

Towards a New Proposal for Translating the Conjunction כִּי in Deuteronomy 4.29¹

[Prepublication Copy]

Full Article: Peter Goeman, “Towards a New Proposal for Translating the Conjunction כִּי in Deuteronomy 4.29,” *The Bible Translator* 71, no. 2 (Aug 2020): 158–178.

Introduction

Bible translators have no easy task. Complexities exist in both the biblical languages as well as the target language, resulting in many difficult translation decisions. Unavoidably, to a certain degree each translation ends up reflecting the translator’s interpretation and understanding. From time to time these translations are challenged and new interpretations are proposed based on a reexamination of the evidence.

Accordingly, it is the goal of this paper to challenge the traditional English translation of Deuteronomy 4.29 and propose a new translation. Historically, this verse has been translated in English as part of a conditional clause.² However, I believe there is enough evidence to seriously reconsider the English translations. Before looking at this evidence, a brief survey of English translations demonstrates the near-universal translation of Deuteronomy 4.29 as a conditional statement (see Table 1).³

¹ I am grateful for the constructive feedback I received on an earlier draft of this paper from Abner Chou and William Barrick. Their feedback helped sharpen the focus of this paper. However, any remaining shortcomings in this article are the fault of the author.

² This translational history goes back as far as the 1382 AD Wycliffe Bible.

³ The only exceptions I noted were the HCSB (2009)/CSB (2017) and YLT (1862), which translate the pertinent clause as “when” rather than “if.”

Table 1: Representative English Translations of Deuteronomy 4.29⁴

But from there, you will search for the LORD your God, and you will find Him when you seek Him with all your heart and all your soul. (CSB)
But from there you will seek the LORD your God and you will find him, if you search after him with all your heart and with all your soul. (ESV)
But if from thence thou shalt seek the LORD thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul. (KJV)
But from there you will seek the LORD your God, and you will find Him if you search for Him with all your heart and all your soul. (NASB) ⁵
But if you seek the LORD your God from there, you will find him, if, indeed, ⁶ you seek him with all your heart and soul. (NET)
But if from there you seek the LORD your God, you will find him if you seek him with all your heart and with all your soul. (NIV) ⁷
From there you will seek the LORD your God, and you will find him if you search after him with all your heart and soul. (NRSV) ⁸

The issue at hand is how the כִּי clause should be translated. The Hebrew reads as follows:

ובקשתם משם את־יהוה אלהיך ומצאת כי תדרשנו בכל־לבבך ובכל־נפשך

Although the majority of English translations convey a conditional understanding (“if”), I would like to suggest that the evidence points toward a translation of certainty. I will argue that the evidence points to a causal translation (“for/because”),⁹ though a temporal nuance (“when”) may also be possible. If my proposal is correct, Deuteronomy 4.29 would be giving the reason why Israel will seek Yahweh and find Him. Ultimately, Israel will seek and find Yahweh because they will seek Yahweh with full devotion.

⁴ Emphasis has been added for ease of comparison.

⁵ Both NASB (1977) and NASU (1995) have the same reading.

⁶ The NET Bible utilizes a conditional *and* emphatic translation.

⁷ Both the 1984 and 2011 NIV translations have the same reading.

⁸ Both RSV (1952) and NRSV (1989) have the same conditional reading.

⁹ Such seems to be the understanding of BDB (1977, 473) which lists Deut 4.29 under the section of כִּי translated as “Because, since (ὅτι).” BDB further describes the understanding of this use of כִּי as, “Enunciating the conditions under which a fut. action is conceived as possible.” BDB connects this idea to the German translation *indem* (“by/while”) rather than *wenn* (“if/when”).

The Immediate Context of Deuteronomy 4.29

Deuteronomy 4.29 is a part of a special pericope (4.25-31) that follows a summarization of Israel's history. By reminding Israel of their past (vv. 1-21), Moses points the people toward God's goodness despite their sinful history. Moses then uses the springboard of the past as a warning and an impetus for "future thought and action" (Merrill 1994, 114).¹⁰ As such, Moses urges the people to remember from where they have come, and to remember that their God is a "consuming fire, a jealous God" (v. 24).

Following verse 24, Deuteronomy 4.25 begins a new unit of thought set apart by the כִּי particle. Most English translations translate this כִּי clause as temporal ("when").¹¹ Bandstra observes that when a temporal כִּי is used with a *qatal* or *yiqtol* verb, it signals a "new departure," which is "meant to be discontinuous with the context" (1982, 124). Although this כִּי clause could be conditional, it is more likely temporal. When a "context suggests a higher probability that the contents of the כִּי clause will actually occur," then a translation of "when" is appropriate to express more certainty (see Aejmelaeus 1986, 197).¹²

In defense of the temporal translation of v. 25, we should note that the context speaks of Israel's subsequent generations: children (בָּנִים) and children's children (וּבְנֵי בָנִים) (see Robson 2016, 154). The certainty of having children argues that this is talking about an expected future time period. Additionally, throughout Deuteronomy the certainty of entering and living in

¹⁰ Cf. Mayes 1993, 199. Mayes states, "The reflections on the past and future reach progressively further in each succeeding section.... vv. 25-28 look forward to the Babylonian exile ... vv. 29-31 unite both farthest past and farthest future in seeing the possibility of Israel's renewal in exile on the basis of covenant with the patriarchs, a possibility assured by the very fact that it is with Israel alone out of all the nations that God has entered into a special relationship (vv. 32-40)."

¹¹ Here we have the כִּי particle with an imperfect verb, likely indicating a future time period. Cf. Fuller and Choi 2017, §80f, "This flexible particle, when used temporally, may be used for past time, with the perfect, and for present and future time, usually with the imperfect." See also Robson 2016, 154. It should be noted that although some scholars combine the conditional and temporal categories (cf. *DCH*, 1993–2011, 386), it is still necessary within such classifications to differentiate כִּי clauses that have temporal nuance. Thus, it seems helpful at the outset to maintain a distinction between conditional and temporal understandings (cf. Aejmelaeus 1986, 197).

¹² Aejmelaeus goes on to acknowledge that the line between conditional and temporal is often vague, and so the decision ends up being an examination of the context.

Canaan is expressed temporally in similar ways: either with $\text{כִּי} + \text{הָיָה}$ (cf. 6.10; 11.29), or with $\text{כִּי} +$ an imperfect verb (e.g., 6.20; 7.1; 12.20, 29; cf. 4.25). The Deuteronomic expectation is that there will be a future life experience in Canaan. Thus, it seems reasonable that for the reader of Deuteronomy 4.25 the situation laid out was expected to be a future experience.

