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Abstract
It may be argued that current lexica provide “translation values” for most of the nuances that can be expressed by יָא. However, these resources provide very little or no criteria for establishing when a translation value x, y or z should be opted for. Descriptions of the most typical use of יָא or the difference between יָא and זו in other linguistic works are also not substantiated by means of empirical evidence. In this study the syntax and semantics of each instance of יָא is investigated, and the most prototypical patterns of use are described and compared with those of זו. It is established that, although the two lexemes are sometimes near-synonyms, the former is prototypically a conjunctive adverb and the latter a focus particle. As far as the semantic potential of יָא is concerned, five semantic-pragmatic polysemically-related categories (the most typical which are labelled as “noteworthy addition” and “affirmation) are distinguished, as well as the syntactic constructions and translation values that could be associated with each category of use.
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1. Introduction
The “first” translation value most major BH dictionaries assign to יָא is that of “also”. Furthermore, they do agree that יָא can also be translated as “even, indeed, really, how much more/less”. While there is consensus that the latter translation value is associated with the fixed expression יָא יָא, there is

1) The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this publication and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.

2) Besides its treatment in dictionaries and in T. Muraoka, Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew (Jerusalem and Leiden, 1985), pp. 141-143, יָא has received little systematic attention from BH scholars, despite the fact that commentators and translators often disagree about its interpretation.
disagreement about the word class that אַף belongs to, e.g. BDB, HAH and DCH regard it as a conjunction, while HALOT denotes it as a “particle”. B. K. Waltke and M. O’Connor classify it under the heading “emphatic adverb”, but then sub-classify it with כִּי as “particles recognized as coordinators”. More problematic, however, is what is called in theoretical lexicography the “comments on the semantics” of אַף. Semantic distinctions in the lexica are made, but the grounds of the distinctions, beyond that of possible translation values, are seldom clear. For example, the translation value of “even” in BDB is associated with “implying something surprising or unexpected”. In HALOT “even” is first listed next to “also” as one of the basic meanings of אַף, and then as a translation value of the sub-category “enhancing”. In DCH the translation value of “even” is listed as both a subcategory of “also, and, moreover” (when אַף occurs before a pronoun) and as a separate polysemic distinction of אַף labelled “even, specifying” (DCH 1993, p. 352). HAH groups all instances of “Betonung des Gesagten” (i.e. “gar, sogar, ja, fürwahr”) together, but lists under the heading “adversative” the translation value “vielmehr”.

While it can be argued that most of the semantic nuances illustrated by means of the translation values referred to above capture the semantic potential of אַף, it is not clear from the information provided in all of the lexica whether these translation values refer to definable semantic classes, whether there is a polysemic relationship between these classes and/or whether these classes can be associated with specific syntactic constructions (except in the case of אַף כִּי). Furthermore, the question arises which of the classes represent

---

10) In C. H. J. van der Merwe, J. A. Naudé, and J. H. Kroeze, A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar (Sheffield, 1999), p. 312. אַף is regarded as a focus particle, which in turn is categorized under the umbrella term “adverb”.
12) BDB comments on “even, indeed” as if they are synonyms.
13) DCH, p. 352.
the most prototypical uses of אַף, but whether and in what way אַף differs from גַּם cannot be gleaned from this information. The only resource that comments on the latter two issues is B. K. Waltke and M. O’Connor. They state that of the two, אַף is “simpler and closer to גַּם. It can also serve as a correlative, lining up the situation of its clause with that of the previous clause... Followed by אַף, כי can have an emphatic role... Generally has more distinctly logical force than אַף, though it can be used as an emphatic”. However, apart from three examples, Waltke and O’Connor do not provide much empirical evidence for their depiction of אַף.

In recent studies of two other problematic “small words”, I illustrated the value of a descriptive model that (1) takes the syntactic distribution of these lexemes seriously; (2) tries to understand the differences of translation values as, among other things, the lexicalization of pragmatic or contextual relationships; and (3) profiles the uses of syntactic and semantic categories in terms of their frequency. This study wants to provide an insight into the semantic potential of אַף by illustrating (a) which nuance is displayed when; (b) which are the prototypical (and less prototypical) uses of אַף; and (c) how אַף differs from גַּם in the Hebrew Bible.

