

FOCUS STRUCTURE IN BIBLICAL HEBREW:
A STUDY OF WORD ORDER AND
INFORMATION STRUCTURE WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
DEUTERONOMY

KATSUOMI SHIMASAKI

PARK LEARNING CENTRE
UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE
PO Box 220, The Park, Cheltenham, GL50 2QF
Tel: (01242) 532721

A thesis submitted to
Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education
in accordance with the requirements of
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the faculty of Arts & Education

April 1999

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the word order of Biblical Hebrew from the perspective of Information Structure, specifically in the articulation of a theory of focus structure. To focus is to mark an item as informationally prominent. The thesis proposes that

- 1) in Biblical Hebrew focus is expressed by word order and by pitch prominence;
- 2) the clause-initial position is marked for focus for both nominal and verbal clauses;
- 3) and Biblical Hebrew has three major clause types:

(P represents predicate including verb; X represents an argument, a cover-term for non-predicate elements. Capitals mark focus indicated by word order and/or high pitch.)

a) Px Predicate-Focus Structure adds new information preferably to an active or accessible referent (commenting);

b) Xp Argument-Focus Structure relates X with the missing argument of a presupposed proposition (identification);

c) XP Clause-Focus Structure indicates that the clause has pragmatic implication(s) other than commenting and identification. These implications include

(information level): activation of inactive referents; introduction of a brand-new referent;

(inter-clausal level): exclamation/proclamation, contrast of the whole proposition, circumstantial clause;

(text-unit level): onset functions, background information, climax and closure; and finally parallel construction and list structure.

Most of these implications show non-sequentiality to or independence of the preceding texts informationally, temporally or logically.

The thesis also explores the relationship between emphasis, intensification (loud voice), contrast, focus and word order. Emphasis is achieved through various means which include intensification (loud voice) and implicit contrast. Contrast is created not by fronting but only by the presence of the contrastive members (either explicit or implicit). Contrast belongs to contextual implicatures not to syntax. Intensification belongs to prosody not to syntax. Only focused constituents are contrasted or intensified. Detection of intensification (loud voice) in written texts is highly subjective.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is entirely my own work, that it was not conducted in collaboration with, or with the assistance of others unless otherwise indicated, that this thesis is not being submitted for a comparable academic award, and that the views expressed in this thesis are mine and not of the College.

Katsuomi Shimasaki

LIST OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	7
ABBREVIATIONS	8
1. INTRODUCTION	9
1.1. PAST STUDIES OF NOMINAL CLAUSE WORD ORDER	9
1.2. PAST STUDIES OF VERBAL CLAUSE WORD ORDER	27
1.3. PURPOSE, METHOD AND LIMITATION	34
2. INFORMATION-STRUCTURE ANALYSIS	41
2.1. INTRODUCTION	41
2.2. IDENTIFIABILITY	42
2.3. FOCUS	45
2.4. ARGUMENT AND COMMENT	48
2.5. TOPIC, COMMENT AND THEME	49
2.6. NEW AND OLD INFORMATION, PRESUPPOSITION AND ASSERTION	51
2.7. SUMMARY	52
3. THREE FOCUS STRUCTURES	53
3.1. INTRODUCTION	53
3.2. DIFFERENCE OF THREE FOCUS STRUCTURES	53
3.3. IN OTHER LANGUAGES	55
3.4. BIBLICAL HEBREW	59
3.5. PRAGMATIC PREDICATE AND PRAGMATIC SUBJECT	63
4. CONTRAST, EMPHASIS AND FOCUS	66
4.1. INTRODUCTION	66
4.2. CONTRAST	66
4.3. EMPHASIS	74
4.4. SUMMARY OF "CONTRAST, EMPHASIS AND FOCUS"	82
5. PREDICATE-FOCUS STRUCTURE	84
5.1. INTRODUCTION	84
5.2. ACTIVATION STATES AND TOPIC ACCEPTABILITY	84
5.3. ACTIVE OR ACCESSIBLE REFERENTS FOR TOPIC	85
5.4. INACTIVE OR BRAND-NEW REFERENT FOR TOPIC	105
5.5. INTRODUCTION OF BRAND-NEW REFERENTS	109

	5
5.6. PRAGMATICS AND MARKEDNESS OF PREDICATE-FOCUS STRUCTURE	111
5.7. BUTH'S S-P SEQUENCE	117
5.8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION OF "PREDICATE-FOCUS STRUCTURE"	125
6. ARGUMENT-FOCUS STRUCTURE	129
6.1. INTRODUCTION	129
6.2. WITH CONTRASTIVE MEMBERS	132
6.3. CLOSING FORMULA	134
6.4. SUMMARY OF "ARGUMENT-FOCUS STRUCTURE"	136
7. CLAUSE-FOCUS STRUCTURE	138
7.1. INTRODUCTION	138
7.2. INFORMATION-LEVEL IMPLICATIONS	146
7.3. INTER-CLAUSAL LEVEL IMPLICATIONS	147
7.4. TEXT-UNIT LEVEL IMPLICATIONS (DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS)	161
7.5. SUMMARY OF "CLAUSE-FOCUS STRUCTURE"	180
8. PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION AND LIST STRUCTURE	183
8.1. INTRODUCTION	183
8.2. PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION IN THREE FOCUS STRUCTURES	183
8.3. THREE TYPES OF CLAUSE-FOCUS PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION	185
8.4. LIST STRUCTURE	195
8.5. SUMMARY	199
9. SOME PROBLEMS FOR THE THEORY OF FOCUS STRUCTURE	200
9.1. MURAOKA'S FIVE PECULIARITIES	200
9.2. CONJUNCTIONAL WORDS AND PHRASES	215
9.3. PSEUDO-DIRECT SPEECH	219
10. EXCEPTIONS	223
10.1. HAYA DIVISION MARKER AND EXISTENTIAL CLAUSES	223
10.2. CHIASTIC CONSTRUCTION	225
10.3. PECULIARITIES OF PARTICIPLE	227
11. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	232
EXCURSUS	236
EXTRAPOSITION (CASUS PENDENS)	236
APPENDIX	240
DATA OF NOMINAL CLAUSES	240
DATA OF VERBAL CLAUSES	246

	6
DEUTERONOMY 4:44-11:32	248
BIBLIOGRAPHY	275

TABLE OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: ANDERSEN'S BINARY MODEL	12
FIGURE 2: IDENTIFIABILITY (ACTIVATION STATES)	44
FIGURE 3: HIGH-COST COGNITIVE EFFORT AND IMPLICATIONS	141
FIGURE 4: PARALLEL AND CHIASTIC CONSTRUCTIONS	199

PREFACE

I was first exposed to the inverted word order in Biblical Hebrew in T. O. Lambdin's *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* while I was studying at Japan Bible Seminary (Tokyo, Japan). My interest in word order grew when I was taking an intermediate Hebrew course at Asian Theological Seminary (Manila, Philippines). The present thesis is an attempt to gain a better understanding of this fascinating phenomenon.

I wish to express special thanks to Prof. Dr. G. J. Wenham, my first supervisor, who guided and encouraged me throughout the years and showed concern for my life with my family, without which this study could not have been completed. I also express thanks to Dr. G. Khan for reading my work as a second supervisor and making helpful remarks, to Dr. D. T. Tsumura, who introduced me to the world of Biblical Hebrew in Tokyo, to Dr. R. Stapleton for instruction in the field of word order in the Philippines and to Dr. G. P. Hugenberger for his training me and encouragement for further study of Biblical Hebrew in USA.

I am also grateful for the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom which administers United Kingdom Scholarships for International Research Students (ORS Awards Scheme) and Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education for granting bursaries.

Last but not least I want to thank my wife Natsuko for her never failing support and my three children, Chikara, Leah and Aogu, who had to sacrifice much by moving with me across borders.

April 1999

Katsuomi Shimasaki

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BHRG</i>	van der Merwe, Christo H.J. , Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze. <i>A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar</i> . 1999.
D-Gibson	Gibson, John C. L. <i>Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Syntax</i> . 4th ed., 1994.
GKC	W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch. <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Trans. A. E. Cowley, 1910.
<i>IBHS</i>	B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> , 1990.
Joüon	P. Joüon, <i>Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique</i> , 1923.
J-Muraoka	P. Joüon -T. Muraoka, <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> , 1991.
Lambdin	T. O. Lambdin, <i>Introduction to Biblical Hebrew</i> , 1971.
Muraoka	T. Muraoka, <i>Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew</i> , 1985.
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NIV	New International Version
RSV	Revised Standard Version
<i>SBH</i>	F. I. Andersen, <i>The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew</i> , 1974.
<i>VCBH</i>	C. L. Miller, ed. <i>The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew</i>

Abbreviations of Grammar Terms

A	Adjuncts which are other than verb, object and subject
CNC	Complex Nominal Clause (Niccacci's terminology)
O	Object
P	Predicate. This P is used in two ways. 1) Predicate of a nominal clause, 2) predicate of a verbal clause, namely a finite verb
Pind	Indefinite predicate
Pd	Definite predicate
ptc	Participle
S	Subject
Sind	Indefinite subject
Sd	Definite subject
SNC	Simple Nominal Clause (Niccacci's terminology)
V	Verb
X	Argument, a cover term for non-predicate elements including subjects, objects and adverbial phrases.

Quotations are from NASB unless otherwise stated.

1. INTRODUCTION

The word order of Biblical Hebrew does not seem to have been one of the central issues of grammarians in the past. Introductory grammar books hardly mention it, or if they do, the treatment is only cursory. More academic discussions were only sporadic and their achievements have not been conveyed to students of Hebrew in a comprehensive manner. However, the picture has started to change in the past two decades. The achievements of text-linguistics, functional grammar and information-structure analysis appear to have brought this issue to the forefront of arguments on syntax. Discussions and researches in the last decades in particular demonstrate significant advances in the study of word order. Nonetheless, the problem is controversial. This is partly because the variety of linguistic models and methodologies, which have been adapted, have not always produced agreement. This thesis hopes to throw light on this issue by propounding a new theory of focus structure to answer some of the questions raised by past studies of word order.

This chapter "Introduction" will first examine past studies of nominal and verbal clause word order to present problems in this field of study.

1.1. PAST STUDIES OF NOMINAL CLAUSE WORD ORDER

For a long time the word order of nominal clauses in Hebrew does not seem to have been the subject of careful study,¹ except for some brief notes on the clause-initial position.

1.1.1. Before the 1970's

What characterises early studies of word order is first, scholars did not distinguish nominal and verbal clauses in their study; and secondly, the notion was accepted widely that the clause-initial position is emphatic. For example, as early as 1832, Hyman Hurwitz noted on word order in general:

that *first* which strikes his mind most forcibly, and to which he wishes most to draw the attention of his *hearers*. ----- The more important words will therefore take precedence of those that are less important. (1832, 250)

This statement by Hurwitz appears pre-modern, because of its single approach to both nominal and verbal clauses and the vague notion of "importance."

GKC (1910) changed this approach by asserting the importance of treating nominal and verbal clauses independently:

The above distinction between different kinds of sentence—especially between noun- and verbal-clauses—is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax. (§140 e)

¹ For example, Joshua Blau spares only 5 lines for the word order of nominal clause stating simply "The word order in nominal clauses is either subject-predicate, . . . or predicate-subject . . ." (1976, 90).

IBHS (1990), J-Muraoka (1993)² and D-Gibson (1994)³ and other serious grammarians follow this tradition to distinguish nominal clauses from verbal clauses in the study of word order.

Von C. Albrecht (1887) brought another change in methodology. He seems to have launched a method of normal vs. exception approach. He first set the normal word order and gave reasons for the exception: the inverted word order. For Albrecht, the normal word order of the nominal clause is S-P:

Die regelmäßige Wortstellung im Nominalsatz aller semitischen Sprachen ist daher Subject-Prädicat. (219)

Then he gives reasons for the inverted word order (P-S). For example, when the predicate is an adjective, the norm is S-P (his example is Gen. 2:12). Emphasis is one of the reasons for the inversion (P-S):

Das Adjectiv als Prädicat muß voranstehen, wenn ein besonderer Nachdruck auf ihm liegt. (220)

GKC shares the same method and notion of emphasis on predicate.

The natural *arrangement* of words in the noun-clause, as describing a state, is *subject-predicate*; the principal stress falls on the former since it is the object of the description. Very frequently, however (and not merely in poetry, where greater freedom is naturally allowed in the arrangement of words), the reverse order is found, i.e., *predicate-subject*.

The latter order *must* be used when special emphasis is laid on the predicate, . . . (454)

Joüon (1923) follows Albrecht and GKC in this normal/exception method and in that P is fronted for emphasis:

L'ordre des mots dans la proposition nominale est normalement: Sujet—Prédicat.

Mais s'il y a emphase sur le prédicat on a l'ordre Pr. —Suj. (§154 f)

Therefore it seems that from the late 19th century to the early 20th century the methods and notions were well established that one studied nominal and verbal clauses independently and that one first determined the normal word order pattern for nominal clause (S-P) and then gave the reason for the inversion, that is, emphasis on the clause-initial position, P, of P-S.

1.1.2. The 1970's and 80's

During the 70's and 80's, the study of nominal clause word order became "one of the hotly debated topics" (J-Muraoka §154 n. 1). Works published in this era contributed significantly to the understanding of nominal clause word order by utilising some achievements of modern linguistics. They are Francis I. Andersen's *The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch* (1970), J. Hoftijzer's "The Nominal Clause Reconsidered" (1973) and T. Muraoka's *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (1985).

These modern scholars attempt to solve three questions related to word order. The first question is "what is the functional difference between the two different word orders: Predicate-Subject and Subject-Predicate?" The second question is "what is the role of the

² except for circumstantial clauses (§153, n. 3 in p. 563).

³ except for certain types of clauses including circumstantial clauses (p. 166ff, see §135).

clause-initial position?" The third question is "what is the relationship between word order, emphasis and contrast?"

1.1.2.1.F. I. Andersen's Binary Model (1970)

Andersen's *Verbless Clause* is a monumental work in the study of the nominal clause and its word order. Its vast quantity of material and his systematic descriptive approach with meticulous classification offers invaluable tools for the study of nominal clauses in the Pentateuch.

Andersen's approaches are radically different from the previous studies in two aspects. First, Andersen has no concern for emphasis or importance previously rendered to the clause-initial position:

Explanations of exceptions to the supposed rule S-P are often given in terms of concepts like *emphasis* or *importance*, which have no empirical status. (18)

Secondly, he does not follow the previous method which first established the normal word order (S-P) and then treated the reversed word order (P-S) as exceptions due to emphasis. Andersen takes a functional approach: he recognises two different functions in the opposing word orders, and attempts to describe them. They are identification and classification.

1. Identification: "When both Subject (S) and Predicate (P) are definite, S-P is the sequence for identification." (Rule 1) (39). Examples are

#1 *'ānī yahwē*, "I am YHWH" (Exod. 6:2)

#2 *hū' mōše w'ahārōn*, "that is Moses and Aaron" (Exod. 6:27)

The numbers on the left correspond to Andersen's classification. Identification means that "the predicate has total semantic overlap with the subject; that is, each has exactly the same referent. The predicate supplies the identity of the subject." (32)

2. Classification: "When P is indefinite relative to S, P-S is the sequence for classification." (Rule 3) (42). Examples are

#94 *tāmē' hū'*, "he is unclean" (Lev. 13:36)

#95 *'el qannā' hū'*, "he is a passionate god" (Exod. 34:14)

Notice here that Andersen does not state that *'ānī yahwē*, "I am YHWH" (Exod. 6:2) is the normal pattern and *tāmē' hū'*, "he is unclean" (Lev. 13:36) is an exception to put emphasis on "unclean." Andersen sees two different functions in these two patterns.

This conclusion appears to be substantiated by his statistical data. Below is a chart based on Andersen's Table 4 in his work (p. 110). This chart shows that 71.2% of S-P clauses (with definite subjects, Sd-Pd, up left) are of identification (275) and 93.6% of P-S clauses (with definite subjects, Pind-Sd, down right) are of classification (205).⁴ These two groups occupy 79.3% (480) of all the clauses. Exceptions to his rule are only 20.7% (125.

⁴ Suffixed noun and construct phrase with suffixed noun are excluded because they can be both definite and indefinite. See Andersen's argument in §13. Clauses with Indefinite Subjects in pp. 37-38. Participle is excluded as well. See §9. Clauses with a Participle as Predicate in p. 34.

14 of Pd-Sd, up right, and 111 of Sd-Pind, down left). Exceptions are shadowed in the chart below.

	Sd-P	P-Sd	Total
Pd	275 Sd-Pd (Identification)	14 Pd-Sd (Exception)	289
Pind ⁵	111 Sd-Pind (Exception)	205 Pind-Sd (Classification)	316
Total	386	219	605

Figure 1: Andersen's Binary Model

Despite Hoftijzer's serious criticism of Andersen's methodology (see below), because this statistical presentation covers the majority of the nominal clauses in the Pentateuch (71.2%), Andersen's binary model has been followed by succeeding scholars and appears to have become the accepted theory about nominal clause word order.⁶

Notwithstanding Andersen's new method of functional approach, his thorough work and his many followers, at least three questions should be addressed. They are the notion of grades of definiteness; allo-clauses and exceptions; and the definition of identification.

Grades of definiteness

The first question is concerned with his grades of definiteness. Hoftijzer's "The Nominal Clause Reconsidered" appeared three years after Andersen's *Verbless Clause*, and he questions Andersen's notion of grades of definiteness, which is central to Andersen's theory. Hoftijzer comments "There are quite a number of exceptions to the formal criteria for the grades of definiteness" (451). According to Andersen, pronoun is the most definite, then proper noun and it goes down to the least definite, "interrogative," which is the 19th in the scale of definiteness:

⁵ Andersen proposes that nouns with suffix and participle can be either definite or indefinite. The figures in this row include the number of clauses with nouns with suffix and participle.

⁶ For example, Davidson-Gibson comments that "There are discernible patterns for the sequence of subj. and pred. in these clauses (Andersen)," (52) then he introduces Andersen's binary model. *IBHS* starts the section of "Word Order in Verbless Clauses" with an introduction: "The order of subject (S) and predicate (Pre) in verbless clauses varies tremendously. In investigating the major patterns, we follow the study of Francis I. Andersen." (130)

1. Pr	Pronoun
2. Np	Proper noun
3. N<Ct>Np	Construct phrase with proper noun
4. Nd	Definite noun (article plus noun)
5. N<Ct>Nd	Noun with pronominal suffix
6. Ptd	Definite participle
7. Numd	Definite numeral (e.g., these three)
8. Nom	Nominalized construction (e.g., asher clause)

9. Ns	Suffixed noun (N<Ct>pronoun suffix)
10. N<Ct>Ns	Construct phrase with suffixed noun

11. Ptc (pt)	Indefinite participle (phrase)

12. Ni	Indefinite noun
13. N<Ct>Ni	Construct phrase with indefinite noun
14. Numi	Indefinite numeral
15. Part	Partitive phrase (<i>min</i> + N)
16. If (Pkh)	Infinitive (phrase)
17. Adv	Adverb
18. PpPh	Prepositional phrase
19. Int	Interrogative

(Table 1 in p. 109 in Andersen's *Verbless*)

Hoftijzer remarks that "even a brief explanation of his semantic presupposition is lacking" (469). "Why . . . *hī* . . . is more definite than the proper noun *tāmār* it refers to . . .? Why is . . . *hammèlèk* (in 2 Sam. xiv 1) less definite semantically than *dāwīd* in 2 Sam. xiii 39 whom it refers to?" (469) Hoftijzer repeatedly remarks that Andersen uses semantic and logical criteria in classifying clauses and in explanation of exceptions. In effect it appears to Hoftijzer that Andersen uses undefined logico-semantic terms and criteria, such as "generally less definite," "usually less definite," "generic," "*šēm* is semantically definite," only in cases "where a deviation of the general rules has to be explained" (470). Hoftijzer notes that "the introduction of this term raises questions not answered by him, because he only uses it to remove exceptions to the rules" (472). Then Hoftijzer questions "And if so, is this a justifiable method?" (470) This criticism shakes the foundation of Andersen's work, because it is based on this 19 grades of definiteness.⁷

Allo-clauses and exceptions

⁷ Another factor Hoftijzer points out is the classification of clauses such as declarative or precative, S-P or P-S etc. This arrangement, however, is not only determined by Andersen's theoretical presuppositions, but also by his text interpretations; for it depends, for example, on his interpretation of a clause, whether this clause is listed as precative or as declarative (456). An example of this is Lev. 7:7 "תֹּרָה אֶתָּה לָהֶם" the same law for them" which Andersen classifies under precative. Hoftijzer argues that it should come under declarative (in his term prescriptive, 458).

The second problem of Andersen's model is concerned with exceptions. No theory can avoid exceptions. However, Andersen's exceptions are not insignificant in number and his system of exceptions is disproportionately complex.⁸

Let us look at the Figure 1 above again. According to Andersen's binary model, the shaded parts, Sd-Pind (111 clauses) and Pd-Sd (14 clauses), are considered as exceptions. This means that Andersen's model considers half of the four distinct clause types and all the clauses which fall into these two types as exceptions. We cannot dismiss these clauses simply because the number of their clauses is minor (20.7%). In this regard Hoftijzer is right in attempting to see "a functional opposition" between the two sequences "with the same types of core constituents" but in opposite order (487). Namely Hoftijzer's aim is to determine the functional difference between the two "allo-clauses." Allo-clauses are "semantically equivalent but formally and pragmatically divergent clause pairs."⁹ An example is

(1) Pind-Sd Exod. 33:3 עִם־קִשָּׁה־עֲרֹךְ אַתָּה you are an obstinate people,

(2) Sd-Pind Exod. 33:5 אַתָּם עִם־קִשָּׁה־עֲרֹךְ you are an obstinate people;

For Andersen Exod. 33:5 (2) is exceptional, because Pind-Sd (1) is supposed to express classification and this Sd-Pind (2) also expresses classification. Labelling these 111 Sd-Pind clauses (such as (2) above) as exceptions and classifying them into five categories of exceptions (43-44)¹⁰ may obscure the function that this clause (Exod. 33:5) may have. As I

⁸ Hoftijzer lists numerous examples which do not fit into Andersen's rules. S-P clauses which are not identification are listed in p. 473 and P-S clauses which are not classification are in listed pp. 473-74. Hoftijzer's list of exceptions calls the adequacy of Andersen's theoretical framework into questions.

⁹ This term comes from "allosentence" used by Knud Lambrecht:

Information-structure analysis is centered on the comparison of semantically equivalent but formally and pragmatically divergent sentence pairs, such as active vs. passive, canonical vs. topicalized, canonical vs. clefted or dislocated, subject-accented vs. predicate-accented sentences etc. Using a term introduced by Danes (1966), I will refer to such sentence pairs as pairs of ALLOSENTENCES. (1994, 6)

¹⁰ They are (i) *kōl* clause, (ii) the predicate is participle, (iii) circumstantial clause, (iv) not a clause, (v) precative.

Andersen cannot put this particular clause into his five exceptional groups. He finds five more "unexplainable" clauses (44). They are:

Num. 28:14 זֹאת עֹלֹת חֹרֶשׁ This is the burnt offering.

Gen. 18:20 וְעֵקֶת סֹדֹם וְעֵמֹרָה כִּי־רָבָה The outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah is indeed great.

Gen. 2:23 זֹאת הַבָּעַם עֲצָם מֵעַצְמִי This is now bone of my bones.

Gen. 6:3 בְּשָׂרָם הוּא בָּשָׂר because he also is flesh

Gen. 42:13 אֲנַחְנוּ בְּנֵי אִישׁ־אֶחָד We are the sons of one man.

Andersen's conclusion above leaves an impression that all the classification clauses have the Pind-Sd sequence except these five categories of exceptions and only these six "archaic" and "old" passages do not fit his rules and rules of exceptions (42-44). The fact is that there are more than these six "archaic" inexplicable clauses which do not belong to the five exceptional categories. Below are some of these examples taken from our two-member clauses (#1-60).

will introduce below, Niccacci observes this function of (2) and calls it "presentational." He proposes that there are three clause types in Biblical Hebrew and he calls the third one "presentational." Presentational clauses "are presenting their state," have a function for "someone introducing himself," "reporting on some event," or "submitting to the listener a proposition of his own." Namely Niccacci recognises the third clause type, such as Exod. 33:5 (2) above, has a pragmatic¹¹ function which is different from simply describing "you." In other words, the two clauses above (1) and (2) have the same meaning, but (1) is simply commenting on "you," while in (2) the speaker is attempting to convey to the listener something more than simple commenting, such as "I am presenting my state here," "I am introducing myself," "I am reporting on some event," "I am now presenting my proposition." Suffice it now to say that Andersen does not recognise this pragmatic function of Exod. 33:5 and classifies it as an exception.

We may put it another way. The importance of Andersen's new methodology to seek functional differences between the two word order S-P and P-S cannot be overvalued. Nevertheless, his theoretical framework was not adequate to present the functional opposition of the two different word orders. Hoftijzer's proposal to compare allo-clauses has made a refinement to this new line of method.

Definition of identification

The third problem of Andersen's binary model is his definition of "identification." Andersen defines identification as follows:

When both S and P are definite, the predicate has total semantic overlap with the subject; that is, each has exactly the same referent. The predicate supplies the identity of the subject. (32)

He goes on to specify the definiteness of Subject and Predicate:

Even though both subject and predicate in an identifying clause are definite, the predicate is generally less definite than the subject. . . .Otherwise it would not be possible to speak about sequence in clauses of identification: if both S and P were identical in definiteness, it would be possible to say which was which. (40-41)

Here Andersen claims that the predicate has total semantic overlap with the subject and that identification has the more definite reference as the subject and the less definite reference as the predicate.

#30 Deut. 6:4	יְהוָה אֶחָד	The Lord is one.
#30 Gen. 49:5	שִׁמְעוֹן וְלֵוִי אֶחָיִם	Simeon and Levi are brothers.
#34 Num. 23:21	יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו עִמּוֹ	The Lord his God is with him.
#41 Dt 29:28	הַסֵּתֵרִים לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְהַגְּלוּת לָנוּ	The secret things belong to the Lord our God, but the things revealed belong to us
#41 Num. 5:8	הַאֲשָׁם הַמְּשֻׁב לַיהוָה לַכֹּהֵן	the restitution which is made for the wrong must go to the Lord for the priest,

¹¹ For the definition of the word pragmatic, see 5.6 "Pragmatics and Markedness of Predicate-Focus Structure" pp. 111ff.

Hoftijzer claims that "there are exceptions to the rule that the subject usually is more definite than the predicate." (451) An example he gives is

Gen. 10:2: "וּמְגוֹג וְגֹמֶר יְפֹת בְּנֵי יָפֶתְ The sons of Japheth were Gomer and Magog."

This clause type is Sd-Pd, thus this is "identification." The subject, then, is supposed to be more definite than the predicate. However the subject is less definite than the predicate. Hoftijzer lists many more examples where the predicates are more definite than the subjects (468). The degree of definiteness cannot be a criterion to distinguish subject from predicate.

Another criticism came from Arthur Gibson in *Biblical Semantic Logic* (1981). Gibson questions the use and definition of "predicate" by Andersen. Quoting Andersen's "When both S and P are definite, the predicate has total semantic overlap with the subject that is, each has exactly the same referent," Gibson notes:

It is then strange that solely referential identity should be consigned to 'total semantic overlap' (since 'semantic' is centrally used of sense in Andersen), for 'total semantic overlap' imports synonymy. (172)

T. Muraoka also expresses his dissatisfaction with Andersen's definition of identification by giving an example and introduces his own terms, identification and description.

By "identification" I mean, to illustrate, a sentence like *I am Esau* [and none else] as a reply to the question, whether explicit or implicit, *Who is Esau?* or *Which of you is Esau?* while *I am Esau*, when it can be constructed as a reply to the question, whether explicit or implicit, *Who are you?*, is a description. In contrast, Andersen's approach is typical of the usual understanding of "identification": "When both S and P are definite, the predicate has total semantic overlap with the subject that is, each has exactly the same referent. The predicate supplies the identity of the subject" (op. cit., p. 32). Accordingly *I am Esau* can be only identificatory. It will be seen from this that Andersen's (and many others') categories are those of logic, whereas ours are those of semantics. (8)

Let us develop Muraoka's point based on the definition of identification proposed by a linguist K. Lambrecht. For Lambrecht identificational sentences "serve to identify a referent as the missing argument [non-predicate element]¹² in an open proposition" (1994, 122). For example, an answer to the question by a father to his children "Who broke this window?" would be "Mark (did)." ("did" can be omitted). Identification relates or identifies a referent with a missing subject in the proposition "someone broke the window." Mark happened to break the window but Mark is not totally overlapped with "someone who broke the window." The function of identification relates these two referents "Mark" and "X" in "X (someone) who broke the window" but these two referents do not have to be totally overlapped. We may say that Lambrecht's definition is functional while Andersen's logico-semantic. It is fair for Muraoka to say that there is a functional difference in two answers below:

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| (1) Who are you? | I am ESAU. (read "Esau" with high pitch) |
| (2) Which of you is Esau? | <u>I</u> am Esau. (read "I" with high pitch) |

¹² It includes subjects, objects and adverbial phrases. See p. 48 for the definition.

The first answer describes "I." In other words, it adds new information to "I." The second answer identifies "I" with X in "X (someone) is Esau." As Muraoka mentions above, Andersen's definition does not allow us to distinguish these two different functions. Muraoka names the answer in (1) "description," the answer in (2) "identification." We may say that Andersen's definition of identification cannot explain a functional difference between these two allo-sentences which have different functions while they have the same propositional meaning. We notice that English distinguishes these two answers by pitch prominence. Esau in (1) above has high pitch (marked by small capitals) whereas "I" in (2) above has high pitch (underlined because small capital does not distinguish "I"). This aspect of high pitch in English and new information will be elaborated in the following chapters.

Summary of Andersen's binary model

We may summarise Andersen's binary model as follows. It is a considerable advance that he takes a functional opposition approach against the previous normal/exception approach. However, his model seems to have three problems: first, his grades of definiteness are not well defined; second, his binary model considers half of the four clause types with all their clauses as exceptions and does not explain the allo-clauses (between Andersen's "classification" and Niccacci's "presentational" clause); and finally the definition of Andersen's identification is "logical" and does not see a functional difference between the allo-clauses (between Muraoka's "description" and "identification").

We may say that there is a need for a more comprehensive theoretical alternative. At this stage, it appears that Hoftijzer's proposal to compare allo-clauses and the functional definition of the term "identification" by Muraoka and Lambrecht will enable us to analyse the phenomena more accurately.

1.1.2.2.J. Hoftijzer's "Contrastiveness" (1973)

Hoftijzer, who criticises Andersen's methodology in his article, proposes an alternative theory in the latter half of the article. His intention is to detect "a functional opposition" (487) between allo-clauses (S-P and P-S), and he examines clauses which consist of a definite subject and an indefinite predicate.¹³ The key word he introduces in his theory is "contrastiveness" (493, et passim), or "special importance" (494, et passim).

He first examines the P-S sequence. He observes that P is "contrastive" or "of special importance." For example, he comments

¹³ Since Hoftijzer avoids "logical" terms, he does not use the terms subject or predicate (487-88). Below are the types of clauses he examined, and we may call the left column, indefinite predicates, the right column, definite subjects. He examines two types of word order: P-S and S-P.

Predicate	Subject
1. a non-pronominal definite noun	and a pronoun (488-495)
2. an indefinite noun category	and a definite noun category (495-501)
3. an indefinite participle	and a definite noun category (501-505)
4. a prepositional phrase	and a definite noun category (505-509)

An clear example is Gen. xii 19 (*ʾhōtī hī*; from the context it is clear that Abram does everything to convince people that Sarah is not his wife but his sister). . . . (488)

A similar interpretation is also probable for Jacob's words when he sees angels *maḥanē ʾelōhīm ze* (Gen. xxxii 3); "this is nothing but a (the) camp of God. (489)

Hoftijzer's "contrastiveness" is broader than one expects since he uses "contrastiveness" and "special importance" interchangeably.

In Gen. xvii 15 God says about Abraham's wife *kī sārā šemāh*; here it is of special importance that her name will be *Sara* and that she will not be called with another name, i.e. *Sarai*. (494)

In the sequence S-P, Hoftijzer finds four kinds of clauses. First, S is contrastive; second, S is not contrastive; third, P is contrastive and forth, P is not contrastive. Examples are:

1. S is contrastive:

In Ex. ix 27 Pharaoh says *waʾanī waʾammī hārešāʾīm*: there it is clearly implied that *the "I" and his people* are guilty and not the other party (God). (491)

2. S is not contrastive:

The words *ze sēper tōledōt ʾadām* (Gen. v 1) do not imply that *this* (and nothing else) is the book of the generations of Adam. . . . (491)

In Gen. xix 37 there is said of Moab *hū ʾabī-mōʾāb*; that does not mean that *he* and no one else is the ancestor of the Moabites. . . . (491)

Of one of the rivers originating in Eden it is said *hū hassōbēb ʾet kol-ʾereš kūš* (Gen. ii 13); this does not mean that *this* river (and not one of the others) compasses the land of Cush. (491)

3. P is contrastive:

In Gen. xxxiii 13 Jacob says to Esau *ʾadōnī yōdēaʾ kī-haylādīm rakkīm*; that *this* can be said about the children is in the context an important argument why Jacob will not go with Esau. . . . (499)

In Ex. xxxiii 5 in the words of God to Israel *ʾattem ʾam-qešē-ʾōrep*, it is important that *this* can be said about the people; it is the reason why God does not want to go with them. (499)

4. P is not contrastive:

E.g. in Gen. ix 3 *kol-remeš ʾašer hū-ḥay . . .*, the *ḥay* is clearly not of a contrastive character. (499)

Hoftijzer concludes that in the sequence P-S, P "is of a contrastive character." However, in the sequence S-P, he finds some subjects are contrastive and some are not. Therefore the sequence S-P "gives no indications whether one of the two is contrastive or not" (493, 500, 504 and 509). In other words he observes "contrastiveness" or "special importance" in the clause-initial position in the sequence P-S, but he cannot observe it in the sequence S-P in the same manner.