Verse 25 continues by starting a *weqatal* verb sequence. When a *weqatal* sequence follows an imperfect verb, it is most naturally viewed as communicating succession tied to the imperfect verb.¹³ Thus, in this case, Israel will father children (תוליד), and they will dwell in the land (ונושנתם); but then they will act corruptly (והשחתם),¹⁴ make idols for themselves (ועשיתם), and do evil in God’s sight (ועשיתם). Importantly, each of these *weqatal* verb forms carries on the idea of the previous *yiqtol* form (תוליד) in an unbroken chain. If this unbroken *weqatal* sequence is tied to the temporal clause at the start of v. 25, then this is evidence that this section is meant to be read as a prophecy about Israel’s future (cf. Kalland 1992, 46).¹⁵

Verse 26 interjects with what might be described as an instantaneous use of the perfect (see Waltke and O’Connor 1990, §30.5.1.d.).¹⁶ This use of the perfect is natural in direct speech, and often occurs in prophetic contexts, or contexts of certitude (Fuller and Choi 2017, §3q). As Weinfeld notes, “When one makes a formal declaration, one uses the finite verb, though the declaration pertains to the present or future and not to the past” (1991, 201).¹⁷ The temporal marker “today” (היום) also provides evidence that this is an instantaneous perfect. The speaker is

¹³ On this point, see Fuller and Choi 2017, §6d; Arnold and Choi 2003, §3.5.2; Chisholm, Jr. 1998, 99-103.

¹⁴ Although some English translations see a conditional clause beginning with this *weqatal*, there is no indication of a break here. See Robson 2016, 155.

¹⁵ The statements about Israel’s future here are so strong and coincide so well with what happens that it has caused some commentators to label this passage *vaticinium ex eventu* (a prediction after the fact) since it matches with Israel’s future so closely. For one such commentator, see Biddle 2003, 87, who states, “In fact, vv. 24–28 go on to describe events very similar to those of the Babylonian crisis, occasioning suspicions that they represent a *vaticinium ex eventu*, a prediction after the fact.”

¹⁶ “An instantaneous perfective represents a situation occurring at the very instant the expression is being uttered. This use appears chiefly with *verba dicendi* (‘verbs of speaking,’ swearing, declaring, advising, etc.) or gestures associated with speaking.”

¹⁷ Such declarations usually utilize הנה or ראה (cf. Gen 1.29, 41.41; 47.23; Deut 2.31; 30.15).

providing a contrast between the current situation facing Israel with the future promise of quick removal from the land. In other words, Moses is passionately testifying to Israel that they will not be long in the land, but they will be devastated in the future.

Verse 27 starts another *weqatal* sequence, which either connects to the previous chain in v. 25 or, more likely, connects to the imperfect verbs in v. 26, “You will utterly perish” (אבד), “You will not live long in it” (לא־תאריכּן ימים), and “You will be utterly destroyed” (תשמדון). Verse 27 continues these ideas by stating that Yahweh will scatter (והפיץ) Israel among the peoples, and they will remain among the nations (ונשארתם) in exile. Verse 28 likewise continues the chain of *weqatals* and reveals that in their exile Israel will serve other gods (ועבדתם).¹⁸ Although in some cases the extended relative clause of v. 28 might be seen as a break in the chain of *weqatals*, the repetition of שם in vv. 28 and 29 ties the *weqatal* chain together.¹⁹ Thus, v. 29 continues the *same* chain of *weqatals* with the statement that from their exile Israel will seek Yahweh (ובקשתם), and not only seek him, but they will find him (ומצאת).²⁰ We will address the second half of this verse in detail, but for now it is important to observe the *weqatal* sequence links with the foregoing thoughts of v. 26 and following (see Robson 2016, 158).

¹⁸ As will be discussed later, this prophecy is quite similar to the sequence of events that is found in Deut 29–30 as well as in the prophets. For one example, see Hosea 3.4–5. Notably, both Deuteronomy 4.30 and Hosea 3.5 are tied together through the concept of the “latter days” (באחרית הימים).

¹⁹ שם occurs once in each verse (4x; 4.26–29), tying them all together.

²⁰ It is of interest here to observe the switch from plural “you will seek” (ובקשתם) to the singular “you will find” (ומצאת). McConville sees this as evidence that indicates, “a significant new turn in the argument. The ‘seeking’ of Yahweh by Israel is not merely the next in a series of events, to be taken for granted” (McConville 2002, 110). However, in Deuteronomy 4 there are at least nine significant switches between singular and plural, and one cannot argue each switch is a new turn in the argument. Switches between singular and plural take place in Deut 4.1; 4.3; 4.5 (although רצה may simply be a discourse marker and not a true change); 4.9; 4.11; 4.19; 4.20; 4.23; 4.25; 4.29.

In fact, the pattern of a plural verb switching to a singular occurs 15 times in Deuteronomy, a common pattern without significant changes in argumentation (Cf. Deut 2.24; 4.29; 7.25; 11.10; 12.5; 12.16; 13.1; 14.21; 19.19; 22.24; 27.2; 27.4; 28.62; 31.19). It may be that the change in plurality and singularity is intended for emphasis (Mayes 1993, 201; Weinfeld 1991, 222–23) but to go beyond that seems to be too much speculation. But, see Christensen 2001, 96. Christensen argues that this shift to the singular marks a “new rhythmic unit, which continues through v. 34.” Christensen holds that these occurrences of *Numeruswechsel* are tied to Deuteronomy being an aural book intended to be heard, and thus marking rhythmic units (2001, c–ci).

Further, it is helpful to note at this point that the “heart” and “soul” language used here (and elsewhere in Deuteronomy) is an expectation of Israel’s full commitment to Yahweh.²¹

At this point, v. 30 seems to confirm our understanding of the context being one of prophetic certainty (Merrill 1994, 128).²² Although the LXX takes the phrase “When you are in tribulation” (בצר לך), as the completion of v. 29 (see Wevers 1995, 83), it is best interpreted as asyndesis, and thus belongs at the beginning of v. 30 (Robson 2016, 159).²³ This asyndesis argues for an explanatory connection between v. 30 and the prior verses (Robson 2016, 159).²⁴ The adverbial temporal phrase followed by a *weqatal* is a fairly regularly expression of time found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (see Robson 2016, 159; Waltke and O’Connor 1990, §32.2.6b),²⁵ and it emphasizes temporal certainty rather than conditionality. This certainty is expressed in the translation, “When you are in distress and all these things have come upon you...” (בצר לך ומצאוך כל הדברים האלה).²⁶ The verse continues, “in the latter days you will return to the LORD your God and listen to His voice” (באחרית הימים ושבת עדיהוה אלהיך ושמעת בקלו). Although some do not see the phrase “latter days” (באחרית הימים) as being eschatological, it has been argued elsewhere that the uniqueness of the phrase and the context of its usage suggest that it is a reference to an eschatological sequence and time period which the prophets build upon and expand (see Beale 2011, 92-102).²⁷ If the foregoing interpretation is correct, then v. 30 provides

²¹ Kalland 1992, 42, notes that the only way out of this future predicament is complete recommitment to Yahweh. Kalland also observes that this language of full commitment is picked up in 6.5; 10.12; 11.13; 26.16; 30.2, 6, 10—a connection which will be addressed in the following section.