For this purpose, I commence with a few general remarks on the distribution of אַף. Next, I profile the syntactic distribution of אַף in terms of the frequency of each category and compare it with that of גַּם. In the main part

---

12) In line with insights from the field of cognitive semantics, it is assumed in this study that a high priority should be placed on distinguishing prototypical members of a category from its less prototypical members; cf. C. H. J. Van der Merwe, “Biblical Hebrew lexicology: a cognitive linguistic perspective”, KUSATU 6 (2006), pp. 87-112; C. H. J. Van der Merwe, “Lexical Meaning in Biblical Hebrew and Cognitive Semantics: A Case Study”, *Biblica* 87/1 (2006), pp. 85-95. The gist of prototype theory is the following: of the category bird, a sparrow and a robin would be prototypical members, while an ostrich and a penguin would be less prototypical members. For an explication and critical assessment of prototype theory, cf. D. Geeraerts, “Prospects and Problems of Prototype Theory”, *Linguistics* 27/4 (1989), pp. 587-612. In the case of an ancient language of which only a closed corpus of texts is available, it is assumed that frequency of use may be interpreted as evidence of the prototypicality of that category.

13) Waltke and O’Connor, p. 663.


15) The semantic model underpinning this investigation can be summarized as follows: “The semantics of lexical and constructional units is not a bag of meanings, but is a (prototypically and schematically) structured meaning potential that is sensitive to contextual effects” (D. Geeraerts, “Introduction. A rough guide to cognitive linguistics”, in: D. Geeraerts [ed.], *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings* [New York, 2006], p. 10). Hence, the exhaustive treatment of the syntagmatic distribution of אַף.
of the article the major semantic-pragmatic categories to be distinguished are discussed.\textsuperscript{16} Special attention is paid to the question of whether a category \(x\) can typically be associated with a syntactic category \(y\) (or syntactic categories \(y, z\), etc.). Word class labels will be used to capture the syntagmatic features of each syntactic category.\textsuperscript{17} In conclusion, the semantic potential of \(אַף\) is then summarized with special reference to the “prototypicality”, syntactic distribution (i.e. word class) and translation value that can be attached to each category of use.

2. Distribution of \(אַף\)

According to BDB and HALOT, the lexeme occurs about 120 times in the Hebrew Bible. DCH and HAH are more precise by indicating that it occurs 134x. HALOT also points out that most of the occurrences are in Deutero-Isaiah, Psalms and Job, while BDB observes that \(אַף\) occurs mainly in poetic material, but that \(כִּי אַף\) is evenly distributed in prose and poetry. The latter is an instructive observation, since it may suggest that \(כִּי\) \(אַף\) represents a fixed expression that acquired its own meaning. Of the 134 occurrences of \(אַף\), 24 (i.e. 18\%) belong to this category. Of these 24 instances, four are in Job,\textsuperscript{18} but not one occurs in the Psalms or Isaiah. If one subtracts these 24 instances from 134, it leaves 110 instances of \(אַף\). Of these 110 cases, 14 (i.e. 10\%) occur in Job, 23 (i.e. 20\%) in Psalms, and 30 (i.e. 27\%) in Isa. 26-48.

This uneven distribution of \(אַף\) is in stark contrast to that of \(גַּם\), which is relatively evenly distributed throughout the Hebrew Bible, and also throughout the entire book of Isaiah. Another significant difference between \(אַף\) and \(גַּם\) is the low frequency of instances where \(אַף\) is preceded by \(וְ\), i.e. 15 instances (i.e. 14\%) over against the 257 (i.e. 33\%) of \(גַּם\).\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} It can be rightly argued that BH does not distinguish these categories (R. Sim, personal communication). However, English and many other languages do. In a grammar or lexicon of BH aimed at English speakers, identifying the syntactic, semantic and/or pragmatic environments where a target language (in this case English) does lexicalize these categories has an important heuristic value.

\textsuperscript{17} Scholars disagree widely over the criteria for categorizing lexical items that are often lumped together under the heading “adverb” or “particle”. Cf. C. Schwarz, “Was ist ein ‘Adverb’?”, Linguistische Berichte 81 (1982), p. 61-65; K. Fischer (ed.), Approaches to Discourse Particles (Amsterdam, 2006). In this study the syntactic-semantic scope of \(אַף\) is used as the main criterion for distinguishing various word class labels.


