

***Gam* in the Prophetic Discourse**

Alexey Lyavdansky

Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

The meaning and usage of some Biblical Hebrew particles has drawn much attention in recent years. The grammatical description of these words is highly problematic and has required application of modern linguistic approaches: pragmatics, discourse analysis, transformational generative grammar. The particle *gam* was no exception in this recent trend of research, a number of publications have been dedicated to its linguistic description (Muraoka 1985, 143–146; Van der Merwe 1990, 1992). The present paper deals with the special usage of *gam* + IPP¹ in the prophetic discourse² and in the texts generically related to it. The material I discuss is not unknown to the researchers of the prophetic literature. What I have tried to do, was to collect all the relevant passages, including the problematic and dubious ones, and to consider them from the discourse perspective.

A simple statistical research with the help of concordance shows that there are some particles which are used almost exclusively in the prophetic discourse: *lākēn* and *ya'an*. To them could be added *himmē*³ in one of its morphosyntactic variants—*himmī* + Part.—which occurs mainly in the books of the writing prophets and in the prophetic oracles included into the historical narrative.³ The concentration of these particles in the prophetic discourse is not accidental: a genre-oriented reading of the prophetic texts reveals that these words are used in two main subgenres of prophetic discourse—in the judgment speech and in the prophecy of salvation. Since both subgenres are structurally identical being differentiated only on the semantic level, it seems reasonable to subsume them under one category of “prophetic announcement” (Sweeney 1996) or “reason-

¹ The abbreviations I use in this paper are: IPP—independent personal pronoun; Part.—participle; PA—prophetic announcement.

² There is no need for the exact definition of the prophetic discourse here. It will be enough to refer the reader to the definitions given in the works of the form-critics (Westermann 1991, 90–98; Koch 1969, 210–220; Tucker 1978).

³ As was shown by Humbert 1934.

announcement” speech (Gowan 1971).⁴ The above particles are used in the prophetic announcement not at random, but rather they are given certain strict roles in the texts of that genre. All three of them may be used as markers of certain textual subunits within the unit named *prophetic announcement* (PA), i.e. they are structurally important elements of the text. The function of these and other particles including *gam* can be clarified through the analysis of the structure of the *prophetic announcement*.

1. The structure of the prophetic announcement

Major contribution to the understanding of the prophetic announcement has been made by form analysis beginning with the works of its founder H. Gunkel. In the last two decades the research in this field has been supplemented by discourse analysis. To some extent both methods—one philological/sociological, another linguistic—were working in the same direction. It may well be seen in the way each of them define their aims.⁵

For the present purposes it will suffice to summarise the results of the previous form-critical research in order to present the structure of the *prophetic announcement*.⁶ Here is one of the typical examples of this text type (Jer 29:31b–32):

*ya'an ʾāšār nibbāʾ lākām šəmaʾyāʰ waʾānī lōʾ šəlahitw wayyabtaḥ ʾātkām
ʾal šāqār lākən kōʰ ʾāmar yḥwh hinnī pōqēd ʾal šəmaʾyāʰ
hannāḥlāmī wəʾal zarʾō lōʾ yihyāʰ lōʾ ʾiš yōšēb bəṭōk hāsām hazzāʰ*

⁴ Köhler's definition “messenger speech” is based on the peculiar understanding of the prophet's office (Westermann 1991, 36–40).

⁵ It is widely accepted that “the first step in a form critical analysis is the determination of the appropriate, original unit for analysis” (Tucker 1971, 12). The aim of one of the works dedicated solely to the discourse analysis of Hebrew prophetic literature is stated as follows: “a demarcation of prophetic discourse into hierarchical structure of inclusive and included segments that comprise the complete text of the whole book” (Wendland 1994, 1). The main features of the discourse analysis are: (1) interest in the “final textual product” and (2) lack of interest in its socio-religious setting (op. cit., 2).

⁶ This form once has been considered as “basic” for the prophetic speech/discourse in general (Westermann 1991, 26f). This position was persuasively defended by Westermann, but unfortunately this approach has fallen into disuse later in the form critical analysis, which has been going on demarcating smaller units. The results of this atomistic approach can be illustrated by the long list of the genres of prophetic literature adduced by Sweeney (1996). Westermann considers most of prophetic genres as expansions or modifications of the “basic” form (Westermann 1991, 98, 199–205).

*wəlōʾ yirʾāʰ baṭṭōb ʾāšār ʾānī ʾōšāʰ ləʾammū nəʾrūm yḥwh kī sārāh
dibbār ʾal yḥwh*

Because Shemaiah has prophesied to you, though I did not send him, and has led you to trust in a lie, therefore thus says the LORD: I am going to punish Shemaiah of Nehelam and his descendants; he shall not have anyone living among this people to see the good that I am going to do to my people, says the LORD, for he has spoken rebellion against the LORD.

Thus the *prophetic announcement* consists of two main parts—the *reason* and the *result*. Depending on the contents of these two parts the overall oracle may be called either *judgment speech*, or *salvation oracle*.⁷ Two main parts are logically connected, which is expressed not only by the label of the first part,⁸ the *reason*, but also by the presence of the connective represented by the phrase *lākən kōʰ ʾāmar yḥwh*, or by *lākən* only. The relationship between these two parts has been described mainly in terms of traditional grammar, namely as subordination: the *result* is the main clause, the *reason* is the subordinate clause, the oracle as a whole is the complex sentence. The *reason* may be represented by different speech acts (clause types): a) statement[clause]; b) question[clause]; c) address [clause].⁹ The choice of particle introducing the *reason* depends on the clause type. The statements, if they are not simply juxtaposed without any particle, are introduced by *ya'an*, *ya'an ʾāšār*, *ya'an kī*,¹⁰ *taḥat ʾāšār*, *taḥat kī*, *ʾāšār*, *kī*; the question may be introduced by *ʾēkāʰ*, the address—by *hōy*. The statement of the *reason* has mostly past or present temporal reference. The result is usually a statement with the future temporal reference; it is introduced by the messenger formula *lākən kōʰ ʾāmar yḥwh*, or

⁷ In all probability the judgment speech is the original form. If this is so, the salvation oracle would be a secondary construction repeating the pattern of its prototype.