²² “Not to be overlooked here is the absence of any conditionality. The text is clear that it is not a matter of if Israel returns and obeys but when. Repentance is obviously a matter of free will, but the biblical witness is unanimous that the impetus to repent is something God himself will plant within his people in order to encourage and enable them to return to him and to the land (cf. Lev 26:40–45; Deut 30:1–10; Jer 31:27–34; Ezek 36:22–31).”

²³ Robson states that the attempt to fit בצר לך with verse 29 “represents an attempt to simplify the syntax (*BHQ: Deuteronomy, 63**) and leaves ומצאוך hanging, not consequent on the preceding actions.”

²⁴ In his introduction, Robson states that asyndesis functions one of two ways: (1) as an explanatory or parenthetical phrase, or (2) a start of a new section (Robson 2016, 7).

²⁵ As examples, Waltke and O’Connor give Exod 16.6–7, Deut 4.30, Isa 16.14, Judg 16.2, Josh 2.14.

²⁶ This and the following quotation represent the 1995 NASB translation.

²⁷ Cf. Hos 3.4-5, Mic 4.1, Dan 10.14.

affirmation that the context of Deuteronomy 4.25-31 is one of prophetic certainty and not conditionality. Verse 31 concludes the section by providing the reason Israel can be assured of God's acceptance when they turn to Yahweh. Their God will accept them because He is merciful.

Having argued for a context of predictive prophecy in Deuteronomy 4.25-31, I submit we should allow this context to influence our translation of the ׀ clause in the latter half of v. 29. Given the surrounding context of Deuteronomy 4.29, it seems to make most sense to translate the phrase in question with certainty rather than conditionality. Not only does the near context give credence for this translation, but the remote context of Deuteronomy also appears to argue for this idea.

The Remote Context of Deuteronomy

Having argued for prophetic certainty from the near context of Deuteronomy 4.25-31, I also want to put forward a brief argument that the structure and message of Deuteronomy also point toward understanding Deuteronomy 4.25-31 as prophetic. Many scholars have pointed out the connection between Deuteronomy's latter and former chapters. For example, Christensen outlines Deuteronomy as a "concentric structure" with the following chiasmic pattern (1993, 9):

A—The Outer Frame: A Look Backwards (Deut 1–3)

B—The Inner Frame: The Great Peroration (4–11)

C—The Central Core: Covenant Stipulations (12–26)

B'—The Inner Frame: The Covenant Ceremony (27–30)

A'—The Outer Frame: A Look Forward (31–34)

In explaining this outline, Christensen argues that both of the “Outer Frame” sections (Deut 1–3 and 31–34) can be read together, as well as the two “Inner Frame” sections (Deut 4–11 and 27–30) (1993, 10).

McConville also notes a connection between the first and last parts of Deuteronomy. In his commentary he observes connections between Deuteronomy 27 and Deuteronomy 11 (2002, 387). Additionally, he notes that chapters 29–30 have connections with chapters 10–11 (2002, 413).

Other scholars have also noted connections between the early and latter part of Deuteronomy. Of special note are the works of Craigie, Tigay, Weinfeld, and Robson—all of whom have noted the various connections between Deuteronomy 4 and 30 (Craigie 1976, 363; Tigay 1996, 283; Weinfeld, 1991, 213-216; Robson 2016, 127-28). Regarding the connection between Deuteronomy 4 and 29–30, Robson observes the following:

Structurally within the book of Deuteronomy as a whole, there are close links with chapters 29–30: e.g., bowing down (השתחוה) and serving (עבד) gods of the nations that have been allotted (הלק) to those nations (4.10; 29.25 [ET 26]); calling heaven and earth as witnesses against them (העידתי בכם היום את־השמים ואת־הארץ) (4.26; 30.19); a forward look to exile (4.25-28; 29.22-28 [ET 23-29]) and possible restoration (4.29-31 and 30.1-10) (2016, 127-28).

Based on the foregoing observations, it seems reasonable to view Deuteronomy 29–30 as a further elaboration of what has come earlier. This observation seems confirmed by looking at the sequence between Deuteronomy 29 and 30. Deuteronomy 29 warns of exile, and Deuteronomy 30.1-10 provides assurance of salvation from exile which was warned of in the previous chapter.²⁸ This same chronological sequence is mirrored in Deuteronomy 4.25-31 (Tigay 1996, 283).

²⁸ Multiple authors have noted the chiasmic structure of Deuteronomy 30.1-10, which emphasizes Yahweh giving Israel a new heart, which facilitates their return to Him. See Block 2012, 695; McConville 2002, 424; Tigay 1996, 284.

Deuteronomy 30.6 emphasizes that Yahweh will circumcise Israel’s heart, and thus the Israelite will love Yahweh “with all your heart and all your soul” (בכל־לבבך ובכל־נפשך). Similarly, Deuteronomy 4.29 emphasizes that Israel will find Yahweh because they will seek him “with all your heart and all your soul” (בכל־לבבך ובכל־נפשך)—the exact same phrase as 30.6. In Deuteronomistic theology then, Yahweh is ultimately the one who circumcises Israel’s heart, and this action allows them to seek Yahweh with their whole heart.²⁹

Based on the foregoing discussion, the certainty of exile and restoration seem to be a key part of Deuteronomistic theology. The key to Israel’s return to Yahweh is a circumcised heart, which Yahweh himself will provide. It seems more than reasonable that Deuteronomy 4.29 is also communicating this message. Israel will find Yahweh when they are completely devoted to Yahweh—something Yahweh himself will ensure (cf. Deut 30.6).

Hebrew Grammar and כִּי Clauses³⁰

Up to this point, I have argued from the immediate and remote contexts that Deuteronomy 4.29 should be translated in accordance with prophetic certainty rather than conditionality. Although I have argued that both causal and temporal translations are more conducive to the context of Deuteronomy 4.29, I believe the grammatical evidence points more strongly toward a causal understanding.³¹

²⁹ Commentators often note the connection between Deuteronomy 30.6 and 10.16. In agreement with Meade (2014, 79-80), it seems best to see 10.16 as a command which Israel is incapable of obeying in their own power. Thus, God’s action in 30.6 becomes the necessary step which will bring about devotion to Yahweh (see Merrill, 1994, 388-89). This same paradigm seems present in Deuteronomy 4.25-31.

³⁰ For a thorough history of the study of the כִּי, see Locatell 2017, 10-34; Follingstad 2001, 15-63; Meyer 2001: 41-50.