3. The Syntax of אַף: A Profile in Terms Frequency

3.1 Introduction

Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze state: “as opposed to גַּם, אַף does not necessarily directly precede its syntactic domain”. 20 The question is whether this observation is borne out by the data. We will therefore now consider in more detail the syntax of אַף. Special attention will be paid to the frequency of each category. It will be hypothesized that the frequency of each syntactic category distinguished may point, on the one hand, to the more prototypical uses of אַף and, on the other hand, to some of the similarities and differences between אַף and גַּם.

3.2 The Syntax of אַף

The syntactic model that is used to distinguish the various syntactic categories limits itself not only to the description of the formal combination probabilities of אַף in a single clause or sentence. It also implies a quest to understand the scope of אַף, which may include more than one clause. This investigation has shown that such a quest requires a careful analysis of the information structure of the context in which אַף is used, and that semantic considerations are often needed to determine the syntactic units governed by אַף.

Furthermore, although there is unmistakably a polysemic relationship between כי אַף and אַף, the former developed into a fixed expression with a specific semantic content. For this reason, as well as the fact that this is the only use of אַף that has no counterpart among the uses of גַּם, this category is treated completely separately from the other uses of אַף. 21

The following syntactic configurations are therefore distinguished: 22

3.2.1 אַף + Entity

(i) אַף + Second Member of a Coordinated Construction (Rare: 3/110, i.e. 2.7%)
The items that are coordinated may be a noun (#1) or a noun phrase (#2).

20) Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, p. 312.
21) This is the reason why the frequency of the other syntactic categories is profiled in terms of a total of 110. The 24 instances of כי אַף are subtracted from the 134 times אַף is attested.
22) Since it was not possible to make any sense of them, and in each case one or other type of text-critical issue is involved, the following cases are not accounted for here: Deut. 33:3; 2 Kgs 2:14; Hab. 2:15; Pss. 44:10; 58:3; 108:2.
1. He lives like a lion and tears apart arm and scalp (Deut. 33:20).

2. I told them that the hand of my God was good on me and also the words that the king had spoken to me (Neh. 2:18).

In the case of poetic lines like #3 and #4, where the same subject governs verbs with no complements, it might be argued that two verbs are coordinated.

3. Yahweh makes poor and makes rich, he humiliates and exalts (NRSV: he also exalts) (1 Sam. 2:7).

4. The meadows clothe themselves with flocks, the valleys deck themselves with grain, they rejoice and sing (NET: they shout joyfully, yes they sing (Ps. 65:14).

(ii) אַף + Appositional Phrase (Rare: 2/110, i.e. 1.8%) 

5. So that your trust may be in the Lord, I have made them known to you today—yes, to you (Prov. 22:19).24

(iii) אַף + Constituent (27/110, i.e. 24.5%) 

In most of the cases (11 times) in this category אַף + constituent is fronted in a verbal clause (#6-7).25 אַף + constituent may (6 times) also occur inside the verbal clause (#8). In a few cases (4 times) the predicate of the clause is ellipsed (#9).

23) These two examples are the only ones in the corpus.

24) Cf. also Isa. 35:2.

25) This preference of אַף + constituent to occupy the sentence initial position is similar to that of גַּם + constituent. On the surface level it is not always immediately obvious whether אַף + constituent is indeed involved, or whether אַף is rather governing the entire clause (like in §3.2.1(iv)). The distinctive criterion for identifying גַּם + constituent is whether the predicate of the clause that is governed by אַף is already discourse active or not. In the case of #6 “they will rot away…” it is clearly discourse active.
And those who remain among you will rot away in the land of your enemy because of your iniquity, and also because of the iniquities of their ancestors with them they will rot away (Lev. 26:39).26

I bless Yahweh who gives me counsel, even during the nights my kidneys instruct me (Ps. 16:7).27

Therefore I say: “Listen to me, let me also declare my knowledge (Job 32:10).28

When the chief baker saw that the interpretation was favorable, he said to Joseph, “I also saw in my dream…” (Gen. 40:16).29

In a number of instances (6 times) the constituent immediately following אַף is governed by אַף (#10). However, it cannot be said that “also x” does y, since, what x does is a corresponding reaction to what z did. This is a type of construction that is also attested a number of times where גַּם is used.30 Example #10 is a good illustration of the fact that אַף and גַּם may be regarded as near-synonyms. In the case of אַף, this use represents 5.4% of the corpus. In the case of גַּם, this category makes out 6.1% of the corpus.

I will also go against you (lit. walked with you in hostility), and I will also strike you sevenfold for your sins (Lev. 26:24).31

(iv) אַף + Sentence (36/110, i.e. 32.7%)
In this category אַף governs a sentence. The sentence is sometimes (11 times) introduced by a verb phrase (#11-13).