⁸ There are many instances of the reverse order, some of the reasons for which are formulated by Gowan (1971, 174) and Mulder (1973, 74). Wolff enumerates four structural types: two simpler, with the reason (Begründung) in the beginning (*b-a*) or in the end (*a-b*); two expanded types, accordingly (*b-a-b*) or (*a-b-a*) (Wolff 1934, 2).

⁹ The main contribution here was made by Wolff (Wolff 1934).

¹⁰ Two articles (Gowan 1971; Mulder 1973) dedicated to the use of *ya'an* are in fact very important for the understanding of the structure of the prophetic announcement in general; unfortunately too little attention was given in these works to the other types of *reason*, which were already clarified in Wolff 1934.

by *lākēn*,¹¹ *ʿal kēn*, *hinnē^h*, *hinnî* + Part., *kî*, *gam*.¹² At the end of the oracle may appear the formula *nəʿūm yhw^h*.

This analysis should be supplemented by some important considerations.

1. The text of the *prophetic announcement*, the oracle proper, must be separated from its metatext.¹³ The formulas introducing (*lākēn kō^h ʿāmar yhw^h*) and concluding (*nəʿūm yhw^h*) the direct speech of a prophet (i.e. Yahweh speaking through him/her) are easily identifiable as a metatext since they include the verb *ʿmr*, “to say”, whether they occur before the prophetic announcement, or in its body, between the *reason* and the *result*. In my opinion the particles *lākēn* and *ʿal kēn* appearing between the two parts must be included into the metatext, i.e. they are not a part of the information delivered by a prophet, they organize this information and refer to it; they, as well as introducing and concluding formulas, are “text about text”.

2. Each of both constituent parts of the *prophetic announcement* may be represented not only by a clause, but by a set of clauses.¹⁴ I will use the term “text span” belonging to the descriptive apparatus of Rhetorical Structure Theory (Mann–Thompson 1987).¹⁵ The cohesion of each set of clauses is created by the repetition of (a) person (2nd or 3rd in the *reason*; 1st or 2nd in the *result*) and of (b) temporal reference (past or present in the *reason*; future in the *result*) in each clause.

¹¹ According to Westermann it is the abbreviated form of the messenger formula (Westermann 1991, 171). On the specific function of *lākēn* in the prophetic announcement see further.

¹² The use of *gam* in this context was pointed out in Gowan 1971, 173 and Mulder 1973, 78. For the special attention to this usage, namely, to the phrase *wəgam ʿānî* we are indebted to the commentaries of H. W. Wolff (Wolff 1977, 1990).

¹³ As posited by Wierzbicka (1971): a kind of commentary organizing the flow of discourse inserted into the text by the author himself; most of such expressions are anaphoric, referring to the text itself, “text about text”; fairly often these expressions include or imply *Verba dicendi*, e.g. “then/therefore [I say]”.

¹⁴ Van der Merwe (1990, 50, n. 184) uses the term “sentence cluster”.

¹⁵ Known to me through Korelsky–Kittredge 1996. “At the heart of the theory is the notion of *rhetorical relation*, a relation which holds between adjacent segments (spans) of text. In most cases, the relation is a binary relation between spans identified as the *nucleus* and the *satellite*” (Korelsky–Kittredge 1996, 213). I do not discuss here all the implications of this theory for the analysis of PA. As to the identification of the *nucleus* and the *satellite*, most of the form critics would call the *result* text span a *nucleus*.

3. The unity of overall oracle is not restricted to the relation of subordination, nor to the cause-and-effect relation between both parts; no less important is the relationship existing between the participants of the communication—Yahweh, on the one hand, and a person/group/the whole Israel on the other hand. In most cases the relationship “behind the scene” of an oracle is that of the covenant. A violation of covenant is considered a *personal* affront; it finds its expression in the personal (independent or enclitic) or possessive pronouns (Ezek 5:11f):

*yaʿan ʾāt miqdāšî ʾimmē^t bəkol šiqqūsayîk ʾūbəkøl tōʿābōtayîk...
wəgam ʾānî lōʾ ʾāhmlōl šəlīšūte^h bāhārāb yippālū...*

Because **you** have defiled **my** sanctuary with all **your** detestable things and with all **your** abominations ... **I**, in turn, will have no pity. One third of **you** shall die of pestilence...

The actions referred to in both parts are *reciprocal*: the protagonist of the action referred to in the *reason* affects somehow the protagonist of the action referred to in the *result* and vice versa.

Now it will be reasonable to look at the oracle Jer 29:31b–32 from the perspective of the previous analysis:

reason	<i>yaʿan ʾāšār¹⁶ nibbāʾ lākām šəmaʾyā^h waʿānî lōʾ šəlaḥtūw wayyablah ʾāthām ʿal šāqār</i>
metatext	<i>lākēn kō^h ʿāmar yhw^h</i>
result	<i>hinnî pōqēd¹⁷ ʿal šəmaʾyā^h hannāhālāmî wəʿal zarʾô lōʾ yihyā^h lō ʾiš yō-šēb bətōk hāšām hazzā^h wəlōʾ yirʾā^h baṭṭōb ʾāšār ʾānî ʾōšā^h ləʿammî</i>
metatext	<i>nəʿūm yhw^h</i>
reason'	<i>kî sārā^h dibbār ʿal yhw^h.</i>
reason	Because Shemaiah has prophesied to you, though I did not send him, and has led you to trust in a lie,
metatext	therefore thus says the LORD:
result	I am going to punish Shemaiah of Nehelam and his descendants; he shall not have anyone living among this people to see the good that I am going to do to my people,
metatext	says the LORD,
reason'	for he has spoken rebellion against the LORD. ¹⁸

¹⁶ The words printed in bold are structurally important expressions (introductory particles, connectives, introductory and concluding formulas).