³¹ It should be noted that Follingstad 2001 has argued against the idea of causal categories of כִּי, opting instead for a unified deictic usage. “The core function of כִּי is the same throughout all its contexts. It shifts viewpoint to the propositional content being structured, ‘mentioning’ it metarepresentationally as the object of discourse—marking it as a propositional content (thought or utterance) entertained about some state of affairs, rather than a description of them” (320). This idea has not found widespread acceptance among scholars (cf. *BHRG*, 432-433). Although a thorough examination of Follingstad’s proposal is not possible here, Locatell (2017, 111-118) has pointed out some of the problems with such an approach. Although not rejecting the category of causal כִּי, Muilenburg 1961

Concerning the general usage of כִּי clauses in Biblical Hebrew, it is well established that “כִּי mainly serves as a connective, a conjunction to join clauses to one another” (Aejmelaeus 1986, 195).³² Although there are a variety of ways a כִּי clause can be categorized,³³ for our purposes, the causal use of כִּי needs detailed attention.³⁴ However, to distinguish causal כִּי from other uses is sometimes difficult. In order to discern the nuance of כִּי, a significant factor is the relationship between the כִּי clause and the main clause (see Aejmelaeus 1986, 196; Bandstra 1982, 16-17, 90, 121, 159).

The כִּי clause must either precede the main clause or follow it. Bandstra has observed that 95% of the time a causal כִּי clause *follows* the main clause (1982, 159).³⁵ Bandstra also observed that a circumstantial כִּי clause *precedes* the main clause 94.7% of the time (Bandstra 1982, 121).³⁶ These observations are explainable in that the כִּי clause is related to the main clause through the concept of topicalization (Bandstra 1982, 90-92).³⁷ Thus, in a circumstantial clause,

argues that an original emphatic function of כִּי is to be found in varying degrees in all its uses. Aejmelaeus (1986, 195) correctly challenges the idea that a word’s etymology would be present in all of its functions (cf. Locatell 2017, 24).

³² That is not to say this is the sole function of כִּי. Meyer 2001 has cogently argued that כִּי also can relate to larger units of discourse. In the words of Locatell (2019, 79), “It also transcends morpho-syntactic categories by its extension to other word classes such as complementizer and discourse marker.” Yet, it is certainly most well known for its adverbial function.

³³ For a full listing of usages attributed to כִּי in Biblical Hebrew, see *HALOT*, 470–71; cf. Williams 2007, 156-159.

³⁴ The causal use of כִּי is often subcategorized. Bandstra subcategorizes causal כִּי into three categories: reason, grounds, and motive clauses (1982, 163-171). More recently, Locatell (2019, 82-96) has subcategorized causal כִּי into four domains: speech-act, epistemic, metalinguistic, and content. Helpfully, Locatell has traced the study of the causal use of כִּי (2019, 79-82). Among notable contributions, Claassen 1983 has noted that causal כִּי need not be related to two facts or events, but it can also indicate a speaker’s own position or discourse argument. Locatell 2019 calls this usage speech-act.

³⁵ In his study, Bandstra focused only on the Pentateuch and the Psalms. In his study of כִּי clauses he identifies 1,037 occurrences [my own search yielded 1,040] in the Pentateuch, and 443 in the Psalms (Bandstra, 18). Bandstra notes in his study that the causal use of כִּי is most prominent (58%) of the כִּי clauses (Bandstra, 159). Bandstra also notes that circumstantial כִּי clauses are second most common, occurring 18.4% of the time in his corpus (Bandstra, 121). For more on clause structure for causal כִּי, see Aejmelaeus 1986, 199; Locatell 2019, 84-86.

³⁶ See also Aejmelaeus 1986, 196.

³⁷ Concerning circumstantial (temporal and conditional) כִּי clauses, Bandstra states, “Our analysis of all the כִּי clauses in the Pentateuch reveals that a כִּי clause precedes the clause to which it is linked if it is a circumstantial, conditional-protasis or concessive clause. ... The reason for this fact is now transparent in the light of the topicalization principle. The principle that more topical material comes first can be applied not just to elements within a clause but also to clauses within a sentence. Temporal circumstantial clauses, as well as the ‘given’ clause

the information in the כִּי clause is antecedent to the main clause, and provides the backdrop to understanding the main clause. In contrast to the circumstantial כִּי clause, the causal כִּי clause follows the main clause and thus presupposes the main clause. Bandstra states, “The topicalization principle tells us that given or presupposed material normally comes first. Even though the כִּי clause is temporally or logically anterior to the main clause it follows it in the surface structure because the main clause is presupposed” (1982, 160).

Bandstra’s study is helpful for understanding the general workings of כִּי clauses in Hebrew grammar. However, Bandstra lists our passage (Deut 4.29) and eight other exceptions in Deuteronomy (6.25; 22.8; 28.2; 28.9; 28.13; 28.45; 30.10 2x) which he identifies as circumstantial כִּי clauses even though the כִּי clause follows the main clause (1982, 126).³⁸ Given that all of these exceptions take place in Deuteronomy, I think we profit by examining them in a little more detail.

Deuteronomy 6.25 is the first exception listed by Bandstra (excluding Deut 4.29). Most English translations treat the כִּי clause as a conditional clause.³⁹ The ESV translates it as “And it will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to do all this commandment before the LORD our God, as he has commanded us” (וצדקה תהיה־לָנוּ כִּי־נשמר לעשות את־כל־המצוה הזאת לפני יהוה אלהינו) (כאשר צונו). This translation views the first part of the sentence as the apodosis in the conditional sentence, with the protasis coming after the *athnach* (Robson 2016, 229). Although this could be

of a conditional sentence, and concessive statements, all contain information antecedent to or presupposed by the main clause. Hence these clauses are more topical than the main clause and will ordinarily come before it” (1982, 90-91).

In relation to causal clauses, Bandstra notes, “The כִּי clause breaks the narrative continuity (it is resumed in the next verse) and inserts anterior material. But the כִּי clause follows the main clause (because it is less topical) even though temporally prior. In those rare cases where the כִּי causal clause comes before the main clause the causal clause becomes the focus with the result/main clause becoming secondary” (1982, 92).

³⁸ *BHRG* (433) also lists Deut 4.29 as an example of a protasis following the apodosis, noting that it is rare. However, *BHRG* does not go into detail about how this phenomenon appears limited to Deuteronomy, nor do they list the eight exceptions that Bandstra does.