26) Lev. 26:42; Deut. 15:17; Judg. 5:29; Job 37:1; 1 Chron. 8:32; 9:38.
27) Job 14:3. In two instances אַף is preceding a temporal adjunct, viz. Isa. 46:7 and Neh. 9:18.
28) Deut. 2:11,20; Job 32:17 (2 times). In 2 Sam. 20:14, אַף is not immediately preceding the constituent it governs semantically. This is the only case in the corpus.
29) See also Lev. 26:42; Ps. 68:19; Neh. 13:15.
30) E.g. Gen. 44:9; Exod. 18:23; Num. 22:33.
31) Lev. 26:16,28,41; Ps. 89:28; 2 Chron. 12:5.
In the majority of the cases (20 times), the sentence governed by אַ֝֗ף has a fronted constituent (#14-16). At the surface level these instances are therefore not distinguishable from instances where the domain of אַ֝֗ף is only the constituent immediately following it (§3.2.1(iii)).

14וְאָמַרְתִּ֖ים אֶֽת־שִּׁמְךָ נְפֹֽלָה מַ֓עִי אֶֽלֹהִ֖ים The earth quaked and the heavens poured down rain at the presence of God (Ps. 68:7)

15וַיִּתְגַּלֵּלֲהֵֽי וָהְמִֽצְבָּתָ֖ה מַעִ֑לָּה יִרְגֹּֽז׃ So I became great and surpassed all who were before me in Jerusalem; what’s more, my wisdom remained with me (Eccl. 2:9).34

16וּידָֽעְתָּנִ֖י שֶׁהָיָ֑ה מִכֹּ֛ל וְהוֹסַ֔פְתִּי וְגָדַ֣לְתִּי לִֽי׃ My hand shall support—remain with him, yes, my arm will strengthen him (Ps. 89:22).35

אַ֝֗ף may (5 times) also govern a nominal clause (#17-18)

17וְלָֽהֶם אֵֽין־יֶשׁ־רוּחַ אַ֝֗ף They do have ears, but they do not hear, what’s worse, there is no breath in them (Ps. 135:17).
Listen to me Jacob, and Israel whom I called, I am the He. I am the first and I am the last (Isa. 48:12).36

(v) אַף + Sentences (11/110, i.e. 10%)
Members of this category have in most cases the same surface-level features as those where אַף governs only one sentence. In others words, אַף may be followed by a verb (#19) or by a fronted non-verbal constituent (#20). In #21 the sentence is, however, introduced by a sentence adverbial.

You have raised the right hand of his foe, you have made all his enemies rejoice. What's worse, you turned back the flint-edge of his sword and not supported him in the battle... (Ps 89:43-44).37

...who delivered me from my enemies; indeed, you exalted me above my adversaries; you delivered me from the violent (Ps. 18:49).38

4 And what's more, if indeed I have erred, my error remains with me.
5 If indeed you magnify yourselves against me, and make my humiliation an argument against me,
6 know then that God has put me in the wrong, and closed his net around me. (Job 19:4-6).39

(vi) Yes/No Question Word + אַף + Sentence (7/110, i.e. 6.3%)
This category displays the same syntactic configurations as those of (iv) and (v), viz. the sentence that is governed by אַף is introduced by a verb (#22),

36) Also Pss. 74:16; 89:12. In Song 1:16a the subject of the nominal clause is ellipsed..
37) Also Pss. 93:1-2; 96:10; Isa. 43:19; 1 Chron. 16:30.
38) Isa. 48:13. Also Ezek. 23:40; Song 1:16b-17.
39) Also Job 34:12. However, it might be argued that a coordinated sentence with the same (only differently lexicalized subject) is involved here.
a non-verbal constituent (#23) or a nominal clause (#24). However, the difference between this use of אַף and those of (iv)-(v) is not only the fact that the sentence is introduced by a question word. These instances are regarded as a separate syntactic category, since אַף does not link, as it does in those instances in (iv)-(v), the content of clauses it introduces to that of any preceding utterance.

22 וַיֹּאמַ֑ר אַבְרָהָ֖ם וַיִּגַּ֥שׁﬠִם־רָשָֽׁע׃ Then Abraham came closer and said, “Will you even/indeed sweep away the righteous with the wicked?” (Gen. 18:23).