¹⁷ The relevant element in the form *pōqēd* is its morphological pattern *qōṭel* (see Humbert 1934).

¹⁸ Here and elsewhere I use NRSV with the corrections relevant for the issue of the present paper.

2. *Gam* in the prophetic announcement

As it has been stated above, the particle *gam* (to be more precise *wagam* + IPP) is used to introduce the result clause or the set of clauses functioning as a *result* of the prophetic announcement. In what follows I will present and analyse all the cases of the PA with *gam* opening the *result*.

Already BDB singles out the cases of *gam* in this function, it is included under “4. expressing correspondence, esp. in the matter of retribution (the *gam* *correlativum*)”. The term “retribution” clearly points to the PA, which in fact speaks of retribution (punishment or salvation); this gloss obviously implies that the group of “in the matter of retribution” is included in the more comprehensive group “expressing correspondence”. Unfortunately, BDB enumerates the passages with *gam* in the PA (Jud 2:21; Isa 31:2; 66:3–4; Ezek 5:11; 16:43; 23:35; Hos 4:5; Am 4:6,7; Mic 6:13; Mal 2:9; Prov 1:26) together with many other cases of *gam* expressing correspondence in action. Labuschagne, following BDB, mentions the cases of *gam* where it “goes with the subject and serves to express correspondence in action”¹⁹ and, inter alia, quotes some of the passages with *gam* in the PA adduced in BDB, adding to them Jer 13:26; Ezek 8:18; 24:9. Mulder answering the question, “which linguistic elements (Sprachelemente)” express the logical relation between the *reason* sentence (Begründungssatz) and the *result* sentence (Folgesatz), mentions *gam* among other “elements”.²⁰ His list of the relevant passages adds to our collection the following ones: Jer 48:7; Ezek 20:15, 23; 2Kings 22:19 (paral. 2Chr 34:28).²¹ Short remarks in the commentaries of H. W. Wolff to the Twelve²² show that this outstanding researcher of the prophetic literature understood this “stylistic and syntactic device”²³ better than anybody. Wolff’s list supplements our list with Ezek 9:10; 20:24f (ibid.). Here is the list of the relevant passages:

Jud 2:20–22; 2Kings 22:19 (paral. 2Chr 34:28);
Isa 31:2; 66:3–4;
Jer 13:25b–26; 48:7;
Ezek 5:11–12; 8:17–18; 9:9–10; 16:43; 20:15–16, 24–26; 23:35; 24:9;

¹⁹ Labuschagne 1966, 197.

²⁰ Mulder 1973, 75, 78.

²¹ This passage is interesting but very doubtful: *wagam ʾānōkī* before *lākēn* and before the beginning of the “result” with *hinnī* + Part., quite usual for the PA in the book of Kings.

²² Wolff 1977, 213; 1990, 187.

²³ Wolff 1990, 187.

Hos 4:6; Am 4:4–7; Mic 6:12–13; Mal 2:8–9;
Prov 1:24–27.

It is interesting to note that the above summary list is almost²⁴ identical with the list of passages collected by the author of the present paper. The above mentioned authors who made their contributions to the list apparently did not intend a complete description of this usage of *gam*. In my opinion, only the consistent form-critical perspective supplemented with discourse analysis provides the necessary tools to discern the cases of this specific usage of *gam*.

My working hypothesis is as follows: *gam* is used in the PA, namely in the judgment speech as a marker of the beginning of the *result* textual unit; it is usually accompanied by *wə-* and *ʾānī*; the correlative of the element *wagam ʾānī* must be one of the markers of the *reason* textual unit (*yaʿan*, *yaʿan ʾāšār* etc.), though it may be absent since the cases of the asyndetical *reason* are not excluded;²⁵ the correlative of *wagam ʾānī* may appear after the *result* textual unit.

I will begin with Ezekiel’s passages: the number of them in comparison with other prophetic books shows that this usage of *gam* is “at home” in Ezekiel, being apparently part of his peculiar prophetic style.

(1) Ezek 5:11–12

metatext	<i>lākēn hay ʾānī nəʾūm ʾādōnay yhw ʾim lō</i>
reason	<i>yaʿan ʾāt miqdāšī timmēʾt bəkol šiqqūsayik ʾəbəkol tōʾābōtayik</i>
result	<i>wagam ʾānī ʾāgraʾ wəlō tāhōs ʾēnī</i> <i>wagam ʾānī lō ʾāhmōl šəʾlīsūtēk baddābār yāmūtū...</i>

metatext	Therefore , as I live, says the LORD God , surely,
reason	because you have defiled my sanctuary with all your detestable things and with all your abominations—
result	I, in turn , will cut you down; my eye will not spare, I, in turn , will have no pity. One third of you shall die of pestilence...

The text of the *result* is abridged here not only for the sake of brevity. It is important to see that the pattern of the PA is in fact open to expansions, each of its two constituent parts is not restricted to a clause, nor to a sentence; as has been stated above these parts may be called text spans.²⁶

²⁴ Excluding Jer 48:7 and 2Kings 22:19 (paral. 2Chr 34:28) as doubtful. To this list of relevant but doubtful examples may be added Jer 31:37; Ezek 16:51–53; Hos 12:12.

²⁵ It is stated in Waltke–O’Connor 1990, 39.3.4d: “The particle [*gam*] can serve as a correlative, in an apodosis after *yaʿan* or after an independent clause”.