³⁹ YLT is the lone exception with a temporal translation of “when.”

a genuine exception to the normal grammatical patterns we see in the Pentateuch, two evidences may be used to argue for the expected causal nuance. First, the phrase which heads the verse, “And it will be righteousness for us” (וְצִדְקָה תְהִי־לָנוּ) is a disjunctive clause. It is extremely rare for a *vav* of apodosis to come before a noun. In fact, Joüon and Muraoka note that such a use is strictly a non-classical construction, and they give no examples in pre-exilic Hebrew (2006, §1711).⁴⁰ Second, the context of this verse is one of a father explaining to his children *why* Israel obeys the laws. In context it is acceptable to allow the last phrase to be the reason or motivation for Israel’s righteousness. In other words, within the father’s answer to the son the reason it is “righteousness to us” is because we are keeping (וְנִשְׁמֵר) God’s commands. To be sure, the father’s statements certainly contain inherent conditionality because of the covenantal context of law keeping. But I would propose that while conditionality is found in the context of the conversation between father and son, the grammar itself is emphasizing the role obedience has in being the reason righteousness would belong to the family.

Similar to the previous example, the last part of Deuteronomy 22.8 is treated by most English translations as a condition, “When you build a new house, you shall make a parapet for your roof, that you may not bring the guilt of blood upon your house, if anyone should fall from it” (כִּי־יִפֹּל הַנֶּפֶל מִמֶּנּוּ).⁴¹ If the last *כי* clause is understood as conditional here, this would seem to be a problematic because the verse already has a protasis at the beginning (כִּי תִבְנֶה בַיִת חֹדֶשׁ) which is followed by an apodosis (וַעֲשִׂיתָ מַעֲקֵה לַגֶּגֶךָ וְלֹא־תִשִּׂים דַּמִּים בַּבַּיִתךָ). Another protasis added at the end would be grammatically awkward.

⁴⁰ The only examples they give come from Chronicles.

⁴¹ The ESV is represented here, the only disagreement is in the YLT again, which utilizes a temporal nuance.

Alternatively, the phrase “if anyone should fall from it” (כִּי־יִפֹּל הַגִּפְּל מִמֶּנּוּ) could simply be read as the reason for bloodguilt mentioned in the previous phrase.⁴² Furthermore, although this phrase is part of the Law (which carries with it an inherent hypothetical nuance), the indefinite nature of the English translations is most likely related to the relative use of the participle and not the כִּי clause itself. On this point, Waltke and O’Conner note that the relative use of the participle can reflect a general indefiniteness (cf. “whoever falls”). “This sense is similar to the use of a substantival participle with the article to refer to a class of agents, for example, הַכֹּרֵת ‘the hewer (of trees)’ (Isa 14.8), namely, ‘all those who hew down (trees), woodsman’” (1990, §37.5.c). If this proposed understanding is correct, a possible translation of the last phrase of Deuteronomy 22.8 would be, “because of the one who falls from it,” or “because of someone who falls from it” (i.e. bloodguilt would be realized because someone falls off the roof).

Four of the nine exceptions listed by Bandstra come from Deuteronomy 28, which addresses the covenant blessings and curses for Israel. Deuteronomy 28.2 heads this list and is translated by most English translations similar to how the ESV reads: “And all these blessings shall come upon you and overtake you, if you obey the voice of the LORD your God.” However, not all English translations agree. The CSB, NKJV, and YLT all translate the last phrase as causal, “because you obey the voice of the LORD your God.”

Importantly, when we compare Deuteronomy 28.2 to 28.45 (see Table 2), we note virtually identical grammatical structures. Although Bandstra lists Deuteronomy 28.45 as a circumstantial clause, the majority of English translations identify this כִּי clause as causal: “All these curses shall come upon you and pursue you and overtake you till you are destroyed,

⁴² Although there are not many other examples of this grammatical construction (כִּי + verb + pcp), those that I was able to identify are translated as causal: cf. Exod 1.21; Jer 10.21; Hab 2.18.

because you did not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to keep his commandments and his statutes that he commanded you” (ESV).

Table 2: Comparison of Deuteronomy 28.2 and 28.45

Deut 28.2		Deut 28.45
ובאו עליך כל־הברכות האלה	Coming of blessing/curse	ובאו עליך כל־הקללות האלה
והשיגך	Extent of the “pursuit” of blessing/curse	ורדפוּך והשיגוּך עד השמדך
כי תשמע בקול יהוה אלהיך	Causal link to <i>why</i> blessing/curse come	כי־לא שמעת בקול יהוה אלהיך
	Further clarification	לשמר מצותיו וחקתיו אשר צוּך

The only significant difference between the two grammatical structures is Deuteronomy 28.2 uses an imperfect verb following the *כי* (כי תשמע), whereas in 28.45 a perfect verb follows the *כי* (כי־לא שמעת). In Deuteronomy, when a causal *כי* is followed by a perfect, it explains the causal relationship between an action in the past (real or hypothetical) and its outcome (e.g. 5.5; 9.19; 13.6; 13.11). But, when a causal *כי* is followed by an imperfect, it explains the causal relationship of a situation or action in the future (e.g. 5.25; 7.4), or sometimes more specifically, a future progressive action (e.g. 12.20; 12.25; 12.28).⁴³ With this distinction in mind, perhaps the best way to view Deuteronomy 28.2 and 28.45 is with regard to perspective. Israel would (hypothetically) receive the blessings of the covenant because they will be obeying (תשמע, future progressive) the voice of Yahweh. Alternatively, they would receive the curses of the covenant because they had not obeyed (לא שמעת) the voice of Yahweh.⁴⁴ It seems reasonable to read Deuteronomy 28.2 and 28.45 this way. Therefore, I would argue that the emphasis should remain

⁴³ It also appears that the participle can be used to stress present progressive action in a causal clause (e.g. Deut 13.4; cf. Gen 3.5; 2 Sam 17.10).

⁴⁴ This understanding seems to be verified by simple logic. If Israel ceases at anytime to obey Yahweh, they cease to be “obeying” (progressive), and they have now “not obeyed” (past). Thus, Israel would (hypothetically) receive the blessings of the covenant only because Israel would be consistently obeying Yahweh and his Law.

on causality, emphasizing the link between Israel’s actions (obedience or disobedience) and the result (blessing or cursing).⁴⁵

Deuteronomy 30.10 is the last of Bandstra’s exceptions. Although many English translations treat it as a conditional statement, the ESV, HCSB, and NRSV treat it as temporal (“when you do this”), and the YLT and English Tanakh published by JPS (1985) read it as causal. Context would seem to prefer causal or temporal statement since Deuteronomy 30.1-9 contains a promise to Israel that exile is not the end for them. Verse 10 clearly connects with the preceding verses through numerous vocabulary connections. For example, v. 10 notes obedience to “the voice of Yahweh” (תשמע בקול יהוה), which is a major theme in v. 8. Also, v. 10 mentions the keeping of Yahweh’s “commandments” (מצותיו, cf. 30.8), and allegiance to Yahweh with the entire heart and soul combination (בכל-לבבך ובכל-נפשך, 30.2).