23 כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמְעָ֖ם מִשְׁפָּ֣ט שׂוֹנֵ֣א הַאַ֣ף Can indeed one who hates justice rule? (Job 34:17).

24 יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל בְּנֵ֥י אֵֽין־זוֹ֛את הַאַףנְאֻם־יְהוָֽה׃ Is it not indeed so, O people of Israel? says the Lord (Amos 2:9).

3.2.2 אַף + Clause // אַף + Clause (// אַף + Clause) (13/110, i.e. 11.8%)

This use (#25) of אַף represents a category that is synonymous with a frequently occurring category of גַּם. The latter category represents 21% of the uses of גַּם in the Hebrew Bible. It is remarkable that in Isaiah this type of use of גַּם occurs only in Isa. 48:8 and 66:3-4, while this type of use with אַף is limited to Isa. 40-46.

25 מִי־הִגִּ֤יד אַף־מַשְׁמִ֙יעַ אֵ֣ין אַף־מַגִּ֖יד אַף־וּנֵדָ֑ﬠָה מֵרֹאשׁ אָנָ֖ם נְאֻם־יְהוָֽה׃ Who declared it from the beginning, so that we might know, and beforehand, so that we might say, “He is right”? There was neither who declared it, nor one who proclaimed, nor one who heard your words (Isa. 41:26).

---

40) Gen. 18:23; Job 40:8. In Gen. 18:13 the question word is followed by a sentence adverbial. In Gen. 3:1 the question word is lacking, and a content clause introduced by כי is governed by אַף.

41) These statistics may be misleading. This use is restricted to five verses in the book of second Isaiah (Isa. 40:24 (3x), 41:10 (2x); 41:26 (example #25); 44:15 (2x); 46:11 (3x)).
3.2.3 כִּי אַף Sentence with an Ellipsed Main Clause or Predicate (23/134, i.e. 17.1% of Instances).

This category represents a specialized use of the fixed expression כִּי אַף.

26 לְאֵלָיו דָוִד אַנְשֵׁי וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְרֵאִים בִּיהוּדָה פֹ֛ה אֲנַ֥חְנוּ הִנֵּ֨ה פְּלִשְׁתִּֽים׃

But David’s men said to him: Look, we are afraid here in Judah; how much more then if we go to Keilah against the armies of the Philistines? (1 Sam. 23:3)

27 אֵלָ֔יו דָוִד אַנְשֵׁי בִּיהוּדָה פֹ֛ה אֲנַ֥חְנוּ הִנֵּ֨ה פְּלִשְׁתִּֽים׃

Look, the highest heavens cannot contain you, how much less this house that I have built? (1 Kgs 8:27).

3.3 A Comparison of the Syntactic Profiles

The most significant differences between the syntax of כִּי אַף and גַּם are the following:

- The most frequent occurring syntactic configuration of the former is כִּי אַף + sentence (32.7%), while that of the latter is גַּם + constituent (55%);
- כִּי אַף more often governs more than one sentence than גַּם does (10% vs. 2%);
- גַּם governs “both an entity x as well as an entity y as far a notion z” is concerned less often than כִּי אַף does (10% vs. 21%). The multiple entities that גַּם governs are restricted to sentences (כִּי אַף often governs phrases). Furthermore, the use of כִּי אַף in these constructions is restricted to Isaiah 40-46;
- In a few instances (6%) where כִּי אַף is preceded by a question word, it has no connective function. This phenomenon happens only once with גַּם.

As far as similarities are concerned, the following are noteworthy:

- Both lexemes seldom (3% of their occurrences) precede the second member of a coordinated construction;

• When either אַף or גַּם governs a constituent, the construction tends to occupy the sentence initial position.

In the light of this comparison of the syntax of אַף and גַּם, it is, among other things, evident why it may appear as if אַף always occupies a sentence initial position, and does not, like גַּם, always immediately precede the entity it governs. However, contra to Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze, this detailed analysis of the syntax of אַף has shown that אַף, like גַּם, nearly always immediately precedes the entity it governs.

From the analysis of the semantics of אַף in the next section, it will be apparent that אַף and גַּם are relatively often also semantically similar. However, it will be evident that they are not absolute synonyms.

4. The Semantics and Pragmatics of אַף

Comparing the syntax of אַף and גַּם has shown that אַף typically governs a sentence or sentences, while גַּם tends to govern constituents. When the latter is the case, גַּם is a focus particle and the semantic function of גַּם is to signal that an entity x must be added to an entity y as far as a discourse active proposition z is concerned. In the case of (#28), z is “other men that died” (in a particular battle). The translation values “also, too, as well as” are typical in this type of context.