Hoftijzer's intention to detect "a functional opposition"(487) between allo-clauses (S-P and P-S) is certainly a step in the right direction and his observation of "especial importance" in the clause-initial position seems to be valid. However, we may wonder if his study presents the "functional opposition" between P-S and S-P as he has intended. For example, let us see the typical set of allo-clauses:

P-S Exod. 33:3 עִם־קָשָׁה־עָרַךְ אַתָּה you are an obstinate people.

S-P Exod. 33:5 אַתָּם עִם־קָשָׁה־עָרַךְ you are an obstinate people.

According to Hoftijzer's theory, "an obstinate people" in Exod. 33:3 would be contrasted (P of P-S), while "you" in 33:5 (S of S-P) might be contrastive or might not be contrastive. Then, if both these two different sequences can signify the same contrastiveness, can we assert that there is a "functional opposition" between the two sequences?

1.1.2.3.T. Muraoka's "Emphasis" (1985)

Just as Hoftijzer does, T. Muraoka criticises Andersen's binary model and presents his own. He studied emphasis in Biblical Hebrew in his doctoral dissertation in 1969 and wrote *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (1985) based on his dissertation. Muraoka used his study in his revision of Joüon's grammar.

In *Emphatic*, Muraoka observes a difference in structural meaning, in Hoftijzer's term, a "functional opposition," between the two different word order: P-S and S-P.

It is of fundamental importance to recognize the basic difference in structural meaning carried by the two different word-order patterns: description is the structural meaning of the P-S pattern, except where the predicate is a prepositional or adverbial phrase, when the clause may be identificatory. In contrast, that of the reverse order can be either description or identification. (7)

Since Muraoka observes two "structural meanings" in S-P, he comments on how he can distinguish the two within the same S-P sequence:

the key to the decision for description or identification in the S-P pattern lies in the nature of the predicate; where it consists of an adjective, participle, or indeterminate noun, the meaning of the whole structure is that of description, while, when it consists of a determinate noun or noun phrase, the structure means identification. (8)

Examples are

P-S : description¹⁴

Judg. 7:2 רַב הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתְּךָ The people who are with you are too many (p. 15)

S-P: either description or identification¹⁵

description: Gen. 47:9 יָמַי שְׁנַיִם מֵגוּרֵי שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמְאַת שָׁנָה

The years of my sojourning are one hundred and thirty. (p. 9)

identification: Gen. 48:18 זֶה הַבְּכֹר this one is the first-born.

He comments on this clause that "when the subject is a pron.[ominal] dem.[onstrative], S-P can only signify identification." (p. 10)

Let us briefly examine Muraoka's binary model "description vs. identification" by applying it to the same allo-clauses above:

P-S Exod. 33:3 עִם־קָשָׁה־עָרַךְ אַתָּה you are an obstinate people.

S-P Exod. 33:5 אַתָּם עִם־קָשָׁה־עָרַךְ you are an obstinate people.

¹⁴ "except where the predicate is a prepositional or adverbial phrase, when the clause may be identificatory."

¹⁵ S-P can only signify identification, when S is a demonstrative pronoun. (p. 10)

According to Muraoka, since the subjects are pronouns and the predicates, "an obstinate people," are not "determinate" (8), these two clauses are both "description." A simple question arises. If both the sequences are "description," we wonder again if Muraoka's terms and framework distinguishes "the basic difference in structural meaning carried by the two different word-order patterns": in our terms the functional difference between allo-clauses.¹⁶

In addition to Muraoka's "description vs. identification" binary model, he detects emphasis in the clause-initial position of certain clauses. The majority of his work on nominal clause word order is devoted to emphasis rather than to functional opposition. He detects emphasis in some predicates of P-S clauses¹⁷ and in some subjects of S-P clauses.¹⁸

Emphatic P in P-S

Gen. 27:13 קְלָלָתְךָ עָלַי Your curse be on me. (p. 14)

Emphatic S in S-P

Gen. 31:13 אֲנֹכִי הָאֵל בֵּית-אֵל אֲשֶׁר מָשַׁחְתָּ שָׁם מִצְבָּה

I am the God of Bethel, where you anointed a pillar. (p. 12)

However, Muraoka observes exceptions:

Non-emphatic P of P-S

Ex. 21:3 אִם-בַּעַל אִשָּׁה הוּא if he is the husband of a wife, (p. 15)

Non-emphatic S of S-P

Gen. 47:9 יָמַי שְׁנַי מִגּוּרֵי נְשָׁיִם וּמֵאֵת שָׁנָה

The years of my sojourning are one hundred and thirty. (p. 9)

On the clause-initial position, Muraoka concludes that

König's claim that the initial position occupied by a word can always be explained as due to emphasis seems to be an oversimplification." (3)¹⁹

Hoftijzer, Muraoka and Revell

We may notice here the similarity between Muraoka and Hoftijzer. Both of them purposed to establish the functional opposition between P-S and S-P, However, they observe two different functions in the same S-P sequence.

¹⁶ It may be noteworthy that Muraoka mentions the third clause type in his study of Syriac. He calls it "contrast" (SP) and it has a function to contrast the whole proposition (1975, and 1987).

¹⁷ Particularly when S is a personal pronoun (pp. 14ff). However Muraoka detects no emphasis in circumstantial clauses and some other P-S clauses.

¹⁸ Muraoka detects emphasis in S, when S is a personal pronoun (pp. 11ff). However, he detects no emphasis in other S-P, particularly when P is participle or when the clause is circumstantial.

¹⁹ More recently Muraoka seems to have adopted a different notion than emphasis for clause-initial position. It is "some special prominence or focus" (146). Muraoka detects it in fronted propositional phrases. However, Muraoka similarly concludes that noun followed by prepositional phrase is "the normal sequence for the type of nominal clause" which "is neutral in respect of the prominence to be given to either of the two principal constituents" (1991, 151). In other words, Muraoka detects "prominence" or "focus" in the clause-initial position of certain clauses only.

	Hoftijzer	Muraoka
P-S	contrastive	descriptive
S-P	contrastive or non-contrastive	descriptive or identificational

Therefore we may say that they did not present the functional opposition in the typical set of allo-clauses. This fact raises a doubt whether it is justifiable to seek opposing functions.

The idea of opposing functions is explicitly questioned by E. J. Revell, the author of works on Tiberian vocalisation (1987) and on how individuals are addressed in Biblical narrative (1996). In his "The Conditioning of Word Order in Verbless Clauses in Biblical Hebrew" (1989), he comments that "Description in terms of a single pair of opposing categories is too simple for the complex motivation of word order" (5, n. 5). The reason is:

This is shown, for example, by the fact that, despite the fact that 'identification' is a generally satisfactory designation of the meaning of one category, the answer to the question 'what is your identity?' belongs to the other. (5, n. 5)

Then he refers to Muraoka's doctoral dissertation of 1969 and to Andersen's *Verbless Clause* (1970). The reason he questions this functional opposition is the inadequacy of the term "identification" defined by Andersen. We shall discuss Revell's argument against "identification" below.

The studies by Hoftijzer, Muraoka and Revell may give us an impression that the functional opposition between the two clause types, S-P and P-S "is too simple for the complex motivation of word order" (Revell 1989). It also seems "an oversimplification" (Muraoka 1985) to detect some sort of importance or prominence in the clause-initial position of all the clauses.

1.1.2.4. Summary of the 70's and 80's

We may summarise the studies in the 70's and the 80's as follows.

In 1970 F. I. Andersen launched a radical approach to the study of nominal clause word order. He took an approach of functional opposition over against the normal/exception approach and then he proposed the binary model of classification (Pind-Sd) vs. identification (Sd-Pd). T. Muraoka and J. Hoftijzer criticised Andersen's methodology and intended to present the functional opposition between P-S and S-P. However, they observe two functions within the S-P sequence and therefore they do not seem to have presented a functional opposition. E. J. Revell explicitly questions the functional opposition and notes that it is "too simple" to attempt to describe the word order by the opposing functions. As to the clause-initial position, both Muraoka and Hoftijzer find inconsistency in detecting contrast or emphasis in the clause-initial position.

At the close of the 1980's, it appears that the modern approach, "the functional opposition," has already reached deadlock and that the effort to detect some kind of significance in the clause-initial position has ended unsuccessfully.

1.1.3. The early 1990's

1.1.3.1. Introduction

However, there was a new move in the study of nominal clause word order at the turn of the decade. We shall pay attention to A. Niccacci and Revell whom we have just mentioned. These two scholars have proposed to employ three new methods for the study of word order and they have presented their corresponding outcomes. First, both Revell and Niccacci propose a single approach to both nominal and verbal clauses, which runs contrary to the long history of separation between nominal and verbal clauses. Secondly, Revell, in the above article, introduces a new perspective which analyses the author's intention to draw the reader's attention, which is part of information-structure analysis. Through this method, he argues that he can detect "the primary focus" or "significance" in the clause-initial position of any clause types. Thirdly, Revell and Niccacci consider the inter-clausal syntax and discourse-level phenomena for their analysis. By applying this analysis, Niccacci proposes the third clause type, "presentative," in addition to the two clause types of the previous binary models. Below are details of these three aspects.

1.1.3.2. Single approach

First, both Revell and Niccacci propose a single approach to both nominal and verbal clauses. This distinguishes these two from previous scholars who had long treated nominal and verbal clauses independently. Revell comments on the concentration on the verbal clause study in recent years and he states that it obscures the common features between nominal and verbal clauses:

concentration on verbal clauses has tended to obscure the fact that a number of features of structure are common to clauses of both types. The same structures act as constituents of both types of clause, apart, of course, from the verbal constituent which characterizes verbal clauses. (1)

Niccacci also applies the same principle to both nominal and verbal clauses:

The other main principle of my analysis is that the first position of the sentence belongs to the predicate in Biblical Hebrew. I already applied this principle to the sentence with finite verb form. Accordingly, a sentence is predicative when the finite verb form is found right at the beginning of it; it is nominal when the finite verb form takes the second position (i.e. a CNC). I hope to show that, *mutatis mutandis*, this same principle applies to the sentences without a finite verb form (i.e. a SNC). (217)

CNC (Complex Nominal Clause) is Niccacci's special terms for a verbal clause in which a non-verbal element precedes the verb: "which has a finite verb form in the second position of the sentence, i.e. x-qatal, or x-yiqtol" (216). Let us now use "x" to represent a non-verbal element, following Niccacci, and "v" to represent a verb. What is asserted here is that Niccacci observes the same functional difference both in nominal and verbal clauses. Namely, S-P and X-V share the same features, and P-S and V-X share the same features. Both Revell and Niccacci approach nominal and verbal clauses with a common framework.

1.1.3.3. Revell's concern for information value

The second aspect we shall pay attention to is Revell's new perspective of the informational value on the clause-initial position. Having analysed a considerable number of clauses in various clause types, he argues that "The constituent placed first in the clause is that which the author wishes to be the primary focus of the reader's attention" (p. 2, underline added). Here we need to recognise that Revell has introduced a new perspective into the study of Biblical Hebrew word order. He is concerned with the author's intention to draw the reader's attention, using the term "focus" (2) or "significance" (3, n. 3). For Revell, elements in one clause do not have the same informational value for the reader. "The author wishes" that certain elements in one clause have more informational value for "the reader" than other elements within the same clause. One clause has elements "which the author wishes to be the primary focus of the reader's attention" (p. 2). His analysis of the placing or distribution of the prominent information in a sentence is a part of information-structure analysis which also considers the topic-comment relationship, the state of information (old or new), and the level of definiteness of a referent in the minds of participants (details of the information-structure analysis will follow in the next chapter). Using this new perspective, Revell concludes that "no doubt that this significance was the main factor determining word order" (24). The "most significant item in a clause is placed first" (5). Namely he argues that Hebrew expresses this prominent information (his "focus" or "significance") by word order and the clause-initial position is marked for it. For example,

P-S (p. 6)

2Sam. 15:2 מֵאַחַד שְׁבֵטֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עַבְדְּךָ Your servant is from one of the tribes of Israel.

Revell comments on this clause that

The significant constituent, that representing the item which is the concern of the question, is typically placed first in the response. (6)

1Kings 2:8 עִמָּךָ שִׁמְעִי בֶן־גֵּרָא there is with you Shimei the son of Gera.

Similarly Revell comments on this clause:

Where the adverbial constituent is a preposition with a pronominal suffix, it is commonly significant as indicating the relationship of the clause to its context and so precedes the subject. (6)

S-P (p. 9)

Judg. 13:11 הֲאִתָּה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־דַּבַּרְתָּ אֵל־הָאִשָּׁה Are you the man who spoke to the woman?

Revell comments on this clause:

Where there is a question of whether an individual has a particular identity, the question similarly places the pronominal subject first. (9)

He finds the phenomenon of "focus" or "significance" in the clause-initial position consistent in all types of clause.

1.1.3.4. Niccacci's triadic model

The third feature of this turn of the decade is the consideration of the inter-clausal and discourse (or text-unit) level phenomena. Revell recognises contrast of the whole proposition

and also topic-shift as functions of S-P and X-V (18-19). Niccacci comments on his methodology:

The basic presupposition is that correct syntactic analysis is impossible if one remains bound to the sentence level; only on the larger level of the text are the relationships between sentences correctly understood. (216) (underline added)

By applying this method, Niccacci proposes a clause type which is different from the previous two types. Though Niccacci states that there are two types of clause, predicative and presentative, since he divides the predicative into two types, he is virtually proposing three types of clause.

Niccacci's first clause type is P-S unmarked predicative.

Lev. 11:35 טְמֵאִים הֵם they are unclean

Here, P-S gives general information where "the emphasis falls on" (217) the predicate. This is somewhat similar to Andersen's classification and probably equivalent to Muraoka's "description."

The second type is called "marked predicative." While the unmarked predicative clause is giving general information as Lev. 11:35 above, the marked predicative clause gives specific information: "'who is the subject' or 'how did something happen'" (217). His example is:

Gen. 37:16 as an answer to the question "what are you looking for?":

אֶת־אֶחָי אֲנִי מְבַקֵּשׁ I am looking for my brothers.

This "communicates information not in general terms but stressing only a detail of it" (220). This is what Muraoka and Lambrecht call identification. Gen. 37:16 relates "my brothers" with X in the preposition "I am looking for X."

This Niccacci's "marked predicative" seems to have a terminological difficulty. For Niccacci אֶת־אֶחָי (my brothers) is a predicate. He arrives at this conclusion by translating "It is my brothers that I am looking for" (218). This is not a normal way of defining predicate and subject. Then he classifies this sentence as marked, because this "predicate," "my brothers," is "not belonging to the class of the predicate" (217). Namely "my brothers" above is predicate of the sentence but it does not belong to a group of words called "predicate." The terminology such as "a predicate not belonging to the class of the predicate" may not be easily communicated. Niccacci seems to indicate a function by the first "predicate," and a class or a group of words by the latter "predicate."

This terminological confusion arises from the "two basic principles" (216) which underlie his analysis. The first basic principle of Niccacci is that he uses traditional logical "Aristotelian terms, universals [a class of predicate] and particulars [a class of subject]" (216). Proper names, pronouns, definite phrases (e.g., my friend) belong to particular or substance, while common nouns (man, book, etc.), abstract nouns (beauty), verbs, adjectives and adverbs are universal (general) (217). According to this traditional Greek grammar Niccacci notes:

In principle, substances (or particulars) function as subject while accidental properties (or universals) function as predicate. (217)

"My brothers" above is a "substance" and therefore it cannot function as predicate, but in fact it is functioning as predicate. Therefore Niccacci calls it "marked."

The second basic principle of Niccacci is that the clause-initial position is marked for the predicative function in Biblical Hebrew:

The other main principle of my analysis is that the first position of the sentence belongs to the predicate in Biblical Hebrew. (217)

According to this second basic principle, "my brothers" needs to be labelled as "predicative," because any element in the clause-initial position must be the predicate.

Aristotelian terms may be useful for classification of words in a limited situation. Although Niccacci's observations are insightful and valid, his two basic principles seems to mar the theoretical presentation of his triadic model. Probably we need to seek more appropriate terms for the function of this second type. Following Muraoka and Lambrecht, I shall call Niccacci's second type "identification," and the item identified, "argument" following Lambrecht. "Argument" is a cover term for any non-predicating element in a clause. It includes pronouns, noun phrases, subordinate clauses, and certain adverbial phrases expressing place, time, and manner.²⁰ It includes a subject, an object, and an adverbial phrase.²¹ In the above example of Gen. 37:16, "my brothers" is not a predicate, but it is an argument. This clause, Gen. 37:16, identifies (or relates) "my brothers" with a missing argument (X) of the proposition "I am looking for someone (X)." The introduction of this new term, "argument," has the advantage, because an argument can be a subject or an object. For example, the example that Muraoka gives happens to have the subject as the identified element:

Which one is Esau? I am Esau. ("I" is read with high-pitch)

This is certainly identificational, because the clause identifies "I" with the missing argument of the proposition "someone (X) is Esau." However, in Niccacci's example, it is an object that is identified:

Who are you looking for? I am looking for my brothers.

This term 'argument' may be used for both the cases above: for the subject and for the object. This term, argument, will also be used in verbal clauses with "x" as its representation, just like Niccacci's "x" for non-verbal elements in verbal clauses. Let us leave, therefore, Niccacci's use of Aristotelian terms and call this second clause type "identification," and use the term "argument" for any non-predicate elements.²²

Niccacci's third type of clause is called S-P "presentative" or "circumstantial."

Num. 9:7 אֲנִיחָנוּ טִמְאִים We are unclean

Niccacci comments that "they are presenting their state to Moses so that a solution can be found" (221). In other instances, S-P has a function for "someone introducing himself" (Gen. 28:13), "reporting on some event" (Num. 11:27) or "submitting to the listener a

²⁰ See Lambrecht, 75 and 224.

²¹ See C. Creider observes that the fronted adverbial phrase is focused in an answer to the question in English. See Creider 1979, 7.

proposition of his own" (Gen. 19:31) (219). Namely, the third type of clause has a pragmatic function in addition to predicating the subject. In other words, Num. 9:7 "אֲנַחְנוּ טְמֵאִים We are unclean" is not only predicating the subject "we," but "they are presenting their state to Moses so that a solution can be found" (221). Introduction of one person, event-reporting, presenting a proposition are all concerned with the speaker-listener relationship and with the flow of a narrative (pragmatics) in addition to the mere content of a proposition "we are unclean." We may notice the similarity between this functions of the SP presentative clause and Niccacci's XV clauses. In his work on verbal clauses (1990), Niccacci argues that XV breaks the narrative line and provides "comment" or "background" information (chapter 3 and 5). Namely, Niccacci observes pragmatic or discourse functions in both SP and XV clauses.

Niccacci's triadic model will be summarised as follows. The second type, the marked predicative is now called identification following Muraoka and Lambrecht and we shall use the new term "argument" in place of the subject or the object represented by the letter X.

1. Predicative (P-X)

Lev. 11:35 טְמֵאִים הֵם they are unclean

This clause gives general information about the subject or the argument.

2. Identificational (X-P)

Gen. 37:16 "what are you looking for?"

אֶת־אֲחֵי אֲנֹכִי מִבְּקֵשׁ I am looking for my brothers.

This clause identifies (or relates) "I" with the missing argument of the proposition "I am looking for someone (X)."

3. Presentative (X-P)

Num. 9:7 אֲנַחְנוּ טְמֵאִים We are unclean

This type of clause has pragmatic functions which are concerned with the speaker-listener relationship and also with the flow of a narrative in addition to the mere content of a proposition "we are unclean."

Niccacci's proposal of the third category and his observation of its pragmatic function is significant, because it explains the short-comings of the previous binary models proposed by Andersen, Hoftijzer and Muraoka, and also shows why Revell thinks that a binary model is too simple to describe word-order phenomena.²³

²² See 2.4 "Argument and Comment" for the definition of "argument" in p. 48.

²³ As we have seen, Revell comments that it is too simple to detect the functional opposition between the S-P and P-S sequences. The term identification by Andersen is certainly inadequate to describe Revell's "identity" (9-10) as Revell suggests. However, the inadequacy of Andersen's definition of identification and the short-comings of the binary models do not necessarily justify Revell's statement of "too simple." We notice that Revell puts under one category of his "identity" those clauses (p. 9-10) which include

1. 2Kings 10:13 אֲנַחְנוּ אֶתְּמֵהוּ אֲנַחְנוּ We are the relatives of Ahaziah

2. Judg. 13:11 הֲאֵפֶה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־דִּבְרָתָ אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה

1.1.3.5. Summary of the early 90's

To sum up, new methods and corresponding outcomes for the nominal clause word-order study were observed in the early 90's which appear to supplement the studies in the 70's and 80's. Niccacci and Revell employ single approaches to both nominal and verbal clauses, and consider discourse functions and information value of elements. As a result, Revell observes the primary focus in the clause-initial position, and Niccacci proposes the third type of clause: "presentative." This is a major breakthrough in the study of word order.

1.1.4. The close of the 1990's

In February 1999, two books on Hebrew grammar were published. One is *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches* edited by Cynthia L. Miller (1999), and another is *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* edited by Christo H.J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze (1999). These two books seem to reflect the present situation of linguistics at the close of the 20th century. They demonstrate the advance of Hebrew linguistics and at the same time the proliferation of methodology. Miller concludes her introductory essay for *VCBH*:

In the decades since Andersen and Hoftijzer wrote on verbless predications, the science of linguistics has experienced extraordinary advances. . . . With the rise of generative syntax, cognitive linguistics, and informational structuring, Hebraists are confronted with far greater choices for analyzing Biblical Hebrew syntax. (1999, 15)

In these two works we may observe three aspects of the latest works in Biblical Hebrew. One is the increasing adoption of the latest linguistics methods and terms, such as, text-linguistics, functional grammar, background-foreground, anaphoric-cataphoric grounding, information-structure analysis (old-new information, topic-comment, topicalisation, focus and referentiality). Secondly, as a result of the first, some grammarians have started to take a single approach to both nominal and verbal clauses. Finally, the adaptation and application of these latest linguistic achievements is "still a preliminary stage" (van Wolde 1999, 332), and

Although much progress has been made in describing and understanding verbless clauses, uncertainty remains about their internal syntactic structure, their integration along with verbal clauses into an account of Biblical Hebrew syntax, and their distribution and rhetorical function on a text-linguistic level. (Miller 1999, 6)

Some of the significant contributions in these two books will be introduced and evaluated in the following chapters.

1.2. PAST STUDIES OF VERBAL CLAUSE WORD ORDER

Are you the man who spoke to the woman?

3. 1Kings 20:28 אֲנִי יְהוָה I am the Lord.

1 is equivalent to Muraoka's description or to Niccacci's predicative. 2 is equivalent to identification by Muraoka and Lambrecht. 3 is equivalent to Niccacci's presentational clause. It appears that the reason the word order appears too complex to Revell may be due to the lack of adequate terms and concepts, particularly, the distinction of these three different clause types as Niccacci proposes.

We shall now turn to the study of verbal clause word order.

1.2.1. GKC and Muraoka

Universally the sequence V-X (verb followed by non-verbal element) is recognised as the normal sequence of Biblical Hebrew and this word order has been studied extensively under the terms "waw-consecutive," or "waw-conversive."²⁴ However, the function of the inverted word order or the fronting of non-verbal element(s) in verbal clauses (X-V) is not widely recognised and some introductory textbooks do not even mention it.²⁵ Even GKC spares only two pages for the inversion (455-56), while it devotes fourteen pages to the waw-consecutive in general (326-339). GKC lists two functions of the inversion (XV): emphasis and "state." GKC's "state" is similar to the circumstantial clause. The scarcity of the XV-clause study may be understandable, because the majority of verbal clauses take the sequence of VX. However, as we have seen in the nominal clause, the minority in number does not necessarily indicate its insignificance.

Recent works, however, pay more attention to the phenomena of XV.

Muraoka (1985) remarks that this inversion expresses contrast or emphasis on the fronted element (33, 38-39), introduces circumstantial clauses (33-34), presents the peculiar case of $\psi^{\prime}\aleph$ (34-35), or reflects style (chiasmus or attraction, 36-37, 39-40), forms response (40), takes cognate objects (40), semantic factors cause the inversion (e.g., verbs of knowledge and movement, 36), the inversion involves peculiarities with legal texts (40-41), and theology causes the inversion (divine being as the fronted subject, 35).

Compared to Joüon's rather simple understanding of word order,²⁶ J-Muraoka follows Muraoka's understanding of word order and emphasis. They list emphasis or contrast (§155 nb), circumstantial clause (§155 nc), "at the very beginning of a statement" (§155 nd), religious sentiment for fronting of God or his agent (§155 ne), $\psi^{\prime}\aleph$ in indefinite sense (someone) or in a negative clause (nobody) (§155 nf), attraction or chiastic construction (§155 ng), response (§155 nh), peculiarity in legal texts (§155 oc), the indirect object of the action (§155 q), the infinitive with \beth indicating the purpose (§155 s), and extraposition structure (casus pendens) (§156).

²⁴ This is one of the phenomena peculiar to biblical Hebrew. Waw-consecutive is also found in Moabite. Though Moabite is a separate language (K. P. Jackson, 130), it is "very closely related to Hebrew and in particular to the Israelite Hebrew dialect." (John C. L. Gibson, 72). K. P. Jackson even writes, "it is probable that Moabite and Hebrew were for the most part mutually intelligible." (130). The fact that the waw-consecutive forms "are only found in Moabite outside Hebrew," (Gibson, 73) reveals further its similarity to Hebrew. See K. Jacson 1989; J. Gibson 1971.

²⁵ For example J. Blau 1976, 46, 86; J. Martin 1993, 87; Mauchline simply mentions that XV "reverts to the proper and natural tense." (1966, 96).

²⁶ See p. 10 of our study for Joüon's understanding.

These scholars above, GKC, Muraoka and J-Muraoka, concentrate on intra-clausal and inter-clausal analysis of XV, while other scholars are more aware of text-unit (discourse) level phenomena.

1.2.2. More recent works

1.2.2.1. Growing concern for discourse functions

Thomas O. Lambdin draws attention to XV naming it "disjunctive" (1971, 162ff) and proposes that XV terminates or initiates an episode and creates circumstantial clauses, and shows contrast.

Andersen in *Sentence of Biblical Hebrew* (1974) is clearly aware of text-unit level phenomena, in that Andersen recognises that XV introduces a circumstantial clause (78), initiates an episode or a paragraph (65, §4.2.2), and shifts the topic (65, §4.2.2). He observes also that XV is used in appositional (47, §3.7.1), chiasmic (121, 134) and contrastive (151) sentence structure.

G. Khan analyses extraposition (traditionally *casus pendens*) from a strong text-linguistic perspective. It is noteworthy that he observes similarities between extraposition structure and SV-clauses.

In many respects SV-clauses are functionally equivalent to Ex/PAR [extraposition] constructions. Compare (a) their use in parallel/chiasmic combinations of clauses (II, 2.1) and (b) their function of marking span boundaries (II, 1.3.1.1, 1.3.2.1) (95)

The functions of SV in marking span boundaries which he observes are Span closure and Span onset. Span onset includes beginning of a speech [initialisation], shift to new topic constituent [topic-shifting], shift to new theme [theme-shifting], shift to background information (86-88).

Alviero Niccacci (1990, chapter 5) notes that XV offers anteriority, simultaneity, contrast, emphasis, circumstance of the following wayyiqtol.

For D-Gibson (1994) XV indicates either that the clause is non-consecutive or that if it is consecutive, XV is 1. highlighting the fronted element (84), 2. focusing, 3. emphasising, 4. marking off-line remarks or 5. relating clauses within a compound sentence for similarity, contrast, etc. (164).

These scholars have advanced the understanding of the functions of the inverted word order (XV) by considering inter-clausal and text-unit (discourse) level phenomena (or discourse analysis).

1.2.2.2. Application of Functional Grammar

In more recent years works by Hebraists have been emerging which have adopted Functional Grammar as the underlying method. The work of Walter Gross, *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa* (1996), that has extensively analysed the word order of verbal clauses, is one of them. Gross employs terms such as "Thema-Rhema," "Topic-Kommentar," and "Fokus-Hintergrund" for his analysis (55-72). He also seems to follow

the approach of Simon Dik's Functional Grammar, using Dik's distinction between prefield and postfield languages. Gross names the preverbal domain "prefield" "Vorfeld" (81) and he argues that the fronting of non-verbal elements, XV, interrupts the sequence of wayyiqtol chain and can have special pragmatic functions in addition to focus (emphasis). They are list, temporal recourse [anterior circumstantial clause], background information, narrative comment [explanatory circumstantial clause] and indication of text boundary (relative and absolute text-beginning and text-subdivision) (142).

Van der Merwe in *BHRG* (1999) follows N. Chomsky, Simon Dik and W. Gross in dealing with verbal clause word order (11; 337, n. 58). He also employs similar methods to Dik and Gross, such as Prefield, fronting for focus, activation and reactivation. Then he reaches a similar conclusion to Gross.

1.2.2.3. Summary

These scholars above have significantly advanced the understanding of XV functions by considering the inter-clausal and discourse (text-unit) level phenomena. On the inter-clausal level, XV clauses express contrast, create circumstantial clauses or subordinate clauses, form chiasmic and parallel constructions. On the text-unit (discourse) level, XV clauses initiate and terminate a text unit (discourse), shift the topic, and give background information.²⁷ It is noteworthy that the most recent works by Gross and van der Merwe consider the phenomenon of focus and that van der Merwe explicitly employs information-structure analysis for verbal clause word order.

1.2.3. Longacre's macro-structure

R. E. Longacre (1989), however, approached these phenomena from a very different angle. He launched a grand-scale new system of macro-structure grammar which integrates the grounding (the foreground/background opposition), the distinction between various discourse types and the hierarchical verb rank theory:

I posit here that (a) every language has a system of discourse types (e.g., narrative, predicative, hortatory, procedural, expository, and others); (b) each discourse types has its own characteristic constellation of verb forms that figure in that type; (c) the uses of [a] given tense/aspect/mood form are most surely and concretely described in relation to a given discourse type. (59)

He describes chains of *waw*-consecutives (preterites) as "the backbone of any Old Testament story" (65), and others are "supportive, descriptive, and depictive materials" (65). These supportive materials are expressed by a hierarchical verb rank. Namely, "*waw*-consecutives" carry the foreground of an episode and the background information is expressed by other types of verbs. The closest to the foreground is qatal, then participle, *hāyā*, nominal clause, existential clause with *yēš*, and the verbal form which is the most remote from the story-line is negated verbs (64-82). According to Longacre this verb rank is "a scheme symbolising

²⁷ Peculiar reasons for the inversion proposed by Muraoka and J-Muraoka will be discussed in a different chapter.

degrees of departure from the storyline." (82, n. 6). In other words, most of the functions that the word-order inversion is thought to have, according to the previous studies, are now attributed to this hierarchical verb rank system. For example, in the narrative discourse type, *x-qatal* or *x-participle* creates a circumstantial clause, not because of the inverted word order, but because it departs from the *waw*-consecutive. This verb rank system differs from discourse type to discourse type (e.g., narrative, hortatory, predictive, expository, etc.) and each discourse type has its own verb rank system to express the foreground and the departure from it (the background). Longacre posits that "the uses of [a] given tense/aspect/mood form are most surely and concretely described in relation to a given discourse type" (above). Namely a given discourse type and its grounding rules morphology. D. A. Dawson (1994) and N. Winther-Nielsen (1995) follow Longacre.

This top-down monosystemic grand-scale grammar is questioned by traditional grammarians. *IBHS*, which acknowledges the importance of going beyond the sentence grammar of the past (53), quotes Longacre (53) and states that

In the light of these claims, we must cautiously defend the more traditional path followed in this grammar. . . . For our purposes a grammar of this magnitude is not prudent. . . . (54)

We have resisted the strong claims of discourse grammarians in part for the theoretical and practical reasons mentioned earlier: most syntax can be and has been described on the basis of the phrase, clause, and sentence. (55)

It appears at first glance that this gap between the traditional bottom-up grammar and this new type of top-down discourse grammar is unreconcilably large. Nevertheless, we may observe some changes among Hebraists since then. First, the macro-structure theory is established as a school among some Hebraists, such as de Regt (1999). Den Exeter Blokland also attempts to reach a macro-structure of one corpus by analysing paradigmatic-syntagmatic features (1995).

Secondly, some Hebraists are adopting modified grounding theories. T. Givón, recognising the achievement of the grounding theory (foreground/background), points out that this binary theory may fail to capture the more complex and subtle reality of a language. He proposes complementary frameworks, such as, non-binary scaling model (scale of topic-predictability, for example) and the anaphoric-cataphoric grounding theory (1987). Van Wolde is aware of this development and attempts to apply this topic-predictability scale (level of referentiality and topicality) and anaphoric-cataphoric grounding to Biblical Hebrew (1999). Our study employs a framework of scaling, which is similar to Givón's topic-predictability scale (see chapter 5).

Thirdly, some of the latest works seem to attempt to bridge this gap between the two (the traditional bottom-up approaches and the macro-structure/foreground-background theory) by focusing on inter-clausal syntax. For example, Yoshinobu Endo (1996) and Randall Buth (1995) see this controversial issue through the sequential/non-sequential binary opposition. I will elaborate their works here, because their ideas will be our working hypothesis.