Importantly, Deuteronomy 30.2 says that after both the blessing and the curse comes, Israel will “return” (שוב) and “obey” (שמע). These are the same verbal links used as the כִּי clauses in Deuteronomy 30.10. Given the certainty of the previous verses (1-9), it makes more sense to see v. 10 as an explanation for the Yahweh’s newfound delight in Israel (v. 9b).

After examining all of the exceptions listed by Bandstra, I would propose that any conditionality in these examples is derived from the covenantal context, not from the use of the כִּי clause itself.⁴⁶ In these examples it still seems acceptable to translate the כִּי clauses with a causal nuance in accordance with the normal expectation of main clause preceding the כִּי clause

⁴⁵ Deuteronomy 28.9 and 13 are likewise usually translated as conditional statements with the protasis following the apodosis. However, these two verses also belong to a similar covenantal context. Each verse is listed in a series of promises (vv. 7-14) found within the larger section on blessing (vv. 1-14). In keeping with our foregoing argument, there would be nothing awkward in translating these examples with a causal nuance, letting the conditionality be derived from the covenantal context, yet keeping the emphasis on the link between action and result through causality.

⁴⁶ Aejmelaeus also makes note of the covenantal context of Israel’s conditional obedience in these examples (1986, 207-208).

(see Table 3). Applying these observations to Deuteronomy 4.29, I suggest that the grammatical evidence should motivate us to consider translating the כִּי clause there as causal.⁴⁷

Table 3: Bandstra's Exceptions with Proposed Translations

ובקשתם משם את־יהוה אלהיך ומצאת כי תדרשנו בכל־לבבך ובכל־נפשך	But from there, you will search for Yahweh your God, and you will find Him, for you will search for him with all your heart and all your soul (Deut 4.29, my translation).
וצדקה תהיה־לנו כי־נשמר לעשות את־כל־המצוה הזאת לפני יהוה אלהינו כאשר צונו	And it will be righteousness for us, since we are careful to do all this commandment before Yahweh our God, as he commanded us (Deut 6.25, my translation).
כי תבנה בית חדש ועשית מעקה לגגך ולא־תשים דמים בביתך כִּי־יפל הנפל ממנו	When you build a new house, you shall make a parapet for your roof, that you not bring bloodguilt on your house because someone falls from it (Deut 22.8, my translation).
ובאו עליך כל־הברכות האלה והשיגך כי תשמע בקול יהוה אלהיך	All these blessings will come and overtake you, because you obey the LORD your God (Deut 28.2 CSB).
יקימך יהוה לו לעם קדוש כאשר נשבע־לך כי תשמר את־מצוות יהוה אלהיך והלכת בדרכיו	Yahweh will establish you for himself as His holy people, as he swore to you, because you are keeping the commands of Yahweh your God and you are walking in His ways (Deut 28.9, my translation).
ונתנך יהוה לראש ולא לזנב והיית רק למעלה ולא תהיה למטה כִּי־תשמע אל־מצוות יהוה אלהיך אשר אנכי מצוה היום לשמר ולעשות	And Yahweh will make you the head and not the tail, and you will only go up, and not down, because you obey the commands of Yahweh your God, which I am commanding you today to observe them carefully (Deut 28.13, my translation).
ובאו עליך כל־הקללות האלה ורדפוּך והשיגוך עד השמדך כִּי־לא שמעת בקול יהוה אלהיך לשמר מצותיו וחקתיו אשר צוה	All these curses will come, pursue, and overtake you until you are destroyed, since you did not obey the LORD your God and keep the commands and statutes he gave you (Deut 28.45 CSB).
כי תשמע בקול יהוה אלהיך לשמר מצותיו וחקתיו הכתובה בספר התורה הזו כי תשוב אל־יהוה אלהיך בכל־לבבך ובכל־נפשך	Since you will be heeding the LORD your God and keeping His commandments and laws that are recorded in this book of the

⁴⁷ Although I am persuaded by the above argumentation, I readily admit that some of Bandstra's examples could be true exceptions to the normal grammatical pattern. The proposal that Deut 4.29 should be read as a causal clause does not rest on the need to disprove all of Bandstra's exceptions. It is only in an effort to be thorough that I explain my reasoning on the exceptions listed by Bandstra.

	Teaching—once you return to the LORD your God with all your heart and soul (Deut 30.10 JPS Tanakh).
--	---

כי Clauses Following a *Weqatal*⁴⁸

One more grammatical argument might be helpful to consider in our discussion. Since the כי clause in Deuteronomy 4.29 follows a *weqatal* verb, we can compare other instances in Deuteronomy where a כי clause follows a *weqatal* verb.⁴⁹ I have categorized the results by their typical translations in English (see Table 4).⁵⁰

Table 4: כי Clauses Following *Weqatal* in Deuteronomy

Causal (17x)	Content (12x)	Temporal (5x)	Conditional (6x)
4.6	4.39	6.10	15.16
4.15	5.15	11.29	22.8
8.18	7.9	26.1	24.3
10.19	8.5	30.1	28.2
12.12	9.3	31.21 (1 st כי)	28.13
13.11	9.6		28.45
14.29	11.2 (or Causal)		
16.1	15.15		
19.6 (2x)	16.12		
21.5	24.18		
22.19	24.22		
22.21	28.10		
28.62			
30.9			
31.21 (2 nd כי)			
31.29			

⁴⁸ Unless otherwise noted, in this section I accumulated the data through searches in Logos 8, using *BHS* as the source.

⁴⁹ I ran a simple grammatical search which yielded 53 verse results. Deut 19.6 and 31.21 each contain two relevant כי clauses, thus there are 55 total hits (54 excluding Deut 4.29). The general search had to be narrowed down to only applicable results. The search included 14 כי clauses that directly followed non-*weqatal* verb forms (Deut 2.19; 7.16; 7.25; 7.26; 8.19; 12.20; 12.28; 14.21; 20.1; 24.1; 26.3; 28.39; 29.18; 31.17). These fourteen hits were outliers because they directly followed either an imperfect, jussive, or a verb of direct discourse (Deut 14.21 follows an infinitive absolute). All but three occurrences of these outliers are categorized as causal. Two are identifiable as content (8.19; 26.3), and one as concessive (29.18).

⁵⁰ For a base, I used primarily the ESV, unless it was a minority view.

A few observations are noteworthy. First, causal usage dominates as the primary category. This is expected since the *כי* clause is most often following a main clause carried on by the *weqatal*. A second observation is that content clauses (often called the nominalizing use of *כי*) are prominent. It is helpful to observe that in every one of these content clauses, *כי* is used with a verb of perception—primarily *יָדַע* or *זָכַר*, but also once *רָאָה* (28.10). Aejmelaeus notes that it is the verbal idea behind these verbs of perception which creates the expectation for an object clause following the main clause, which is marked by *כי* (1986, 200).