You must say, “Also your servant Uriah, the Hittite died” (2 Sam. 11:21).

When the item to be added represents an extreme or unexpected case, the translation value of “even” is more appropriate (#29).

46) Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, p. 312.
47) In only one instance is this not the case, viz. 2 Sam. 20:14. As far as גַּם is concerned, cf. Job 2:10.
48) It appears that Waltke and O’Connor, p. 663, did not observe this significant syntactic difference between אַף and גַּם.
BH does not lexicalize (as English does) the pragmatic value involved, i.e. the extremeness of the case to be added. Neither is the extremeness marked syntactically. Exegetes and translators have to infer from the context whether an extreme case is involved or not. They often differ in this regard. Compare, for example, the RSV’s (“also”) and NRSV’s (“even”) rendering for גַּם in Jer. 27:6. The same can be said of instances where גַּם is used to signal that the information referred to in a sentence (or sentences) y needs to be considered in addition to information referred to in an immediately preceding sentence (or sentences) x as far as an explicit or implicit notion z is concerned. In the case of #30, גַּם signals information to be considered by the addressees in addition to “Saul your lord is dead” as far as the notion z, i.e. the appeal “be courageous...”, is concerned. The question of whether “the house of Judah has anointed mé to be king over them” is regarded as the most compelling part of the motivation, or not, determines the “translation value” of גַּם. In the case of #31, the implied notion z is apparently “The prostitute is not there anymore”. The information to be added, in my opinion, represents the most compelling or conclusive part of the report, hence the translation “what’s more”. This nuance is also not lexicalized or grammaticalized. So the choice between “and, also, furthermore” and “moreover, what’s more/worse” is in a way similar to that between “and, also, too, as well as” and “even”. I say “in a way” because the difference between these two sets of translation values is not always so clear-cut. For example, one of the translation equivalents from the first set with the appropriate intonation may express the same value as when “moreover” or “what’s more” is used.

Therefore, be courageous and be valiant (lit. let your hands be strong and be sons of valiance); for Saul your lord is dead, (and) furthermore, the house of Judah has anointed mé to be king over them (2 Sam. 2:6-7).

He said: “I have not find her, what’s more, the men of the place said: ‘There has been no prostitute here’” (Gen. 38:22).

When one considers the most typical syntactic use of אַף in the Hebrew Bible, i.e. governing a sentence or sentences, it is immediately evident that אַף nearly always relates the content of two sentences or sets of sentences. The relationships may be of the types described below.

(i) Noteworthy Addition (Most Frequent, About 45%)

אַף signals that the information referred to in a sentence (#15)51 or sentences (#19)52 y needs to be considered, in addition to information referred to in an immediately preceding sentence (or sentences) x as far as an explicit or implicit notion z is concerned. In contrast to גַּם, the information to be added after אַף (in cases like #15 and 19) represents predominantly the most conclusive or compelling information of what is asserted in the context.53 In other words, it must nearly always54 be translated as “moreover, what’s more or what’s worse” or their equivalent, e.g. “and” in #18.55

The two cases where it may be hard to argue that אַף points unambiguously to the most conclusive part of a two- (#14) or a multi-pronged (#11) assertion may therefore be regarded as untypical uses of אַף.

The fixed expression כִּי אַף + sentence (with ellipsed main clause or predicate) has been treated in §3.2.2 as a category completely separate from the other occurrences of אַף. Although this relatively frequently occurring expression (17.1%) developed into a lexeme with its own specialized meaning, it did retain two features of אַף, viz. it signals a connection (i.e. a comparison) between two pieces of information, and the second piece of information (predominantly a condition) is the most compelling or conclusive of the two,

51 Lev. 26:40,44; Num. 16:14; Deut. 33:28; Isa. 26:8,9; 41:23; 45:21; Pss. 16:9; 68:17; 135:17; Job 6:27; 15:4; 36:29; Prov. 23:28. Also Ps. 119:3; Job 36:16; Est. 5:12.
52 Ezek. 23:40; 34:12. Also Job 19:4-5, Song 1:16b-17.
53 This interpretation is in line with T. Muraoka, p. 143, who observes: “we may say that forcefulness is certainly felt in (rhetorical) rhetorical questions with ‘af and in climatic additions in the poetic style”.
54 In the case of גַּם about one third of the cases may be regarded as “neutral additions”.
55 Also Pss. 74:16; 89:12.
hence the translation values “how much more” (#26)\(^{56}\) and “how much less (#27).\(^{57}\) For this reason, the fixed expression can be semantically classified under the heading “noteworthy addition”.