1.2.4. Sequential/non-sequential Verbal System

Endo analyses the Hebrew verbal system and observes the sequential vs. non-sequential opposition in the use of the verbal conjugations. In the past context, *yiqtol* is used to convey sequentiality and *qatal* non-sequentiality. In the non-past context, *qatal* conveys sequentiality and *yiqtol* non-sequentiality. In the volitive context, *qatal* conveys sequentiality and imperative, jussive and cohortative non-sequentiality (321):²⁸

CONTEXT	NON-SEQUENTIAL	SEQUENTIAL
PAST (Complete)	QATAL	(waY)YIQTOL
NON-PAST (Incomplete)	YIQTOL	(we)QATAL
VOLITIVE	IMPR. JUSS & COH	(we)QATAL

Then Endo repeatedly stresses that

So far as the "backgrounding - foregrounding" theory (Niccacci, Longacre, *et al.*) is concerned, this distinction does not seem to be a determinative factor for the choice of the verbal forms. This distinction [backgrounding - foregrounding] seems to be a secondary phenomenon or a by-product of the distinction between sequentiality and non-sequentiality. (324, underline added)

Endo offers a reason which explains the phenomena of the grounding without resorting to the difference of discourse types of Longacre. This is a significant contribution in terms of "filling the gap." Notice here the tense of one verbal conjugation is determined by the tense of its context.²⁹

However, from the point of view of word order, Endo follows Longacre that the word-order inversion (XV) simply shifts the topic.³⁰ For Endo also, most of the functions that the traditional grammar has observed in the word-order inversion are ascribed now to the verbal system except for the topic-shift.

Buth, on the other hand, who is a proponent of a Praguian-generative-functional approach (1999, 79-80), uniquely integrates the sequential/non-sequential verbal system and the word-order study of the past. First he presents a binary verbal system (99) which is similar to Endo's (modified for comparison):

Tense-Aspect	Discontinuity	Continuity
Past, Perfective, Realis	X + qatal	wayyiqtol
Non-Past, Imperfective, Irrealis	X + yiqtol	weqatal

Then Buth concludes:

With foreground-continuity (VS) versus background-discontinuity (XV) we are dealing with a binary structure that can be manipulated in many circumstances to produce quite

²⁸ While Lambdin understands that this non-sequentiality is brought by the non-verbal element after *waw*, Endo argues that the verbal system itself expresses it without *waw*. J-Muraoka also notes "But in certain cases the Waw must be separated from the verbal form, for example, to indicate the absence of sequence" (§155 n).

²⁹ This is also observed by W. Moran in Akkadian of Byblos. He comments on the future tense of the perfect: "The future meaning in these instances can only derive from the context. (1950, 33)

³⁰ Longacre later adds other functions of fronting: "at least three such functions in biblical Hebrew: paraphrase, amplification, and contrast . . ." (1992, 210).

an array of subtle distinctions. The text is able to signal foreground-continuity [by VS] and able to break-up that continuity [by XV] to report parallel actions, out-of-sequence actions, new topics, new units and even to mark dramatic pause in a grammatical inversion [that is XV]. (99-100, underline added)

He observes that XV is "able to break-up that continuity to report parallel actions, out-of-sequence actions, new topics, new units and even to mark dramatic pause in a grammatical inversion."

What we may observe here is that the majority of implications of the inverted word order (XV) observed by many scholars in the past is considered to be non-sequential, discontinuous or independent. They include GKC's state (anteriority and simultaneity), J-Muraoka's circumstantial clause, "at the very beginning of a statement," Muraoka's circumstantial clause, Lambdin's circumstantial use, explanatory or parenthetical use and initial use, circumstantial clause of *SBH* (Andersen), episode-initial, topic-shifting, Khan's marking of span boundaries, Niccacci's anteriority, simultaneity and circumstantial clause, D-Gibson's marking off-line remarks and circumstantial clause, and Longacre and Endo's background, topicalisation and topic-shifting. These are either on the inter-clausal level (circumstantial clause and parallel constructions, etc.), or on the text-unit level (onset, background information, closure, etc.).

It appears, then, that Buth's theory successfully integrates both the achievements of the past word-order study and the sequentiality verbal system; and both the traditional bottom-up approach and the grounding theory. Nevertheless, his integrated system may be questioned in two respects.

First, we observe that many clauses express non-sequentiality or discontinuity without the word-order inversion. For example, Endo gives an example of a non-sequential clause. 1Sam. 14:52:

וְרָאָה שָׂאוּל כָּל-אִישׁ גִּבּוֹר וְכָל-בֶּן-חַיִל
וַיֹּאסֶפֶהוּ אֵלָיו

and when Saul saw (QATAL) any mighty man or any valiant man,
he attached (wayyiqtol) him to his staff.

The first clause with qatal in the past context "functions as a circumstantial clause or a temporal clause"(Endo, 97). This is a non-sequential clause without the word-order inversion. Another example is 2Kings 21:3-4:

וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ לְכָל-צָבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם
וַיַּעֲבֹד אֹתָם
וַבְּנָה מִזְבְּחֹת בַּבַּיִת יְהוָה

1 he worshipped (wayyiqtol) all the host of heaven
2 and served (wayyiqtol) them.
3 built (qatal) altars in the house of the Lord

Line 3 is called "goal" by Endo which closes this sequence of clauses (146-51). This is another non-sequential clause (closure) without the word-order inversion. It seems therefore that the sequentiality verbal system itself can express sequentiality or non-sequentiality, independent of the word order.

The second aspect which raises questions about Buth's theory comes from the study of nominal clause word order. As we have surveyed in the previous section, Niccacci observes pragmatic functions in his S-P "presentative" clause type, such as introduction of one person, event-reporting, and presenting a proposition. These are all concerned with the speaker-listener relationship and with the flow of a narrative. In addition to it, Niccacci argues that these pragmatic functions of SP are shared by XV verbal clauses (1993) which breaks the narrative line and provides background information (1990). In other words, the word order also expresses "non-sequentiality" or "discontinuity" independent of the verbal system.

It is probably against the actual data to ignore one or the other: the word order or the verbal system. It appears at present that we need to acknowledge that these two systems coexist, operate independently but are interwoven closely (polysystemic, see below).

1.2.5. Summary of "past studies of verbal clause word order"

We have seen that the study of verbal clause word order in recent years has developed significantly by considering the inter-clausal and text-unit (discourse) level phenomena. The emergence of the top-down discourse grammar challenged the traditional approach, however, some of latest works attempt to bridge the two by focusing on the inter-clausal functions of the verbal system, which is a sequential/non-sequential or continuity/discontinuity binary system. Some text-linguists attribute the functions of XV solely to the verbal system except for topic-shift. However, the data and the studies of nominal clause word order seem to suggest that both the word order and the verbal system coexist, operate independently, but are closely interwoven. The recent works by Gross and van der Merwe are particularly significant in that they have reached the conclusion that XV clauses have pragmatic functions from the perspective of word order and they employ the latest linguistic methodology. Therefore we need to acknowledge the achievements of these studies for understanding both word order and the verbal system.

1.3. PURPOSE, METHOD AND LIMITATION

1.3.1. Purpose

The present study hopes to answer some questions raised in the past concerning the word order of Biblical Hebrew. These questions are still in dispute. The aims of this thesis are 1) to discover the underlying principle for both nominal and verbal clause word order; 2) to ascertain the role of the clause-initial position; 3) to elucidate the functional difference of the different word orders (SP/PS, XV/VX); and 4) to clarify the relationship between word order, emphasis and contrast reflected in the use of Biblical Hebrew.

1.3.2. Method, Data and Presupposition

Methods

In order to achieve the goals above, this thesis will employ methods and presuppositions which build on, develop and integrate past studies of both nominal and verbal clause word order and at the same time utilise the latest linguistic tools for analysis. Our central interests cover

1) An analysis of functional difference among allo-clauses.

We shall follow the functional approach which Andersen launched with a specific interest in the difference between allo-clauses as Hoftijzer proposed. This method is one of the major characteristics of this present study.

2) The triadic model.

The thrust of our thesis is a triadic model. This triadic model, which has overcome some shortcomings of the binary models, was originally introduced by Niccacci and is modified based on the works of Muraoka and Lambrecht. This model is also an application of Lambrecht's "three focus-structure categories" to Biblical Hebrew (1994, 222). This hypothetical model, which is central to our whole thesis, will be introduced in Chapter 3.

3) The single approach to both nominal and verbal clauses.

We shall not alter the method according to the two clause types, nominal and verbal. As Revell and Niccacci have started and now more modern scholars are attempting to do in recent years, we shall use the same framework in analysing both nominal and verbal clauses.

4) An analysis of inter-clausal and text-unit level phenomena.

In addition to the traditional intra-clausal syntax, our study analyses the inter-clausal syntax (relations among clauses, such as subordination, circumstantiality, contrast, chiasmic or parallel constructions), and the relations among components of a text unit (i.e., discourse analysis, e.g. onset, background information, climax, closure).³¹ We need to note that the distinction among these three levels, intra-clausal, inter-clausal and discourse level, is not

³¹ For linguists before the 70's, syntax meant the study of relations within a sentence or a clause (R. Robins 1967, 190; J. Lyons 1968, 172), and they did not pay much attention to the broader context. Its analysis was concentrated on the relations among elements within a clause, such as subject, predicate, adverbial or prepositional phrase, concord of verbs, etc. (intra-clausal syntax). It does not mean, however, that there were no concerns beyond a clause before the 70's. As early as 1957, J. Firth (1957, 177-189) introduced a term "situation" which takes into consideration sender, receiver, their world-view or speech community, events, time and place, objects, non-verbal expression and action, and larger contexts of utterance. He considered "the context of situation" as an important factor in grammatical analysis. In the late 60's H. Gleason introduced communication theory to linguistics, encoding and decoding for example (1969, 373). In the 1970's linguists digested and developed achievements of other disciplines such as sociology and psychology as well as communication theory in the name of text-linguistics or discourse analysis which approaches language from a much broader perspective than the sentence (or clause. For classical discussion of sentence, see R. Robins 1967, 190-192). In Europe Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang U. Dressler introduced it comprehensively as a new type of linguistics (1981). In America J. Grimes (1975), and other numerous works appeared in the 70's. For more later development, see P. MacDonald 1992, 155-161.

absolute and often fluid. However, this distinction is a helpful framework to approach the reality of a language.³²

5) An information-structure analysis.

This study employs information-structure analysis, which incorporates some of latest achievements of modern linguistics. This analysis will examine the topic-comment relationship of one clause, the distribution of prominent information (focus), the status of referents: new or old, and the state of conscious-level definiteness (activation state, referentiality) of referents. The methods and concepts of this analysis will be elaborated in the following chapter, Chapter 2.

6) Recognition of the past verbal clause studies.

Our study will build on the past achievements of verbal clause word-order studies (e.g., GKC, Lambdin, Muraoka, J-Muraoka, D-Gibson, SBH, Khan, Niccacci, Gross and van der Merwe) and presupposes the sequential/non-sequential verbal system (Endo and Buth). However, our thesis questions the notion that an item is fronted for emphasis. Chapter 4 will propose to clarify the relations between word order, emphasis and contrast.

In addition to these six essential methods above, our study has other methods and presuppositions which are peripheral compared to those above.

a) Our study is "cross-discourse-type."

We will not take the difference of literary genre or text-unit types (discourse types or text types) into consideration. Our data contains narratives, songs, commands, instructions for building, reported speeches, and legal texts. We will not alter the method of analysis according to these text-unit types, whether a clause is in "narrative" or in "discourse" (Niccacci 1990), in "prose" or in "poetry" (Gross 1987) or in other proliferated "discourse types" (Longacre 1989).

b) Our approach is "synchronic."

Diachronic approaches are indispensable for comprehensive understanding of Biblical Hebrew.³³ However, we do not take diachronic drift into consideration in this present study.

³² Our study presupposes that syntax has structural properties, though it may change in time.

The distinction between these levels of a language, such as morphology or syntax, is questioned by some scholars. For de Saussure such a distinction is "illusory" and linguistic terms are to be defined relatively to each other, not absolutely. De Saussure admits, however, that "the traditional divisions of grammar may be useful in practice." Erica C. García denies the existence of "syntax" at all. Talmy Givón proposes that syntax *per se* is a constantly changing "artifact" (82) by demonstrating instances of syntacticization of pragmatic mode, which is formalisation of discourse level phenomena into syntax. However he maintains that syntax "does have highly specific structural properties" (109). Givón's diachronic-historical approach to syntax is intriguing, however, his view of the evolution of human languages seems highly speculative. See F. de Saussure 1959, 135-137; E. García 1979; T. Givón 1979a. See also F. Dinnen 1967, 414; W. Bodine 1992, 90; R. Robins 1964, 201.

³³ For diachronic approaches, see for example, W. Adams 1972 and 1975; W. Adams and L. Adams 1977; R. Bergey 1988; T. Givón 1977 and 1979a; A. Hurvitz 1973; S. Layton 1990; R. Polzin 1976; D. Robertson 1972; M. Rooker 1990, 1990 and 1996; K. Simasaki 1995; S. Takeuchi 1993; D. Tsumura 1992; L. Walker 1986; Ian Young 1993; Z. Zevit 1995.

c) It presupposes that a language is "polysystemic."

A language seems to have multiple aspects or levels and each has its own system while they are interwoven.³⁴

d) A linguistic theory is "provisional."

Theories are processes to reach the reality of a language, and not the reality itself.³⁵

e) A language theory is "probabilistic."

Theories state what is *usually* the case rather than *always*.³⁶

Data

Because of the analytical methods we will employ as described above, which require a considerable amount of data processing for one clause, we need to limit the data that we shall examine.

For the nominal clause, we shall use the clauses from Andersen's *Verbless Clause*. Though his classification has some problems (see Hoftijzer's criticism above), his "Part III The Corpus of Detailed Evidence" offers valuable material. We shall limit the range of the data to the most basic pattern of the nominal clause which consist of only the subject and the predicate.³⁷ Let us call these nominal clauses "two-member clauses." The total number of

³⁴ Though information structure appears to play one of the major roles in inter-clausal syntax and text-unit level phenomena, information structure is only one of many aspects of biblical Hebrew. Some linguists apply one system found in one level to all other levels (monosystemic). For example García attempts to explain all the syntactic phenomena by communicative-discourse-level functions. It seems more likely that each level may have a different system of its own, although those systems are closely related, interwoven and interact with one another (polysystemic). For this polysystemic approach, see F. Dinnen 1967, 318-320; and R. Robins 1964, 167-68.

E. Talstra argues that it is important to admit that there are two syntactic levels: clause-grammar or clause-level which deals with tense, mood and aspect; and text-grammar or text-level. He proposes "to start from the text-level parameters" which influence the clause-level (1997). Our thesis proposes to start from the inter-clausal syntax which is used in the text-unit level structures.

³⁵ The description of structure is not itself the real structure of a language. Our grammatical categories (verb, noun, adjective etc.), for example, even if these terms are derived not from logic (as in classical grammars) but from structural analysis as much as possible, may not be identical with the structural reality that a language actually has. Our analysis or the grammatical categories that we produce will probably remain an attempt or a theory to describe such a reality. This is partly because language is a major part of extremely complex human behaviour. Therefore we have to choose one theory (including categories of grammatical elements or levels of structure) over the other if it seems to describe the language more accurately than the other model, admitting that any theory is provisional or tentative and not identical with the reality. See Part II of N. T. Wright (1992) for the discussion about the spiral or dialogic relationship between our knowledge of a reality and the reality itself.

³⁶ de Beaugrande states that

We also see theories and methods will have to be PROBABILISTIC rather than DETERMINISTIC, that is, they will state what is *usually* the case rather than *always*. (1981, 7)

³⁷ In Andersen's term, Independent Declarative verbless clauses without Margins. "Independent" clause excludes co-ordinated clauses which start with *waw*, subordinated clauses which start with subordinating particles such as ׀ and nominalised clauses which start with ׀. "Declarative" clauses exclude precative

verbless clauses in the Pentateuch which Andersen lists is 1857 (p. 109) and we have 528³⁸ two-member clauses which is 28.4 % of all the verbless clauses he lists. Though the number is limited, this two-member clause is the most basic type of the nominal clause. Therefore we hope that our analysis may reveal underlying principles for all other nominal clauses in general. Moreover, the number 528 will be large enough to resist manipulation of the data. These verses are listed in the Appendix.³⁹ Verses with numbers in front, for example, "#23 Gen. 12:12," are taken from Andersen's nominal clause data and the number corresponds to the classification in his work.

For the verbal clause, we shall analyse 296 verbal clauses with the inverted word order presented by GKC, Muraoka and J-Muraoka. There are two reasons for choosing these scholars. First, their studies detect emphasis in the inverted word order more strongly than others. Secondly, Muraoka and J-Muraoka present some unique cases of the inversion which appear to contradict the functions observed by other scholars in the past. They observe that 1) divine subjects, such as God, tend to occupy the clause-initial position; 2) וְאִישׁ is fronted when it is used in indefinite sense, such as "someone"; 3) certain verbs, such as "go" and "know" tend to have fronted subjects; 4) certain verbs have their cognate objects fronted; 5) legal texts tend to have fronted subjects. These cases will be examined in a separate section 9.1. In our discussion, the name "Muraoka" often represents both Muraoka's *Emphasis* and J-Muraoka, since Muraoka extensively revised Joüon's section on word order according to his theory and used many examples from *Emphasis* in J-Muraoka. These verses are in the Appendix. We may note here that compared to the number of nominal clauses we will examine, the verbal clauses are small in number. This is because the majority of functions that have been observed in past studies of verbal clause word order does not contradict our thesis, and therefore the main focus in our study will be to observe the same functions from a different framework.

Besides these selected texts above, we shall examine every clause of Deuteronomy 4:44-11:32 (476 clauses). Though we shall examine the wide context of each clause which is selected as described above, there may be a limitation if we only consider selected clauses. The purpose of choosing Deuteronomy 4:44-11:32 is to test our thesis in one continuous corpus including both nominal and verbal clauses, so that our theory may be investigated more thoroughly. This whole corpus is attached in the Appendix with an analysis of each

and interrogative clauses. Clause "with no margins" excludes casus pendens, adverbs and other elements other than subject and predicate.

³⁸ The total number 605 which appears in Figure 1 in our introduction differs from our 528, that is the number of clauses we are going to treat. This is due to the fact that the number 605 includes clauses with margins and casus pendens.

³⁹ We need to understand that due to the amount of material that Andersen gathered and categorised, and also because he classifies clauses according to his own interpretation, there are some clauses in our data which belong to other categories. For example, certain clauses in our data are verbal clauses, nominalised clauses or subordinated clauses. These clauses are listed under "Different Categories" in Appendix.

clause. An outline of the corpus based on the analysis is also shown at the end of the Appendix.

1.3.3. Limitation

The limitations of this study are:

This study focuses on the functions of different word order sequences: SP vs PS (or XV vs VX). Therefore it does not treat the difference of various word order patterns within VX, such as VSO and VOS. This thesis does not cover word order in general, but only the functional opposition of the word order which involves the first two constituents.

The analysis of Information Structure is only a part of the broader analyses of texts. The present thesis does not perform rhetorical, literary or broader social-linguistic analysis, for example.

The data is limited. The present study has analysed 528 nominal clauses in the Pentateuch, 296 verbal clauses presented by some scholars and clauses in Deuteronomy 4:44-11:32.

There is an assumption of linguistic universals in that we suppose that if many languages have means of focus, Hebrew may have one (the term focus will be explained in the following chapter).

It cannot eradicate a certain degree of subjectivity in analysing the identifiability (activation state) of a referent, and the function or the implication of a clause in a certain context.

Our theory presupposes that essential information can be expressed by a proposition (e.g., themes are expressed by propositions).

These limitations mean that even if most clauses may be explained by our theory, it will not prove our theory but simply suggest that our theory may be a better framework than previous models and that it may be applicable to other texts of Biblical Hebrew.

Having laid bare the limitations of our procedures, it may be worth offering some justification for them.

The general linguistic tendency to express focus is so well established that there is a high probability that Biblical Hebrew has it.

The nominal clauses we will analyse have the most basic pattern. The clauses of GKC, Muraoka and J-Muraoka cover a wide range of inverted word order clauses. The continuous corpus offers good data for experiment. Therefore we may say that our data offer good grounds on which to develop a theory.

Since a language is a major part of extremely complex human behaviour and is deeply involved in our conscious-level phenomena, we cannot become closer to a linguistic reality without resorting to means which may appear to be subjective. In other words, we cannot analyse a linguistic reality by a purely formal approach.

We have to admit that the propositional presentation of information has its own limitation.⁴⁰ Further study will be needed to explore the relationship between epistemology and a functional approach to languages.

1.3.4. Outline

The following chapter, Chapter 2, will introduce the information-structure analysis. Chapter 3 will present our hypotheses, the theory of the three focus structures. Chapter 4 will be devoted to the relationship between contrast, emphasis and focus. Chapters 5 to 7 will attempt to verify the hypotheses by classifying all the clauses within our data according to their focus structures. Chapter 8 will observe Parallel Construction and List Structure. Chapter 9 will discuss some problems our theory has. Chapter 10 expounds some apparent exceptions to our thesis. Chapter 11 will summarise and conclude our study.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of the propositional approach to truth, see A. McGrath 1996, 163-179. We may understand that one proposition is a part of "a story." See N. T. Wright 1992.

2. INFORMATION-STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Along with the inter-clausal and text-unit level analysis, the analysis of information structure is an essential tool for our study. This chapter will elaborate on its method and terms as the foundations of this paper.

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Information-structure analysis examines the state of information of a referent (old-new or presupposed-asserted), the level of definiteness of a referent in the mind of participants (activation states), the distribution of prominent information (focus), and the topic-comment relationship. This analysis has been developed originally by French and English linguists, such as Knud Lambrecht, and S. J. Galambos in French (Lambrecht 1981, Galambos 1980)⁴¹ and by E. Prince (1982) and R. Quirk (1985) in English. From a perspective of Functional Grammar, Simon Dik spares one chapter and introduces the analysis which involves topicality and focality (1981, chapter 13).

2.1.1. T. Muraoka and E. J. Revell

This information-structure analysis, however, is not totally new to Hebraists. As we have seen in the introduction, E. J. Revell is concerned with the distribution of prominent information within a clause. Muraoka is aware of the state of information and the conscious level of definiteness and expresses it by the term "determinate":

By "determinate" noun or nominal phrase I mean such a noun or noun phrase that can be conceived by virtue of the context as already known to the speaker(s) or the hearer(s), chiefly because it has been mentioned earlier in the flow of speech, so that it can be referred to by means of an anaphoric pronoun, or because it indicates something which is part of the common knowledge of the participants in a given speech situation, such as well known names or the name of God. (8-9, underline added)

Here Muraoka distinguishes the grammatical definiteness and the conscious-level determinateness. Muraoka introduces a method which takes conscious-level phenomena into consideration as a part of his grammatical analysis. These conscious-level phenomena are related to "the flow of speech" between the speakers and to "the common knowledge of the participants in a given speech situation." Muraoka suggests that these phenomena are reflected in morphology ("by means of an anaphoric pronoun").

In information-structure analysis, the term "information" is used because "the context," "the flow of speech" and "the common knowledge" are all concerned with the state of information in communication between the speakers. The term "structure" is used because

⁴¹ Galambos argues that topicality and focus are different notions. His idea will be incorporated in our thesis and will not be mentioned further.

they believe that this flow of information and the conscious-level phenomena is embodied in and expressed by "structure" such as word order, pitch prominence, and by particular particles, that is, morpho-syntactically.

2.1.2. N. Bailey and B. Bandstra

A more developed style of information-structure analysis has been applied to Scriptures in the last few years. N. Bailey applies the information-structure analysis to the genealogies in Matthew (1998). Barry L. Bandstra's work is, to my knowledge, the first one to apply information-structure analysis to Biblical Hebrew word order. He concludes:

What has been perceived by students of the text and termed *emphasis* can now be given linguistic definition. Emphasis is a function of non-V-(S)-O word order and can better be termed *topicalization*. Topicalization takes what is normally nonsalient information, fronts that constituent, and places it in a position of informational prominence. (1992, 123)

Bandstra's work has much in common with this present study, because he approaches Hebrew word order and the traditional notion of emphasis through the information-structure and the discourse analysis. The major difference between Bandstra and our thesis is our triadic focus structures and the notion of emphasis. These two issues will be discussed in later chapters.

2.2. IDENTIFIABILITY

As Muraoka pointed out, there is a distinction between grammatical definiteness and definiteness in one's consciousness.

In many cases grammatical definiteness of a word is related to the definiteness or identifiability of an item in the mind of a listener or a receiver. When someone says "The book is on the table," he presupposes that the receiver can identify the particular book he is referring to. This definiteness or identifiability is expressed morphologically in Hebrew by using pronouns and the definite article ה followed by noun phrases. Therefore in many cases morphological definiteness is closely related to the definiteness of conscious-level identifiability or in Muraoka's term "determinateness." Nevertheless, there are times when grammatical and conscious-level definiteness do not coincide, such as in Deut. 1:28:

עַם גְּדוֹל וְרָם מִמֶּנּוּ	"The people are bigger and taller than we;
עָרִים גְּדוֹלוֹת וּבְצוּרוֹת בַּשָּׁמַיִם	the cities are large and fortified to heaven.

Although עַם and עָרִים are grammatically indefinite, the sender (the spies) presupposed that the receiver (the people) could identify who and what the spies meant by עַם and עָרִים (Amorites and their cities). The phenomenon may be a reflection of the time when Hebrew did not have the definite article. In this study we shall continue to use "definite" as a grammar term and "identifiable" as a term of Information Structure.

2.2.1. Various Activation States

This identifiability has been the concern for linguists and they used different terms for it: "referentiality" and "degree of subject's topicality" (Givon 1977, 182-83), "recoverability" (Kuno 1978, 282-83),⁴² and even "given information" (Prince 1981, 228). These scholars have demonstrated that an item can be in different levels of identifiability. Among Hebraists, Bandstra applies this identifiability to Hebrew and recognises two activation states: activated or inactive (1992, 114). C. van der Merwe (1999) is also aware of different activation states in the consciousness of the reader and employs terms, such as referent, entity, proposition (344), and active, activated, reactivated (347). In general the notion of identifiability or activation states is becoming more recognised among Hebraists over the past several years.

Let us call an item referred to as "a referent." A referent in this study may be an entity such as "John" or "my book," or a proposition such as "Tony Blair is the prime minister." The point of this section is that a referent can be in different levels of identifiability. Some referents are very easily identified, and some are not. This difference of identifiability is described as "activation states," and Chafe proposes three activation states: active, accessible (semi-active), and inactive (unused) (1987, 25-36; 1994, 53-81). Lambrecht follows Chafe (1994, 93ff), but adds one more state: unidentifiable (brand-new). It appears the four activation states may be observed also in Biblical Hebrew and they are reflected in grammar morpho-syntactically. Definitions of these four activation states described below are taken from Chafe (1987 and 1994) and Lambrecht (1994). A full application of this notion of identifiability will be demonstrated in chapter 5 Predicate-Focus Structure.

2.2.2. Active Referent

A referent is active when it is "currently lit up" in the consciousness or when it is "in a person's focus of consciousness." Here a referent is in the easiest state for the receiver to identify. For example, if two students are talking about a particular book for their homework, the speaker or sender assumes that the book is active in the consciousness of the receiver, and therefore s/he can refer to the book by a pronoun, "it." For example, "I read it yesterday."

2.2.3. Accessible Referent

When a referent is peripherised, inferable, and situationally-present, the referent is accessible.

A referent is peripherised, when the referent is "in a person's peripheral consciousness" or "in the background awareness," but has not been lit in the centre of their consciousness. For example, when these two students are now talking about their plan for a

⁴² Kuno means that a piece of information which can be identified from the previous context is defined as "old information." This is in our terms active and accessible (see below).

trip to France, the book they talked about is now in their peripheral consciousness or in the background awareness, not lit in the centre of their consciousness. We may say that the referent "the book" is now peripherised or deactivated. It needs to be reactivated to come back to the centre of their consciousness. An utterance, "Ah, you know the book we were talking about," may reactivate the referent in the receiver's consciousness.

An inferable referent is one which is not active at the time of utterance but which the listener can identify easily by inference. For example, "I think my sister knows about France really WELL." "My sister" is not active but it is not totally a new unidentifiable referent, because having a sister can be inferred (many of people have sisters) and the referent can be identified.

A situationally-present referent is not active in the consciousness of the receiver, but it can be easily activated because it is physically present.

Those referents above are all accessible referents, meaning that they are not difficult for a receiver to identify.

2.2.4. Inactive Referent

A referent is inactive when the referent is "in a person's long-term memory, neither focally nor peripherally active." It is unused. For example a last year's class teacher may be an unused referent. The speaker expects that the receiver may need to make a larger effort to identify the unused referent. "Do you remember, Mr. GRANT, our MATHS TEACHER LAST YEAR?"

2.2.5. Unidentifiable or Brand-new Referent

The four referents above are identifiable referents which have a potential for activation. An unidentifiable referent has no potential for activation. Thus it needs to be introduced anew. For example, if one of the two friends has a friend in France, he would introduce him to the discourse by saying "I have a friend in Paris. His name is Paul. I met him in London."

These terms may be schematised:

	active	
identifiable	accessible	1. peripherised 2. inferable 3. situationally present
	inactive	(unused)
unidentifiable (brand-new)		

Figure 2: Identifiability (Activation States)

Lev. 13:40 is taken as an example where these terms are applied.

<u>וְאִישׁ כִּי יִפְרֹט רֹאשׁוֹ</u>	1 Now if a MAN loses the HAIR of his HEAD,
<u>קָרַח הוּא</u>	2 he is BALD;
<u>טָהוֹר הוּא</u>	3 he is CLEAN.

In Line 1 a brand-new referent "a man who loses the hair of his head" is introduced.⁴³ The referent now becomes identifiable for the receiver. Namely, the referent is recognisable for the receiver and it has a potential to remain in the receiver's memory for a certain period of time. By the end of Line 1 the referent has not only become identifiable for the receiver, it has become active in the receiver's consciousness, that is that the referent is currently in the centre of consciousness of the receiver.

In Line 2 the sender plans to add new information to the immediately preceding active referent. Since the referent is active in the immediately preceding text, the sender expresses the referent by a pronoun, "הוא, he" (proform or proform coding thereafter) here, instead of the lexical form וְאִישׁ. The sender uses the proform because he assumes no ambiguity in the receiver's mind in identifying it. Notice also the word order in Line 2 where the predicate is preceding the subject (P-S). In Line 3 we can see the same word order and the same proform coding.

Hebrew examples of accessible and inactive referents will be shown in chapter 5.

2.3. FOCUS

The definition of the term "focus" varies considerably among scholars. Focus is often equated with "new information," "assertion," "where the assertion differs from the presupposition" (Lambrecht 1994, 213), "comment" or even "foreground" (Tomlin 1987, 457).

The term "focus" is increasingly used among Hebraists, however, the tendency among Hebraists is to restrict this term to emphasis, stress or special usage. Revell notes that

"Focus" should refer to the deliberate placing of an item in first position in contrast to the expected usage" (1999, 307).

Niccacci defines:

In the present essay, the term *emphasis* is equivalent to *stress* and *focus*. (1999, 218) For R. Buth, focus is equivalent to "be contrastive" "to fill in . . . missing information" [identification], or for "special enforcement, through repetition" [emphasis] (1999, 81). W. Gross uses focus and emphasis interchangeably throughout his article (1999, 39-40). C. van der Merwe seems to follow Gross in its usage (1999, 345-47).

In my opinion, the terminological confusion about "focus," "new information," "comment," "assertion," "contrast" and "emphasis" is one of the main factors in the controversy about Biblical Hebrew word order.

⁴³ The word order of verbal clause, SV, which has a function to present a new referent, will be discussed in chapter 7.

Our focus is not equivalent to comment or assertion, nor it is restricted to such special usages as emphasis or contrast. Our focus is defined as follows:

To focus is to mark an item as informationally prominent, or highlight it (2.3.12.3.1, 2.3.22.3.2). Not only new information but also old information may be focused for functional purposes (2.3.42.3.4). This focus can be expressed prosodically, morphologically or syntactically (3.33.3).

This definition will be explicated below.

2.3.1. Informational Prominence

An "informationally prominent" element is a valuable piece of information in communication between the interlocutors. For example in an English sentence:

He is tall,
the information "tall" is prominent in this communication. It is the thrust of the message that the sender wishes to convey to the receiver.

2.3.2. Focus is marking

Focus is marking, and there are multiple ways to focus. Focus is not a property or a prominent piece of information in itself, such as "new information," "assertion"⁴⁴ or "comment" which are often equated with focus. Focus is to mark an item as a prominent piece of information. In English pitch prominence is the most common device of focus (small capitals are high pitched).⁴⁵

He is TALL.

Here "tall" is not said loudly or stressed which would be emphatic or intensifying. It is simply read with a pitch slightly higher than "he."

A cleft sentence structure is another device of focus:

It was JOHN who broke the window.

Here the informational prominence is the same as

JOHN broke the window.

but it uses a cleft sentence structure to focus John in addition to pitch prominence.

French uses the cleft sentence more frequently than English; Italian can use word order; and Japanese and Korean use particles for focus. I posit in this study that Biblical Hebrew uses word order for focus and that the clause-initial position is marked for focus. See below for detail under "Three Focus Structures."

⁴⁴ We have departed from Lambrecht in defining this significant term. The term "focus" is defined by Lambrecht as follows:

FOCUS: The semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition (213).

Namely Lambrecht's focus seems to be a part of assertion or new information.

⁴⁵ See Creider 1979, 12ff for focus by pitch in English.

2.3.3. New information is focused.

The comment is a new piece of information added to the knowledge of the receiver concerning the topic. The comment is the most important part of the proposition that the sender wishes to convey to the receiver. Therefore the comment is always focused.