A third observation is that the temporal use of *כי* following a *weqatal* occurs not after a singular verb, but in the phrase *וְהָיָה כִּי* which is used at the beginning of the verses. The phrase *וְהָיָה כִּי* is used regularly in the Pentateuch to communicate temporality.⁵¹ Interestingly, Deuteronomy 15.16 (listed in the table as conditional) also utilizes the phrase *וְהָיָה כִּי* at the beginning of the verse, but there it seems to be conditional.⁵²

In addition to Deuteronomy 15.16, there are 5 other *כי* clauses following a *weqatal* that are classified as conditional by English translations. These verses should look familiar in that, apart from Deuteronomy 24.3, we have looked at these verses in detail as part of Bandstra's exceptions and proposed that they could be interpreted as causal. Although the *כי* clause in Deuteronomy 24.3 follows a main clause and a *weqatal* it is best understood as circumstantial because the *כי* clause is combined with the *אִם* conjunction. Each occurrence of *כי אִם* in the Hebrew Bible is the continuation of a circumstantial clause with slight modification. Each occurrence also takes place legal texts, as might be expected (Exod 21.33; Lev 5.3; 13.16; 15.25;

⁵¹ *וְהָיָה כִּי* occurs 19 times in the Pentateuch.

⁵² See Aejmelaeus (1986, 196). "The various *כי* clauses *preceding* their main clause are normally interpreted as conditional, temporal, or causal clauses. It is, however, an obvious fact that Hebrew does not formally distinguish between these cases. The common denominator of all *כי* clauses preceding their main clauses is that they state a circumstance pertaining to the following clause. For this reason, I suggest calling these *כי* clauses *circumstantial כי clauses*" (cf. 206).

Deut 24.3). As such, this example, though clearly conditional, does not fit the pattern of a standalone כִּי clause which follows a main clause.

In summary, out of all the כִּי clauses which follow a *weqatal* verb, the only כִּי clauses which are clearly circumstantial (conditional or temporal) occur in כִּי וַהֲיִה כִּי or כִּי אִם combinations. There are also a significant number of content clauses, but each of these are marked by verbs of perception (יָדַע, זָכַר, רָאָה). Because the כִּי clause in Deuteronomy 4.29 is non-complex (i.e., not combined with another particle), and does not follow of verb of perception, it is likely that the כִּי clause should be translated as a causal in line with the above evidence.

Evidence from the LXX

I have argued that the context of Deuteronomy 4.29 merits a translation of certainty rather than conditionality. I have also proposed that in accordance with the observed grammatical usage of כִּי clauses and their relationship to *weqatal* verbs, a causal understanding is most probable. At this point, it is helpful to consult the LXX as additional evidence.

Being the first translation of the Hebrew Bible, the LXX can often provide a helpful gauge to measure our understanding of the Hebrew. In Deuteronomy 4.29, it seems significant that the LXX opts for a non-conditional approach: “And there you will seek the Lord your God and you will find [him], when you seek him with all your heart, and all your soul, in your oppression,” (καὶ ζητήσετε ἐκεῖ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν καὶ εὕρήσετε, ὅταν ἐκζητήσητε αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου ἐν τῇ θλίψει σου).⁵³ The relevant portion of the LXX, ὅταν ἐκζητήσητε αὐτὸν, translates the Hebrew כִּי תִדְרֹשׁוּ. Rather than utilizing the normal conditional particle (ἐάν),⁵⁴ the translator of Deuteronomy opts for ὅταν, a marker of

⁵³ My translation.

⁵⁴ There are 140 occurrences of ἐάν in Deuteronomy, 70 of which are translations of כִּי. For comparison, εἰ is only used 14 times in Deuteronomy.

temporality.⁵⁵ Thus, it seems the translator of Deuteronomy 4.29 understood the context to have more certainty to it than is often conveyed in English translations.⁵⁶

Insight into the כִּי clause of Deuteronomy 4.29 might also be found in Jeremiah 29.13 (36.13 LXX). The connection between these two texts is very strong (see Table 5) and has caused at least one scholar to postulate that Deuteronomy 4.29 is literarily dependent upon Jeremiah 29.13 (see Biddle 2003, 88).⁵⁷ However, it seems more likely that Jeremiah is dependent upon Deuteronomy (see Huey, Jr. 1993, 254; Weinfeld 1991, 209).⁵⁸ Interestingly, although the Hebrew in Jeremiah 29.13 is almost unquestionably a reference to Deuteronomy 4.29 (Fretheim 2002, 405), English translations typically translate Jeremiah 29.13 with temporal certainty rather than conditionality.⁵⁹

Table 5: Comparison of Deuteronomy 4.29 and Jeremiah 29.13

ובקשתם משם את־יהוה אלהיך ומצאת כי תדרשנו בכל־לבבך ובכל־נפשך (Deut 4.29)	ובקשתם אתי ומצאתם כי תדרשני בכל־לבבכם (Jer 29.13)
---	--

Grammatically these verses stand fundamentally identical. So, why do English translations prefer a conditional translation in Deuteronomy 4.29 and temporal certainty in Jeremiah 29.13? Perhaps the answer is that some translators doubt the prophetic context of Deuteronomy 4, while the prophetic context in Jeremiah 29 is almost universally recognized. However, if my foregoing argument is correct, the context of Deuteronomy 4.29 also aligns with

⁵⁵ In the entire Pentateuch, *ōtan* is only used as a translation for כִּי in Exod 3.21; Lev 19.23; 23.10; Num 11.29; 15.2; 15.22; Deut 4.29; 6.10; 11.29; 15.23. Setting aside Deut 4.29, each of these cases seems best understood as temporal references. On Num 11.29, see Wevers 1998, 178.

⁵⁶ “The *ōtan* clause is meant to modify εὕρησθε, thus ‘you will find (him) when’” (Wevers 1995, 83).

⁵⁷ Biddle notes, “Scholars debate whether Deuteronomy 4:29 depends literarily upon Jeremiah 29:13 or vice versa. The prophetic character of the notions of seeking and finding YHWH suggest Jeremiah 29:13 as the source for Deuteronomy 4:29.”

⁵⁸ Huey and Weinfeld both argue that Jeremiah’s prophecy is dependent not only on Deuteronomy 4.29 but also on 30.1-10.

⁵⁹ The NET Bible is the only notable exception.

a prophetic context. If that argument holds up, then Jeremiah 29.13 parallels Deuteronomy 4.29 not only grammatically, but also contextually.