²⁶ See note 15 above.

What is important for *wagam* + IPP is its position on the border between two text spans, namely at the beginning of the *result*. NRSV translation of the first *wagam ʾānī* with “therefore” (usual equivalent of *lākēn*) is very apt: both elements—*lākēn* and *wagam ʾānī*—belong to the border domain of PA; nevertheless “I in turn” or “I for my part” would be much better as the expression of the re-action of Yahweh as a participant of the reciprocal relationship with an addressee (see 1.3).²⁷

(2) Ezek 8:17–18

metatext	<i>wayyō mār ʾēlay</i>
reason	<i>hārāʾūtā bān ʾādām hānāqēl ləbēt yəhūdāʰ mēʾāsōt ʾūt hattōʾēbōt ʾāšār ʾāsū pōʰ</i> <i>kī mālāʾū ʾūt hāʾārūs hāmās wayyāšūbū ləhakʾīsēnī</i> <i>wəhinnām šōləhīm ʾūt hazzəmōrāʰ ʾəl ʾappām</i>
result	<i>wagam ʾānī ʾāʾšāʰ bəhēmāʰ lōʰ tāhōs ʾēnī wə lōʰ ʾāh̄mōl wəqārāʾū</i> <i>bəʾoznay qōl gādōl wə lōʰ ʾāšmaʰ ʾōtām</i>
metatext	Then he said to me,
reason	“Have you seen this, O mortal? Is it not bad enough that the house of Judah commits the abominations done here? Surely, they filled the land with violence, and provoked my anger still further. See, they are putting the branch to their nose!
result	Therefore I will act in wrath; my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity; and though they cry in my hearing with a loud voice, I will not listen to them.”

The *reason* is joined to the result *asyndetically*, it opens with a rhetorical question. The particle *kī* does not introduce the *reason* and cannot be considered with a certainty a particle relevant to the structuring of the text.²⁸ The following passage is structured in a very similar way, though the *reason* does not include a question.

(3) Ezek 9:9–10

metatext	<i>wayyō mār ʾēlay</i>
reason	<i>ʾāwōn bənē yisrāʾēl wihūdāʰ gādōl bimʾōd məʾōd</i> <i>wattimmālēʰ hāʾārūs dāmīm wəhāʾēr mālāʾāʰ muʾtāʰ</i> <i>kī ʾāmərū ʾāzab yhw̄h ʾūt hāʾārūs wəʾēn yhw̄h rōʾāʰ</i>
result	<i>wagam ʾānī lōʰ tāhōs ʾēnī wə lōʰ ʾāh̄mōl</i> <i>darkām bəʾōšām nātātī</i>

²⁷ Waltke–O’Connor (1990, 664) render this idea fairly good: “I will in *recom-pense* diminish (you)”.

²⁸ I mark *kī* bold on the reason that the possibility of *kī* being a correlative to *wagam ʾānī* is not to be excluded. Then it may be translated “because”.

metatext	He said to me,
reason	“The guilt of the house of Israel and Judah is exceedingly great; the land is full of bloodshed and the city full of perversity; for ²⁹ they say, ‘The LORD has forsaken the land, and the LORD does not see.’
result	As for me , my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity, but I will bring down their deeds upon their heads.”

(4) Ezek 16:43

reason	<i>yaʾan ʾāšār lōʰ zākartī ʾūt yəmē nəʾūrayik wattirgəzī lī bəkol ʾēllāʰ</i>
result	<i>wagam ʾānī hē darkēk bəʾōš nātātī</i>
metatext	<i>nəʾūm yhw̄h</i>
reason	Because you have not remembered the days of your youth, but have enraged me with all these things;
result	I for my part have returned your deeds upon your head,
metatext	says the LORD God.

This PA may include also the rest of v. 43 as a *reason*’ in the form of rhetorical question.

(5) Ezek 20:15–16

result	<i>wagam ʾānī nāsāʾtī yādī lāhām bammidbār ləbiltī hābīʰ ʾōtām ʾəl hāʾārūs ʾāšār nātātī zābat hālāb ūdabaʰ šəbī hīʰ ləkol hāʾārūsōt</i>
reason	<i>yaʾan bəmišpātay māʾāsū wəʾāt huqqōtay lōʰ hālākū bāhām wəʾūt šabbətōtay ḥillēlū kī ʾah̄rē gillūlēhām libbām hōlēk</i>
result	I, for my part , swore to them in the wilderness that I would not bring them into the land that I had given them, a land flowing with milk and honey, the most glorious of all lands,
reason	because they rejected my ordinances and did not observe my statutes, and profaned my sabbaths; for their heart went after their idols.

PA with the reversed order. V. 15 may seem to be the continuation of the unit 20:13–14, at least from the point of view of person (both in vv. 13 and 14 the subject is in the 1st person). But v. 14 tells the story of God changing his mind instead of punishing Israel; v. 15, on the other hand, reminds of the promise to punish Israel. Moreover, clear correlation between *yaʾan*

²⁹ Or: “**Because** they say, ‘The LORD has forsaken the land, and the LORD does not see.’ **I, in turn** [will do the following:], my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity, but I will bring down their deeds upon their heads”; i.e. *kī* may be a correlative to *wagam ʾānī* like in the previous passage.

and *wagam ʾānī* in Ezekiel (cf. 5:11–12; 16:43; 23:35) and other cases of the order *result-reason* in the PA³⁰ allow to consider 20:15–16 a textual unit.