End-Focus

However, in English it is not that the whole comment is focused, but only a part of the comment is focused, such as "TALL" in "he is TALL." For example, in

She went to the PARK.

the pitch prominence on the predicate does not necessarily fall on the entire predicate domain (went to the park) but tends to fall on its last constituent (park). This is called End-Focus (Quirk 1985, 1357; Creider 1979, 13).

In Biblical Hebrew a comment is fronted for focus: "טָהוֹר הוּאֹ he is CLEAN" (Lev. 13:40). Topic and comment will be explained in the following section "Topic, Comment and Theme."

2.3.4. Old information is also focused.

In a clause of identification and in a presentative clause, old information is often focused for specific functions. For example, in "JOHN broke the window" (an answer to "who broke the window?"). John is marked as "prominent" but John is not a "new" referent. Similarly the focused referent Judah is not a new piece of information:

(? . . Who will be the first to go up . .?)
 (מי יעלה-לני)

Judg. 1:1 יהודה יעלה JUDAH is to go.

Though focus is closely related to new information, focus is a different concept from the status of information (old or new). Focus is to mark an element not necessarily as "new" but as "prominent." All the new information is prominent, but not all the prominent information is new.

In the case of an identification clause, such as above, we may describe it in a slightly different way. The new information in Judg. 1:1 above is the new relation between the old information Judah and the old information "X is to go." The clause "found" the missing argument and asserts that Judah is the one the proposition was looking for. Though Judah is old information, since it represents this new relation, it is marked as prominent (focused).

2.3.5. Focus is a prerequisite for contrast and emphasis

Focus is different from and a prerequisite for contrast and emphasis.

If one wants to emphasise or intensify "tall," one will use morpholexical means, such as inserting "very" before tall. One may use a prosodic feature of stress (louder voice, underlined):

He is TALL.

Another difference between focus and emphasis is that only the focused element may be emphasised.

Contrast may be intended by the sender and expressed by the context, namely, by the presence of its contrasting member(s).

A. He is SHORT.

B. No, he is TALL.

In the sentence B above, "tall" is focused. Again only the focused element may be contrasted.

Focus is the necessary condition for contrast and emphasis. Namely only focused elements can be contrasted or emphasised. The confusion between focus, contrast and emphasis is one of the reasons why Hoftijzer and Muraoka could not detect "importance" in the clause-initial position of some of the clauses.

Difference between focus, emphasis and contrastiveness will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4 "Contrast, Emphasis and Focus."

2.4. ARGUMENT AND COMMENT

Though we encounter the term, argument, often in linguistic circles,⁴⁶ it is seldom defined. In addition to it, the definition of the term "predicate" seems to be controversial in determining subject and predicate in nominal clauses among Hebraists.⁴⁷ In our study we follow Lambrecht's definition⁴⁸:

Discourse referents are syntactically expressed in ARGUMENT (including adjunct) categories, such as noun phrases, pronouns, various kinds of tensed or non-tensed subordinate clauses, and certain adverbial phrases (those that can be said to refer to the circumstances of a predication). They cannot normally be expressed in phrases which serve as PREDICATES. Predicates by definition do not denote discourse referents but attributes of, or relations between, arguments. For example a finite verb phrase cannot play an argument role in a sentence unless it is made into a referential expression by being "nominalized." (1994, 75)

For example, in a sentence "John hit the ball in the field," "John", "the ball," and "in the field" are arguments and "hit" is the predicate which denotes "attributes of, or relations between arguments." Argument is represented by X in our study. The predicate includes both nominal predicate and verbal predicate (i.e., finite verb) and it is represented by P.

It should not be overlooked that argument includes not only subject, but also object and adverbial phrases in our study and that the distinction between these two plays a vital role in our analysis. To put it another way, the distinction between other grammatical elements, subject and object for example, is not crucial in the analysis of pragmatic functions. W. Gross relates to this issue by commenting that the subject does not have a privileged role in terms of the clause-initial position:

⁴⁶ Both uses argument without the definition for Biblical Hebrew (1999, 79).

⁴⁷ See Miller (1999) for example.

⁴⁸ See also Lambrecht's comment on potential problems of this definition in p. 76.

Undoubtedly, the strongest and most typical point of focus in the Hebrew clause is the position before the finite verb. But this is just as true for all other clausal constituents as it is for the subject. In this regard, the Hebrew language offers no grounds for privileging the subject as such. (1999, 40)

It is also noteworthy that the analysis of the first two constituents affects the pragmatic functions the most, and therefore, clauses are represented by the structure of the first two constituents: XP or PX for both nominal and verbal clauses.

Nevertheless, these two terms, X and P, are not meant to blur the grammatical distinction between subject, object and other constituents. Grammatical labels are also used where it is necessary to show grammatical structure. In those instances ordinary abbreviations are used: S for subject, O for object, A for Adjunct (mainly adverbs and adverbial phrases: other grammatical elements than S, V and O).

For example, a clause of Gen. 43:14

וְאֵל שְׂרֵי יִתֵּן לָכֶם רַחֲמִים לְפָנֵי הָאִישׁ

and may GOD ALMIGHTY grant you COMPASSION in the SIGHT of the man, may be described as SVAO grammatically, but it is XP in our analysis which means that this clause has the fronted argument (the subject here) and the predicate (the finite verb here) is in the clause-second position.

2.5. TOPIC, COMMENT AND THEME

2.5.1. Topic and Comment

MacDonald remarks "Although the term *topic* is universally used in discourse studies, it is rarely well defined; and even when it is, the definitions vary from study to study" (1992, 168). There are at least three definitions. Generally the topic is equated with old or given information and the comment with new information (Miller 1999, 6). For Chafe the topic is "the spatial, temporal, or individual framework within which predication holds" (1976, 76). R. Buth seems to follow this definition when he defines topic as a "contextualizing constituent" whose "purpose is to help the listener understand how and on what basis some sentences are grouped together" (1995, 84; 1999). We follow the third definition that "The topic of a sentence is what that sentence is about" (MacDonald 1992, 168) or "the things we talk about" (Dik 1989, 264), namely, "aboutness" is the central idea.

An example is

1. JOHN is my FRIEND.
2. He is a TALL MAN.

The inactive or new referent John is introduced, activated and recognised as the topic in Line 1. "John" is the topic of the second sentence as well. We need to distinguish topic from topic expression. The topic is John for the two sentences above, but the topic expressions are different: it is "John" in Line 1 and "He" in Line 2. The example we have seen above, Lev. 13:40, is a Hebrew example.

<u>וְאִישׁ כִּי יִפְרֹט רֹאשׁוֹ</u>	1 Now if a MAN loses the HAIR of his HEAD,
<u>קֵרַח הוּא</u>	2 he is BALD;
<u>טָהוֹר הוּא</u>	3 he is CLEAN.

Line 1 is "presentational" (Niccacci) in that the clause introduces a new topic referent, a man who loses the hair. The man is the topic for Lines 2-3 and the topic expression is הוּא in Lines 2 and 3.

Comment, then, according to MacDonald, "identifies what it is that is said in the sentence about the topic" (168). The topic-comment relationship of a sentence "He is a tall man," will be schematised as follows:

Sentence: He is a tall man.

Topic: John

Comment: He is a tall man.

Lev. 13:40 Line 2

Clause: he is bald.

Topic: the man who loses the hair

Comment: he is bald.

There is an important distinction between the two sets of terms: old-new information and topic-comment.

It may be generally observed that topic is old information and comment is new information. For example, MacDonald comments on the topic that "It usually denotes something already stated in the discourse, that is, 'old' information" (168). For example, in Line 2 of the English example above,

2. He is a TALL MAN.

the topic John is old information, because it is already introduced in Line 1. However, we may say there is a difference between these two sets of terms. Old or new information is concerned with the status of information in the consciousness of the interlocutors (old or new, shared knowledge or not), while topic and comment are concerned with "aboutness" of a proposition or with the relationship to the proposition. For example, John in Line 1 "JOHN is my FRIEND" above is new information, namely, Line 1 initiates a new episode and a brand-new referent John is introduced. Line 1 also tells "about" John. Here we can see that this new information, John, is the topic of the sentence.

2.5.2. Constituents, and Elements

Topic and Comment are constituents of a sentence. This term is also used for subject, predicate, object and so on as a constituent of a sentence. The term element is used to refer to any words or phrases.

2.5.3. Topic in different levels

As Dik notes (1981, 266-67), the topic can be expressed in different levels of language.⁴⁹ In a sentence, the topic is often, but not necessarily the grammatical subject or agent of the sentence, and the topic of a text unit is the central figure in the unit (discourse topic or text-unit topic). Thus topical phenomena are found on multiple levels of a language. For example the topic of one sentence may be the same as the topic of its text unit A (an episode, for example). If this text unit A is embedded within a larger text unit B (a book, for example), the topics of A and B may or may not be the same.

2.5.4. Theme

In this study the term "theme" is used differently from the ordinary notion of topic. The theme of a unit is the abstract or summarised notion or proposition of Topic and Comment.

A theme of an episode may be a statement, such as "Mike is a good boy." The theme of the largest text unit, such as a complete story or a book, controls the over-all structure and development of the story (macro-structure, Longacre 1989, 42). It affects topic-comment-theme of smaller text units within the largest unit. The correct interpretation of the theme depends on the extent of the shared background knowledge (including culture and worldview) and even on the personality of the hearer. However, "there is apparently enough overlap that communication takes place between people day in and day out without insurmountable ambiguity" (MacDonald 1992, 171).

2.6. NEW AND OLD INFORMATION, PRESUPPOSITION AND ASSERTION

In our study the term "presupposition" is used interchangeably with old information, given information, or shared knowledge and the term assertion with new information. These terms may be used in an example as follows.

When the interlocutors know that John broke the window, one may add a new piece of information by:

(1) John broke the window with a BALL.

The presupposition (old information, shared knowledge) is "John broke the window" or "John's breaking window" and the assertion (new information) is "he did it with a BALL."

Presupposition (old information):	John broke the window.
Assertion (new information):	He did it with a BALL.
Topic:	John (or "John broke the window")
Comment:	He did it with a ball.
Focused item:	with a ball

On the other hand, if "with a ball" is the shared knowledge, and the sender wishes to report that John did not play with it but broke the window instead, he would say:

(2) John BROKE the WINDOW with the ball.

⁴⁹ sentence (or clause) > paragraph > episode > book

The presupposition is "John did something with the ball" and the assertion is "he broke the window with it." The topic may be "John" or "John and the ball" and the comment is "he broke the window with it."

One may notice that the assertion may be an old piece of information. For example, in the answer to the question "Who broke the window?"

(3) JOHN did.

John is old information (shared knowledge between the interlocutors), but it is asserted.

2.7. SUMMARY

We have defined and illustrated the terms and concepts used in our information-structure analysis. To sum up, this analysis will examine

- 1) the identifiability (activation state) of a referent: whether it is active, accessible, inactive or unidentifiable (brand-new);
- 2) the location of focus: which constituent is marked as prominent;
- 3) what is the topic and the comment of a clause;
- 4) and what is presupposed (old) or asserted (new) information.

3. THREE FOCUS STRUCTURES

3.1. INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapter we have illustrated the method of our information-structure analysis. We will now turn to apply our method. We have surveyed past studies of the nominal clause word order in the first chapter, and paid special attention to Niccacci's modified triadic model. This triadic model will be expounded in this third chapter and presented as the central thesis of our study.

The reason to choose Niccacci's modified triadic model is two-fold.

First it overcomes the difficulties of the past binary models. We have seen that F. I. Andersen, J. Hoftijzer and T. Muraoka sought the functional opposition between the S-P and P-S sequences by presenting their binary models. However those binary models faced some difficulties. Andersen's "identification" does not distinguish Muraoka's descriptive clause from Muraoka's identificational clause. Hoftijzer and Muraoka observe two functions within the SP sequence. However, A. Niccacci proposes the third clause type to solve the shortcomings of the previous binary models. Let me repeat Niccacci's triadic model which is modified by Muraoka and Lambrecht's identification. The letter X represents an argument.

1. Predicative (P-X)

Lev. 11:35 טְמֵאִים הֵם they are unclean

This clause gives general information about the subject or the argument.

2. Identificational (X-P)

Gen. 37:16 "what are you looking for?"

אֶת-אֲחֵי אֲנֹכִי מְבַקֵּשׁ I am looking for my brothers.

This clause identifies (or relates) "I" with the missing argument of the proposition "I am looking for someone (X)."

3. Presentative (X-P)

Num. 9:7 אֲנִיחֵנוּ טְמֵאִים We are unclean

This third type of clause has functions which are concerned with the speaker-listener relationship and also with the flow of a narrative in addition to the mere content of a proposition "we are unclean."

The second reason to choose the triadic model is that Lambrecht observes these three clause types in different languages as we shall see below.

3.2. DIFFERENCE OF THREE FOCUS STRUCTURES

A distinctive feature of Lambrecht's work among information-structure analysts is that he observes three distinct clause types in modern languages: English, French, Italian and Japanese.

His terms for these types are "Predicate-Focus Structure," "Argument-Focus Structure" and "Sentence-Focus Structure" (221ff). We shall use the term "Clause-Focus Structure" in place of "Sentence-Focus Structure."

The difference among these three focus structures may be exemplified as follows.

3.2.1. Predicate-Focus Structure

The predicate-focus structure is equivalent to Muraoka's "description" and to Niccacci's "unmarked predicative." As Muraoka indicates, Andersen does not have the means to distinguish this clause type from the identificational clause. For example (small capitals have pitch prominence),

(1) Tony Blair is the prime MINISTER.

(2) TONY BLAIR is the prime minister.

In (1), the low pitch of Tony Blair indicates that the sender supposes that the receiver knows or can remember easily (access) the referent Tony Blair. This is shown further that (1) can be replaced with

(1a) He is the prime MINISTER. (Sd-Pd)

Here the sender expects that the receiver will understand that the topic of their conversation has been Tony Blair and now the sender adds new information about the active referent Tony Blair. Lambrecht comments that this type of clause has the topic-comment relationship. We may call this function "commenting," because the function of this sentence is to add new information to the already active or accessible referent. Since the predicate is always focused, and most of the subjects are not focused, this structure is called Predicate-Focus Structure. The focused predicate⁵⁰ is added to the world of the discourse. In this respect, the function of (1a) is not different from

(1b) He is actually VERY YOUNG. (Sd-Pind)

where the sender likewise adds new information to the topic Tony Blair.

In short the predicate-focus structure has the focused predicate and the non-focused argument. Its function is commenting.

3.2.2. Argument-Focus Structure

The second type of clause, the argument-focus structure, is equivalent to identification of Muraoka-Lambrecht and Niccacci's marked predicative. For example,

(2) TONY BLAIR is the prime minister.

is an answer to the question "Who is the prime minister?" This sentence is identificational in our functional definition since the receiver is expected to identify Tony Blair with the prime minister. In other words, (2) relates Tony Blair with the missing argument of a proposition:

⁵⁰ See p. 47 for English "End-Focus."

"someone (X) is the prime minister." Tony Blair is focused (or high pitched in English) for identification, while the rest is not, because the proposition "X is the prime minister" is active and presupposed between the speakers. Since only the argument is focused and the predicate is not focused, this type of structure is called Argument-Focus Structure. We need to recognise that the function of this structure is not commenting on the entity Tony Blair, but identifying it.

3.2.3. Clause-Focus Structure

The third type of structure, the clause-focus structure, is equivalent to Niccacci's "presentative" type.

(3) (A MAN CALLED) TONY BLAIR became the PRIME MINISTER.

This structure indicates pragmatic implications other than commenting and identification, such as event-reporting (an answer to the question "what happened": Niccacci 1993; Lambrecht 1994), "presentational" (Lambrecht 1994), exclamatory, surprise, contrasting the whole proposition, presenting the topic of a new episode (topicalisation) or simply this is the start of a new episode (initiation). These implications are detected by the context: where, how and to whom it is uttered.

3.3. IN OTHER LANGUAGES

The difference between these three focus structures is observed in other languages.

Japanese

(1) Tony Blair wa SHUSHO DESU.

(2) TONY BLAIR ga Shusho desu.

(3) TONY BLAIR (TO YUUHITOGA) ga SHUSHO ni natta.

The difference among these three types of sentence is expressed morphologically and prosodically. Here *Wa* in (1) is the topic marker which marks the subject as the topic of the sentence. *Ga* in (2) is the focus marker and this sentence identifies Tony Blair as the prime minister. This is the answer to the question "Who is the prime minister?" (3) is the answer to "what happened." *Ga* is used to focus the subject, and the comment is focused as well by pitch prominence. We can see here that there are three kinds of sentences in Japanese as well. (1) the predicate-focus structure which has the commenting function; (2) the argument-focus structure which has the identificational function; and (3) the clause-focus structure which has other pragmatic function. Notice that the pitch prominence is identical with English.

German

(1) TONY BLAIR ist der Premierminister.

(2) Tony Blair ist der PREMIERMINISTER.

(3) TONY BLAIR ist PREMIERMINISTER geworden.

German, like English, distinguishes the three types of sentence by pitch only.

French

- (1) Tony Blair est le PREMIER ministre.
- (2) TONY BLAIR est le Premier ministre.
- Or (2') C'est TONY BLAIR qui est Premier ministre.
- (3) TONY BLAIR est DEVENU le Premier ministre.

It is significant to see that French uses the cleft sentence to focus on Tony Blair in (2'). In (3) the subject and the verb have pitch prominence. This may be due to the general tendency for a pitch prominence to fall on a portion of the whole constituent, the comment "devenu le Premier ministre" here. While in English the pitch prominence tends to fall on the last word of a phrase or a constituent (End-Focus, see p. 47).

Korean

- (1) Tony Blair nun SUSANG ipnida.
- (2) TONY BLAIR ga susang ipnida.
- (3) TONY BLAIR ga SUSANG yi doeut-ssumnida.

Korean, like Japanese, uses particles for distinction.

Italian

Lambrecht comments that Italian uses word order for focus (1994, 223). The sentences below are translated as "my car broke down." (1) is the answer to the question "what happened to your car?" (commenting); (2) is the response to the statement "I heard your motorcycle broke down" (identification); (3) is the answer to the question "what happened" (out of the blue). The difference of word order is evident: (1) is sV and high pitch; (2) is vS or cleft sentence and high pitch; (3) is vS and high pitch.

- (1) (La mia macchina) si è ROTTA.
- (2) Si è rotta la mia MACCHINA./E la mia MACCHINA che si è rotta.
- (3) Mi si è rotta (ROTTA) la MACCHINA.

In the examples below, (2) is the preferred structure, but (2') may also be used. (1) and (3) have the same pitch prominence as other languages.

- (1) Tony Blair è il primo MINISTRO.
- (2) TONY BLAIR è il primo ministro.
- Or (2') Il primo ministro è TONY BLAIR.
- (3) TONY BLAIR è DIVENTATO primo MINISTRO.

Other modern languages

M. Mithun studies the word order of Cayuga, Ngandi, and Coos (1987) and questions the notion of the universal basic word order. She observes the difference in structuring word order between these "pragmatically based languages" and the "syntactically based languages" such as English and other Indo-European languages. Syntactically based languages have more or less fixed and rigid word order, and they express pragmatic functions by other means (such as high pitch). Therefore "Deviation from the basic [such as right and left dislocation] . . . indicates an unusual situation." On the other hand Cayuga, Ngandi and

Coos express pragmatic functions by word order and "Constituents appear in descending order of newsworthiness" (325). Namely informationally prominent elements tend to be fronted. We may assume, therefore, that there are other languages which express pragmatic functions by word order. She implies further that we should not take the same analytical method for these two different groups of languages. For pragmatically based languages we need to pay more attention to the variation of word order in order to detect pragmatic functions.

Akkadian of Byblos

Getting much closer to Biblical Hebrew, we can observe this distinction in the Akkadian of Byblos which reflects a Canaanite language in Byblos in the 14th century B.C.⁵¹ Agustinus Gianto (1990) argues that Akkadian of Byblos found in Amarna letters along with other Amarna languages are not "mere examples of faulty grammar" but have their own grammatical features (7-11).

Gianto introduces two different kinds of word order in the nominal clause of the Akkadian of Byblos: Subject-Predicate and Predicate-Subject. He presents allo-clauses for "I am your loyal servant."

SP

'False words are now being spoken in the presence of the king, the Sun.'

a-na-ku ÌR *ki-ti-ka* 'I am your loyal servant' (108:22).

PS

'You know my conduct when you were in Şumur.'

Ì[R] [*k*]*i-ti-ka a-na-ku* 'I am your loyal servant' (73:42).

Gianto introduces Andersen's binary model and comments that:

It is conceivable that the explanation of the variation of word order lies not in the meaning of the sentence, namely, identification or classification, but elsewhere. (23-24)

He proposes to

"take into consideration the syntactic environments of the equational sentence [nominal clause]. The choice of one or the other order seems to be conditioned by such environments rather than by the elements within the sentence itself.

Gianto introduces a new inter-clausal syntactic concept of "dependece" as the key concept for the SP/PS diversion. Namely, SP sentences are independent of the preceding text, while the PS is dependent. He concludes:

Earlier it was shown that most PS examples have emphasis on the first position. This, together with what is said about emphasis in SP above, argues for the first position as the usual position of emphasis. But since all the SP examples are independent sentences and

⁵¹ The language of Byblos Syllabic Inscriptions is dated "no later than ca. 1800 B.C." which is before the "enormous linguistic changes that resulted in the Ugaritic and other Canaanite dialects" between 2000 and 1700 B.C. (G. Mendenhall 1992). The language in Akkadian of Byblos at Tel-Amarna reflects that of the 14th century, one of the Canaanite dialects.

Byblos, an ancient Phoenician seaport city, is known as Gebal in the Bible, and is mentioned in Josh. 13:5, 1Kings 5:18 and Ezek. 27:9. (R. Roth 1992)

all the PS examples are dependent sentences, the status of the sentence remains the better explanation of the distribution of SP and PS. Emphasis in the first position is therefore a coincidence. At best it can be said that there is a tendency to assign the first position to the information which is meant to be important. (33-34) (underline added)

Gianto clearly captures the concept of "focus," recognises the difference between emphasis and focus, and proposes the clause-initial position is marked for focus in the Akkadian of Byblos. He also recognises the functional opposition between PS and SP. He calls the function of PS "dependent" on the preceding text. In our terms, Gianto's PS represents our Predicate-Focus Structure which is commenting (adding new information to the preceding active or accessible referent). Gianto observes all the SP clauses are "independent" of the preceding text. In our term, his SP represents our Clause-Focus Structure which can be independent of the presupposition between the interlocutors and can be uttered out of the blue (possible informational independence).⁵² In my opinion, this observation by Gianto on the nominal clause word order has not received the attention it deserves, and it has not reflected in the later studies of the nominal clause word order in Semitic studies (see below).⁵³

Other Semitic languages

To my knowledge, the information-structure analysis with a perspective of these focus structures has not been used for the study of word order of other Semitic languages. They include: Akkadian by J. Huehnergard (1997), A. Ungnad (1992) and Riemschneider (1974),⁵⁴ Ugaritic by G. Wilson (1982),⁵⁵ Akkadian of Ugarit by Wilfred Hugo van Soldt (1991),⁵⁶ and J. Huehnergard (1989),⁵⁷ Akkadian of Amarna by Shlomo Izre'el (1991),⁵⁸ Tamar Zewi (1995) and J. P. van der Westhuizen (1992), Akkadian of Byblos by W. Moran (1950), Aramaic of Daniel by P. Coxon (1977), Biblical Aramaic by J. A. Naudé (1994),

⁵² Gianto's treatment of verbal clause captures less of this notion of focus than his section on nominal clause. However, he observes topicalisation, topic-shift and our clause focus parallel construction in verbal clauses. See pp. 93-158.

⁵³ Huehnergard recognises two functions, dependent and independent, in verbal conjugations of Ethiopic, Akkadian of Byblos, Hebrew, and Aramaic (1995, 98-107).

⁵⁴ Ungnad comments that SOV is the normal word order and V "can stand first for emphasis" (107). Riemschneider observes that SOV is the normal word order and O can be fronted for emphasis (24). In Neo- and Late-Babylonian has VO under the influence of Aramaic (183).

⁵⁵ Wilson's analysis is limited to intra-clausal syntax.

⁵⁶ Soldt observes that the inversion from the normal SVO pattern is caused either by chiasmus or by emphasis. See pp. 477, 484-85.

⁵⁷ Huehnergard states that S-P is the norm for nominal clauses and S-O-A-V for verbal clauses. (A stands for adverb or prepositional phrase.) He observes a tendency that the deviation from this norm signifies emphasis on the fronted element or chiasmus. See pp. 211-14, 215-224.

⁵⁸ Izre'el proposes SP for nominal clauses and SVO for verbal clauses are the unmarked word order. The deviation is for "special stress or emphasis on any of the individual components (348).

Targumic Aramaic by D. Golomb (1983), Syriac by T. Muraoka (1975 and 1987), and Ethiopic by A. Gai (1981).⁵⁹

Summary

As we have seen, some languages have ways to distinguish these three types of focus structure, prosodically, morpho-syntactically or both. Examples of this phenomenon in Semitic languages is restricted, because scholars of such languages are not familiar with the concept. The observation of Akkadian of Byblos by Gianto is significant, since it demonstrates that the language seems to express our focus and to have at least two clause types: predicate-focus and clause-focus structures.

3.4. BIBLICAL HEBREW

If we admit that some languages, of east and west; ancient and modern, have some means to express focus and have these three focus structures, it is more reasonable to assume that Biblical Hebrew had them than not to assume it. This section proposes that Biblical Hebrew expressed focus primarily by two means: the clause-initial position and pitch prominence and that Biblical Hebrew had the three focus structures.

3.4.1. Focus by word order (the clause-initial position) in Hebrew

First we may assume that Biblical Hebrew expressed focus by word order as Italian and Akkadian of Byblos do, and that the clause-initial position is marked for focus as it is in Akkadian of Byblos.

The notion of our focus in the clause-initial position is not actually new to Hebraists. For example, some clauses of "replies"⁶⁰ in Muraoka and J-Muraoka and their explanation demonstrate Muraoka's grasp of our focus. J-Muraoka notes that "In replies the essential part comes first" (§155 nh). Muraoka expresses that "It may be thought rather natural that the substantial part of a reply to a question should be given at the beginning" (18). This is exactly what we call focus. Let us compare with English. In English "the substantial part of a reply" is not given at the beginning, because English does not express focus by word order

⁵⁹ The same applies to New Testament Greek by S. Porter (1993), Old Persian by M. Hale (1988), and Afro-Asiatic languages by S. Lieberman (1986). Lieberman takes an approach of so called "linguistic universals." He is in the line of Roman Jakobson and Joseph H. Greenberg who express a positive view of applying linguistic universals. See R. Jakobson 1966, and J. Greenberg 1966.

Out of these scholars, von Soldt, Izre'el and Hale have a perspective of "topicalisation." Porter explores the relationship between topic-comment and word order. Van der Westhuizen follows Gianto and takes an approach of PS-dependent // SP-independent model. Gai approaches the functional difference between attribute-noun vs noun-attribute sequence from a perspective of focus, "informative value," in his term. He concludes that noun-attribute is unmarked, while attribute-noun is marked for focus on the attribute. Shlonsky follows Chomsky. See p. 19 for Muraoka.

⁶⁰ See Appendix for the verse reference.

but by pitch prominence. For example, a reply to a question "Which COLOUR do you choose?" may be "I choose GREEN." In English, Green is not fronted for focus but high-pitched for focus. Muraoka, by his remark, is virtually saying that Hebrew expresses focus by word order and the clause-initial position is marked for focus. His examples below may be classified into two groups according to which constituent is fronted: predicate or argument. Compare here the difference of the methods of focus between Hebrew and English. Hebrew expresses focus by fronting, while English expresses it by pitch prominence.

(1) Predicate is fronted.

Gen. 29:4	אָחֵי מֵאֵין אַתֶּם מִחֶרֶן אֲנָחְנִי	"My brothers, where are you from?" "We are from HARAN."
2Sam. 1:8	מִי־אַתָּה עַמְלֵקִי אֲנֹכִי	"Who are you?" "I am an AMALEKITE."

"The substantial part of a reply" in these clauses are fronted in Hebrew, while it is simply high-pitched in English.

(2) Argument is fronted.

Judg. 1:1	מִי יַעֲלֶה־לָנוּ יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה	"Who will be the first to go up . . . ?" "JUDAH is to go."
Judg. 6:29	מִי עָשָׂה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה גִּדְעוֹן בֶּן־יֹאשׁ עָשָׂה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה	"Who did this?" "GIDEON, son of JOASH, did it."

The "the substantial part of a reply" in these clauses are fronted in Hebrew. They are fronted in English as well, because English is a SV language, however they are high-pitched. Compare with "Judah is to GO" in which a predicate is focused.

In an example below, a prepositional phrase is fronted for focus in Hebrew, while in English uses high-pitch.

Judg. 15:10	לָמָּה עָלִיתֶם עָלֵינוּ לְאַסּוֹר אֶת־שַׁמְשׁוֹן עָלֵינוּ	"Why have you come up against us?" "We have come up to BIND SAMSON . . ."
-------------	---	--

Muraoka and J-Muraoka conclude that "In replies the essential part comes first" (J-Muraoka §155 nh). Their comments on these examples shows that they understand the notion of our focus, though not fully. The underlying principle we observe here is that Hebrew expresses focus by word order and the clause-initial position is marked for focus.

In the past other scholars attempted to grasp some notion of "prominence" in the fronted position of Biblical Hebrew. They are "important" (Hurwitz, 1832), "emphasis" (Albrecht 1887, GKC 1910, Joüon 1923, Muraoka 1985), "contrastiveness" and "special importance" (Hoftijzer 1973), "significant" or "focus" (Revell 1989, 1999) and "focus" (Gross 1996; van der Merwe 1999). However, these scholars do not always find those notions in every clause. Namely they find it inconsistent except for Hurwitz and Revell. I suspect that the reason they find it inconsistent may be due to the terms and the definitions they choose. If we follow our definition of "focus," we can observe focus in every clause-initial position.

3.4.2. Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew

Secondly we may assume that Biblical Hebrew expressed focus by pitch prominence as well. This is a deduction from language universals. In the modern languages we have observed above, all the focused elements have pitch prominence even though they are already marked morpho-syntactically (e.g., Japanese or Italian). Namely the fronted elements might have pitch prominence in Biblical Hebrew. R. Buth also proposes to read preverbal elements with high pitch in Hebrew:

Thus, a sensitive reader would read this constituent with a high-tone (or in whatever manner ancient focal intonation patterned) Focal intonation pattern, which probably involved some kind of high tone, to judge from modern languages using intonation patterns. (1999, 83, n. 10)

After presenting that Hebrew in First-Temple Period and Second-Temple Period is not a tonal language (such as Chinese), Buth further comments:

we can assume that special contours for focal intonation existed [in Biblical Hebrew]. . . . Since the existence of Focal contours in a nontonal language is the default situation whose nonexistence would be quite surprising and need justification, we certainly cannot work from an artificial or false framework that ignores the existence of this category, even if we do not know precisely how such contours would have sounded. This is not very different from assigning vowels to an ancient text even if we do not know exactly what their phonetic quality was. (1999, 83, n. 10)

Here, we may wonder about the relationship between the Massoretic accentual system and these focal contours. Buth examined this relationship between the Massoretic accents and potential intonation pattern and concludes:

Unfortunately for the concerns of this paper, the [Massoretic] accents are more sensitive to the length of an utterance than its pragmatic, informational structure and thus do not directly reflect syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic relations. . . . Further study will need to be made on the extent to which the Masoretic "chant" tradition may interact with pragmatic structure in general. (1999, 84-85, n. 12)

I need to agree with Buth on this issue at present, since I could not find direct relationship between the Massoretic accents and our focus patterns in our study. Nevertheless, we notice that the studies of the relationship between them have been emerging recently. For example, Haïk-Vantoura argues that the Massoretic accentual system was originally a method of recording hand signal for musical performance at the temple (1991). L. Lode approaches the Massoretic accentual system through discourse analysis, and concludes that the rarer disjunctive accents represent intonations that indicate semantic overtones of focus and emphasis (1994). Further study of this kind may reveal more of this relationship between the Massoretic accents and the pitch contours. This welcoming tendency among Hebraists seems to reflect the development of the study of pitch contours in general. Although this field of study does not have long history, it is advancing by absorbing achievements of other fields of linguistics. For example, J. Pierrehumbert started her theory of pitch contour from the field of phonetics and phonology (1980) and now she observes that various pitch contours express different pragmatic functions (1990).

It should also be noted that the pitch prominence we shall concentrate in our study is only one of many other prosodic features. In addition to pitch, the study of prosody involves

duration, intensity, pausing, and changes in voice quality and contours, including acceleration and deceleration (Chafe 1994, 58-60). It is beyond the scope of our study to deal with these wider prosodic features. Nevertheless pitch plays a decisive role in focus, and therefore the axis of pitch in our study will suffice to meet our present purposes.

In our study, we will not directly argue for the notion that Biblical Hebrew expressed focus also by pitch prominence, but we assume it as a working hypothesis deduced from the language universals. However, if we can verify the two major hypotheses, one is that the clause-initial position is focused, another is that Hebrew also has the three focus structures, this assumption will have considerable validity. See also "Middle pitch" in pp. 90ff.

3.4.3. Three focus structures in Hebrew

The third assumption, and the second of the two major hypotheses of our study, is that Hebrew had the three focus structures. This hypothesis is supported by Niccacci's modified triadic model and by the language universals as we have seen above. I shall attempt to further verify this hypothesis in the following chapters (5-7) by analysing the information structure of all the clauses in our data. The three structures in Hebrew may be briefly sketched as follows:

1. Predicate-Focus Structure

Exod. 33:3 עִם-קָשָׁה-עַרְךָ אַתָּה you are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE

Lev. 13:17 טָהוֹר הוּא he is CLEAN

Here, only the predicates are focused by fronting and probably by high pitch, while the following argument is mostly presupposed and thus not focused. The functions is commenting: adding new information preferably to an active or accessible referent.