At this point it is helpful to point out that the Greek translation of Jeremiah 29.13 (36.13 LXX) supports a causal reading of the ׀ clause: “And you will seek me and find me, for you will seek me with your whole heart,” (καὶ ἐκζητήσατέ με, καὶ εὐρήσετέ με, ὅτι ζητήσετέ με ἐν ὅλη καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν).⁶⁰ The pertinent phrase, “For you will seek me” (ὅτι ζητήσετέ με), clearly functions as a causal/explanatory clause in Greek.⁶¹ Thus, at least for the translator of Jeremiah 29.13 (36.13 LXX), the reason Israel will find Yahweh is because they will search for Him with full commitment.

After examining the evidence from the LXX translators, both Deuteronomy 4.29 and Jeremiah 29.13 (36.13 LXX) seem to point the English translator away from a conditional understanding of Deuteronomy 4.29. Although the LXX translation cannot be a conclusive argument on its own, coupled with the contextual and grammatical arguments of this article, I believe it presents a compelling reason to reexamine the English translations of Deuteronomy 4.29.

Conclusion

This article has sought to challenge the conditional understanding of the ׀ clause in Deuteronomy 4.29. Rather than viewing this verse as conditional, it seems to make more sense with a temporal or causal translation. This understanding makes sense of both the near and far context in Deuteronomy. The context of Deuteronomy 4.25-31 argues for the prophetic certainty

⁶⁰ My translation.

⁶¹ Aejmelaesus 2007 argues that LXX translators commonly utilize ὅτι as a translation to communicate causality rather than the often expected γάρ. She argues that in the translation history of the LXX partially influences the NT in this regard.

of Israel's rebellion and exile, but also for their return to Yahweh. The expectation of Deuteronomy is that Israel will live in the land, rebel against Yahweh, and go into exile. However, the story does not end there. Israel is also promised restoration. The key to Israel's restoration is God's action, as detailed by the wider context of Deuteronomy, especially 30.1-10.

In addition to the arguments from context, the grammatical usage of כִּי clauses in the Pentateuch presents strong evidence for a causal nuance. Since the כִּי clause in question follows the main clause, a causal understanding would be the most natural reading of the text. Additionally, in Deuteronomy when a non-complex כִּי clause follows a *weqatal*, it is likely a causal clause. Although grammatical rules can have exceptions, the evidence presented seems to confirm that it would be most natural to translate the כִּי clause in Deuteronomy 4.29 as causal.

Finally, looking at the earliest translation of Deuteronomy 4.29 and Jeremiah 29.13 (36.13 LXX) has added value to our proposal. Both the translator of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah seem to understand the context to be one of certainty rather than conditionality. In light of the presented evidence, I would argue that it seems best to translate the כִּי clause in Deuteronomy 4.29 as a causal statement rather than conditional. As such, Deuteronomy 4.29 gives the reason for Israel's latter days return to Yahweh—Israel will find Yahweh because they will seek Him with their whole heart.

References

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. 1986. "Function and Interpretation of ׀ in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105(2): 193-209.
- . 2007. "OTI causale in Septuagintal Greek." Pages 11-30 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Revised and expanded ed. Dudley, MA: Peeters.
- Arnold, Bill T., and John H. Choi. 2003. *A Guide to Biblical Syntax*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandstra, Barry L. 1982. "The Syntax of Particle KY in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic." Ph.D. Dissertation, New Haven, CN: Yale University.
- Beale, G. K. 2011. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Biddle, Mark E. 2003. *Deuteronomy*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys.
- Block, Daniel I. 2012. *Deuteronomy*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles Augustus Briggs. 1977. *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Chisholm, Jr., Robert B. 1998. *From Exegesis to Exposition: A Practical Guide to Using Biblical Hebrew*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Christensen, Duane L. 1993. "Deuteronomy in Modern Research: Approaches and Issues." Pages 3-20 in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song: Essays on the Book of Deuteronomy*. Edited by Duane L. Christensen. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 3. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- . 2001. *Deuteronomy 1:1–21:9*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary 6A. Dallas, TX: Word Books.
- Claassen, W. T. 1983. "Speaker-Orientated Functions of kî in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 11: 29-46.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. 1993–2011. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic.
- Craigie, Peter. 1976. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Follingstad, Carl M. 2001. *Deictic Viewpoint in Biblical Hebrew Text: A Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Analysis of the Particle ׀*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- Fretheim, Terence E. 2002. *Jeremiah*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing.
- Fuller, Russell T., and Kyoungwon Choi. 2017. *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: An Intermediate Grammar*. Invitation to Theological Studies Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic.
- Huey, Jr., F.B. 1993. *Jeremiah, Lamentations*. New American Commentary 16. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Jouön, Paul, and T. Muraoka. 2006. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Kalland, Earl S. 1992. "Deuteronomy." Pages 1-236 in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 & 2 Samuel*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner, eds. 1994–2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 volumes. Revised by Walter Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm. Translated and edited by M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill.
- Locatell, C S. 2017. Grammatical Polysemy in the Hebrew Bible: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to ׀. PhD Dissertation, Stellenbosch University.
- . 2019. “Causal Categories in Biblical Hebrew Discourse: A Cognitive Approach to Causal ׀.” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 45(2): 79-102.
- Mayes, A. D. H. 1993. “Deuteronomy 4 and the Literary Criticism of Deuteronomy.” Pages 195-224 in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song: Essays on the Book of Deuteronomy*. Edited by Duane L. Christensen. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 3. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- McConville, J. Gordon. 2002. *Deuteronomy*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 5. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.
- Merrill, Eugene H. 1994. *Deuteronomy*. NAC 4. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Meyer, Esias E. 2001. “The Particle ׀, a Mere Conjunction or Something More?” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 27(1): 39-62.
- Muilenburg, James 1961. “The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle ׀ in the Old Testament.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32: 135-160.
- Robson, James E. 2016. *Deuteronomy 1–11*. Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Tigay, J. 1996. *Deuteronomy*. JPSTC. Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society.
- van der Merwe, Christo H. J., Jacobus A. NaudE, and Jan H. Kroeze. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O’Connor. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. 1991. *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 5. New York: Doubleday.
- Wevers, John William. 1995. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 1998. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 46. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Williams, Ronald J. 2007. *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Revised and expanded by John C. Beckman. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Abbreviations

BDB	<i>Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i> (1977)
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BHQ	<i>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</i>
BHRG	<i>A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar</i> (2017)
CSB	Christian Standard Bible (2017)
DCH	<i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i>
ESV	English Standard Version (2001)
HALOT	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (1994–2000)
HCSB	Holman Christian Standard Bible (2009)

KJV	King James Version (1611)
NASB	New American Standard Bible (1977)
NASU	New American Standard Bible: Updated Edition (1995)
NET	New English Translation (2006, 2017)
NIV	New International Version (2011)
NKJV	New King James Version (1982)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (1989)
RSV	Revised Standard Version (1952)
YLT	Young's Literal Translation (1862)