiveness rather than to God's punishment. The reference I have in mind is that of the *ekklēsia* which would be different: *ai bō mīdādūn*. However much we have sinned, God has mercy and forgiveing".

171^o Cf. A. SCHOOIJER, *Das Buch Jesaja 1 (1972)*, p. 113. Others render it as conditional: "Gott hat uns vergeben", G. FÖRSTER, *Das Buch Jesaja 1 (1966)*, p. 210; H. WILDEBERGER, *Jesaja 1975*, p. 590.

172^o Cf. KÖHLER-BURGARTNER, *LWT*, p. 433; HAL, p. 449; BROCKELMANN, *GB* and *BBB*.

173^o Quasi according to GB and BBB.

174^o Casually causal.

175^o P. 97.

176^o Cf. supra p. 261.

[199] So RSV; J. DE FRAINÉ, *Géretis* (1963), p. 336.

[198] C.F., p. 262; So RSV; W. RUDOLPH, *Servita* (1958), p. 32. The consecutive markings is accepted by BJS; E. DHOORNE, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[197] So E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 32. The consecutive markings is accepted by BJS; W. RUDOLPH, *Servita* (1958), p. 32. [The consecutive markings is accepted by BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 267, has himself his doubts about this text.

[196] C. VREZEN, *art. cit.*, p. 267, has himself his doubts about this text.

[195] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[194] So E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. [This note couple as for Etz, practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[193] C. VREZEN, *art. cit.*, p. 267, has himself his doubts about this text.

[192] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[191] So E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[190] C. VREZEN, *art. cit.*, p. 267, has himself his doubts about this text.

[189] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[188] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[187] So E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[186] C.F., p. 262; So RSV; W. RUDOLPH, *Servita* (1958), p. 32. The consecutive markings is accepted by BJS; E. DHOORNE, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[185] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[184] C.F., p. 262; So RSV; W. RUDOLPH, *Servita* (1958), p. 32. The consecutive markings is accepted by BJS; E. DHOORNE, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[183] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[182] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[181] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[180] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[179] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[178] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[177] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[176] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[175] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[174] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[173] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[172] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[171] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[170] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[169] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[168] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[167] So RSV; BJS; E. DHOORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 250. Consequently practice quite little in Germany, also W. RUDOLPH, *Bible de la Pologne*, 2, p. 252.

[166] An emphatic *ki* is suggested by A. DRUBBET, *Numeri* (1963), p. 119.

able, although for some of them an alternative explanation remains possible. Thus Gen. I 17 permits the explanation of *it* in a causal sense [59]; *jeff.* iv 30 can be understood as a causal sense [59]; the question *ma taaffi:* "Wat are you doing that you dress in scar- let?" [60] *jeff.* xlvi 23 is also capable of a causal explanation [61], where- as the *et* of Aflic. viii 8 could be temporal or conditional [62]. As to Ruth i 12-13, the second *et* of vs. 12 certainly is concessive, but *et-marr-if we ed mikem* in vs. 13 has been generally parsed as a causa- tive clause, explaining why Naomis daughters-in-law should not stray with her [63]. According to Vriezen, the concessive meaning is possible and preferable in ls. vii 8-9; Num. xxii 23 and Ez. ii 6. As to the first text, I have already suggested that it is a subject clause subordinated to the verbs *redyfum* and *lygef* of vs. 7. Num. xxii 23 can be understood in a causal sense, although the exact meaning of the verse is not sure at all [64]. In Ez. ii 6 the concessive meaning of *et* is certainly preferable. Concessive *et* is still used at Qumran, as the *et* in 13 *marr-*

invoked 1s, ill 10 as an attestation of interrogative *if*: “See how happy (*if*-*if*) the tigheiros is” 183), but, of course, a nominalizing

if can do it here, as well as in Ps. xxv 19.

In this commentary on the Psalms, M. Dahood quite regularly translates *if* by “how”, but he lists these passages with “emphatic if functioning as intefection” 184). So he sees the same syntactical

function of *if* in Ps. lvi 3, rendered: “I will praise your Name, Yahweh, truly good”, as in Ps. lvii 3: “How many are battling against me”. To him all of these *ifs* are emphatic, which certainly is more acceptable than the new function suggested by Albright. But again, most of the examples are capable of an alternative understanding.

Ps. lvi 3, lxxxvi 11; cii 15, cxlvii 4 185) are good examples of emphatic *if*. The just quoted translation of Ps. lvi 3 e.g. can be equi-

vally expressed as follows: “Really, many are battling against me”, Severe instances of *if*-*if* (Ps. lii 11; lvii 4; cix 21;

cxxvii 1) or *if*-*na*,¹⁸⁶ (Ps. cxviii 3; cxlvii 1) allow to read an emphatic

if but they can be explained as causal or explicative as well. In Ps.

lvi 2 and lxxxvi 11, the causal meaning is self-evident. Ps. cxlvii 5 could be cited as an example of the so-called *if*-*recitation*, which,

as we have seen, amounts to an emphatic *if*, although a causal func-

tion cannot be totally excluded. In Ps. cvii 4-5, Dahood seems to improve on the traditional rendering by taking *if*-*gadol* to vs. 4 and

translating: “I will thank you among peoples, Yahwe, I will sing to you among nations, O truly Great One” 186). But to this Ugariotic

lxxviii 16: *if i na-ni-tim . lu-ni-pi-wr*, “How can I send anyone else?”; ARM

V, 18, 16: *if i na-ka-ni-tim . lu-ni-pi-wr*, “How can I hesitate?”; PRU II,

186) So e.g. EA 252, 20: *if i na-ka-ni-tim . lu-ni-pi-wr*, “How can I hesitate?”; ARM

177) W. F. Albright, *Arabs and Saw ki toba*, in *Genesis*, Alf-

langes bibliotheek, *A. Robert* (1956), p. 22f.