(6) Ezek 20:24–26

reason	<i>yaʿan mišpāṭay lō ʾāsū wəhuqqōṭay māʾāsū wəʾāt šabbəṭōṭay ḥillelū wəʾahārē gillūlē ʾābōtām ḥayū ʾēnēḥām</i>
result	<i>wagam ʾānī nātattī lāḥām huqqīm lō lōbīm ūmišpāṭīm lō yihyū bāḥām wāʾāṭammē ʾōtām bəmatṭənōtām bəhaʾābīr kol pātār rāḥam.</i>
reason'	<i>ləmaʿan ʾāšimmēm ləmaʿan yēdərū ʾāšār ʾānī yḥwh</i>
reason	Because they had not executed my ordinances, but had rejected my statutes and profaned my sabbaths, and their eyes were set on their ancestors' idols,
result	I, in turn, gave them statutes that were not good and ordinances by which they could not live. I defiled them through their very gifts, in their offering up all their firstborn,
reason'	in order that I might horrify them, so that they might know that I am the LORD.

(7) Ezek 23:35

metatext	<i>lākēn kōʰ ʾāmar ʾādōnāy yḥwh</i>
reason	<i>yaʿan šāḥaḥat ʾōtī wattašlīkī ʾōtī ʾahārē gawwēk</i>
result	<i>wagam ʾat šəʾē zimmāṭēk wəʾāt laznūtāyik</i>
metatext	Therefore thus says the LORD God:
reason	Because you have forgotten me and cast me behind your back,
result	therefore bear you also the consequences of your lewdness and whorings.

This passage deserves closer reading because of the 2nd person in the *result*.³¹ The translation “you in turn” or “you on your part” will be incongruous here. Nevertheless the context of preceding accusation beginning with *yaʿan* and the place of *wagam* at the outset of the *result* permit to include this passage into our list. The particle *gam* here may be additive (meaning “also”): the preceding context (vv. 5–9, 31f) provides a clear referent for “you also”, it is Oholia (Samaria), the sister of the addressee Oholiba (Jerusalem). I do not exclude the possibility that *gam* even in this case connotes retribution, but the passage remains dubious for me. The 2nd person in the *result* may be explained as follows: the Lord’s recipro-

³⁰ See note 7.

³¹ Cf. Jer 48:7; Ezek 16:51–53, but both passages are dubious.

cal action is not mentioned in the *result*, whereas the attention is drawn to the effect of this action upon Oholiba (personified Jerusalem).

(8) Ezek 24:9

metatext	<i>lākēn kōʰ ʾāmar ʾādōnāy yḥwh</i>
reason	<i>ʾōy ʾīr haddāmīm</i>
result	<i>wagam ʾānī ʾagdāl hammədārāʰ</i>
metatext	Therefore thus says the Lord God:
reason	Woe to the bloody city!
result	I for my part will make the pile great.

The *reasons* beginning with *ʾōy* or *hōy* followed by nominal clauses are not as frequent as those beginning with *yaʿan*. It was Wolff who has argued for the inclusion of these texts into the class of *reasons* (cf. Isa 31:2 further). Usually the *reasons* beginning with *ʾōy/hōy* are much longer; Ezek 24:9 is the example of extreme brevity, though balanced with the brevity of the *result*. The *reason* character of the clause *ʾōy ʾīr haddāmīm* is confirmed by Ezek 9:9 where an expression very close in wording is included into the description of the land’s “crime”: *wattimmālē ḥāʾārāš dāmīm*.

Most of Ezekiel’s PA with *wagam* + IPP have the *reason* beginning with *yaʿan* (five cases out of the eight), which conforms to the classical preexilic prophetic style of Isa and Jer. It is worth noting that the connector *lākēn* (*kōʰ ʾāmar yḥwh*) never appears in these Ezekiel’s PA with *wagam* + IPP between *reason* and *result*. One of the possible explanations is that *wagam* + IPP appearing on the border between the two text spans takes on the function and the meaning of the logical connector *lākēn*.³²

The number of cases of PA with *wagam* + IPP as a marker of the result text span (8) permits to consider it a feature of Ezekiel’s prophetic style. The issues of style are not the theme of my work, but the question of the origin of this feature leads us to the text of Lev 26 which is usually treated as a literary precursor of many passages in Ezekiel.³³ Here, among the many similarities with the language of Ezekiel,³⁴ we find *gam* + IPP in a very similar function:

³² This shift in the meaning of *gam* may be attested in the cases of its translation in the PA as “therefore” (NRSV in Ezek 5:12; 8:18; 16:43; 23:35). See also my commentary to Ezek 5:11–12 above.

³³ Whether Lev 26 (or the Holiness Code in general) or Ezek was the source is a matter of dispute; most of the scholars opt for Lev 26 being earlier than the original layers of Ezek.

³⁴ See, e.g., Zimmerli (1979, 50–52). The terminological connections between the punishments in Ezek 4–5 and Lev 26 are adduced by Rooker (1990, 61f). Most recently Milgrom (2001, 2363) gives nine examples of borrowing “from Lev 26 to

(9) Lev 26:23–24

reason *wə'im bə'ellā' lō' tiwwāsərū lī wahālakām 'immī qārī*
 result *wəhālakti 'ap³⁵ 'ānī 'immākām baqārī*
wəhikkēti 'ātkām gam 'ānī šāba' 'al ḥaṭṭō'tēkām...

reason **If** in spite of these punishments you have not learned from **me**,
 but continue hostile **to me**,
 result **then I too** will continue hostile **to you**:
I too will strike you sevenfold for **your** sins.

It is not a case of PA, but the *reason-result* relation along with the reciprocity of action and reaction undoubtedly is present here.³⁶ *lī* and *'immāi* in the reason text span; *'immākām*, *'ātkām* and *ḥaṭṭō'tēkām* in the result text span. Note the non-initial position of *gam* + IPP and interchange of *gam* with *'ap*,³⁷ though not corroborated by the Samaritan version. Most other cases of textual units with the *reason-result* relation in Lev 26 have *'ap 'ānī* in the result text span:³⁸ Lev 26:14–17, 27–33, 40b–41a; the *result* in 26:18–20 is not marked by a particle.