A feature of the semantic category “noteworthy addition” is that הַף typically governs a sentence, and in a few cases more than one sentence. In the former case it could therefore be labelled as a conjunctive adverb\(^{58}\) and in the latter case a macro-syntactic connective.\(^{59}\)

(ii) Affirmation (About 20%)

הַף signals that the information referred to in a sentence (or sentences) \(y\), affirms\(^{60}\) the information referred to in an immediately preceding sentence (or sentences).\(^{61}\) In other words, what must be added to strengthen an argument is not a second new proposition, but the specification of a discourse active one.

The border between “noteworthy addition” and “affirmation” is not always clear-cut. In #20\(^{62}\) it is fairly clear that the sentences governed by הַף further specify “delivers me from my enemies”, and in this way affirms what is said in the previous utterance. In the case of #16, the question may be asked: is Ps. 89:22b additional information “what’s more”, or does it merely further specify and affirm what is said in 22a, in other words, “yes, indeed”?\(^{63}\)

Despite this “fussy border” between the semantic categories “noteworthy addition” and “affirmation”, what is relevant as far as this investigation is concerned, is the following: firstly, in comparison with הַף, גַם occurs significantly more frequently (19/134 versus 13/769) in contexts where it can have an

---


\(^{60}\) This interpretation disagrees with T. Muraoka, p. 143, who also observes that “emphasis in the sense of asseveration is not a function of the particle”.

\(^{61}\) In two cases noun phrases, and not sentences, are involved, viz. Isa. 35:2 and Prov. 22:19.

\(^{62}\) Deut. 33:3; Isa. 26:11; 42:13; 43:7,19; 46:6; 48:13,15; Pss. 16:6; 77:17,18; 89:22; 93:1; 96:10; 1 Chron. 16:30. Also Isa. 33:2; Job 6:27.

\(^{63}\) Cf. how the following versions differ in their translation of הַף: NRSV: “my hand shall always remain with him, my arm also shall strengthen him”; NIV: “My hand will sustain him, surely my arm will strengthen him”; NJPS: “My hand shall be constantly with him, and my arm shall strengthen him”.

affirmative interpretation, and secondly, the shift in meaning from “noteworthy addition” to “affirmation” is not hard to “motivate.”

The above-mentioned shift in meaning may also explain another (secondary) shift in meaning, viz. those instances where אַף does not connect two pieces of information, but is used in a question as a sentence adverbial. In each instance the factuality (“is indeed”?) of an event (#22) or state of affairs (#24) is questioned.

Apart from operating as a sentence adverbial, the syntactic features of this semantic category are similar to those of “noteworthy addition”. אַף is predominantly a conjunctive adverb and sometimes a macro-syntactic connective.

(iii) Addition (About 15%)

Another less frequent, but not rare, use of אַף is one that corresponds with the most prototypical use of גַּם as a focus particle (see the first paragraph of §4.). The translation values in most cases (16/21) are “also, too” (#6). In five instances it may be argued that an extreme or unexpected entity must be added. In these cases, a translation value of “even” (#7) would be appropriate. These instances would be regarded as “noteworthy additions” and then belong to (i) above.

In a few instances (3/134), אַף is the second member of a coordinated phrase. In the case of #2, it may be argued that the information signalled to be added by means of אַף has one or another type of relevance in the context. In other words, the permission of the king (Neh. 2:8) was the most important part of what Nehemiah told his audience that inspires them to act (Neh. 2:18b). This use of אַף then also belongs to (i) above.

The same cannot be said of #170 and #32. Is אַף here functioning as a near-synonym of וְ or does it do something more, a nuance that can be expressed by “as well as”? Consider also examples #14 and #18 above.