2. Argument-Focus Structure

Imag. אַתֶּם עִם-קָשָׁה-הָעַרְךָ YOU are the obstinate people.

Judg. 1:1 (מִי יַעֲלֶה-לָנוּ) Who will be the first to go up . . .?)

יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה JUDAH is to go.

Here, only the argument is focused by fronting and probably by pitch prominence, while the predicate is presupposed and thus not focused (Xp). The function of this structure is identification, that is, to relate the argument (Judah) with X (the missing argument) of a presupposed proposition "X should go.

3. Clause-Focus Structure

Exod. 6:6 אֲנִי יְהוָה I am the LORD

Exod. 33:5 אַתֶּם עִם-קָשָׁה-עַרְךָ YOU are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE

Here both the argument and the predicate are focused by fronting and/or high-pitch (XP). It indicates functions other than commenting or identification, such as event-reporting, presentation, exclamation, and surprise.

The three structures above are schematised as follows:

<u>Focus Structure</u>	<u>Word order</u>	<u>Function</u>
Predicate Focus	Px	commenting
Argument Focus	Xp	identification
Clause Focus	XP	other pragmatic functions

Predicate-Focus Structure will be discussed in chapter 5, Argument-Focus Structure in chapter 6 and Clause-Focus Structure in chapter 7.

3.5. PRAGMATIC PREDICATE AND PRAGMATIC SUBJECT

Before we close this chapter, I will introduce another set of terms. They are "pragmatic subject" and "pragmatic predicate."⁶¹

As might have been noticed, the presentation of the three focus structures above does not use the terms, "topic" and "comment" for classification, even though the relationship between the argument-predicate in Predicate-Focus Structure is that of topic-comment. On the other hand, the relationship between the argument-predicate in Argument-Focus Structure is not that of topic-comment, but identification. Namely the clause of Argument-Focus Structure simply relates two presupposed pieces of information: the active referent and the presupposed proposition whose argument is missing. In this structure the argument is NOT the topic and the predicate is NOT commenting ABOUT the argument.

	argument	predicate
predicate-focus structure	topic	comment
argument-focus structure	referent identified	proposition missing an argument

We could have used the terms 'topic' and 'comment' for Predicate-Focus Structure. However, for the presentational purpose we have unified the terminology.

Although this uniformity of terminology is beneficial for simplicity of presentation, it has one disadvantage. Though rarely, we encounter a situation where the grammatical predicate of a clause is the topic of the clause. For example, 2Chr. 20:6:

וַיֹּאמֶר
 יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ
 הֲלֹא אַתָּה הוּא אֱלֹהִים בְּשָׁמַיִם
 וְאַתָּה מוֹשֵׁל בְּכָל מַמְלָכוֹת הַגּוֹיִם
 וּבְיַדְךָ כַּחַ וְגִבּוֹרָה וְאֵין עִמָּךְ לְהִתְיַצֵּב

⁶¹ Lambrecht uses these two terms in a different situation in which he describes a construction of an identificational sentence. His example is in p. 223. "I heard your motorcycle broke down?" "My CAR broke down." The semantic subject "my car" is actually a comment in a pragmatically structured sentence, "What broke down is my car." Therefore he calls it predicate. In order to distinguish it from an ordinary predicate, Lambrecht calls the semantic subject a pragmatic predicate. See p. 231.

and he said,

1 "O Lord, the God of our fathers,

2 art Thou not God in the heavens?

3 And art Thou not ruler over all the kingdoms of the nations?

4 Power and might are in Thy hand so that no one can stand against Thee.

In the passage above, the topic and subject of Line 2 and 3 is the Lord. Line 4 is not actually about the subject כֹּחַ וְגִבּוֹרָה , power and might, but about the Lord that is expressed in the prepositional phrase בְּיָדְךָ . Namely in Line 4, the topic is the Lord.⁶² Its topic-comment relationship is:

Topic: the Lord

Comment: He has power and might in his hand.

Or

Topic: the Lord's hand

Comment: there is power and might in it.

This phenomenon is readily expressed in Japanese in which "in your hand" is marked by the topic-marker particle *wa*:

2 Anata-wa You + topic-marker *wa*

3 Anata-wa You + topic-maker *wa*

4. Anata-no-miteni-wa Your + hand + in + topic-marker *wa*

It is noteworthy that in all the Line 2 to 4, all the topics are fronted. This juxtaposition of three clauses with the same topic-comment sequence is one of the frequently used device of Clause-Focus Structure (Clause-Focus parallel construction in chapter 8). In order not to fail to capture the structure, we employ the terms, pragmatic subject and pragmatic predicate, for this phenomenon:

	topic-comment relationship	presentation	
2	topic + comment	subject	+ predicate
3	topic + comment	subject	+ predicate
4	topic + comment	pragmatic subject	+ pragmatic predicate

When the grammatical subject is the comment of the clauses, we call it the pragmatic predicate. When the grammatical predicate is the topic, we call it the pragmatic subject. Therefore in the clause above

Pragmatic Subject is בְּיָדְךָ

Pragmatic Predicate is כֹּחַ וְגִבּוֹרָה

Another example is

Judg. 3:16 $\text{חֶרֶב וְלָהּ שְׁנַי פִּיּוֹת}$ a sword which had two edges.

The clause which starts with וְלָהּ adds new information to the active referent חֶרֶב .

Topic: the sword

Comment: it has two edges

⁶² T. Givón discusses the topicality of non-subject elements. See T. Givón 1977, 192 and 202.

Therefore we call לָהּ the pragmatic subject and שְׁנֵי פִיּוֹת the pragmatic predicate.⁶³

⁶³ See also 1Sam 1:2 and Job 12:13 for pragmatic subject and predicate.

The allo-clause: שְׁנֵי פִיּוֹת לָהּ is not attested in Scripture. However we have some other examples:

Jer. 6:25b כִּי חָרֵב לְאֵיֵב For the enemy has a sword.

1Sam. 25:7 כִּי גִזְזִים לְךָ that you have shearers.

Here the pragmatic predicates are fronted because these clauses are commenting.

4. CONTRAST, EMPHASIS AND FOCUS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Since we have illustrated the method of information-structure analysis and presented our theory of three focus structures in the preceding chapters, we are ready to test the theory by examining our data. However, before doing this we should make a few remarks about the distinction between contrast,⁶⁴ emphasis and focus.

The relation between contrast and focus is one of the themes for information-structure analysts (Chafe 1994, 76-78; Lambrecht 1994, 286-295), because these two terms, contrast and focus, are closely related, while they are distinct notions.

For Biblical Hebrew, this problem is greater, since emphasis, contrast and focus are all intricately intertwined with word order. For example, as we have seen in Introduction, Hebraists have detected emphasis and contrast in the clause-initial position of Biblical Hebrew.

In the nominal clause, Albrecht, Joüon, Hoftijzer and Muraoka attempted to observe contrast or emphasis in the clause-initial position.

In the verbal clause, Joüon, GKC, Muraoka, J-Muraoka, Niccacci (1990) and D-Gibson detected emphasis in the clause-initial position. Muraoka, J-Muraoka, Lambdin, Andersen (SBH) and D-Gibson detected contrast in the clause-initial position.

More recently, Bandstra challenges the traditional notion of emphasis in the clause-initial position by applying the information-structure analysis. He concludes that "Emphasis . . . can better be termed *topicalization*" (1992, 123).

The relation among the three notions, contrast, emphasis and focus, has been a controversial issue awaiting solution. The analysis of information structure with the theory of the focus structure may contribute to this problem.⁶⁵

4.2. CONTRAST

Let us first consider the relation between contrast and focus. As I mentioned above it is generally agreed among linguists that contrast and focus are closely related, while they are distinct notions. This closeness is exhibited in the fact that all the contrastive members are focused.

⁶⁴ Contrast in this work includes antithesis.

⁶⁵ I will not list all the clauses which are traditionally labelled as "emphatic" or "contrastive" in this chapter. Most of those "emphatic" or "contrastive" clauses in our data will be scattered in the following chapters 5 to 7 and will be discussed under the functions which those clauses seem to have.

- (1) A. LEAH is SHORT.
B. No, She (Leah) is TALL.
- (2) A. JOHN is TALL.
B. No. LEAH is (tall).
- (3) A. JOHN is SHORT, but
B. LEAH is TALL.

In (1-B) the predicate, tall, is contrasted and focused. In (2-B) the argument, Leah, is contrasted and focused. In (3) the whole proposition, "Leah is tall," is contrasted and focused.

The same phenomenon is observed in Hebrew.

- (4) #92 Gen. 12:19
A לָמָּה לֹא־הַגַּדְתָּ לִי כִּי אִשְׁתְּךָ הִוא
B לָמָּה אָמַרְתָּ אָחִתִּי הִוא

A Why did you not tell me that she was YOUR WIFE?

B Why did you say, "She is MY SISTER."

- (5) 1Kings 18:21
A אִם־יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים לָכוּ אַחַרָיו
B וְאִם־הַבַּעַל לָכוּ אַחַרָיו

A If the LORD is GOD, follow Him;

B but if BAAL, follow him

- (6) #41 Deut. 29:28
A הַנְּסִתָּוּת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
B וְהַנְּגַלְתָּ לָנוּ וּלְבָנֵינוּ עַד־עוֹלָם

A The SECRET THINGS BELONG to the LORD our GOD,

B but the THINGS REVEALED BELONG to US and to our SONS FOREVER.

In (4-B) the predicate, אָחִתִּי (my sister), is contrasted and focused by fronting and probably by high pitch. In (5-B), the argument, הַבַּעַל (Baal), is contrasted and focused by fronting and probably by pitch. In (6-B) the whole proposition, וְהַנְּגַלְתָּ לָנוּ וּלְבָנֵינוּ עַד־עוֹלָם (the things revealed belong to us and to our sons forever), is contrasted and focused by fronting and probably by high pitch.

The instinctive conclusion would be that either focus makes contrast or contrast makes focus. For Hebrew, the clause-initial position appears to make the element contrastive, or conversely, contrast appears to bring the element in front. This is widely held by Hebraists (see above). However, closer examination will reveal a more complex reality. Three points seem to be helpful in attempting to sketch out these phenomena.

4.2.1. Contrast is created only by the context

The first point is that contrast is the product of the context, not of focus (word order or high pitch). Let us extract B sentences here:

- (7) She is TALL.
(8) LEAH is (tall).
(9) LEAH is TALL.
- (10) אָחִתִּי הִוא She is MY SISTER
(11) וְאִם־הַבַּעַל if BAAL (is God),

(12) והנגלת לנו ולבנינו עד-עולם

the THINGS REVEALED BELONG to US and to OUR SONS FOREVER.

These six clauses do NOT convey contrast to the hearer. They are ordinary clauses classified according to their focus structures. (7) and (10) simply comment on the activated topic referent (Predicate-Focus Structure). (8) and (11) identify their arguments, Leah and Baal, with the missing arguments of the presupposed propositions: "someone is tall" and "someone is God" (Argument-Focus Structure). (9) and (12) can be uttered out of the blue, can be proclaimed, or can start a new episode (Clause-Focus Structure). Contrastive connotation that all these clauses have in (1) to (6) above was created by the context, that is, by the presence of the contrastive members. Without the presence of those contrastive members, contrast cannot be conveyed to the hearer as we can see in (7) to (12). We may say that contrast is the product of the context, not of focus, syntax or prosody. Hoftijzer rightly comments on (4):

A clear example is Gen. xii 19 (*ʿhōt hīʾ*; from the context it is clear that Abram does everything to convince people that Sarah is not his wife but his sister). (488, underline added)

4.2.2. Focus indicates which constituent is contrasted.

The second point is the role of focus (word order and high pitch). If word order or high pitch do not express contrast, what do they do? They do have a role in contrast. Focus indicates which constituent is contrasted. When we look at (1) to (6), we can judge which constituent is contrasted by knowing where the focus falls on. In (1) and (4), it is the predicate that is contrasted. In (2) and (5), it is the argument that is contrasted. In (3) and (6), it is the whole proposition that is contrasted. Focus does not make contrast, but it indicates which constituent is intended to be contrastive.

4.2.3. Contrast results in focus through information structuring

A question may arise here. If we can judge which element is contrasted by determining the position of focus, cannot we still state that contrast makes focus? For example, when Elijah intended to contrast God with Baal, he focused God and Baal by fronting:

(5) 1Kings 18:21

A אִם-יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים לְכוּ אַחֲרָיו

B וְאִם-הַבַּעַל לְכוּ אַחֲרָיו

A If the LORD is GOD, follow Him;

B but if BAAL, follow him

It appears that Elijah's intention of contrast brought God and Baal in front (focus), and it has been the understanding in the past. This, however, is not an accurate description of this phenomenon.

There are two examples to demonstrate the inadequacy of this notion. The first example is

(6) #41 Deut. 29:28

A הַנְּסִתָּהּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

וְהַנְּגִלָּת לָנוּ וּלְבָנֵינוּ עַד-עוֹלָם B

A The SECRET THINGS BELONG to the LORD our GOD,

B but the THINGS REVEALED BELONG to US and to our SONS FOREVER.

Here, it is not only the subjects ("the secret things" and "the things revealed") which are contrasted, but also the predicates ("belong to the Lord" and "belong to us") are contrasted. The notion "contrast brings constituents in front" cannot explain why the predicates are not fronted while the predicates are also contrasted.

The second example is an imaginary clause (11') below.

(11') מִי הָאֱלֹהִים Who is God?
 הַבַּעַל BAAL

The traditional notion cannot explain why Baal is fronted without contrastive connotation in (11') above. This is similar to the question-answer: "who is the prime minister?" "TONY BLAIR." Tony Blair is focused by high pitch not because of contrast. Similarly Baal here is focused not because of contrast. The statement, "contrast brings constituents in front," does not apply here. It describe a part of reality, but it lacks precision.

The information-structure analysis with the theory of focus structure will describe the relation between contrast and fronting (focus) more accurately. In the case of (5) above, Baal is fronted (focused), not directly because of contrast, but through identification.

We may put it in another way. Contrast results in focusing constituents through information structuring. Let us start with English examples.

(1) A. LEAH is SHORT.
 B. No, She (Leah) is TALL.

In (1), the speaker B does not challenge the topic Leah, therefore the topic is the same as in sentence A: Leah. The topic expression is the pronoun "she" and it is not focused (not high pitched). What sentence B challenges is the comment of the sentence A, and sentence B intends to contrast it with a new information "she is tall." This new information is added to the topic Leah. This is the function of commenting. Thus it is focused by high pitch. In other words, focus on "tall" is not directly due to contrast but to commenting. Contrast of the predicates (short <> tall) results in focusing the predicates "tall," through information structuring (commenting of the predicate-focus structure). Contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by the presence of the contrastive members.

(2) A. JOHN is TALL.
 B. No. LEAH is (tall).

In (2) the proposition "someone is tall" is activated by the utterance of A. The speaker B does not challenge this proposition "X is tall," but he intends to contrast the subject Leah with John. Therefore the speaker B identifies the argument Leah with X of the presupposed proposition "X is tall" (sentence B, identification). The argument, Leah, is focused not due to contrast, but to identification. Contrast of the arguments (John <> Leah) results in focusing the argument "Leah," through information-structuring (identification of the argument-focus structure). Contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by the presence of the contrastive members.

- (3) A. JOHN is SHORT, but
B. LEAH is TALL.

In (3), the speaker B intends to challenge the whole proposition of A and to contrast it with a whole new proposition. The speaker B presents an "out-of-the-blue" whole new proposition B, which is, as a whole, new information. Since the whole proposition is new and asserted, both the subject and the predicate are focused. The foci are not due to contrast, but to presenting a whole sentence anew. Contrast of the whole sentences results in focusing the whole sentence B through information structuring. Contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by the presence of the contrastive members.

- (4) #92 Gen. 12:19 A לָמָּה לֹא־הַגַּדְתָּ לִי כִּי אִשְׁתְּךָ הִוא
B לָמָּה אָמַרְתָּ אֶחָתִי הִוא

A Why did you not tell me that she was YOUR WIFE?

B Why did you say, "She is MY SISTER."

In the two propositions of (4) above, the referent Sarai is referred to by the pronoun הִוא, because the referent is activated in v. 17. Pharaoh intends to contrast two comments about Sarai: "she is your wife" and "she is your sister." Thus he presents two new comments about the same topic Sarai. Since these two clauses are commenting, their comments are focused by fronting, while the same topic referent remains unfocused. The focus (fronting) on אֶחָתִי (she is MY SISTER) is not due to contrast, but to commenting. Contrast of the predicates (be your wife <> be your sister) results in focusing the predicates through information structuring (commenting of the predicate-focus structure). Contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by the presence of the contrastive members.

- (5) 1Kings 18:21 A וְאִם־יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים לָכֵן אֲחַרְיוּ
B וְאִם־הַבַּעַל לָכֵן אֲחַרְיוּ

A If the LORD is GOD, follow Him;

B but if BAAL, follow him

In (5), the proposition, "X is God," in Line 2 is presupposed and not challenged. Therefore it is not focused (ellipsis). On the other hand, the subject is contrasted and a different (contrasting) subject, Baal, is presented. In this conditional clause, Line 2 identifies Baal with X of the presupposed proposition "X is God" (identification). Baal is focused (fronted) not due to contrast, but to identification. Contrast of the arguments (God <> Baal) results in focusing the arguments through information structuring: (5-B) is an identifying clause. Contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by the presence of the contrastive members.

- (6) #41 Deut. 29:28 A הַסֵּתֵרִים לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
B וְהַנִּגְלֹת לָנוּ וְלִבְנֵינוּ עַד־עוֹלָם

A The SECRET THINGS BELONG to the LORD our GOD,

B but the THINGS REVEALED BELONG to US and to our SONS FOREVER.

In (6), the whole clauses are contrasted. Each clause has a subject and predicate which are different from their opposite members. Hence Clause-Focus Structure. Foci are not due to contrast, but to the presentation of a whole new clause. Contrast of the whole clause results in focusing the whole clauses through information structuring: these contrastive clauses are

clauses of presentation or out-of-the-blue. Contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by the presence of the contrastive members.

We have observed that those contrastive constituents are focused (fronted and high pitched in Hebrew), not directly because of contrast. They are focused because they have their own focus structures and functions. Contrast results in focusing contrastive constituents through information structuring.

4.2.4. Implicit Contrast

The examples we have seen above have explicit contrastive members and therefore contrast is obvious. However, we need to note here that the contrastive members can be implicit. Let us take an English example first:

- A. Mother: Jane is going to sleep in your sleeping bag.
B. Daughter: JANE is TALL.

In this conversation, the structure of the sentence B is puzzling, because the topic Jane is an active referent and it does not need to be focused. From the point of view of activation state, it should be a sentence of Predicate-Focus Structure, and even the proform "she is TALL" should be able to replace it. However, this Predicate-Focus Structure, "she is TALL," does not make sense in this context. This is not a failure of the information structure. The sentence B is actually a sentence with Clause-Focus Structure with contrastive implication in which the contrasting counterpart is not verbalised. It would be "OTHER friends would fit into my SLEEPING BAG. But JANE is TOO TALL for that." Jane is focused as well as the comment "is tall" here because the entire proposition which is presented is different from the implied presupposed proposition, "OTHER friends would fit into my SLEEPING BAG." The intended contrast is expressed information structuring, and becomes evident to Mother by the context. It is noteworthy that contrastiveness can be expressed without explicit contrasting member(s).

J-Muraoka mentions this implied contrast (§146-a), and gives an example Judg. 14:3:

אֹתָהּ קָח-לִי כִּי-הִיא יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵינַי "Get HER for ME, for SHE looks GOOD to me"

J-Muraoka explains

The pronoun [היא] is added to bring out antithetical contrast; . . . In some cases the contrast is only implicit, only one of the two contrasting members being explicitly mentioned. (§146 a 1)

The contrastive member is implied by Samson's parents in v. 3:

"Is there no woman among the daughters of your relatives, or among all our people, that you go to take a wife from the uncircumcised Philistines?"

If Samson simply intended to add a new information to the woman in Timnah (commenting), the clause would have been a Predicate Focus:

יִשְׂרָאֵל הִיא בְּעֵינַי. (Verb-Subject-Prepositional-phrase)

However, Samson intended to contrast "the woman in Timnah looks good" with the implied proposition "Israelite women do not look good."

A: ISRAELITE WOMEN do NOT look GOOD.

B: but SHE looks GOOD. היא ישרה בעיני

Here Samson presents a whole new proposition with a different topic and a different comment. Therefore both the constituents are focused. This is a clause of Clause-Focus Structure with contrastive connotation.

This implicit contrast has been equated with emphasis in past studies; however, it is necessary to distinguish these two terms. Implicit contrast is only one means to convey emphasis along with many other means. See below for further discussion.

What we have observed here is that contrast may be detected by the presence of an implicit contrastive member without an explicit one and that implicit contrast may be used to express emphasis.

4.2.5. Application to examples of GKC, Muraoka and Hoftijzer

We shall now apply our three points of contrast to examples given by GKC, Muraoka and Hoftijzer. GKC detects emphasis in the clause-initial position. Hoftijzer detects contrast in the clause-initial position, but he finds it inconsistent. Our three points will show that many of GKC's emphatic clauses are contrastive, and will explain why Hoftijzer finds it inconsistent.

GKC's emphatic clauses

Contrast has often been confused with emphasis in past studies. Let us take some examples from GKC's emphatic clauses in §142 f. For GKC, "the natural *order of words* . . . is: *Verb—Subject*" and the inversion occurs when the fronted element is "specially emphasized." However, some of GKC's emphatic examples below are actually in our terms contrast through information structuring. For example, Gen. 21:7:

והיאָמַר מִי מֵלַל לְאַבְרָהָם
הַיְנִיקָה בָּנִים שָׂרָה
כִּי־יִלְדָתִי בֶן לְזַקְנִי

And she said, "Who would have said to Abraham that Sarah would nurse children?"

Yet I have BORNE HIM A SON in his old age."

GKC detects emphasis in יִלְדָתִי, However, this is contrast. First this contrast becomes evident by the presence of contrastive members:

Sarah would (not) nurse CHILDREN.

(but) Sarah has BORNE a SON.

Then we see that the predicates are fronted for focus and the topic is the same for the two clauses and not focused.

Finally we understand that these two predicates are fronted not directly due to contrast. They are fronted because these two clauses are commenting on the active topic. Contrast resulted in focusing those predicates through information structuring. Contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by the presence of the contrastive members.

Another GKC's emphatic example is 2Kings 5:13:

אָבִי דְבַר גָּדוֹל הַנְּבִיא דְבַר אֱלֹהִים
הֲלוֹא תַעֲשֶׂה

1 My father, had the prophet told you to do some GREAT THING,

2 would you not have done it?

Line 1 has OSVA. GKC detects emphasis in the object דְבַר גָּדוֹל. This is actually contrast. First, contrast becomes evident from the context. Naaman was told to do a trifling thing, which is bathing in a small river. The presence of this contrastive member creates contrast. Then we can detect which element is contrasted by the placement of focus. Since the argument, דְבַר גָּדוֹל, is fronted for focus, and the proposition "the prophet told you do X" is presupposed from the preceding context, we find that only the argument is contrasted here. Finally we can observe that this fronting is not directly due to contrast, but to identification. דְבַר גָּדוֹל is identified with X of the presupposed proposition "the prophet told you to do X." Thus the protasis has Argument-Focus Structure. Contrast results in focusing דְבַר גָּדוֹל through information structuring.

Other examples of GKC's "emphatic" clauses which have Argument-Focus Structure (identification) with contrastive connotation: Gen. 37:4 (nobody else but him), Judg. 14:3 (not other women, but she), 1Sam. 18:17 (not other women, but her), 1Sam. 21:10 (not others but that sword), Exod. 18:23 (not other things but this thing).

Hoftijzer's non-contrastive clauses

Hoftijzer, who attempts to detect contrast or "special importance" in the clause-initial element, finds it inconsistent. This inconsistency is inevitable because the clause-initial position is marked for focus, not for contrast. Contrast is created only by the presence of explicit or implicit contrastive members. For example, Hoftijzer comments on one of the S-P clauses:

The words *ze sēper tōledōt 'adām* (Gen. v 1) do not imply that *this* (and nothing else) is the book of the generations of Adam. (491)

Hoftijzer is right not to detect contrast in *ze* here, because there is no explicit or implicit contrastive member in this context. This clause has Clause-Focus Structure which introduces a new text unit with a general description.⁶⁶ The subject *ze* is not fronted for contrast, but for focus.

Another example of Hoftijzer's non-contrastive S in S-P clauses is Gen. 19:37. He comments "In Gen. xix 37 there is said of Moab *hū 'ab-mō'āb*; that does not mean that he and no one else is the ancestor of the Moabites" (491). Hoftijzer is right not to detect contrast here. This is not contrastive, because there is no contrastive member in the context. This has Clause-Focus Structure of circumstantial clause of gloss.⁶⁷ Fronting does not create contrast, only the presence of explicit or implicit contrastive member does (the first point).

⁶⁶ Introductory Formula or titling, which will be discussed in chapter 7

⁶⁷ see chapter 7 for this term

"focus," "enforcement," and even "topicalization." It seems the term emphasis needs to regain its appropriate and significant status by reconsidering all the related terms.

4.3.1. End and means of emphasis

T. Muraoka's *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (1985) is a prominent work which analyses emphasis in Biblical Hebrew comprehensively. It studies emphasis expressed by word order, personal pronouns, copula, infinitive absolute, casus pendens and even by 16 particles. According to T. Muraoka, emphasis is "psychological" (xiii) and it has two aspects: "the force and stress laid upon the fact," and "an outflow and discharge of inner intensified emotion" (xiv). We shall follow this definition in our study.

This "emphasis" appears to be too broad a term for minute linguistic researches. This is probably one of the main reasons why this term is less often used in modern Hebrew linguistics. However, the broadness of this term should not discourage its use in linguistics works, since emphasis is a legitimate linguistic phenomenon. What we need to do is to understand that emphasis is the end and a language has many means to achieve that effect. Then we can concentrate on analysing those means and may recover the status of the term emphasis.

Emphasis (force, stress or emotional outflow) may be expressed by various means. To give only a few examples, emphasis can be expressed

1. by intensification (loud voice);

I want to go THERE. (loud voice or stress)

2. morpho-lexically;

a. emphatic use of plural (ex. heavens)

b. emphatic adverb (ex. very, every) or adverbial phrase

This is very important. (an intensive adverb)

What in the world is this!?! (an emphatic adverbial phrase)

Even my mother allowed me to watch it. (an emphatic adverb)

c. emphatic use of pronouns (ex. myself)

I didn't know myself.

3. stylistic-syntactically;

Go, go!! (repetition)

4. combination;

Truly, truly I say unto you. (an emphatic adverb, repetition)

5. by contrast;

(not other women, but) "get her for me"⁶⁸

6. by rhetorical negation:

"then would I not tell you about it?"⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Judg. 14:3: אֲנִי אֶתְּחַבֵּל לָךְ, see p. 79.

⁶⁹ 1Sam. 20:9 וְלֹא אֶתְּחַבֵּל לָךְ This is taken from GKC's emphatic clauses. The clause has Argument-Focus Structure which is relating Saul's decision with X of the presupposed proposition: "I will tell you

It appears that these devices of emphasis are prone to be confused with emphasis itself in the past studies.

The term "intensification" is introduced in our study as one of various means of emphasis. It should be noted that this term is strictly suprasegmental or prosodic,⁷⁰ that is, it is expressed by loud voice.⁷¹

We have also mentioned above that contrast with an implicit contrastive member may be used to express emphasis, such as, "(not other women, but) אִתָּהּ קַח-לִי get her for me" (Judg. 14:3).

It is important to distinguish the three terms here: emphasis, intensification and contrast. Emphasis is a broad term which encompasses various means such as above, including intensification and contrast. In other words intensification and contrast are means to express emphasis, and these two terms must not be equated with emphasis itself. The point made here is the necessity to distinguish emphasis from the means to express emphasis, such as intensification, contrast and so on. By reorganising this difference, we may use the term emphasis, which refers to a duly recognised and established linguistic phenomenon.

4.3.2. Focus and intensification

We have laid down a principle for the study of emphasis above. It is to distinguish the means of emphasis from emphasis itself and then to analyse those means.

We shall now turn our attention to the relation between intensification and focus, because focus is often equated with intensification. I suspect that this equation is one of the causes that past studies often detected emphasis in the clause-initial position of Biblical Hebrew. In other words, it appears that some of the past studies did not distinguish focus from intensification, and thus interpreted some fronted elements as emphatic. I will demonstrate the distinction between them below. Let us first see the six sentences we examined in the previous section. Small capitals are high pitched. In Hebrew, underline is focused by word order and high pitch.

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|--|
| (1) | Leah is TALL. | (as an answer to "Is Leah small?") |
| (2) | LEAH is tall. | (as an answer to "Who is tall?") |
| (3) | LEAH is TALL. | (an out-of-the-blue exclamatory sentence) |
| (4) | אִתָּהּ <u>הִיא</u> | She is MY SISTER (as an answer to "who is she?") |

X" (identification). This clause has contrastive connotation: "I may not tell you other news, but I will tell you about THAT."

⁷⁰ See Chafe 1994, 58 for prosodic intensification

⁷¹ This definition of intensification is different from Muraoka's definition of intensification which is morphological (e.g., *m'ōd*). Muraoka distinguishes his intensification from emphasis and excludes this "intensification" from the process of his study (xiv, xv). However, it is not clear how his "force and stress" are different from intensification. It appears that both our prosodic intensification and Muraoka's morphological intensification are aspects of the broad notion of emphasis.

(5) הבעל האלהים BAAL is God. (as an answer to "who is God?")

(6) והנגלת לנו ולבנינו עד-עולם

the THINGS REVEALED BELONG to US and to OUR SONS FOREVER.

(an out-of-the-blue exclamatory sentence)

In (1) and (4), only the predicate is focused for commenting (Predicate-Focus Structure). In (2) and (5), only the argument is focused for identification (Argument-Focus Structure). In (3) and (6), the whole proposition is focused for other pragmatic functions. In order to make these sentence emphatic, we can intensify (say loudly) constituents. What has to be noticed in intensifying constituents in these sentences is that we only intensify the focused elements. Underlined elements are said loudly:

(1') Leah is TALL. (as an answer to "Is Leah small?")

(2') LEAH is tall. (as an answer to "Who is tall?")

(3') LEAH is TALL. (an out-of-the-blue exclamatory sentence)

(4') אחתי הוא She is MY SISTER (as an answer to "who is she?")

(5') הבעל האלהים BAAL is God. (as an answer to "who is God?")

(6') והנגלת לנו ולבנינו עד-עולם

the THINGS REVEALED BELONG to US and to OUR SONS FOREVER.

(an out-of-the-blue exclamatory sentence)

There is no doubt that intensification can be added only to the focused elements. Focus is different from intensification and the prerequisite for intensification.

4.3.3. Detection of intensification in written texts

Although *Emphatic* by Muraoka is a thorough and valuable work for the study of emphasis, it does not always seem to distinguish intensification, a means, from emphasis, the end. In order to detect emphasis, Muraoka looked for "sure external and objectively identifiable signs of emotion in the context" (xiv, underline added). This probably means that he attempted to detect intensification from the context. This method is, however, as Muraoka himself admits, "not an easy task to attain objectivity" (xiv). For example, let us compare Muraoka's two examples, Exod. 21:3 and Gen. 42:19.

(1) Exod. 21:3 אם-בעל אשה הוא "if he is the HUSBAND of a WIFE"

(2) Gen. 42:19 אם-פנים אהם "if you are HONEST MEN"

Both of them have the same grammatical structure: the indefinite predicate followed by the personal pronoun, and they would be the normal and unmarked sentence structure "description" according to Muraoka (182). In addition, those clauses have no emphatic particles or adjectives. Namely, there is no difference between them morpho-syntactically. However, from the context Muraoka detects no emphasis in the fronted element of (1), בעל אשה, while he detects emphasis in that of (2), פנים (p. 15). The immediate context of the latter is

Do this and you will live, for I fear God: If you are honest men, let one of your brothers stay here in prison. (vv. 18, 19)

which does not necessarily show "sure external and objectively identifiable signs of emotion in the context." This set of clauses and Muraoka's interpretation demonstrate that it is "not an easy task to attain objectivity" (xiv) in detecting stress or emotional outflow only from the context.

We need to consider how "stress" or "emotional outflow" was expressed without morpho-syntactic means. If the original author or narrator meant אִם-כֹּפְנִים אִתְּם to be emphatic above,⁷² it would have been marked prosodically, such as stress, because emotional outflow and intensity are often expressed prosodically (pause, stress, intonation and quality of voice).⁷³ This understanding is significant in reading written texts in which we cannot hear stress on words.⁷⁴ It means that detection of intensification in written texts can be very subjective.

Compared to the detection of intensification, it is not difficult to determine the place of focus in a written sentence from the context. For example,

- (7) A When the lady asked, "Is Leah small?"
B John answered, "No, Leah is tall."

Here, from the context of (7), it is certain that "tall" is high-pitched, because the topic, Leah, is activated, and "she is tall" is new information added to the topic referent (Predicate-Focus Structure). However whether "tall" is intensified or not is uncertain from this particular context. It appears this "tall" is not intensified because there is no sign for intensification, while, however, some may detect intensification from a wider context, such as, this lady was despising John's girl friend Leah prior to the utterance of 7-A. Nonetheless detection of intensification still depends on the interpretation of a reader. To put it another way, even if the wider context suggested that John was very emotional at the time of response, he could still say the sentence in a controlled tone. This applies to Hebrew.