* * *

The rest of cases with *gam* + IPP in the *result* of PA found in the books of the writing prophets can be analysed in the same way as (1)–(8). I will quote only the problematic passages.

(10) Isa 31:1–3

reason *hōy hayyōradīm mišrayim lə'āzrā' 'al sūsīm yiššā'ēnū*
wayyib'təhū 'al rākāb kī rāb wə'al pārasīm kī 'āšəmū mə'ōd
wəlō' šā'ū 'al qədōš yišrā'ēl wə'at yhw h lō' dārāšū
 result *wəgam hū' hākām wayyābē' rā' wə'at dəbārāw lō' hēsēr*
wəqām 'al bēt mərə'im wə'al 'āzrat pō'ālē 'āwān
ūmišrayim 'ādām wəlō' 'ēl wəšūšehām bāsār wəlō' rā'h
wayhwh yattā' yādō wəkāšal 'ōzēr wənāpal 'āzūr
wəyahdāw kullām yiklāyūn

Ezekiel". None of these authors mentions the discussed usage of *gam/ap* as an example of connection between Lev 26 and Ezekiel. To my knowledge, only Van der Merwe (1990, 153) noticed the similarity in the usage of *gam* between Lev 26:24 and Ezek 5:11 (amazingly enough, only one example out of 8 in Ezekiel).

³⁵ The Samaritan version has *gm* here.

³⁶ For the “conditional” PA beginning with *'im* cf. 2Chr 15:2.

³⁷ On this interchange see Van der Merwe 1990, 152f.

³⁸ Cf. 2 Chr 12:5.

reason **Alas** for those who go down to Egypt for help and who rely on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong, but do not look to the Holy One of Israel or consult the LORD!
 result **Yet he too** is wise and brings disaster; he does not call back his words, but will rise against the house of the evildoers, and against the helpers of those who work iniquity. The Egyptians are human, and not God; their horses are flesh, and not spirit. When the LORD stretches out his hand, the helper will stumble, and the one helped will fall, and they will all perish together.

At first glance *gam* in 31:2 bears its usual additive component of meaning: those who go down to Egypt for help are in a sense “wise”, cunning in contriving a means for military success—so he is wise too in inventing the ways of punishment. On the other hand there are here clear signs of PA with the expressed negative reciprocity fairness: 31:1 recalls a number of crimes, followed by the promise of punishment in 31:2–3; *reason* points to the one part's abuse of the other part (the Holy One) being the subject of the *result* text span.

(11) Isa 66:3–4

reason *šōhēl haššōr makkē' 'š zōbē'h hasšā' 'ōrēp kälāb*
mas'ālē' minhā' dam ḥāzār mazkār ləbōnā məbārēk 'āwān
gam hēmā' bāhārū bədārkēhām ūbāšiqqūšēhām napšām ḥāpēšā'
 result *gam 'ānī 'ābḥar bəta'ālūlēhām ūmāgūrōtām 'ābī' lāhām*
 reason' *ya'an qārā'tī wə'ēn 'ōnā' dibbartī wəlō' šāmē'ū*
wayya'āsū hāras' bə'ēnay ūba'āšār lō' ḥāpaštī bāhārū

reason Whoever slaughters an ox is like one who kills a human being; whoever sacrifices a lamb, like one who breaks a dog's neck; whoever presents a grain offering, like one who offers swine's blood; whoever makes a memorial offering of frankincense, like one who blesses an idol. **These** have chosen their own ways, and in their abominations they take delight;

result **I also** will choose to mock them, and bring upon them what they fear;

reason' **because**, when I called, no one answered, when I spoke, they did not listen; but they did what was evil in my sight, and chose what did not please me.

The passage is unique in introducing one of the clauses of the *reason* text span with *gam* + IPP, which is correlative to *gam* + IPP opening the *result*. Correlative repetition of an additive particle or conjunction is no surprise

in most of the languages of our cultural milieu. For the repetitions of *gam* in the Hebrew Bible see [BDB]; Jer 51:49 is probably another example of *gam* ... *gam* marking *reason* and *result*, but the text is difficult.

The structure of this PA resembles very much (2) and (3), if we consider *kî* as a correlative to *gam* + IPP. If it is true, we have a number of cases with a sort of preamble to a *reason* or a preliminary statement of crime unmarked by any particle; a *reason* proper is marked by *kî* or *gam* + IPP.

(12) Jer 13:25b–26 is too obvious to quote; the *reason* begins with *ʾāšār*, which is rare (but cf. Mic 6:12f).

(13) Jer 31:37 is problematic, but may be interpreted as follows: The condition clause beginning with *ʾim*³⁹ does not look like a *reason*; on the other hand, the clause introduced by *gam ʾānî* is obviously a *result* followed by *reason*; the metatext frame is typical for PA.

metatext	<i>kô^h ʾāmar yhw</i>
“reason”	<i>ʾim yimmaddû hasšāmayim milma^llā wəyēhāqərû mōsədə ʾārūš ləmallā</i>
result	<i>gam ʾānî ʾām^ʾas bəkol zāra^ʾ yišrāʾēl</i>
reason	<i>ʾal kol ʾāšār ʾāsū</i>
metatext	<i>nəʾūm yhw</i>

metatext	Thus says the LORD:
“reason”	If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth below can be explored,
result	then I will reject all the offspring of Israel
reason	because of all they have done,
metatext	says the LORD.

In this context the conditional clause may be interpreted as a hidden quotation of an opponent who doubts the unfathomable wisdom of Yahweh who upholds Israel, his own nation, as he maintains the fixed cosmic order of his creation (vv. 35f.). Thereby the prophet defends Israel’s status as the nation of Yahweh. Naturally, this passage may be included in the list of examples relevant for the present study only with reservation: it is not a “classical” prophetic PA, rather a “hymnic poem”⁴⁰ in the form of PA.