65) For the word class “sentence adverbial”, cf. H. Bussman, p. 428.
66) In Gen. 18:13 the question word is followed by a sentence adverbial. In Gen. 3:1 the question word is absent and a content clause introduced by כִּי is governed by אַף.
68) Gen. 40:16; Lev. 26:42 (2x); Deut. 15:17; 2:11,20; Judg. 5:29; 2 Sam. 20:14; Job 32:10,17 (2x); 37:1; Neh. 13:15; 1 Chron. 8:32; 9:38.
69) Also in Isa. 46:7 and Neh. 9:18 אַף precedes a temporal adjunct. Cf. also Ps. 68:19; Job 14:3.
70) Also Ps. 89:6.
71) In C. H. J. van der Merwe (JSS [forthcoming]), it has been established that in a similar syntactic construction, i.e. דָּרָע without היה in a coordinated phrase, דָּרָע is used as a near-synonym of היה.
Let the heavens praise your wonders, O Lord, and as well as your faithfulness in the assembly of the holy ones (Ps. 89:5).

(iv) A Corresponding Reaction of an Actor x to that of an Action by an Actor y

In about 5% of cases, אַף points out, just like the focus particle גַּם, the role of people or God in a corresponding reaction (#10).

(v) Noteworthy In-/Exclusion (about 10%)

Another category that was listed separately, on mainly syntactic grounds, is that of אַף + clause // אַף + clause (/אַף + clause) (#25). This use of אַף as a correlative conjunction is regarded as “noteworthy inclusion”, since it signals that the information referred to in each sentence preceded by אַף carries equal weight as far as the substantiation of explicit or implicit assertion is concerned.

As far as the categories (iii-v) are concerned, אַף operates as a near-synonym of בַּד. Like בַּד, it appears in a few cases to be a near-synonym of ב. In (iii-iv) its syntagmatic distribution corresponds with that of בַּד when it is used as a focus particle and in (v) when it is used as a correlative conjunction.

5. Conclusions

This empirical study confirms the hypothesis that it is possible to provide a more nuanced description of אַף than those that may be found in current lexica, the works of Muraoka (1985), Waltke and O’Connor (1990) and Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999). Although each of the 134 instances of אַף cannot be assigned unambiguously to one discrete semantic category, and although about 30% of its occurrences display exactly the same syntactic and semantic features as בַּד, this study has shown that the most prototypical uses of אַף differ from those of בַּד. What is more, commencing with the most proto-

72) See §3.2.1(iii).
73) Lev. 26:16,28,41; Ps. 89:28; 2 Chron. 12:5.
74) Also Isa. 40:24 (3x); 41:10 (2x), 44:15 (2x); 46:11 (3x). Despite the syntactic similarities, the use of אַף in Isa. 40:24 and 46:11 are not prototypical examples of this category in the same way as Isa. 41:26. For example, in Isa. 46:11, four sentences (which form two pairs) are involved, but the third one lacks אַף.
typical uses of אַף, the following semantic-pragmatic categories have been identified, as well as the syntactic constructions (formalized in terms of word class labels) and translation values that could be associated with each category of use:

1. אַף typically signals *noteworthy addition*. This happens predominantly when אַף is a conjunctive adverb, or sometimes when it is used as a macro-syntactic marker (i.e. when it governs the content of more than one sentence). In these cases, English translation equivalents like “moreover, what’s more, what’s worse” capture the semantic relation signalled by אַף. In a few cases where אַף functions as a focus particle, noteworthy addition is also involved. In cases where אַף governs a constituent, a translation value can be “even”, and where it occurs in a coordinated phrase, “also” seems to capture the nuance of noteworthy addition. Although כי אַף gained a very specific meaning, translatable as “how much more” or “how much less”, this fixed expression unambiguously signals a noteworthy addition.

2. In a number of instances a semantic relation of *affirmation* is displayed by אַף. That happens mainly when אַף is a conjunctive adverb or a macro-syntactic connective. In these cases a translation value of “yes, indeed” can be used to express the affirmative relation. In those few instances where the factuality of event or state is questioned in the form of a sentence adverbial, אַף can best be rendered as “indeed?”

3. In addition, when it mainly functions as a near-synonym of the focus particle,76 it is hard to describe the addition signal by אַף as noteworthy, and the mere “addition” is then to be rendered as “and, also, as well as”.

4. Also, in analogy to the focus particle גַּם, there are a few instances where a corresponding reaction of an actor is signalled to be translated as “also x”, or “in turn x”.

5. *Noteworthy in/exclusion* “(n)either . . . (n)or” in the format of a correlative conjunction is rare, but indeed attested.

---

76 In contrast to its use as conjunctive adverb or macro-syntactic connective, which occurs predominantly in poetic texts, the use of אַף as a focus particle is significantly more frequent in non-poetic texts.