(7') 1Kings 18:21

וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלֶיהֶם אֵל-כָּל-הָעָם וַיֹּאמֶר
עַד-מָתַי אִתְּם פְּסָחִים עַל-שְׁתֵּי הַסַּעֲפִים
אִם-יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים לְכֹ אַחֲרָיו
וְאִם-הַבַּעַל לְכֹ אַחֲרָיו
וְלֹא-עָנוּ הָעָם אִתּוֹ דְבָר

And Elijah came near to all the people and said,
"How long will you hesitate between two opinions?
If the LORD is God, follow Him;
but if BAAL, follow him."
But the people did not answer him a word.

⁷² It may be emphatic if we interpret that it is a response to the brother's statement "Your servants are honest men, not spies" in v. 11 as Muraoka suggests. It is however speculative.

⁷³ and by non-linguistic means (facial expression and gesture).

⁷⁴ For prosodic features in Massoretic accentual system, see 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew"

The focus on "הַבֶּעַל" is certain, because it is fronted and also the predicate "X is God" is presupposed and omitted. However detection of intensification on Baal may depend on the interpretation of the reader. The point here is that detection of intensification on the focused elements can be very subjective in written texts.

If the author intends to have "tall" said loudly, he can specify intensification on "tall" by:

- (8) A When the lady asked "Is Leah small?"
 B John shouted, "No, Leah is tall."

Here intensification on "tall" is explicitly suggested by the word "shout." Similarly in Biblical Hebrew,

(8)' Gen. 45:1

וְלֹא-יָכַל יוֹסֵף לְהִתְאַפֵּק לְכָל הַנִּצְבִּים עָלָיו
 וַיִּקְרָא הוֹצִיאוּ כָל-אִישׁ מֵעָלָי

Then Joseph could not control himself before all those who stood by him,
 and he cried, "Have everyone go out from me."

Here "could not control himself" and "cried" explicitly suggest intensification at least on הוֹצִיאוּ.

To sum up, Muraoka's emphasis detected only by the context seems to mean intensification (loud voice) and detection of intensification in written texts is highly subjective, unless it is explicitly specified.

4.3.4. Emphasis by contrast

We have seen the difference between focus and intensification above. Now we need to take contrast into our consideration of intensification and focus.

It is important to recognise that a contrastive counterpart can be implicit as J-Muraoka mention (see above under "Contrast"). This contrast has been simply labelled as "emphatic" in the past. For example, Judg. 14:3

אֹתָהּ קַח-לִי כִּי-הִיא יִשְׂרָה בְּעֵינַי "Get HER for me, for SHE looks good to me"
 GKC detects emphasis here in the object "her."

This label of "emphasis" needs elaboration. If this is emphatic, this is emphasis through contrast.⁷⁵ The clause is contrastive, and the contrastive member is implicit. The context indicates that the connotation is "not other women or Israelite women, but that young Philistine woman in Timnah." This contrast of the two resulted in focusing (fronting) the woman through information structuring (identification).

Through this contrast we may say "the Philistine woman" is "emphasised." Contrast with an implicit contrastive member can be perceived as one means of emphasis. We have to note, however, that this contrast should not be equated with emphasis itself. It goes without saying that this contrast does not justify intensification (loud voice or stress) on "her" or

⁷⁵ See 4.3.1 for various means of emphasis.

"she." We shall not classify this clause as emphasis, but as contrast, though the outcome may be emphatic.

Another example is Judg. 13:22:

וַיֹּאמֶר מְנוּחַ אֶל-אִשְׁתּוֹ
מִזֹּת נָמוּת
כִּי אֱלֹהִים רָאִינוּ

So Manoah said to his wife,
"We shall surely die,
for we have seen GOD."

Muraoka detects emphasis in the fronted object "God" (39). However, this "emphasis" also needs more accurate description. This fronting of אֱלֹהִים is not a peculiarity of a theophany story. This is contrast. Manoah intended to contrast God with an implicit contrastive member, "something else" or "man." This contrast resulted in focusing (fronting) God through information structuring, that is, identification. The clause identifies God with X of the presupposed proposition "we have seen X," and therefore אֱלֹהִים is fronted. Now, this contrast with the implicit contrastive member seems to have an emphatic effect: "nothing else but God."⁷⁶ Contrast with this implicit contrastive member is one means for emphasis here. However, this contrast should not be equated with emphasis itself, and contrast does not assure intensification: it is not certain if אֱלֹהִים was intensified (said loudly).

J-Muraoka give Judg. 7:4 as an example of contrast without an explicit contrasting member: הוּא יֵלֵךְ. They comment "*he* (and not someone else) shall go" (§146 a 1) and do not label it as emphasis. Here they correctly distinguish implicit contrast from emphasis.

In summary, contrast with an implicit contrastive member has been often labelled as simply "emphatic." However, this labelling lacks accuracy. It may be emphatic by means of implicit contrast. However, contrast should not be equated with emphasis itself and this contrast does not assure intensification.

4.3.4.1. Application to other clauses

These examples above demonstrate four points in terms of the relationship between focus and intensification. 1) Focus and intensification are different notions. 2) Focus is prerequisite for intensification. 3) Detection of intensification is highly subjective in written texts, unless it is explicitly specified. 4) Contrast may be used as a means of emphasis, but it should not be equated with emphasis and it does not assure intensification.

With these four points in our mind, we shall analyse some examples of emphasis in GKC and Muraoka. Muraoka attempts to detect emphasis in the clause-initial position (P in P-S and S in S-P), but he finds it inconsistent. The four points above may reveal the background of this inconsistency.

⁷⁶ Emphasis on the whole complex clause can also be detected because of the strong word "die" with the addition of the infinitive absolute.

Muraoka's non-emphatic clauses

Muraoka is right not to detect emphasis in the predicate וְאִם-אִישׁ עָנִי in Deut. 24:12:

וְאִם-אִישׁ עָנִי הוּא לֹא תִשְׁכַּב בְּעִבְטוֹ

"And if he is a POOR MAN, you shall NOT SLEEP with his PLEDGE.

In this example, the topic referent "he" is activated in the immediately preceding verse. Therefore the topic is expressed by the proform and the predicate, "is a poor man," is fronted to add new information (commenting). The predicate is fronted certainly for focus. However, intensification on this focused element is doubtful from the context.

Another example of Muraoka's non-emphatic P in P-S clause

Exod. 21:3: אִם-בַּעַל אִשָּׁה הוּא.

One of Muraoka's examples of non-emphatic S in S-P clauses (p. 9) is Gen. 47:9:

וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב אֶל-פַּרְעֹה
יָמֵי שְׁנֵי מִגֹּדְרֵי שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאֵת שָׁנָה
 מָעַט וְרָעִים הָיוּ יָמֵי שְׁנֵי תַיִ
 וְלֹא הִשְׁיִגוּ אֶת-יָמֵי שְׁנֵי תַיִ אֲבֹתַי בְּיָמֵי מִגֹּדְרֵיהֶם

So Jacob said to Pharaoh,

"THE YEARS OF MY SOJOURNING are ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY;

few and unpleasant have been the years of my life,

nor have they attained the years that my fathers lived during the days of their sojourning."

Muraoka is right not to detect emphasis in the subject יָמֵי שְׁנֵי מִגֹּדְרֵי. It is not emphasised or intensified, but is focused as well as the predicate "are 130." The subject is the topic of this text unit and it is announced at the beginning of the unit. This is topicalisation, an implication (or a discourse function) of Clause-Focus Structure.⁷⁷

Another of Muraoka's examples of the non-emphatic Subject:

Exod. 22:13, 14 (Eng. 14, 15): two בְּעֶלְיוֹ. This is another case of Clause-Focus Structure [Parallel Construction, contrasting the whole proposition].

GKC's emphatic clauses

GKC sees emphasis in "the serpent" in Gen. 3:13:

מִה־זֹאת עָשִׂיתָ וְתֹאמְרֵי הָאִשָּׁה
הִנָּחַשׁ הִשְׂאֵנִי וְאָכַל

"What is this you have done?" And the woman said,

"THE SERPENT DECEIVED ME, and I ATE."

The serpent is fronted not for emphasis but for focus. There are three ways to say "the serpent deceived me." Below are imaginary clauses.

(1) Px Predicate-Focus Structure

הִנָּחַשׁ לֹא הִיטִיב-לִי The SERPENT was not KIND to me.
הִשְׂאֵנִי הִנָּחַשׁ The serpent DECEIVED me.

⁷⁷ See 7.4.1.1 "Topicalisation and Initiation" in pp. 163ff.

(2) Xp Argument-Focus Structure

הָאָדָם לֹא הִשִּׂיאָנִי The MAN did not deceive me.

הַנָּחֶשׁ הִשִּׂיאָנִי The SERPENT deceived me.

(3) XP Clause-Focus Structure

מָה חַטָּאתִי WHAT is my SIN?

הַנָּחֶשׁ הִשִּׂיאָנִי The SERPENT DECEIVED me.

In (1), the topic, the serpent, is activated and therefore it is not focused, while the predicate is focused (by fronting) because it is a new comment. In (2), the proposition "X deceived me" is presupposed and thus not focused, while the serpent is focused because the clause relates the serpent with X. In (3) both the topic and the comment are not presupposed and focused. (3) is an unexpected out-of-the-blue utterance. The actual information structure of Gen. 3:13 is similar to (3) above where Eve was not expecting God to know that the serpent deceived Eve.⁷⁸ Hebrew does not express emphasis by the clause-initial position. It expresses focus by it.

It appears that some of the past studies did not distinguish focus from intensification, and thus they interpreted some fronted elements as emphatic.

4.3.5. Summary of "Emphasis"

What we have discussed above on emphasis may be summarised as follows:

Emphasis, which is stress or emotional outflow, can be expressed by various means, such as intensification and contrast (4.3.1). Intensification is stress by loud voice and it is different from focus which is to mark an element as informationally prominent. Focus is prerequisite for intensification and only the focused element(s) in each of the three focus structures can be intensified (4.3.2). In written texts, detection of intensification is highly subjective, unless it is explicitly specified. (4.3.3) Contrast, implicit contrast in particular, may express emphasis, but it should not be equated with emphasis itself (4.3.4).

4.4. SUMMARY OF "CONTRAST, EMPHASIS AND FOCUS"

We have attempted to shed light on the long disputed problems of emphasis. The problems seem to have been caused by the lack of appropriate terms which can be used for more precise description of the phenomena related to emphasis. The distinction among four terms, emphasis, intensification, contrast and focus, is particularly important for finer analysis, and in turn, this distinction may enable us to use the term emphasis with more confidence. We have given emphasis the position of "end" and intensification (loud voice) and contrast (implicit contrast in particular) that of "means" among others (4.3.1).

⁷⁸ This Clause-Focus Structure may have another implication of initiation.

In closing this chapter, I will present another set of examples, which may further clarify the relationship between these terms. This presentation is considerably simplified, however, it hopes to convey the essence of this chapter.

1. "You are a righteous people" may be contrasted with

Exod. 33:3 אַתָּה עַם־קָשָׁה־עֲרֵב you are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE

Here only the predicate is contrasted and may be intensified (Predicate Focus Structure)

2. "Edom is not the obstinate people of the land" may be contrasted with

Image. אַתֶּם עַם־קָשָׁה־הָעֲרָב YOU are the obstinate people.

Here only the argument is contrasted and may be intensified (Argument Focus Structure).

3. "Edom is a righteous people" may be contrasted with

Exod. 33:5 אַתֶּם עַם־קָשָׁה־עֲרָב YOU are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE

Here, the whole proposition is contrasted and may be intensified (Clause Focus Structure).

Only the focused element may be contrasted (4.2.2) or intensified (loud voice) (4.3.2). Focus is prerequisite for both contrast and intensification.

Contrast is made possible not by fronting but only by the presence of contrastive members. Contrast does not belong to syntax but to contextual implicatures (4.2.1). Intensification does not belongs to syntax but to prosody (4.3.2). Therefore in the written form, detection of intensification is highly subjective, unless it is explicitly specified (4.3.3).

5. PREDICATE-FOCUS STRUCTURE

5.1. INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapters, we have laid out the method of information-structure analysis (chapter 2) and presented our main thesis, the theory of three focus structures (chapter 3). Based on these two chapters, we have attempted to shed light on the controversial issue of emphasis by clarifying the relations among emphasis, contrast, focus and intensification (chapter 4). These preceding three chapters have offered a framework of our study. The following three chapters, starting with this chapter, will examine all the clauses within our data to test our two major hypotheses: the notion of focus in Hebrew and the three focus structures.

This chapter will examine clauses in our data which have fronted predicates, such as:

Exod. 33:3 עַם-קָשָׁה-עָרָב אָתָּה you are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE

Lev. 13:17 טָהוֹר הוּא he is CLEAN

The purpose of this chapter is to verify that these clauses have the function of commenting, that is, to add new information to a referent. We have posited that other functions belong to the other two clause types, Argument-Focus Structure and Clause-Focus Structure. Therefore if we can observe that the clauses have the topic-comment relationship and at the same time they do not have other functions, it will support our thesis.

Apart from this main purpose, this chapter will deal with two issues most relevant to this topic-comment relationship, which have been the subjects of discussion among linguists in the past. One is the relationship between identifiability (or referentiality) and topichood (or topicality), that is, how easily one referent in a particular activation state can be activated and become the topic of a clause. Another is the use of pronouns and nouns, that is, when and why pronouns and lexical forms are used. We shall also consider these two issues below.

5.2. ACTIVATION STATES AND TOPIC ACCEPTABILITY

The first issue is the relation between identifiability (referentiality) and topichood.

Givón introduces the "widely attested scale," "topic predictability scale." We can predict most easily that a referent with "zero anaphora" becomes the topic. Then follow "unstressed/clitic pronouns," "stressed/independent pronouns," "definite nouns," and the least predictable topic is "modified definite nouns" (1987, 177-78).

Chafe approaches the same phenomenon from a different angle. He introduces the idea of "cognitive cost." It is mental effort for the receiver to make in order to activate a referent.

If a referent is active, the cognitive cost to activate it is "least." If it is semi-active, "somewhat more costly." If it is inactive, it is most costly to activate it (1994, 73).

Lambrech (1994, 109, 165-66) relates this idea to the topichood of the referent. He states that an active referent is the most acceptable and preferred as the topic, because it requires least cognitive effort to identify the referent. An accessible referent is "less easily interpretable but still acceptable and indeed frequently occurring" as the topic. An unused (inactive) referent is on the borderline. A brand-new (unidentifiable) referent is least acceptable as the topic, because the cognitive effort required for identification is most costly. In other words, the more identifiable it becomes, the easier it becomes for the receiver to understand the clause and the more preferable. This acceptability is described in the scale ("topic acceptability scale"): active > accessible > inactive (unused) > brand-new (unidentifiable).

For Biblical Hebrew, van Wolde proposes to adopt Givón's topic predictability scale to Biblical Hebrew (1999). It is also briefly explored by E. J. Revell as "referentiality" and "topic status" (1999). However, to my knowledge, a full application of the topic acceptability scale to Biblical Hebrew has not been conducted. In our study we shall follow the approach of Chafe and Lambrecht.

The following sections in this chapter will be divided according to the topic-accessible scale. The first section analyses clauses with the active or accessible topic referents. The following section will analyse clauses with inactive or brand-new topic referents. All of these clauses have fronted predicates.

5.3. ACTIVE OR ACCESSIBLE REFERENTS FOR TOPIC

The clauses we will analyse in this section have fronted predicates and following arguments. These arguments are primarily the topic of the clauses. These topic referents are active or accessible referents and they take either proforms (pronouns and affixation) or lexical forms.
Px (x=active referent)

5.3.1. Proform for topic

The most natural and well-formed clause has an active referent as the topic, particularly the topic coded with a proform. An English example,

1 JOHN is my FRIEND.

2 He is TALL.

In Line 1 John is introduced by Clause-Focus Structure which will be discussed in chapter 5. Line 2 has the structure with the low pitched proform followed by the high pitched predicate. It indicates that the sender adds new information to the already active referent. Notice the high pitched predicate "TALL." This is marked as prominent (focused) because it is the new information the sender wishes to add (the comment).

Here the proform is preferred as the topic,

because the mental effort necessary to process sentences containing them is not increased by the additional task of assessing the topic REFERENT, by retrieving it from long-term memory or by drawing inferences leading to its assessment. Chafe (1987) calls the cognitive effort necessary to interpret a discourse-active referent a "low cost" effort. (Lambrecht 1994, 165)

A Hebrew example is "טהור הוא" he is clean" in Lev. 13:17:

וְרָאָהוּ הַכֹּהֵן וְהָיָה נֹהֶפֶךְ הַנִּגַּע לְלָבָן
וְטָהַר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַנִּגַּע
טָהוֹר הוּא

and the priest shall look at him, and behold, if the infection has turned to white,
then the priest shall pronounce clean him who has the infection;
he is clean.

In the last clause "טהור הוא" he is CLEAN," the sender expects the receiver to understand that the sender is providing new information about the referent, "the infected man," which is already active. In English "he" has low pitch and is not focused, because it is presupposed, and "clean" is focused by high pitch. In Hebrew, טָהוֹר is focused by fronting and probably by high pitch, while הוא is not focused. This focus structure, Predicate-Focus Structure, is commenting preferably on the already active or accessible referent both in English and Hebrew. Within our nominal clause data, we have 69 more clauses with pronominal subjects and indefinite predicates such as this example (see the Appendix). All of these clauses are adding new information to the already active referent.

We can observe the same commenting function in clauses with definite predicates and pronominal subjects (Pd-Sd), such as

#92 Gen. 12:19 אַחֻתְךָ הִיא she is your sister

According to Andersen's binary model, only Pind-Sd is supposed to be classification. Therefore he needs to treat these Pd-Sd clauses of classification under exceptions. He also categorises these definite predicates, such as "my sister," as indefinite predicates. We do not need to categorise these clauses under exceptions nor to assume "my sister" as an indefinite predicate as Andersen does. The perspective we need to employ is identifiability (activation states) not the grammatical definiteness. For example another Pd-Sd is

#90 Gen. 24:34:

וַיֹּאמֶר עֶבֶד אַבְרָהָם אָנֹכִי So he said, "I am ABRAHAM'S SERVANT. . ."

Abraham's servant is active in the mind of the receiver and the clause is simply adding information to the referent.⁷⁹ Thus it is Predicate-Focus Structure.

In verbal clauses, active topic referents are proforms in verb affixation, such as "וַיֹּאמֶר" and he said" (Gen. 3:11). It is obvious and seems mere common sense that the proform is used to refer to something preceding either in English or in Hebrew. However, the usage of

⁷⁹ Other "I am . ." clauses with Predicate-Focus Structure out of our data are: Judg. 17:9, 1Sam. 9:21, 1Sam. 30:13, 2 Sam. 1:8, 13, Jonah 1:9.

proforms supports the validity of the information structure. The sender expects the receiver to identify the referent by a proform. It means the sender assumes that the referent is still in the centre of the receiver's consciousness (being active).

In Deuteronomy, as expected, the majority of clauses in our corpus have Px Predicate-Focus Structure with affixed proforms which simply comment on the active referents, such as in Deut. 4:47:

וַיִּירְשׁוּ אֶת־אֶרֶצוֹ And they TOOK POSSESSION of his LAND.

In English not the whole comment domain is focused but focus tends to fall on the latter element (see End-Focus, in p. 47)

A command has Predicate-Focus Structure, such as in Deut. 5:19:

וְלֹא תִגְנוֹב You shall NOT STEAL.

Here the referent "you" (affixed to the verb) is the active topic referent. לֹא here may be understood as a part of the predicate. For Longacre (1989) and Dawson (1994), the rank of negated verbs is low, namely, gives off-line information. From a topic-comment point of view, "you" is the activated topic and this negated imperative is a new piece of information (or assertion), and thus fronted.

Redundant pronouns in verbal clauses

In verbal clauses, pronouns are redundant. This pronominal redundancy seems to have some purposes and a few are attested within our data.

One is to specify accompaniment:

Gen. 31:21 וַיִּבְרַח הוּא וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ So he FLED with ALL that he HAD.

Another is emphasis. For example, Deut. 5:27:

קָרַב אַתָּה וּשְׁמָע אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְאֵת דְּבַר אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יִדְבֹר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵלֶיךָ

1 Go near and hear all that the Lord our God says;

2 then speak to us all that the Lord our God will speak to you,

Line 1: as Muraoka argues, this redundant personal pronoun אַתָּה in this verbal clause seems emphatic (1985, 58). This is emphasis by means of redundancy. Notice here the word order is that of Predicate-Focus Structure, Px, suggesting that the speaker is simply commenting on the activated subject "you," while "you" is emphasised. Line 2 has the inverted word order. This is emphatic also but by a different means: implicit contrast (not God speaking to us directly, but you speak to us). This clause probably has Argument-Focus Structure (identifying "you" with the missing argument of the presupposed proposition"). By these two means of emphasis, "you" is considerably emphasised in these two clauses.

Below are other examples of Predicate-Focus Structure with proforms.

From nominal clauses

Relations in predicates, such as אָחֻזְתְּךָ הִוא she is your sister

Wife: #92 Gen. 12:12, #92 Gen. 26:9; Sister: #92 Gen. 12:13, #92 Gen. 12:19, #92 Gen. 20:2, #92 Gen. 20:5, #92 Gen. 26:7, #92 Lev. 18:11; Brother: #92 Gen. 20:5, #92 Gen. 20:13; Mother: #92 Lev. 18:7; Aunt: #92 Lev. 18:14; Son's wife: #93 Lev. 18:15.

Others in predicates:

#90 Gen. 32:	<u>מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים זֶה</u>	"This is GOD'S CAMP."
#90 Exod. 8:15	<u>אֶצְבַּע אֱלֹהִים הוּא</u>	"This is the FINGER of GOD."
#91 Lev. 4:21	<u>חַטָּאת הַקֹּהֵל הוּא</u>	it is the SIN OFFERING for the ASSEMBLY.
#91 Lev. 13:23	<u>צָרַבַת הַשְּׁחִין הוּא</u>	it is only the SCAR of the BOIL;
#91 Lev. 13:28	<u>שֹׁאֵת הַמְּכוּה הוּא</u>	it is the SWELLING from the BURN.
#91 Lev. 13:30	<u>הוּא הֵיאָה הַזֶּקֶן אוֹ הַזֶּמֶן</u>	it is <u>LEPROSY of the HEAD or of the BEARD.</u>
#92 Lev. 15:3	<u>טִמְאָתוֹ הוּא</u>	it is his UNCLEANNESS_
#93 Lev. 18:8	<u>עֲרוֹת אָבִיךָ הוּא</u>	it is your FATHER'S NAKEDNESS.
#93 Lev. 18:12	<u>שָׂרַר אָבִיךָ הוּא</u>	she is your FATHER'S BLOOD RELATIVE.
#93 Lev. 18:16	<u>עֲרוֹת אֲחִיךָ הוּא</u>	it is YOUR BROTHER'S NAKEDNESS.
#90 Num. 1:16	<u>רָאשֵׁי אֲלָפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הֵם</u>	they were the HEADS of DIVISIONS of ISRAEL.

Summary

In the above clauses we have examined fronted predicates. They are nominal predicates, either definite or indefinite grammatically, and also finite verbs with affixed subjects. Then pronominal subjects and pronominal affixation to verbs follow as active topic referents. These clauses are adding new information to the active referents, namely commenting. Therefore we may suggest that predicates are fronted for focus and that these clauses have the predicate-focus structure Px with the function of commenting.

Pronouns in verbal clauses are redundant. Specification of accompaniment and emphasis are some of the purposes of this redundancy.

5.3.2. Lexical form for topic

Active lexical topic expressions occur frequently in place of proforms. For example, in #111 Lev. 13:51, הַמַּלְאָכָה is an active referent:

וְרָאָה אֶת־הַמַּלְאָכָה בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי
כִּי־פָשָׁה הַמַּלְאָכָה בַּבְּגָד אוֹ־בְשֵׁתִי אוֹ־בְעֵרֶב אוֹ בְּעוֹר לְכֹל

1 He shall then look at the mark on the seventh day;

2 if the mark has SPREAD IN THE GARMENT, whether in the warp or in the woof, or in the leather,

In Line 2, the lexical form, הַמַּלְאָכָה the mark, is chosen for the active referent in place of a proform. A question in this usage is why the author chose to use the lexical form where the proform may be sufficient or even preferable.

Here we deal with the second issue involved in the topic-comment clauses.

It is the use of pronouns and nouns.

According to R. Tomlin (1987), linguists have observed certain phenomena in the use of pronouns and nouns.

On the use of pronouns (or proforms), Tomlin lists that 1) proforms are used to refer to the active referent within a paragraph or an episode (episode/paragraph approach), and 2)

proforms are used when the referents are active. T. Givón suggests approaching this issue from a point of view of "anaphoric vs. cataphoric grounding." Anaphoric grounding is "what the speaker assume about *shared knowledge* with the hearer" and cataphoric process involves "clues the speaker gives the hearer . . . as to how to ground it vis-a-vis the *following* discourse." Pronouns and zero anaphora are "primarily *anaphoric* devices" (1987, 180). We have observed these two in the preceding section.

On the use of nouns (or lexical forms), Tomlin lists that 1) an active referent loses its state by not been mentioned for a period of time and it requires more material (lexical form) to maintain reference (recency/distance approach); 2) lexical forms are used to "reinstate reference" or reactivate the referent at the beginning of a new paragraph or an episode (episode/paragraph approach); and 3) lexical forms are used to solve ambiguity ("ambiguity resolution"). We shall observe below that these phenomena are also present in Biblical Hebrew. It seems there are at least five categories of the use of lexical form (i.e. nouns) observed in Biblical Hebrew. They are: 1) ambiguity resolution (Tomlin's no. 3), 2) to narrow down the topic, 3) literary rephrasing, 4) theme announcement (Tomlin's no. 2), and 5) participant reference resources (Tomlin's no. 1).

It should be noted that all of the clauses below, though classified into five, have fronted predicates and following active topic referents.

5.3.2.1. Ambiguity resolution

5.3.2.1.1. The presence of multiple active referents

One reason to choose a lexical form in place of a proform is to resolve ambiguity. It seems there are two situations of ambiguity. First, ambiguity may arise when there are multiple active referents in the immediately preceding text.

In English

(1) JOHN is my FRIEND.

(2) He has TWO SONS called TOM and BOB.

(3) TOM is a tall MAN and he is in COLLEGE.

Since the referent "Tom" is introduced in Line 2, the proform coding is expected in Line 3. In Line 3, however, the lexical form Tom is chosen as the referent expression. This is to resolve ambiguity. In other words due to the introduction of new referents Tom and Bob in Line 2, the sender presupposes that the receiver has two or three active referents in the receiver's consciousness. Thus the proform coding "He is a tall man" would be too ambiguous. In order to clarify the topic for the following clause Line 3, the sender reactivates the referent Tom by the lexical form. This is a use of lexical form in Predicate-Focus Structure due to ambiguity raised by multiplicity of active referents.

We can see the same feature, reactivation, by the lexical form when the active referent is peripherised.

(4) JOHN is my FRIEND.

(5) He has a SON called TOM. Tom is a tall MAN and he is in COLLEGE. He wants to become a MEDICAL DOCTOR.

(6) JOHN owns a SHOP in town.

In Line 5 the referent John is peripherised by making Tom the centre of the current concern (topic) and John is pushed aside to the receiver's peripheral consciousness. Thus the sender assumes the need of reactivation by using the lexical form John in Line 6. Notice here also that John in Line 6 has pitch prominence. We may notice that the pitch of Tom in Line 3 and that of John in Line 6 can possibly be slightly lower than the pitch of John in Line 1 and Line 4. This may suggest that English distinguishes by pitch between

- a. commenting on a brand-new referent (John in Line 4)
- b. reactivation of peripherised (or ambiguous) referents (John in Line 6).

Further, the active referent "he" receives the lowest pitch and the predicate domain seems to receive relatively high pitch, though lower than the focused element within the predicate domain. Therefore we may assume that English has at least three to four pitch levels:

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Highest: | focus |
| Higher middle: | the rest of the predicate domain |
| Lower middle: | for reactivation of an active referent |
| Low: | for an activated proform |

Multiple active referents and deactivation necessitate reactivation. This reactivation is achieved by both the lexical form and relative high pitch in English.

Middle pitch

The actual pitch level of English is much more complex. For example, Chafe (1994) gives a sentence as an example which contrasts "hall" with other parts of a building.

and so the hall is real long.

Chafe analysed this sentence by a sound spectrograph and observes three levels of high pitch (299 hertz for "hall," 211 hertz for "real" and 192 hertz for "long") in addition to the baseline (59). He also pays attention to length and loudness attached to those three levels of high pitch and then classifies prosodic prominence into three: 1) high-pitched and loud (hall); 2) high-pitched and long (long); and 3) high pitch only (real) (61). He also suggests that more prominence is recognised in lexical form than proform (71). L. Kumpf (1987), and J. Pierrehumbert and J. Hirschberg (1990, 280-283) similarly recognises "mid tone."

This phenomenon may also be found in biblical Hebrew. Though we cannot verify, we may infer that active lexical forms have "mid tone." This pitch is lower than the focused predicate of Px Predicate-Focus Structure, but higher than the active proforms. However, we shall limit our prosodic considerations only to the two levels of frequency, high and low pitch, though it may seem over-simplifying.⁸⁰

As I mentioned before,⁸¹ this pitch is only an element of prosody of a language which involves

- changes in duration (perceived as the shortening or lengthening of syllables or words),
- changes in intensity (perceived as loudness), alternations of vocalization with silence

⁸⁰ Two level pitch approach is justified by J. Pierrehumbert (1980).

⁸¹ See 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew" pp. 61ff.

(perceived as pausing), changes in voice quality of various kinds, and sometimes changes of turn. (Chafe 1994, 58)

Again this pitch levels and contours and other aspects of the Hebrew prosody await further enquiry.

Now returning to ambiguity resolution, when there are multiple active referents, the sender uses the lexical form to resolve ambiguity in Biblical Hebrew also. In the following examples, Hebrew focus is indicated by underline. English focus is indicated by small capitals. Dotted line indicates the active topic referents with lexical forms, which might have had the middle pitch. Not all clauses are marked with these symbols, but only relevant ones.

The first example is #111 Lev. 13:51:

וּרְאָה אֶת־הַנִּגַּע בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי
כִּי־פָשָׁה הַנִּגַּע בַּבְּגָד אוֹ־בַשֹּׂתִי אוֹ־בְעֵרֶב אוֹ בְעוֹר לְכֹל
אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה הָעוֹר לְמִלְאכָה
צִרְעַת מִמְאֵרֶת הַנִּגַּע
טָמֵא הוּא

1 He shall then LOOK at the mark on the SEVENTH DAY;

2 if the mark has SPREAD in the GARMENT, whether in the WARP or in the WOOF, or in the LEATHER,

3 whatever the PURPOSE for which the leather is USED,

4 the mark is a LEPROUS MALIGNANCY,

5 it is UNCLEAN.

In Lines 2-3 "the mark" is the primary active referent (and the topic). In Line 4 the lexical form, "the mark," is used to resolve ambiguity raised by multiple active referents, the leather in particular, which appears twice in the immediately preceding text. Now "the mark" is reactivated in Line 4, Line 5 uses the proform, because there is no ambiguity. We may put it another way. By the insertion of the clauses started with "whether" and "whatever" in Line 2 and 3, the sender supposes that the primary active referent might have been deactivated to the secondary active state⁸² in the mind of the receiver. Therefore the sender assumes the need of reactivation by the lexical form.

Other examples:#120 Lev. 19:21,⁸³ #114 Num. 3:47 (half a shekel and the shekel), #114 Exod. 30:13 (the same as Num. 3:47 above), #120 Deut. 29:22 (Eng. 23) ("your sons," "the foreigner," "a distant land," "the plagues of the land," "the diseases" and "Lord" are active in v. 21.)

⁸² that is one of active referents, not any more receiving the central attention among active referents.

⁸³ אִשָּׁם לַיהוָה a guilt offering is a ram. Andersen understands it "his guilt offering is a ram" though BHS does not offer the alternative reading. Its grammatical structure is also ambiguous. It may be a phrase not a clause: "a ram for a guilt offering."

If it is a clause, this referent may be translated in "the guilt offering is a ram" with the definite article, since it is introduced in the immediately preceding text (אִשָּׁמוֹ) within the same verse. Thus P-S. The repetition of the lexical form may due to multiple active referents: the Lord, the entrance, the tent and the meeting.

5.3.2.1.2. Unpredictability at the beginning of an utterance

The second instance of ambiguity may be felt in the first utterance of a speech. The proform coding is ambiguous at the beginning of a speech, because it is difficult to predict accurately what the sender is going to utter in response to a particular situation. For example, #112 Deut. 1:14

וַתַּעֲנֵנִי אֲתִי וַתֹּאמְרֵי
טוֹב הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתָּ לַעֲשׂוֹת

"And you ANSWERED me and SAID,

'The thing which you have SAID to DO is GOOD.'

The referent "the thing which you have said to do" is Moses' proposal that is introduced in the preceding verse 13 and thus this referent is active now. Verse 14 comments on this referent, therefore the sequence is P-S here. However the clause with the proform, טוֹב הוּא, as the first utterance of the people's response to Moses, would be ambiguous, since there are other activated entities within the proposal of Moses in verse 13, such as "men" "tribes" "heads." Here, however, it is not only the multiplicity of the referents which is promoting the choice of the lexical form. It is also unpredictability as to how the people would respond to Moses' proposal. In other words the people did not assume that Moses could predict how they would respond. Therefore the people thought that the proform, טוֹב הוּא, might be ambiguous for Moses.