³⁹ For *ʾim* introducing the *reason* see (9) and note 36.

⁴⁰ Carroll 1996 ad loc.

(14) Jer 48:7

reason	<i>kî yaʾan biḥēk bəma^ʾāsayik ūbəʾōšərōtayik</i>
result	<i>gam ʾat tillākēdî wəyāšā^ʾ kəmoš baggōlā^h kōhānā^ʾw wešārā^ʾw yaḥdā^ʾw</i>

reason	Surely, because you trusted in your strongholds and your treasures,
result	you also shall be taken; Chemosh shall go out into exile, with his priests and his attendants.

Undoubtedly we have an example of PA here. As to the meaning of *gam*, its function as a marker of the *result* is not so certain. It may be an additive *gam*. The problem of this interpretation is that it is not easy to find a clear referent for “also”.

For the 2nd person in the *result* see my commentary to (7).

(15) Hos 4:6

reason	<i>kî ʾattā^h hadda^ʾat mā^ʾastā</i>
result	<i>wəʾām^ʾaskā mikkahēn lî</i>
reason ^ʾ	<i>wattīškəḥ tōrat ʾālōhēkā</i>
result ^ʾ	<i>ʾāškəḥ bānēkā gam ʾānî</i>

reason	Because you have rejected knowledge,
result	I reject you from being a priest to me.
reason ^ʾ	And since you have forgotten the law of your God,
result ^ʾ	I in turn will forget your children.

This beautiful piece of poetry is full of poetic devices which sew two PA together into one textual unit. I will point out only the inversion, because it is responsible for the non-initial position of *gam ʾānî*. The inversion is recognisable here on two levels: a) on the level of the PA¹ (the final position of the verb in the *reason* and the initial position of the verb in the *result*);⁴¹ b) on the level of the textual unit PA¹ + PA² (the initial and the final position of the personal pronoun, respectively). I am not sure there is a way to express the inversion (b) in good English, that is why I did not bring the translation in correspondence with it.

It is interesting to compare this passage with Hos 12:12, where two PA are also juxtaposed, the *result* clause of the second PA having *gam* (without IPP) at the beginning.

⁴¹ The inversion is supplemented by the lexical repetition *mā^ʾastā—wəʾām^ʾaskā* (*epanastrophē* in the Greek rhetorical theory).

(16) Am 4:4–7

reason	<i>bō'ū bēt 'ēl ūpiš'ū haggilgāl harbū lipšō'^s wəhābī'ū labbōqār zibhēkām lišlōšāt yāmim ma'sərōtēkām wəqattēr mēhāmēs tōdā^h wəqir'ū nādābōt hāsmī'ū kī kēn 'āhābīām bənē yisrā'ēl nə'ūm 'ādōnāy yhw wəgām 'ānī nātātī lākām niqyōn šinnayim bəkol 'ārēkām wəhōsār lāhām bəkol məqōmōtēkām wəlō' šabtām 'āday nə'ūm yhw wəgām 'ānōki māna'tī mikkām 'āt haggāšām...</i>
reason	Come to Bethel—and transgress; to Gilgal—and multiply transgression; bring your sacrifices every morning, your tithes every three days; bring a thank offering of leavened bread, and proclaim freewill offerings, publish them; for so you love to do, O people of Israel! says the Lord God.
result	I, in turn , gave you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and lack of bread in all your places, yet you did not return to me, says the LORD. And I also withheld the rain from you...

(17) Mic 6:12–13 is interpreted in Wolff 1990, ad loc.⁴² Before Wolff 1990 there was a tendency to look for an antecedent for *'āšār* in v. 12. I hope my study provides additional arguments for *'āšār* being a marker of *reason* text span.

(18) Mal 2:8–9 is also mentioned in Wolff 1990, 195. Note the *reason*' introduced by absolutely unique for prophetic discourse and undoubtedly late *kəpī 'āšār*.

* * *

There are cases of the same usage of *gam* + IPP outside of the writing prophets:

(19) Jud 2:20–22

metatext	<i>wayyihar 'ap yhw bəyisrā'ēl wayyō'mār</i>
reason	<i>ya'an 'āšār 'ābərū haggōy hazzā^h 'āt bərūtī 'āšār šiwwitī 'āt 'ābōtām wəlō' šāmə'a^h laqōlī</i>
result	<i>gam 'ānī lō' 'ōsīp ləhōrīš 'iš mippənēhām min haggōyim 'āšār 'āzab yəhōšū'^s wayyāmōt</i>

⁴² This interpretation is accepted in McKane 1998. I have to confess that this very interpretation of Wolff was the decisive impulse for the present research.

metatext	So the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel; and he said,
reason	“Because this people have transgressed my covenant that I commanded their ancestors, and have not obeyed my voice,
result	I in turn no longer drive out before them any of the nations that Joshua left when he died.”

It is no surprise that we do not see any prophet nearby: the PA is first of all a divine speech, which may be quoted in a narrative without mentioning any mediator.

(20) Prov 1:24–27

reason	<i>ya'an qārā'tī wattəmā'ēnū nāfītī yādī wə'en maqšīb wattiprə'ū kol 'āšātī wə'tōkahtī lō' 'ābūtām</i>
result	<i>gam 'ānī bə'ēdākām 'āšhāq 'ālsag bəbō' pəhdākām bəbō' kəšō'a^h pəhdākām wə'ēdākām kəsūpā^h yə'ātā^h bəbō' 'ālēkām šārā^h wəšūqā^h</i>
reason	Because I have called and you refused, have stretched out my hand and no one heeded, and because you have ignored all my counsel and would have none of my reproof,
result	I in turn will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when panic strikes you, when panic strikes you like a storm, and your calamity comes like a whirlwind, when distress and anguish come upon you.