178) W. F. Albright, “The Hebrew, And God saw ki toba, in *Genesis*”, Alf-

another interrogative *ha* - were added 182). Albright could have

“Is it (not) so that he was the most renowned of the thirty 181)?” And

here marks the subject clause in a compact interrogative sentence:

variant of the latter 180). As to 2 Sam. xxii 19, we have seen that *if*

two translations is immaterial, since the former can be considered a

with the common use of *et*. To be sure, the difference between the

of the City of David were great, is as good and more in accordance

meaning “how”, is proved. The rendering “You saw that the breaches

translations of Is. xxxii 9, that the use of *et* with the interrogative

the City of David have become”, offers a fluent and satisfactory

It is not because the sentence: “You saw how great the breaches of

junction marking the object clause, which is true of Is. xxxii 9 too.

recitive a satisfactory explanation, when *et* is considered as the con-

the emphatic *et*. Also in Lam. iii 22, the *et* is emphatic. Gen. i 4 etc.

Albright cannot be contested 182). But in Hebrew, the thesis of that

Gen. xviii 20, the best-known passage for this meaning of *et* according

instances can be explained in a proper way. So we have seen that

of *et* having this meaning, is not proved at all. The four above-cited

Albright cannot be contested 183). As far as Akkadian is concerned, the thesis of

Mlat and Ugariot 184). As far as Akkadian is concerned, the thesis of

founded it on the use of Akkadian *et* with this meaning in Amarna,

late: “And God saw how good it was”, He found the same meaning

“how” 176). His starting point was the well-known phrase *waya*,

182) Cf. A. Pines, *L'acception des lettres de Mait* (1956), p. 128; W. von Soden,

183) Cf. E. Ben Yehuda, *Treatise*, p. 2338, explains 177) *as* a superlative

184) M. Dahood, *op. cit.*, p. 93f.

185) Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms III* (1970), p. 405f.

186) Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms III* (1968), p. 48ff.

187) Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms III* (1966), p. 862.

188) Taking *dmur* as equivalent of Akk. *amdu*, Ug. *am*, “to see”, Cf. W. T.

189) Cf. A. Pines, *L'acception des lettres de Mait* (1956), p. 128; W. von Soden,

190) Cf. E. Ben Yehuda, *Treatise*, p. 248, “Well sit zahlich waran”, As suggested above (p. 256),

the *et* in this type of phrases could also be emphatic: “You saw the breaches;

they have really become great”, D. L. Bomberg (1966), p. 24f., “Well sit zahlich waran”, As suggested above (p. 256),

which are really become great”, H. Wunderger, *jesada* (1977), p. 80f.; G. Horner, *Das*

191) Cf. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 89 (1943), p. 31; G. Dossoff, *R.A. 35* (1937),

King”, C. W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 99 (1955), p. 5.

Load, presents *ahletenu* as the *thes* and *best* (= how fine, how good) to his

15,14, 11, 26-28: *betlyā m Afadtenet eti damañ eti tib ana pani karriti qarrabti*, “My

V, 18, 16: *et i na-ni-tim . lu-ni-pi-wr*, “How can I send anyone else?”, PRU II,

186) So e.g. EA 252, 20: *et i na-ka-ni-tim . lu-ni-pi-wr*, “How can I hesitate?”, ARM

177) W. F. Albright, *Arabs and Saw ki toba*, in *Genesis*, Alf-

langes bibliotheek, *A. Robert* (1956), p. 22f.

178) W. F. Albright, “The Hebrew, And God saw ki toba, in *Genesis*”, Alf-

another interrogative *ha* - were added 182). Albright could have

“Is it (not) so that he was the most renowned of the thirty 181)?” And

here marks the subject clause in a compact interrogative sentence:

variant of the latter 180). As to 2 Sam. xxii 19, we have seen that *et*

two translations is immaterial, since the former can be considered a

with the common use of *et*. To be sure, the difference between the

of the City of David were great, is as good and more in accordance

meaning “how”, is proved. The rendering “You saw that the breaches

translations of Is. xxxii 9, that the use of *et* with the interrogative

the City of David have become”, offers a fluent and satisfactory

It is not because the sentence: “You saw how great the breaches of

junction marking the object clause, which is true of Is. xxxii 9 too.

recitive a satisfactory explanation, when *et* is considered as the con-

the emphatic *et*. Also in Lam. iii 22, the *et* is emphatic. Gen. i 4 etc.

Albright cannot be contested 182). But in Hebrew, the thesis of that

Gen. xviii 20, the best-known passage for this meaning of *et* according

instances can be explained in a proper way. So we have seen that

of *et* having this meaning, is not proved at all. The four above-cited

Albright cannot be contested 183). As far as Akkadian is concerned, the thesis of

Mlat and Ugariot 184). As far as Akkadian is concerned, the thesis of

founded it on the use of Akkadian *et* with this meaning in Amarna,

late: “And God saw how good it was”, He found the same meaning

“how” 176). His starting point was the well-known phrase *waya*,

187) E. Ben Yehuda, *Treatise*, p. 2338, explains 177) *as* a superlative

188) Cf. A. Pines, *L'acception des lettres de Mait* (1956), p. 128; W. von Soden,

189) Cf. E. Ben Yehuda, *Treatise*, p. 248, “Well sit zahlich waran”, As suggested above (p. 256),

the *et* in this type of phrases could also be emphatic: “You saw the breaches;

they have really become great”, H. Wunderger, *jesada* (1977), p. 80f.