When a sender is going to make an utterance in response to the preceding utterance of the receiver or in response to a particular situation, the sender cannot presuppose with confidence that the receiver can predict exactly what the sender is going to utter. There is always a certain degree of unpredictability at the beginning of an utterance. Therefore, even if the sender plans to continue the same topic of the preceding conversation, he tends to use the lexical form to resolve ambiguity at the beginning of his utterance. The lexical form is particularly necessary when there are multiple active referents. Notice, however, the sequence is the same P-S sequence because the sender is simply commenting. This has the predicate-focus structure.

Let us examine three more examples.

#112 Deut. 1:25

וַיָּקֻחוּ בְיָדָם מִפְּרֵי הָאָרֶץ וַיִּזְרְדוּ
אֵלֵינוּ וַיִּשְׁבוּ אֶתְנוּ דָּבָר וַיֹּאמְרוּ
טוֹבָה הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ נֹתֵן לָנוּ

1 Then they took some of the fruit of the land in their hands and brought it down to us; and they brought us back a report and said,

2 "It is a good land which the Lord our God is about to give us."

(more literally, the land which the Lord our God is about to give us is GOOD).

"The land" is contextually active since both the interlocutors recognise that these men are going to give a report about the land and the land is pragmatically inferable because the fruit in front of them was from the land. Thus the sequence is P-S. However the proform coding,

טובה היא for example, at the beginning of the spies' utterance is ambiguous due to the multiple active referents: the fruit (mas. sing. this is situationally-present), the people (mas. sing.) and the cities (fem. pl.) (v. 28). The people and the cities are inferable because of the frame (or background) of spying. These referents are not feminine singular, and it may still be possible for the receiver to recognise that טובה היא indicates the land because of its gender and number. However, we may assume that the proform in this situation requires the receiver to make an extra cognitive effort for processing. For better and smoother communication, the lexical form is preferred. The content of the spies' report is also unpredictable at the time of the utterance. The proform coding is ambiguous in this respect also. Hence P-S (lexical).

Deut. 5:28

In 5:27 the words of the people are finished and the response of the Lord starts in 5:28.

וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת־קוֹל דְּבַרְיִכֶם בְּדַבְּרְכֶם אֵלַי
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת־קוֹל דְּבַר יְהוָה הַזֶּה

1 "And the Lord HEARD the VOICE of your WORDS when you SPOKE to me,

2 and the Lord SAID to ME, 'I have HEARD the VOICE of the WORDS of this PEOPLE.'

Though the Lord is an active referent, the lexical form is used to resolve ambiguity and to shift the theme (Line 1). In Line 2 the same form is used. This is probably more related to maintaining the status of the major participant (Participant Reference Resources, see below).

Deut. 6:10 וְהָיָה כִּי יָבִיאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ

Then it shall come about when the Lord your God BRINGS you into the LAND

וְהָיָה כִּי indicates a boundary of a text unit.⁸⁴ Though the referent "the Lord" is active in the mind of the receiver, the lexical form is used to avoid ambiguity (after a series of commands vv.4-9), for theme-shifting and maintaining the major participant status.

Below are other examples.

From nominal clauses

#111 Gen. 28:17⁸⁵ מִה־נֹרָא הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה "HOW AWESOME is this place! . . ."⁸⁶

#116 Gen. 26:20⁸⁷ לָנוּ הַמַּיִם "The water is OURS!"

⁸⁴ See 10.1 "HAYA Division Marker and Existential Clauses" pp. 223ff.

⁸⁵ "This place" is activated in v. 16. Thus P-S here. The active referents are multiple (the Lord and the place in v. 16), and there is unpredictability of the Jacob's utterance in response to the situation described in v. 16. Thus the lexical form. We may assume that Jacob utters this clause as if he talks to another person. This is a peculiarity of monologue where the sender and the receiver are identical.

⁸⁶ This is a dynamic equivalent. More literally, "this place is how awesome."

⁸⁷ The theme of the immediately preceding text is "the herdsmen of Isaac found a well of flowing water." "The water" is, therefore, contextually active for the herdsmen of Isaac (mentioned in the immediately preceding text or text-unit). It is probably situationally-present as well (the both parties are near the well). Hence P-S.

The proform coding לנו הוא or לנו הם is possible, because contextually active and situationally-present referents are limited (probably the active referents are the well, the water and the two parties of herdsmen).

#107 Num. 24:20 ⁸⁸	<u>רִאשִׁית גּוֹיִם עַמְלֵק</u>	"Amalek was the FIRST of the NATIONS."
#120 Deut. 26:5 ⁸⁹	<u>אֲרַמִּי אֲבִד אָבִי</u>	'My father was a WANDERING ARAMEAN,
#124 Num. 12:7 ⁹⁰	<u>לֹא-כֵן עַבְדֵי מֹשֶׁה</u> <u>בְּכָל-בֵּיתִי נִאֱמָן הוּא</u>	My servant Moses is NOT SO, He is FAITHFUL in ALL MY HOUSEHOLD.
Deut. 5:25	<u>כִּי תֹאכְלֵנוּ הָאֵשׁ הַגְּדֹלָה הַזֹּאת</u>	for this great fire will CONSUME US.

In summary, lexical forms are used in place of proforms to resolve ambiguity. These clauses above have fronted predicate and are commenting on the active referents. They also seem to have the predicate-focus structure Px.

5.3.2.2. Narrowing down the topic

The second category of using lexical forms in place of proforms is when one describes parts of a building or an artifact.

In instructions of constructing artifacts or buildings, the parts of an artifact or of a building are expressed by lexical forms. These clauses also have the predicate-focus structure: fronted predicates followed by active topic referents. This focus structure is understandable since the topic is not shifted from the artifact or the building, and the sender is commenting on these accessible referents (inferable from the artifact or the building). The lexical form is used to specify the parts of it.

For example, #117(#122) Gen. 6:15 Noah's ark:

וְזֶה אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָהּ
שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת אַמָּה אֶרֶץ הַחִבָּה
חֲמִשִּׁים אַמָּה רְחֹבָהּ
וּשְׁלֹשִׁים אַמָּה קוֹמָתָהּ

However the lexical form is chosen to avoid possible ambiguity because the sender understands that there is always certain degree of unpredictability at the beginning of an utterance.

⁸⁸ Amalek is both contextually active (Amalek is introduced in the preceding setting) and situationally-present (the sender in his oracle, Balaam, is looking at them now). Thus P-S. The lexical form is used at the beginning of his oracle in order to avoid possible ambiguity because there is an unpredictable element there. An oracle is not a pure monologue where the sender and the receiver are identical. In an oracle the sender anticipates another audience consciously or subconsciously.

⁸⁹ "My father" is contextually active since in verse 3 "our fathers" is activated. Thus P-S. Since it is deactivated by the ritual in verse 4 and it became peripherised, it needs to be reactivated by the lexical form. In other words the proform coding אֲרַמִּי אֲבִד אָבִי is too ambiguous. In addition to it, Pind, a wandering Aramean, seems to be focused in contrast to the fact that he became a great nation.

⁹⁰ This is an utterance by the Lord to Aaron and Miriam. Moses is active in the minds of the receivers (Aaron and Miriam), because Aaron and Miriam were called by the Lord together with Moses to the tent. Hence P-S. The lexical form is used to avoid ambiguity due to multiple active entities (Moses, Miriam and Aaron), and is used to reactivate it since the referent (Moses) is deactivated by the utterance of the Lord in the preceding verse 6. This may be theme announcing as well (see below). Notice here that the predicate לֹא-כֵן seems to be fronted for focus due to the contrast with verse 6 as well. In the second line P-S (pronoun) is used because there is no ambiguity.

- 1 And THIS is how you SHALL MAKE it:⁹¹
- 2 the length of the ark is THREE HUNDRED CUBITS,
- 3 its breadth is FIFTY CUBITS,
- 4 and its height is THIRTY CUBITS.

The referent "the ark" is presented in the preceding verse 14 and it is active. The lexical forms are used to specify its parts in Lines 2-4. Because all of these referents are accessible, the focus structure of Lines 2-4 is the predicate-focus structure.

Other examples: #122 Gen. 6:15 Noah's ark; #122 Gen. 24:22 a gold ring and two bracelets; #122 Exod. 25:10 the ark; #122 Exod. 25:17 the lid of the ark; #122 Exod. 25:23 the table; #117 Exod. 26:16 the boards for the tabernacle; #122 Exod. 27:1 the altar; #122 Exod. 28:16 the breastpiece; #113 Exod. 28:17 breastpiece; # 123 Exod. 30:2 the horn of the altar; #122 Exod. 30:2 the altar of incense; #117 Exod. 36:21 the boards for the tabernacle; #122 Exod. 37:1 the ark; #122 Exod. 37:6 the ark; #122 Exod. 37:10 the table; #122 Exod. 37:25 the altar of incense; #122 Exod. 38:1 the altar of burnt offering; #122 Exod. 39:9 breastpiece; #113 Exod. 39:10 breastpiece; #122 Deut. 3:11 the length of Og's bed.

All of these clauses have fronted predicates and active topic referents. Their function is commenting on those active topic referents.

5.3.2.3. Literary Rephrasing

The third category of use of lexical forms is to rephrase the same entity as a literary device. For example, in #121 Gen. 49:5 "their swords" is used in place of "they" (or "Simeon and Levi"):

שמעון ולוי אחים
כלי חמס מכרתיהם

- 1 "SIMEON and LEVI are BROTHERS;
- 2 Their swords are IMPLEMENTS of VIOLENCE.

Sd-Pind in Line 1 is a typical Topic Announcement or topicalisation.⁹² Since the referents are introduced, Simeon and Levi are now active. Line 2 is commenting on them, thus Px Predicate-Focus Structure. Although the proform coding is expected in Line 2, the lexical form is used. The sender hopes to express this new information in a more literary refined way than "they are violent." We may call this device literary rephrasing.

Other examples of this literary rephrasing: #104 Exod. 15:1 and 2 יה (Yah) for יְהוָה, #111 Deut. 29:23⁹³ "this great outburst of anger" for God's destructive anger in vv. 23 and 24a, #120 Deut. 33:25 "Your locks shall be iron and bronze" for "you are strong," #105 Deut. 33:27 "the eternal God" for "God," #120 Num. 24:21 "Your dwelling place" for "you."

Literary rephrasing may be found to express modesty.

⁹¹ This clause has the clause-focus structure (Introductory Formula. See 7.4.1.2 in pp. 168ff)

⁹² See 7.4.1.1 "Topicalisation and Initiation" in pp. 163ff.

⁹³ English v. 24. מַה הַזֶּה הַקֶּדֶשׁ הַגָּדוֹל הַזֶּה? Why this great outburst of anger? Andersen notes that מַה is exclamatory (63) in this clause, while it seems interrogative, therefore it seems to have Argument-Focus Structure rather than Predicate-Focus Structure. Whatever מַה is, the subject is a literary rephrasing for God's destructive anger in vv. 23 and 24a.

#121 Gen. 47:3 "your servants" for "we" (rephrasing for modesty)

וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה אֶל-אֶחָיו מִה־מְעֹשֵׂיכֶם
וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל-פַּרְעֹה רְעָה צֹאן עִבְדֵינוּ.

Then Pharaoh said to his brothers, "What is your occupation?"

So they said to Pharaoh, "Your servants are SHEPHERDS . . ."

The brothers could have said אֶנְחֵנוּ רְעָה צֹאן "we are shepherds"⁹⁴ without any ambiguity. However, as it was the norm for an ancient near eastern subject to address himself as "your servant" to his master,⁹⁵ they rephrased "we" with this lexical form "your servants" for modesty. Notice that the word order here is PS.

Another example of rephrasing for modesty: #122 Gen. 42:13 "your servants" for "we."

The lexical forms are used in these examples for literary rephrasing in place of proform. All of these clauses have fronted predicates and following active topic referents. The function is commenting.

5.3.2.4. To announce theme (thematizing)

The fourth category is the use of lexical forms at the beginning of a subdivision within a large text unit (discourse) in order to announce the theme⁹⁶ of the subdivision. For example, #107 Gen. 49:9:

גֹּדֵר אַרְיָה יְהוּדָה
מִטְּרֵף בְּנֵי עֲלִיָּה פָרַע רִבֵּץ פְּאֲרִיָּה
וּכְלָבִיא מִי יִקְיָמוּנֵי

"Judah is a LION'S WHELP;

From the prey, my son, you have gone up. He couches, he lies down as a lion, And as a lion, who dares rouse him up?

The referent Judah is activated in the immediately preceding verse 8 and it is the topic of verse 8. The same topic is continued without any intervention in v. 9. The clause is commenting on Judah. Thus Px Predicate-Focus Structure. Since Judah is an active referent which is activated in v. 8, the proform coding is expected without ambiguity: גֹּדֵר אַרְיָה יְהוּדָה. However, the lexical referent expression Judah is repeated here. This repetition seems to announce the theme⁹⁷ of the whole verse 9: "Judah is a lion's whelp." Here the theme of the whole text unit (v. 9) is presented at its beginning. This function may be called "theme announcing," or "thematizing." This is a text-unit (discourse) level phenomenon.

This use of the lexical form is not to narrow down the topic, or because of ambiguity, literary rephrasing, or unpredictability at the beginning of an utterance. It is a text-unit level function to start a new sub-text-unit with a different theme within a larger text unit that is

⁹⁴ אֶנְחֵנוּ in Gen 42:31. See Gen 42:11 and 13.

⁹⁵ indicated by Wilfred G. E. Watson at an interview in Edinburgh, UK in June 1999.

⁹⁶ See 2.5.4 "Theme" in pp. 51ff.

⁹⁷ Theme is different from topic. A theme is the abstract or summarised notion or proposition of Topic and Comment. See 2.5.4 in p. 51.

united under the same topic. The reader will notice that after the first Pind-Sd (lexical), most of the topics are expressed by proforms within its text unit. This further supports this special usage of the lexical form.

The following verse, verse 10 has a similar usage of the lexical form.

Gen. 49:10

לֹא־יִסּוּר שִׁבֹט מִיְהוּדָה
וּמִחֶקֶק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו

1 The scepter shall not DEPART from JUDAH, V-S- Prepositional phrase

2 Nor the ruler's staff from between his FEET, \emptyset -S- Prepositional phrase

In this following verse 10, the grammatical subjects, the scepter and the ruler's staff, are accessible referents (inferable from the kingship of Judah implied in v. 9). These clauses are commenting on these accessible referents and thus Px Predicate-Focus Structure.

At the text-unit level, we may notice that the topic of this text unit is the same "Judah." However, the theme is shifted from "Judah is a lion's whelp" of v. 9 to "Judah shall retain his kingship" of the text unit vv. 10-12. At the theme-shift of Line 1 in v. 10 above, the lexical form, Judah, is used (Line 1) but the following line (2), the proform is used "his feet." This supports further that the lexical form is used for theme-shifting for this new text unit.

Thus we can view the structure of Judah's blessing in terms of Information Structure as follows:

49:8 S (Judah)-P starts a new text unit about Judah (topicalisation).

Theme is "Judah is praised by his brothers."

49:9 P-S (lexical subject) starts a sub-text-unit (theme shifting).

Theme is "Judah is a lion's whelp."

49:10-12 P-S (lexical form in comment) starts another sub-text-unit (theme shifting).

Theme is "Judah shall retain his kingship."

Another example of theme announcing (thematising) is #104 Exod. 4:22

וְאָמַרְתָּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה
כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה
בְּנִי בְכֹרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Then you shall say to Pharaoh,

Thus says the Lord,

"Israel is my SON, my FIRST-BORN.

The situation in which this speech of Moses is delivered is after the miracles performed before Pharaoh in order to let the Israelites go (4:21). Since Israel is active in the minds of Pharaoh, Pind-Sd. It seems the lexical form, Israel, is chosen not only to resolve ambiguity as the first utterance in response to the situation (Pharaoh does not let them go), but also in order to present the whole theme at the beginning of the speech. Notice the key word in the following part of the speech is "בן son" in Exod. 4:23:

וְאָמַר אֵלָיךְ שְׁלַח אֶת־בְּנֵי

וַיַּעֲבֹדֵנִי וַתִּמְאַן לְשַׁלְּחֹנִי
הִנֵּה אֲנֹכִי הִרְגִּיתְךָ אֶת־בְּנֶיךָ בְּכַרְךָ

"So I said to you, 'Let My son go,
that he may serve Me'; but you have refused to let him go.
Behold, I will kill your son, your first-born."

Namely, the lexical form יִשְׂרָאֵל is used to announce the theme at the beginning of a speech.

The last example is Deut. 5:1.

וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה אֶל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל

Then Moses SUMMONED ALL ISRAEL, and SAID to THEM, "HEAR, O ISRAEL, . . ."

The referent Moses is the major participant from the beginning of our corpus (4:44) and it reoccurs to maintain its status as the major participant (4:45, 46) (see below for Participant Reference Resources). In 5:1 Moses is reactivated for the same reason, however, there seem to be other reasons for this reactivation.

One is that the referent might have been peripherised by the account of the occupation of Sihon and Bashan (vv. 47-49). Another is to shift the theme to Moses' speech.

Other examples of theme announcing are

#106 Num. 23:19⁹⁸ לֹא אִישׁ אֵל וַיִּכְזֹּב "God is NOT a MAN, that He should lie, . . ."

#114 Num. 11:21⁹⁹ שֵׁשׁ־מֵאוֹת אֶלֶף רַגְלֵי הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי בְּקִרְבּוֹ

"The people, among whom I am, are 600,000 on FOOT; . . ."

To sum up, what we have observed above is a discourse function to announce a new theme at the beginning of a subsection which is still united with other subsections under the same topic. Since the clause is still commenting on active or accessible referents, the clause has the predicate-focus structure. To announce the theme of a subsection is a pragmatic function, however, this function is assigned to the predicate-focus structure, probably because it may be distinguished from topicalisation indicated by the clause-focus structure.

5.3.2.5. Participant Reference Resources

The last category of the use of lexical forms in place of proforms is participant reference resources. Longacre lists ranks of participants: major participants (protagonist, antagonist, bystanders); minor participants (appear in certain episodes only); and props (1989, 142). These participants are introduced, assigned as major, minor participants or props,

⁹⁸ Balaam's utterance is the response to the question of Balak, "מָה־יִדְבָּר יְהוָה? What has the Lord spoken?"

Therefore God is active and thus P-S. Since this Balaam's utterance is at the beginning (except vocatives) of his oracle in response to the question, the lexical form is used (Unpredictability at the beginning of an utterance). We may notice also that the theme of verse 19 is "God is not a man" and this theme is presented at the beginning of the oracle. This is thematising, a text-unit level function of Pind-Sd (lexical).

⁹⁹ The theme of the preceding text-unit is "the Lord will give meat to the people" and the people is active. Thus P-S. The lexical form is used because it is at the beginning of Moses' utterance in response to the preceding Lord's statement. We may notice also that the large number is the theme of Moses' response in verses 21 and 22 and it seems the thematic proposition is fronted here.

reintroduced to the story, or mentioned to keep track, etc. This is called operations (143). The narrator uses a proper name liberally to keep the protagonist central and focused (147). This is called Participant reference resources (141). For example, Deut. 5:15

וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי־עֶבֶד הָיִיתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
וַיֹּצֵאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִשָּׁם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה וּבְזֹרֵעַ נְטוּיָה
עַל־כֵּן צִוְּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־יּוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת ׀

- 1 'And you shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt,
- 2 and the Lord your God BROUGHT YOU OUT of THERE by a MIGHTY HAND and by AN OUTSTRETCHED ARM;
- 3 therefore the Lord your God COMMANDED YOU to OBSERVE the SABBATH DAY.

The long lexical form יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ above does not have to be used for communication because it is active in the mind of the receiver. However, this lexical form is used frequently in Deuteronomy chapter five to keep the protagonist central and focused in the world of discourse. This use of lexical form does not override the information structure. The clauses have Px Predicate-Focus Structure, because the function is commenting.

Other examples: Deut. 5:15, Deut. 5:28, Deut. 6:3.

5.3.2.6. Summary of lexical form

We have observed five categories in which lexical forms are used where proforms are expected. All of these clauses have fronted predicates and following active or accessible referents. The function of these clauses is commenting on those active or accessible lexical referents. Therefore we may suggest that those predicates are fronted for focus and the clauses have the predicate-focus structure.

5.3.3. Other types of topic

In the preceding two sections, we have observed that active topic referents can have proforms or lexical forms in the clauses. We can see below that the topic can be a "pragmatic" subject¹⁰⁰ and an infinitive phrase as well.

5.3.3.1. Pragmatic subject for topic

#57 Lev. 21:21

כָּל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ מוּם מִזֶּרַע אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן
לֹא יֵגַשׁ לְהַקְרִיב אֶת־אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה
מוּם בּוֹ
אֵת לֶחֶם אֱלֹהָיו לֹא יֵגַשׁ לְהַקְרִיב

- 1 'No man among the descendants of Aaron the priest, who has a DEFECT,
- 2 is to come near to offer the Lord's offerings by fire;
- 3 he has a DEFECT,
- 4 he shall not come near to offer the bread of his God.

¹⁰⁰ See 3.5 "Pragmatic Predicate and Pragmatic Subject" in pp. 63ff for this term.

This verse presents a good example where its information structure explains the two different word orders: **בֹּן מִזִּמָּה** in Line 1 has Clause-Focus Structure (the pragmatic subject fronted) and **בֹּן מִזִּמָּה** in Line 3 is Predicate-Focus Structure (the pragmatic predicate fronted).

In both the clauses **בֹּן** is the pragmatic subject, namely the topic of the existential clause:

Topic: the descendant of Aaron

Comment: he has a defect

This is exemplified by English:

1 who has a DEFECT,

3 he has a DEFECT,

In Line 1 the pragmatic subject (topic) **בֹּן** is fronted, because it functions as a circumstantial clause [gloss or parenthetical] for the preceding **אִישׁ** (Clause-Focus Structure).¹⁰¹ On the other hand the pragmatic subject (topic) **בֹּן** in Line 3 is preceded by the pragmatic predicate **מִזִּמָּה** (comment), since it simply comments about the man. Line 3 is commenting on the activated topic referent "the descendant of Aaron."

Line 1 Pragmatic S-pragmatic P:

Clause-Focus Structure: circumstantiality

Line 2 Pragmatic P-pragmatic S:

Predicate-Focus Structure: commenting

Below are other examples.

#57 Lev. 22:25 **מִזִּמָּה בָּם** they have a DEFECT.

#57 Gen. 43:28¹⁰² **שְׁלוֹם לְעַבְדְּךָ לְאָבִינִי** Your servant our father is WELL.

5.3.3.2. Infinitive phrase for topic

The topic may be an infinitive phrase. For example, #129 Gen. 2:18.

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים
לֹא־טוֹב הֵיחֵת הָאָדָם לִבְדּוֹ

Then the Lord God said,

"It is NOT GOOD for the man to be alone; (to be alone is NOT GOOD)

The proposition "Adam is alone" is activated prior to this verse. Thus P-S. Since Andersen regards an infinitive phrase as indefinite, this clause is categorised under Pind-Sind. However, the infinitive phrase is an active referent.

Other examples of active or accessible infinitive phrases:

#129 Gen. 29:7¹⁰³ **לֹא־עַתָּה הָאֶסְרֵי הַמִּקְנֵה** it is NOT TIME for the livestock to be gathered.

¹⁰¹ See 7.3.3 "Circumstantial clause" in pp. 153ff for detail.

¹⁰² This is a response to the question by Joseph concerning Jacob. Thus the pragmatic subject "your servant our father" is preceded by the pragmatic predicate.

¹⁰³ The livestock is already gathered in front of them (v. 2). The topic referent is active, and thus P-S.

(that the livestock to be gathered is NOT TIME)

#129 Deut. 1:6 רַב־לַכֶּם שָׁבַת בְּהַר הַזֶּה You have stayed long enough at this mountain
(the stay in this mountain is LONG for YOU)

Another example of רַב־לַכֶּם in Predicate Focus clause: #129 Deut. 2:3

5.3.4. Other examples from GKC, Muraoka and Deuteronomy

We have observed in the preceding sections that all the clauses have fronted predicates which are followed by active or accessible topic referents. Although those topics may have various forms, such as proforms, lexical forms, pragmatic subjects and infinitive phrases, all the clauses are commenting on those active or accessible referents. Therefore we may suggest that the predicates are fronted for focus and the clauses have the predicate-focus structure: Px.

In this section, we shall analyse other clauses with fronted predicates taken from GKC, Muraoka and Deuteronomy which also comment on active or accessible referents.

GKC's emphasis

GKC sees emphasis in some of the clauses with fronted verbs. However they are simply commenting and no emphasis may be detected for certainty. For example, GKC sees emphasis in וְדַבַּרְתִּי (speak) of Hos. 12:11:

וְאֵנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
עַד אֲשִׁיבְךָ בְּאֱהָלִים כִּימֵי מוֹעֵד
וְדַבַּרְתִּי עַל־הַנְּבִיאִים

(v. 10) 1 But I have been the LORD your GOD since the LAND of EGYPT;
2 I will make YOU LIVE in tents again,
As in the DAYS of the APPOINTED FESTIVAL.

(v. 11) 3 I have also SPOKEN to the PROPHETS,
[and I will SPEAK to the PROPHETS. Shimasaki]

Line 1(XP) is topicalisation (and probably exclamatory as well).¹⁰⁴ Line 2 and 3 are simply commenting on the Lord. Hence Predicate-Focus Structure.¹⁰⁵

Other examples with Predicate-Focus Structure of commenting in GKC's "emphasis": Job 11:19, Num. 5:23 and Job 29:25, Is. 19:13 (commenting on the same leadership of Egypt which is activated in v. 11).

Muraoka's examples

J-Muraoka states that "At the beginning of a statement, we usually find the order S—V" (§155 nd). However, J-Muraoka give some examples where VS initiates a statement. This is not a peculiar phenomenon. Many of them are simply commenting on active or

¹⁰⁴ See 7.4.1.1 "Topicalisation and Initiation" in pp. 163ff and 7.3.1 "Exclamation/Proclamation" in pp. 147ff.

¹⁰⁵ The following two clauses seem to consist a list which is in apposition to Line 3.

accessible referents. If the speaker or the narrator can presume that the listener has the topic referent activated in his mind, they use Predicate-Focus Structure even at the beginning of a speech. For example Gen. 27:35 initiates a speech:

וַיֹּאמֶר בְּאָזְנוֹתָיךָ בְּמַרְמָה And he said, "Your brother [Jacob] CAME DECEITFULLY.

Isaac is aware that the referent Jacob (your brother) is active in the mind of Esau in v. 33 and not yet peripherised. In other words, Jacob was commenting on the referent which was active in the mind of Esau at the time of utterance. Hence Predicate-Focus Structure. The lexical form is used to resolve ambiguity.

Other examples of Predicate-Focus Structure which comment on the active or accessible referents: in Fronted subjects; Jer. 47:5 (Predicate Focus Parallel Construction on the Philistines which is activated in v. 1), Ezek. 7:7 (Predicate Focus Parallel Construction on the last day which is activated in v. 6), Judg. 5:19 (Predicate Focus Parallel Construction), Hos. 9:7 (punishment is activated in theme in previous verses 1-6), Is. 19:13 and Psa. 34:22.¹⁰⁶ See 9.3 "Pseudo-direct Speech" (p. 219) for 2Sam. 3:23, and Gen. 39:17; in Fronted Adverb: 1Sam. 4:4.¹⁰⁷

For the term Predicate-Focus Parallel Construction, See 8.2.1 "Predicate-Focus Parallel Construction" in pp. 184ff.

From Deuteronomy

Some referents are not active in the mind of the receiver. However, since they are easily accessible for the receiver to identify, those referents often become topics of clauses and those clauses are not considered to be ill-formed. For example, Deut. 7:22:

לֹא תוּכְלוּ כִּלְתָם מִהֵרָא
 כִּי־תִרְבֶּה עֲלֵיךָ חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה

you will not be able to put an end to them quickly,
 lest the wild beasts grow TOO NUMEROUS for YOU.

חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה may be an inferable referent from the context or the frame of the Israelites occupying the land.

5.3.4.1. Summary

We have analysed some clauses taken from GKC, Muraoka and Deuteronomy. These classes have fronted predicates and following active or accessible referents. The function is commenting on those referents. Therefore we may suggest that predicates are fronted for focus and the clauses have the predicate-focus structure Px.

¹⁰⁶ The last two examples, Is. 19:13 and Ps. 34:22, are not at the beginning of a statement. They are commenting on the already active or accessible referent (Vx Predicate-Focus Structure). The two clauses in Is. 19:13 are actually commenting on an already activated topic ("the Princes of Zoan" is activated in v.11: Predicate Focus Parallel Construction). The first clause in Ps 34:22 comments on the active referent, Lord, and the second clause has an implication of closure. With both 22a and 22b it forms chiasmic construction (VX//XV).

¹⁰⁷ The adverb is a predicate of a nominal clause.

5.3.5. Divided Predicate Domain

Before closing the section of active and accessible topic referents, I will make a cursory comment on a phenomenon of divided predicate domain. We may notice in the above Hebrew example that the predicate domain is divided into two. For example Gen. 27:35:

וַיֹּאמֶר בֵּן אָחִיךָ בְּמַרְמָה And he said, "Your brother [Jacob] CAME DECEITFULLY,

The predicate, בֵּן, and the argument which belongs to the predicate domain, בְּמַרְמָה are divided and the active referent Jacob (activated in the preceding episode) is inserted in-between.

Verbal clauses with Predicate-Focus Structure have various types of predicate.

(1) Some clauses have only the predicate proper:

Gen. 15:5 "וַיֹּאמֶר" and he SAID, "

Here the topic is affixed, namely the active referent is often imbedded in the conjugation (affixation).

(2) The pronoun appears after the verb to specify accompaniment:

Gen. 31:21 וַיִּבְרַח הוּא וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ So he FLED with ALL that he HAD

(3) The lexical topic referent is used for theme-shift.

Gen. 15:2 וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם And Abram SAID,

In all of these cases, we understand they have Px Predicate-Focus Structure.

However, probably in more clauses, the predicate domain is divided on both sides of the topic expression, such as Gen. 27:35 above and also in Gen. 14:22:

(4) Gen. 14:22 וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם אֶל-מֶלֶךְ סוּדֹם And Abram SAID to the KING of SODOM.

In English, the comment is not divided: "said to the king of Sodom." However, in Hebrew this comment is divided into two with the topic in the middle. Givón describes this phenomenon:

One must first note that a VSO language is 'pragmatically schizophrenic', since the new information portion of the sentence is scattered on both sides of the topic/subject. (Givón 1977, 241)

On the other hand, E. J. Revell notes on the post-verbal elements:

The standard order represents the common gradation of the significance of the constituents in relation to the action: subject-object-adverbials. (Revell 1989, 3)

Namely Revell understands that the clause-initial element (the verb here) has the most "significance" (p. 3) and the further it departs from the clause-initial position, the less significant one element becomes. It may be difficult to establish Revell's gradation theory, since we often find new information in the latter part of the comment, such as the introduction of a brand-new referent. For example,

(5) Gen. 38:1-2:

וַיֵּשֶׁב אִישׁ עַדְלָמַי וּשְׁמוֹ חִירָה
וַיְרָא שָׁם יְהוּדָה בַת־אִישׁ כְּנַעֲנִי

1 he stayed with a man of Adullam named Hirah (NIV modified).

2 And Judah saw there a DAUGHTER of a CERTAIN CANAANITE.

Here the brand-new referent is introduced in the latter part of the comment of Line 2. Notice here that שָׁמְעֵנִי precedes the grammatical subject Judah. The preceding clause Gen. 38:1 activates the location by introducing an Adullamite. Namely the active (old) referents "there" and "Judah" are placed between the new information, the verb $\text{וַיִּרְאֵ$ and its object $\text{כְּנָעֲנִי בֵּת-אִישׁ}$. This further supports Givón's notion that the predicate domain is often divided on the both sides of the topic (active or old) referents.

Predicate — Topical element(s) — Other arguments in Predicate Domain

In our study we understand that the predicate proper, a verb in verbal clauses, represents the whole comment. Therefore when a finite verb is fronted and an argument follows it (including affixation in #1 Gen. 15:5 above), we understand that it has Px Predicate-Focus Structure.

We may apply this principle to nominal clauses. Since we are only dealing with two-member nominal clauses, our data are limited for this inquiry. However, Andersen states

Table 5 shows that there are 185 clauses with a predicate of the kind [longer predicate domains] in which discontinuity [divided predicate domain] might occur; and of these, 153 have a predicate divided asunder by the subject. (1970, 37)

Namely most long complex predicates are divided into two with the subject in-between. Typical examples he gives are:

141 Gen. 23:6

$\text{שָׁמְעֵנִי אֲדֹנָי נְשִׂיא אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה בְּתוֹכֵנוּ}$

Hear us, my lord, you are a MIGHTY PRINCE AMONG US.

#141 Gen. 24:24

$\text{וַתֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו בֵּת-בְּתוּאֵל אָנֹכִי בֶן-מִלְכָּה}$

And she said to him, "I am the DAUGHTER of BETHUEL, the son of MILCAH

Andersen's observation and his examples (##141-159) seem to support our principle for nominal clauses. Namely also in nominal clauses the long predicate domains are tend to break up into two: the predicate proper in front and the arguments which belong to the predicate domain. The active structure is inserted in-between.

