

Waw Consecutive with the Imperfect Used as a Pluperfect?

Adams, John. Sermons in Syntax or Studies in the Hebrew Text. Edinburg, 1908. pp. 180-182

✓ Isa. xxxix.1 is scarcely a case in point. The R. V. renders, not as a pluperfect, had heard, but simply as a fresh circumstance suggested to the mind of the prophet, and rightly introduced at this point by the help of waw consecutive with the imperfect - "For he heard that he had been sick." Nevertheless, the actual report of Hezekiah's sickness must have been prior to the sending of the Babylonian embassy; and since the pluperfect sense is found in the parallel passage in 2 Kings xx.12, the suggestion made by Delitzsch and others is probably to be accepted as correct that וַיִּשְׁמַע is a copyist's error for $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַעַ$, "for he had heard." Cf. 1 Sam. ii.21, where we have a similar confounding of the two letters ו and וַ . The accepted reading, $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַעַ$, yields no intelligible sense, and must be corrected into $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַעַ$ with the LXX. Emended in this way, Isa. xxxix.1 is not to be regarded as a case of waw consecutive at all.

And yet on other grounds it is of the highest possible interest to the Hebrew student. It has broached the question how far the imperfect with strong waw can convey the meaning of a Pluperfect? There is, of course, no doubt that the formula may denote the continuation of a pluperfect, as Gen. xxvi.18, xxxi.34, xxxix.13, etc. But can it introduce it? Can it, instead of conducting us forward to a succeeding act or detail, lead us back to one which is chronologically anterior? Driver, in his exhaustive note, has ^{gone} ~~given~~ over all the passages, and concluded, like Böttcher, in the negative -- quoting Dr. Pusey in the "Minor Prophets," who remarks on Jonah iv.5, "Some render, contrary to grammar, 'and Jonah had gone.'" Strange to say, the Jewish grammarians were unanimously in favour of this construction; and the A.V., in following their example, has inserted the reading "had" in a great variety of passages. But in the R. V. every instance has been corrected or emended, with the exception of 1 Kings xiii.12, Isa. xxxviii.21, 22, Zech. vii.2, Neh. ii.9; and even in these instances the student will experience little difficulty in finding another and equally