It seems to me that the prophetic style of the Wisdom's reproof (*tōkaḥat*) in Prov 1:22–33 is easily recognisable by the presence of two PA, our passage being the first one, vv. 29–31—the second.⁴³

3. Conclusion

Gam as a marker of the *result* text unit of the PA occurs only in the judgment speech, hence it is a marker of the announcement of punishment. It lays bare the reciprocal relationship between participants,⁴⁴ which is

⁴³ Its accusation begins with *taḥat kī*, cf. more usual opening *taḥat 'āšār*: 2Kings 22:17 (= 2Chr 34:25); Isa 53:12; Jer 29:19.

⁴⁴ Van der Merwe in his book dedicated to the syntactic-semantic description of *gam* in Gen-Kings describes one of the above cases (Lev 26:24b) in the very similar terms: “Common to the sentence content relations in all these cases [including Lev 26:24b] is the fact that SV [Sachverhalt], referred to in the second sentence, follows the former in time, as a reciprocal, corresponding action or a corresponding result” (Van der Merwe 1990, 151).

characteristic for every PA (see 1.3). Since *gam* occurs only in the judgment speech, it connotes the negative reciprocity fairness from the part of Yahweh. It takes initial position in a sentence and is followed by independent first person pronoun; in most cases it is preceded by the conjunction *wə*. Excluding the cases where the statement of the reason is joined to the result asyndetically or the *reason* is represented by question or imperative, *gam* has a regular correlative—a marker of the accusation of the judgment speech (*yaʿan*, *yaʿan ʾāšār*, *ʾāšār kî*, *ʾôy*, *hōy*). PA with *gam* + IPP never has metatextual elements (like *lākēn*) between *reason* and *result*. It may point to the appropriation of the function of *lākēn* by *gam* + IPP.

PA with *gam* + IPP belongs to the style of exilic-postexilic prophets, who are familiar with the fully conceptualized idea of the covenant—reciprocal relationship between Yahweh and his people. This usage of *gam* in Ezekiel, other prophetic books and in Proverbs is probably influenced by the language of the Holiness Code (Lev 26).

The article in BDB⁴⁵ may be supplemented by the gloss “expressing negative reciprocity in the judgment speech” which would refer to the passages discussed in the present article.

⁴⁵ Unfortunately the results of BDB in the description of this usage of *gam* had been almost completely lost for HALAT.

References

- Carroll, R. P. *The Book of Jeremiah. A Commentary* (OTL). London, 1996.
- Gowan, D. E. “The Use of *yaʿan* in Biblical Hebrew”. *VT* 21 (1971) 168–185.
- Humbert, J. “La formule hébraïque *en hineni* suivi d’un participe”. *REJ* 97 (1934) 54–59.
- Koch, K. *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition. The Form-Critical Method*. Transl. from the second German edition by S. M. Cupitt. New York, 1969.
- Korelsky, T., Kittredge, R. “On the Stratification of Rhetorical Structures”. *The Moscow Linguistic Journal* 2 (1996) 212–226.
- Labuschagne, C. J. “The Emphasizing particle GAM and its Connotations”. // *Studia biblica et semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen dedicata*. Wageningen, 1966, 193–203.
- Mann, W., Thompson, S. *Rhetorical Structure Theory: A Theory of Text Organization*. Technical Report No. ISI/RS-87-190, University of Southern California, Information Sciences Institute, 1987.
- McKane, W. *The Book of Micah. Introduction and Commentary*. Edinburgh, 1998.
- Milgrom, J. *Leviticus 17–27* (AB). New York, 2001.
- Mulder, M. J. “Die Partikel *yaʿan*”. *Syntax and Meaning*. Ed. A. S. van der Woude. *OTS* 18, 1973, 49–83.
- Muraoka, T. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem/Leiden, 1985.
- Rooker, M. F. *Biblical Hebrew in Transition* (JSOTSup 90). Sheffield, 1990.
- Sweeney, M. A. *Isaiah 1–39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL). Grand Rapids, 1996.
- Tucker, G. M. *Form Criticism of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia, 1971.
- Tucker, G. M. “Prophetic Speech”. *Interpretation* 32 (1978) 31–45.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. *The Old Hebrew Particle gam. A Syntactic-semantic Description of gam in Gn-2Kg* (ATAT). St. Ottilien, 1990.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. “Old Hebrew Particles and the Interpretation of Old Testament Texts”. *JSOT* 60 (1993) 27–44.
- Waltke, B. K., O’Connor, M. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, 1990.
- Wendland, E. R. *The Discourse Analysis of Hebrew Prophetic Literature. Determining the Larger Textual Units of Hosea and Joel*. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter, 1994.

Westermann, C. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. Transl. by H. C. White. Cambridge/Louisville, Kentucky, 1991.

Wierzbicka, A. "Metatekst w teksście". // Mayenowa, M. R. (ed.). *O spójności tekstu*. Wrocław etc., 1971, 105–121.

Wolff, H. W. "Die Begründungen der prophetischen Heils- und Unheilssprüche". *ZAW* 52 (1934) 1–22.

Wolff, H. W. *Joel and Amos* (Hermeneia). Philadelphia, 1977.

Wolff, H. W. *Micah. A Commentary*. Transl. by G. Stansell. Minneapolis, 1990.

Zimmerli, W. *Ezekiel I. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1–24* (Hermeneia). Transl. by R. E. Clements. Philadelphia, 1979.

Russian
State University
For the Humanities

● **Orientalia**
et **Classica**

Papers of the Institute of Oriental
and Classical Studies

Issue V

Babel und Bibel 1
*Ancient Near Eastern,
Old Testament
and Semitic Studies*

Moscow
2004