The word order of the first two elements is the decisive factor for the choice of focus structures (Px or XP). However, it does not mean that the arguments which belong to the second or latter predicate domain is less significant than the fronted core predicate, since the latter is a vital part the predicate domain. For example in (5), without the object, "a daughter of a certain Canaanite," the verb alone does not make any sense. Therefore we may assume focus (high pitch) on the second part of the comment in verbal clauses in our analysis, since it is still a part of comment (new information, assertion). This may be described as Pxx. The first x represents arguments which are often active and the latter X represents new arguments which belong to the predicate domain or the comment. Our study verifies Givón's observation of VSO languages against Revell that the predicate domain (comment) is divided on both sides of the post-verbal argument (topic here).

In our study, the high-pitch marking by underline for Hebrew and small capitals for English in the latter predicate domain is not consistent. Only certain elements are marked in the latter predicate domains.

5.3.6. Summary of "Active or accessible referents for topic"

In the preceding sections we have analysed the information structure of some clauses which have fronted predicates. These clauses have active or accessible referents following the predicates. These referents may appear as proforms, lexical forms, pragmatic subjects and infinitive phrases. The function is commenting on those referents, namely, these clause have the topics-comment relationship. Therefore we may conclude that it is probable that the clause-initial position is marked for focus and the clauses have the predicate-focus structure. We may also infer that the fronted predicates are focused by high pitch also. This focus structure may be represented as Px, the fronted focused predicate and the following non-focused argument.

In some clauses, lexical forms may be chosen in place of proforms. The reasons for this seem to be: 1. to resolve ambiguity, 2. to narrow down the topic, 3. literary rephrasing, 4. to announce theme (thematising) or 5. to keep the protagonist central and focused (participant referent resources).

In verbal clauses, pronouns are redundant. Specification of accompaniment and emphasis are some of the purposes of this redundancy.

Long predicate domains (comments) tend to be divided into two and the default sequence is: the predicate proper + the active topic referent + the rest of arguments which belong to the predicate domain (comment): PxX.

5.4. INACTIVE OR BRAND-NEW REFERENT FOR TOPIC

Active or accessible referents are preferred as the topic and the majority of P-X clauses do have active or accessible topic referents as we have seen above. However, inactive and brand-new referents may be activated and may become the topic of a clause. Clauses we shall examine also have fronted predicates but have inactive or brand-new referents.

5.4.1. Inactive referent for topic

For inactive referents Lambrecht notes:

The cognitive effort required in this case is of relative "high cost" because, in addition to processing propositional information about some topic, the interpreter must determine the referent of the topic itself, which was not previously made available in the discourse. (1994, 166)

Identification of an inactive (unused) referent requires a high-cost cognitive effort.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ However, we need to admit that "Some unused referents may be easier to access for an interlocutor than others and the acceptability of the sentence varies accordingly" (Lambrecht 1994, 166).

For example, Deut. 10:6:

וַיִּכְהֶן אֱלֵעָזָר בְּנוֹ תַּחְתָּיו

Then ELEAZAR his son MINISTERED as PRIEST in his PLACE. [Shimasaki]

The priest Eleazar does not appear in Deuteronomy prior to this verse. This may be either an inactive (unused) referent or an accessible referent. The anchoring (see below) to "Aaron's son" and the verb "כהן" may indicate that this is an inactive referent.

5.4.2. Brand-new referent for topic

Brand-new (unidentifiable) referents are least acceptable as topics. A sentence with a brand-new reference as the topic is usually an ill-formed sentence which does not make sense to the receiver, such as

"A boy is tall." (Lambrecht 1994, 167)

It occurs in Hebrew, though probably not ill-formed. For example, Num. 11:27:

וַיֵּרֶץ הַנַּעַר וַיִּגֵּד לְמֹשֶׁה So a young man RAN and TOLD MOSES.

וַיֵּרֶץ הַנַּעַר is peculiar. It is a brand-new referent, but it has the definite article and has the topic status in this clause. Keil-Delitzsch compares this with Gen. 14:13 "וַיָּבֹא הַפְּלִיט" Then a fugitive came" (1981, 71). GKC comments on this phenomenon:

Peculiar to Hebrew is the employment of the article to denote a single person or thing (primarily one which is as yet unknown, and therefore not capable of being defined) as being present to the mind under given circumstances. In such cases in English the indefinite article is mostly used. (§126 q-r)

5.4.3. Anchored and unanchored referents

Inactive and brand-new referents occur as the topic in Biblical Hebrew, but not so frequently. When it occurs, it is often anchored for identification. To anchor is to link a referent to another referent for identification.

"A boy in my class is really tall." (Lambrecht 1994, 167)

"A guy I work with." (Lambrecht 1994, 86)

These anchored expressions are more acceptable as the topic than unanchored ones, such as above "A boy is tall" (Lambrecht 86).

A Hebrew example of this anchored brand-new referent is Judg. 10:1:

וַיָּקָם אַחֲרָי אַבִּימֶלֶךְ לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל
תּוֹלַע בֶּן־פּוּאָה בֶּן־דּוֹדוֹ אִישׁ יִשְׂשַׁכָּר

After the TIME of ABIMELECH

a MAN of ISSACHAR, TOLA son of PUAH, the son of DODO, ROSE to SAVE ISRAEL.

If the clause is simply "and Tola AROSE to save ISRAEL," it may still be understandable for the reader that Tola is the next judge to save the Israelites. However, this brand-new referent, Tola, is anchored to two other referents: "after Abimelech" and "the son of Puah, the son of Dodo, a man of Issachar." By this anchoring, it becomes easier for the receiver to identify this brand-new referent.

We may notice that these two referents have different information status and locations. The first one, אֲבִימֶלֶךְ אֶחָרִי, is placed immediately after the verbal predicate וַיִּקַּם, and is an active referent: the preceding text unit is about Abimelech. The second referent is brand-new: "the son of Puah, the son of Dodo, a man of Issachar." The location of the first active referent, which is immediately after the verbal predicate, seems to help the receiver further for smoother communication. This location is in accordance with the default verbal Predicate-Focus Structure: verbal predicate + active topical referent + the rest of arguments in the predicate domain (PxX, see above). In the example above, Judg. 10:1, although the active referent אֲבִימֶלֶךְ אֶחָרִי is not the grammatical subject of the clause, it functions anaphorically to link this clause to the preceding active structure (here the text unit about Abimelech). This is one means of anaphoric grounding.¹⁰⁹

There are other similar examples.

Gen. 39:1:

וַיֹּסֶף הוֹרַד מִצְרַיִמָּה
וַיִּקְנֶהוּ פוֹטִיפָר סָרִיס פְּרֹעָה שֶׁר הַטַּבָּחִים אִישׁ מִצְרַיִם
מִיַּד הַיִּשְׁמַעֲלִים אֲשֶׁר הוֹרְדוּהוּ שָׁמָּה

1 Now JOSEPH had been TAKEN DOWN to EGYPT.

2 Potiphar, an EGYPTIAN who was one of PHARAOH'S OFFICIALS, the CAPTAIN of the GUARD, BOUGHT HIM from the ISHMAELITES who had TAKEN HIM THERE.

Line 1 is initialising.¹¹⁰ In Line 2 (Px Predicate-Focus Structure), the grammatical subject, Potiphar, is a brand-new referent, which is least acceptable as the topic. Here the difficulty of identification is eased by anchoring to an active referent: the suffixed object of וַיִּקְנֶהוּ which refers to Joseph; and an accessible referent: "an Egyptian who was one of Pharaoh's officials, the captain of the guard." Notice also that the active referent Joseph (in suffixed proform) appears with the verbal predicate. This clause also shows that the post-verbal position in Predicate-Focus Structure is used for anaphoric grounding.

This observation suggests the close relationship between this post-verbal anaphoric grounding and the default sequence of the verbal Predicate-Focus.

Brand-new topic:	Verb + <u>active</u> referent	+	brand- <u>new</u> topic
Divided Predicate Domain:	Verb + <u>active</u> topic referent	+	<u>new</u> information

Concerning pitch prominence on brand-new referents, I do not have sufficient information to judge it. Through analogy we may infer that these inactive or brand-new referents may have certain high pitch. Let us consider some English sentences.

(1) And then he had a CAR accident.

(1) has a preferred Predicate-Focus Structure with the active topic referent "he."

(2) And then a BOY had a CAR accident.

¹⁰⁹ See p. 89 for Givón's anaphoric grounding (1987, 180) and van Wolde's explanation and proposal to adopt this grounding for Hebrew (1999, 326-27).

¹¹⁰ This has the clause-focus structure. See 7.4.1.1 "Topicalisation and Initiation" in pp. 163ff.

(2) has a brand-new referent "a boy" which is not anchored. It may not be ill-formed in certain contexts, however, it is generally unacceptable. This "boy" seems to have pitch prominence which is probably lower than "traffic."

(3) And then a BOY in my CLASS had a CAR accident.

(3) is more acceptable as a sentence because of the anchoring. Notice that the referent "class" in "in my class" also has pitch prominence lower than "car."

(4) And then a guy I WORK with had a CAR accident.

In (4), the brand new topic referent "guy" seems slightly high-pitched. "Work" has relatively higher pitch, and "car" has the highest.

It may be schematised:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Low:	he		(boy)	guy
Middle:		boy	boy	(guy)
Middle (anchor):			class	work
High:	car	car	car	car

What we can observe here is 1) the predicate is high-pitched; 2) the active topic referent is low-pitched; 2) either the brand-new referent or its anchored referent has a relative pitch prominence.

This suggests that either brand-new referents or referents anchored to the brand-new referents may have relatively high pitch in Hebrew also, such as appositional phrases, prepositional phrases and אשר relative clauses. The study of Biblical Hebrew pitch contours will be a field to be explored. At present pitch prominence on brand-new referents in Hebrew are not certain, and therefore this is not dealt with in our study. Some of Hebrew brand-new referents or anchored referents are marked as high-pitched by underline, however, they are mere suggestions and it is not the object of our study.¹¹¹

Another example of an anchored brand-new topic referent: Deut. 10:6 (an unused referent Eleazar anchored to "Aaron's son" and the verb "כהן")

5.4.4. Indefinite unanchored topic 'על

We need to pay attention to a peculiar phenomenon of איש. It often appears as the topic of clauses without anchoring. For example, Deut. 34:6:

וַיִּקְבֹּר אֹתוֹ בְּנֵי בְּאֶרֶץ מוֹאָב מוֹלַבֵּית פְּעוֹר
וְלֹא-יָדַע אִישׁ אֶת-קְבֻרָתוֹ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה

He buried him in Moab, in the valley opposite Beth Peor,

but to this day NO one KNOWS where his grave is.

This clause is not considered as an ill-formed clause, because its indefinite nature ("someone," "anyone," "nobody") or its generic nature (a man in general) does not require the receiver to identify it.

¹¹¹ See 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew" in p. 61 and also "Middle pitch" in pp. 90ff.

This is clearly distinguished from the fronted **אִישׁ** clauses in Clause-Focus Structure which introduce new referents as the topic of a new text unit (see below in the "Introduction of brand-new referents").

Other examples are:

- Deut. 8:5 כְּאִשֶּׁר יַיְסֵר אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ just as a man DISCIPLINES his son.
 יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ (מִיִּסְרֶךָ) the LORD your GOD was DISCIPLINING you.)
 Deut. 7:24 לֹא־יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ בְּפָנֶיךָ NO man will be ABLE to STAND before you.
 Deut. 11:25 לֹא־יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ בְּפָנֶיכֶם NO man will be ABLE to STAND before you.

5.4.5. Summary of "Inactive or brand-new referent for topic"

We have seen some clauses with fronted predicates. Although the following arguments are inactive or brand-new referents, the function is still commenting. We may therefore suggest further that these predicates are fronted for focus and the clauses have the predicate-focus structure. We may infer that these predicates are focused by high pitch as well. Pitch prominence on these inactive or brand-new topic referents might have relatively high pitch but it is not certain. Px or PX.

Since these referents are less acceptable as the topic than active and accessible referents, they are frequently anchored for identification. In these cases, the clause-second position is often used for anaphoric grounding: to link the clause to the preceding active structure. We have observed that the clauses with active or accessible topic referents are also placed in the clause-second position. It may not be coincident to observe that the clause-second position is used for active structure (both topic and non-topic referent) for anaphoric grounding in both categories (i.e., active or accessible and inactive or brand-new topic referents).

An indefinite **אִישׁ** is unanchored but is not considered to be ill-formed. This is because its indefinite nature ("someone," "anyone," "nobody") or its generic nature (a man in general) does not require the receiver to identify it.

5.5. INTRODUCTION OF BRAND-NEW REFERENTS

It is verified that the most of clauses with fronted predicates have active or accessible referents. This is because it is easier for the receiver to identify the active or accessible referents. Though it is possible to make inactive or brand-new referents as the topic, it is not preferred. It follows that Hebrew (as well as other languages) prefers to introduce brand-new referents to the world of discourse prior to its topic status in commenting clauses. This device is a typical means of "cataphoric grounding" which grounds the referent "so that it can now be attached at a relevant location in the mental representation of the incoming text" (van Wolde 1999, 326). In other words, because of this introduction of a brand-new referent, this

referent becomes either active or accessible so that it can become not only the topic of an immediately succeeding clause, but it has a potential to be activated in a later episode.

The question in this section is where and how those active referents are first introduced into the world of discourse and activated in the mind of receiver. Within our data Hebrew appears to have three ways: 1) brand-new referents are introduced in existential clauses; 2) brand-new referents are often introduced in the comments of clauses; 3) brand-new referents are also introduced as the topic of a clause of Clause-Focus Structure.

5.5.1. Introduction of brand-new referents in the existential clause

Brand-new referents are introduced by existential clauses.

5.5.1.1. By *hāyāh* existential clause

The *hāyāh* clause is often used as a boundary marker and initiates a new text unit.¹¹² It sometimes introduces a brand-new referent. For example, Judg. 13:2:

וַיְהִי אִישׁ אֶחָד מִזֹּרָה מִבְּנֵי שֵׁפְתַח הַדָּנִי וְשֵׁמוֹ מָנוּחַ

There was a man of Zorah, from the clan of the Danites, whose name was Manoah,

5.5.1.2. By *yēš* existential clause

yēš functions as a predicate to introduce a brand-new referent.¹¹³

Gen. 42:1 יֵשׁ-שָׁבֶר בְּמִצְרָיִם there was grain in Egypt

The topic comes immediately after the first predicate.

Gen. 43:7 הֲיֵשׁ לָכֶם אָח 'Do you have another brother?'

5.5.2. Introduction of brand-new referents in the comments

Brand-new referents are often introduced in the comments of clauses. Those brand-new referents are probably high-pitched.

5.5.2.1. In a comment of Predicate-Focus Structure

Brand-new referents are often introduced in the comments of clauses with Predicate-Focus Structure. For example, Gen. 38:6:

וַיִּקַּח יְהוּדָה אִשָּׁה לְעֵר בְּכוֹרוֹ וְשֵׁמָּה תָמָר

Judah got a WIFE for ER, his firstborn, and her name was Tamar.

The clause comments on the active referent Judah, and therefore Px Predicate-Focus Structure. The topic referent Judah has the lexical form probably for ambiguity resolution (Shua, Onan and Shelah are also activated) and for thematising or theme-shifting (the theme

¹¹² See 10.1 "HAYA Division Marker and Existential Clauses" pp. 223ff.

¹¹³ We may understand either that the topic is omitted or that "in Egypt" is the topic.

of vv. 6-7 is Judah got a wife for Er). A brand-new referent, "a wife for Er," is introduced in the latter comment, and activated in the mind of the receiver with a minimum effort.¹¹⁴

5.5.2.2. In a comment of Clause-Focus Structure

Brand-new referents are also introduced in the comments of clauses with Clause-Focus Structure. For example, #32 Gen. 11:10:

שֵׁם אֱלֹהֵי תּוֹלְדֹת שֵׁם THESE are the RECORDS of the GENERATIONS of SHEM.

The new referent "Shem" is introduced to the world of discourse in the comment "the records of the generations of Shem."

5.5.3. Introduction of brand-new referents as the topic of Clause-Focus Structure.

Brand-new referents are introduced as the topic of XP Clause-Focus Structure. This will be discussed in 7.2 "Information-Level Implications" in pp. 146ff.

5.5.4. Summary of "Introduction of brand-new referents"

The question of this section was how a brand-new referent is introduced to the world of discourse for the first time prior to its topic status in a clause of Px Predicate-Focus Structure. This question arose because clauses with Predicate-Focus Structure prefer to have already active or at least accessible referents, and therefore we sought to know where those active or accessible referents come from. We have observed that those referents are originally introduced to the world of discourse by three means. They are introduced 1) in existential clauses; 2) in the comments of clauses; 3) and as the topic of a clause with Clause-Focus Structure. This introduction of brand-new referents is one of the major devices of cataphoric grounding.

5.6. PRAGMATICS AND MARKEDNESS OF PREDICATE-FOCUS STRUCTURE

This chapter has analysed the information structure of the clauses with fronted predicates and argued that the clause-initial position is marked for focus and that those clauses have the Px predicate-focus structure. This structure, often grammatically represented as VSO in verbal clauses, is considered by recent scholars (Buth 1999, Gross 1996 and van der Merwe 1999) as the basic word order and is unmarked for pragmatic function. On the other hand, PS, which is the same predicate-focus structure in nominal clauses in our theory, is considered as marked for pragmatic function. This section will argue against these two commonly held ideas in recent years.

¹¹⁴ The second clause, וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ מִנְזָח, has Clause-Focus Structure (circumstantial clause [gloss or parenthetical]).

5.6.1. Pragmatic Functions

First of all we should define the term 'pragmatic.' The general consensus of the term 'pragmatic' is that it is an aspect of languages which goes beyond sentence grammar. C. Fillmore puts pragmatics above syntax and semantics. He describes pragmatics as an aspect which incorporates syntax and semantics but takes setting into consideration. This setting includes not only the preceding context but the culture shared between the interlocutors (1981). Similarly G. Green and J. Morgan suggest that there are layers of meanings in one sentence: propositional content, linguistic meaning, speech act, implicatures and more which will involve large areas of knowledge of communication (1981). R. Buth defines it more narrowly for his purpose:

Pragmatics refers to the communication situation. I am specifically interested in constituents that have been *signaled in the language system*, in the grammar, so that they carry additional information beyond the syntactic or semantic information just mentioned. For example, the commonly used terms *Topic* and *Focus* fit there (1999, 81). Since we are mainly dealing with written texts with a particular interest in word order, we shall use the term "pragmatic" for those functions or implications ascribed to our three focus structures. This definition is broader than Buth's, because Buth has limited pragmatics to the functions of his "Focus" and "Contextualizing Constituent" (or "Topic").

Let us take the example we have used.

- (1) Tony Blair is the PRIME MINISTER.
- (2) TONY BLAIR is the prime minister.
- (3) TONY BLAIR is the PRIME MINISTER.

All these clauses have the same propositional value. However each one expresses additional information which is not conveyed merely from its propositional content. (1) conveys that the clause is commenting preferably on an active or an accessible referent.¹¹⁵ (2) implies that the clause is identifying the fronted element with the missing argument of the presupposed proposition between the interlocutors. (3) expects a reader to look for pragmatic implications from the context which are other than the two above.¹¹⁶ These implications and functions are not expressed by the mere propositional semantic content, and we call them pragmatic implications or functions.

5.6.2. Markedness of Predicate-Focus Structure

I have to emphasise here that (1) above, the predicate-focus structure, has its pragmatic function. Clauses with predicate-focus structure do not merely convey propositional information found in exercises of grammar books, for example. They convey additional information that the clause is commenting preferably on an active or an accessible referent. It

¹¹⁵ The terms 'pragmatic subjects' and 'pragmatic predicates' introduced in 3.5 "Pragmatic Predicate and Pragmatic Subject" in pp. 63ff express a pragmatic function of commenting.

¹¹⁶ This is equivalent to Niccacci's presentative clause. See chapter 7 for detail.

even implies that the narrator is commenting on the continued topic referent in a coherent discourse.

As we have seen in this chapter, the clause with the Px Predicate-Focus Structure, VSO or PS, is the easiest structure to understand for the receiver, because it mostly has an active or accessible referent as the topic: the receiver makes a "low cost" cognitive effort for processing the proposition. Therefore when we read a sentence such as "Tony Blair is the prime minister," or "John is my friend" in isolation, the natural reading would be "Tony Blair is the PRIME MINISTER," "John is my FRIEND." These sentences have the unaccented subjects and the accented predicates. It is because

It is more common for speakers to convey information about given discourse entities than to identify arguments in open propositions, to introduce new entities into the discourse, or to report events out of the blue. (Lambrecht 1994, 132)

Thus Lambrecht calls Predicate-Focus Structure "unmarked pragmatic sentence articulation,"¹¹⁷ and he comments that "sentences are primarily used as units of information in coherent discourse." In other words, when we hear a sentence in isolation such as above, we naturally assume "topic continuity" in "coherent discourse"; the subject is the topic of a new sentence ("unmarked topic" Lambrecht 1994, 132); and the sentence is adding new information to it (commenting). This pragmatic implication is expressed in our terms "commenting." Andersen uses "classification," Muraoka uses "description" and Niccacci uses "predicative" for this clause type, however, these terms do not necessarily express this pragmatic implication, but are more associated with logical or propositional understanding of information.

This pragmatic function has not been well recognised in the past. Instead, past studies vaguely understood this pragmatic function as the "normal" word order for long time or in more recent years as "unmarked" word order. In the "normal-exception" approach, one first determines the normal pattern from statistics and then seeks special functions for exceptional cases. GKC notes that "the natural *order of words* within the verbal sentence is: *Verb—Subject*, or *Verb—Subject—Object*" (§142 f). On the contrary Joüon notes that "L'ordre des mots dans la proposition verbale (comme dans la proposition nominale, §154 f) est normalement: *Sujet—Verbe*," and observes emphasis on verbs in the verb–subject sequence (§155 k). J-Muraoka explicitly states:

The statistically dominant and unmarked word-order in the verbal clause is: *Verb—Subject*. But, as in the case of the nominal clause, there is no lack of exceptions. Here again an attempt must be made to account for, or describe those exceptions. (§155 k). (underline added)

D-Gibson also prefers the term "unmarked" to "normal":

Properly, therefore, the so-called normal order should rather be regarded as the *unmarked* order, . . . (§133)

Some other recent scholars also take this normal-exception statistical approach and conclude that VSO or the verb initial clause is normal.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ Lambrecht uses this term markedness in the sense of # 3. See below for this number.

¹¹⁸ For example, K. Jongeling (in the book of Ruth): 1991.

This approach, though it appears practical, may overlook the pragmatic function of commenting by implying that the predicate-focus structure is merely giving propositional information. This tendency to overlook the pragmatics of "the normal" word order still continues among modern Hebraists. However we need to note that "In pragmatically based languages . . . all [different word] ordering reflects pragmatic considerations" (M. Mithun 1987, 325).¹¹⁹

This insufficient understanding of the predicate-focus structure may be demonstrated in two examples.

The first example is when the text is not narrative or command. Let us look at Lev. 7:1-7 as an example:

1 וְזֹאת תּוֹרַת הָאֵשֶׁם
 קֹדֶשׁ קֳדָשִׁים הוּא
 2 בַּמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחֲטוּ אֶת־הָעֹלָה יִשְׁחֲטוּ אֶת־הָאֵשֶׁם
 וְאֶת־דָּמֹו יִזְרֹק עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב
 3 וְאֵת כָּל־חֲלָבֹו יִקְרִיב מִמֶּנּוּ
 אֵת הָאֵלֶיָּהּ וְאֵת־הַחֲלֵב הַמְּכַסֶּה אֶת־הַקָּרֶב
 4 וְאֵת שְׁתֵּי הַכְּלָיִת וְאֵת־הַחֲלֵב אֲשֶׁר עָלֶיהֶן אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַכְּסָלִים
 וְאֵת־הִיתָרְת עַל־הַכֶּבֶד עַל־הַכְּלָיִת יִסִּירֶנָּה
 5 וְהִקְטִיר אֹתָם הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחַה אִשָּׁה לַיהוָה
 אֵשֶׁם הוּא
 6 כָּל־זֹכֶר בַּכֹּהֲנִים יֹאכְלֶנּוּ
 בַּמָּקוֹם קֳדוֹשׁ יֹאכֵל
 קֹדֶשׁ קֳדָשִׁים הוּא
 7 כַּחֲטָאת כָּאֵשֶׁם תּוֹרַה אַחַת לָהֶם
 הַכֹּהֵן אֲשֶׁר יִכְפֹּר־בּוֹ לֹו יִהְיֶה

1 a (SP) 'Now THIS is the LAW of the GUILT OFFERING;

b (Ps) it is MOST HOLY.

2 a (AV) 'In the PLACE where they SLAY the BURNT OFFERING they are to SLAY the GUILT OFFERING,

b (OV) and he shall SPRINKLE its BLOOD around on the altar.

3 (OV) Then he shall OFFER from it ALL ITS FAT:

the fat tail and the fat that covers the entrails,

4 (OV) and the TWO KIDNEYS with the fat that is on them, which is on the loins, and the lobe on the liver he shall REMOVE with the KIDNEYS.

5 a (Vs) 'And the priest shall OFFER THEM UP in smoke on the altar as an offering by fire to the Lord;

b (Ps) it is a GUILT OFFERING.

6 a (SV) 'EVERY MALE among the priests may EAT OF IT.

b (AV) It shall be EATEN in a HOLY PLACE;

c (Ps) it is MOST HOLY.

7 a (SP) The GUILT OFFERING is like the SIN OFFERING, there is ONE LAW for them;¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ See also p. 56 for Mithun's "pragmatically based languages."

¹²⁰ A Hebrew idiomatic usage.

b (SV) the PRIEST who makes ATONEMENT with it shall HAVE it.

All Px Predicate-Focus Structure clauses (Ps or Vs) are indented. The structure of this text unit is that verse 1 is Introductory Formula (Clause-Focus Structure),¹²¹ and the rest of the XP clauses (SP, SV, AV, OV) present new topics and new comments (presentational):

- v. 2a Place to slay
- v. 2b As to its blood
- v. 3 As to its fat
- v. 4 As to the two kidneys
- v. 6a Who can eat it
- v. 6b Place to eat it.
- v. 7a The nature of the guilt offering
- v. 7b Who shall have it.

All the indented Px clauses (v. 1b, 5a, 5b, 6c: Ps or Vs) are adding new information to the already active or accessible referents (commenting). What we can observe here is Px is used for commenting, while XP is used for other pragmatic functions, which is in accordance with our theory of focus structure.

In this text unit the dominant word order of verbal clauses is X-V (AV, OV or SV: 7 out of 8). If we use statistical frequency as the only measure to determine normalcy, we would need to conclude that X-V is the normal or unmarked word order. However, many readers of the Hebrew Scripture would not suppose that X-V is the normal word order of Biblical Hebrew. This is because when we hear the word "normal" and "unmarked," we unconsciously think of the most frequently used word order in high topic-continuity text or discourse, such as narrative, a series of commands, and daily conversation. In other words, in practice we are not dependent only on the statistical frequency in determining the "normal" word order. We unconsciously take the nature of text-unit (discourse) types into consideration. Or more precisely, the "normal" word order is the most frequently used in high topic-continuity texts (e.g., narrative and commands). It is the sequence of VSO in verbal clauses. Here our theory reveals this unconscious presumption of normalcy or unmarkedness. When one states that VSO is unmarked, it means that it is the most frequently used structure in high topic-continuity texts.

The second instance is more misleading than this first example of the legal texts. It is concerned with the normal word order of nominal clauses. As we have seen in Introduction, SP was recognised as "normal" by Hebraists in earlier days, such as Albrecht, GKC and Joüon. This notion of normalcy in nominal clauses was not considered by Andersen, Hoftijzer and Muraoka, however, it revived in recent years (V. DeCaen 1999; R. Buth 1999). Namely, SP is considered as the "normal," "underlying" and "unmarked" word order probably based on the statistics. For example according to the figures taken from Andersen's *Hebrew Verbless Clause*, 386 two-member nominal clauses in the Pentateuch have the SP sequence compared to PS's 219.¹²²

¹²¹ We will discuss this formula in 7.4.1.2 "Introductory Formula" in pp. 168ff.

¹²² See p. 12 in Introduction.

This fact, however, does not justify the "unmarked" status of SP. As we have observed in this chapter, the function of PS is commenting and it is used in texts with high topic continuity. See above for example. Lines 1b, 5b, 6c in Lev. 7:1-7 have the PS sequence and they are commenting on the preceding active topic referents. On the other hand, SP in Line 1 starts the new text-unit and Line 7-a shifts the topic to a new referent. As we will observe in detail in chapter 7, SP has different pragmatic functions from commenting and is often used in low topic-continuity texts. Though SP is used even in the narrative, it is only used in low topic-continuity parts such as setting, background information or episode-initial. If one determines that SP is the "normal word order" simply according to the overall statistical majority rule, he will seek for "special" or "exceptional" function in PS where there is no such special pragmatic functions except commenting. In determining "normalcy" or "statistical unmarkedness," one must consider the nature of the text in terms of topic continuity.

To sum up, our theory reveals the unconscious presumption of normalcy or unmarkedness. When we say that one clause type is "normal" or "unmarked," we unconsciously think of the clause type that is used most frequently in high topic-continuity text, such as narrative or a series of commands. If we apply the same principle, PS is the "normal" or "unmarked" sequence in nominal clauses, not SP.

Our predicate-focus structure is the normal or unmarked focus structure in this particular sense both in nominal (PS) and verbal (VSO) clauses.

5.6.3. Markedness

Apart from this popular notion of markedness, that is associated mainly with statistical frequency, markedness has different connotations which may be worth noting.¹²³

C. Miller distinguishes two types of markedness: privative and equipollent. Privative markedness indicates that "the presence of a feature at one pole signals the absence of the feature at the opposite pole." Equipollent markedness indicates that the presence of a feature at one pole signals the logical opposite of that feature at the other pole (1996, 309). For E. van Wolde "'marked' means the necessary presence of an element, while 'unmarked' means the element may or may not be present; it is simply not specified (1999, 322). In addition to these three technical definitions, we have seen a popular usage of markedness; "unmarked" is the normal or frequent pattern, while "marked" is not. We have used the term in this sense in the section above. We must be aware of the difference in using the terms.

¹²³ C. Miller uses three criteria to determine the markedness of the quotation formulae. They are "(1) frequency, (2) complexity, and (3) prototypicality" (1996, 310). Namely a form may be unmarked if it occurs more frequently, it has a simpler structure and it is prototypical. This set of criteria appears to have an unverifiable presupposition of hierarchical development: from a simple, frequent and prototypical form to a more developed, complex; infrequent form.

	Marked	Unmarked
# 1. Miller's privative	present	absent
# 2. Miller's equipollent	present	logical opposite
# 3. Van Wolde's privative	present	present or absent
# 4. Frequency	infrequent	frequent

According to the definition of #1, the predicate-focus structure is marked for the feature of commenting. Similarly the argument-focus structure is marked for the pragmatic function of identification (see the following chapter) and the clause-focus structure is marked for pragmatic functions other than commenting and identification (see chapter 7).

5.6.4. Summary

We may summarise this section on the pragmatic function and markedness of the predicate-focus structure. The predicate-focus structure (i.e., PS or VSO grammatically) is not a neutral structure, but it is marked for the pragmatic function of commenting. It implies or expects that the clause is commenting on an active or accessible referent in a coherent discourse. We may label it as "unmarked" as long as we understand that it means it is the most frequently used structure in high topic-continuity texts, such as narrative or a series of commands. Past studies appears to have overlooked this pragmatic function of the predicate-focus structure and then depended on overall statistical frequency in determining "normalcy" or "unmarkedness" without taking the nature of texts into consideration. These two factors seem to have led some of the past and recent studies to the questionable statement that SP is the "normal" word order.

5.7. BUTH'S S-P SEQUENCE

Before we close this chapter we shall pay attention to some large differences between our theory and that of R. Buth.

Buth shares with us many terms and methods of analysis, such as, consideration of pragmatic functions and focus. He correctly observes pragmatic functions of XV verbal clauses based on the "basic VSOX order" (95). Namely preverbal fronting signifies "pragmatic marking" (95), and fronted elements indicate "Contextualizing Constituent"¹²⁴ or "Focus."¹²⁵ Buth applies the same framework to nominal clauses. His observations will contribute significantly to the study of Biblical Hebrew word order in that he analyses pragmatic functional difference in allo-clauses (80) and he observes that Biblical Hebrew expresses focus by fronting. For Buth elements in "Focus" are fronted, and deictic phrases are also fronted to provide a framework for texts and text-unit (discourse).

¹²⁴ This means topicalisation (p. 82), extraposed topic (p. 86, n. 16) or framework of an episode by deictic temporal or spatial phrases.

¹²⁵ This means contrast, identification and emphasis (p. 81).

Though we share some methods and conclusions, the differences are not insignificant. One of the differences is manifested in the understanding of the "normal" word order of nominal clauses.

For Buth, the "normal" (1999, 96) or "underlying order in nominal clauses is Subject–Predicate" (107), just as he understands VSO as normal. Anything fronted before the subject-predicate structure is "for pragmatic marking" (96) which signifies either "Focus" or "Contextualization" (107). He schematises it as follows:

(CC) (Focus) Subject Predicate (107)

Namely, when an element is placed before the subject-predicate structure, it functions as either Focus (making it informationally prominent) or as Contextualizing Constituent (providing a framework of a discourse).

This understanding does not agree with our interpretation of the "normal" or "unmarked" nominal clause word order (see the preceding section). We have observed that P-S, more precisely, Px Predicate-Focus Structure in nominal clauses is unmarked in terms of the most frequently used structure in a high text-continuity text.

I have to raise some questions concerning this default S-P sequence proposed by Buth in this last section of the chapter.

5.7.1. Andersen's statistics

The first question is concerned with his understanding of Andersen's statistics. Buth quotes Andersen that

Table 5 shows that there are 185 clauses with a predicate of the kind in which discontinuity might occur; and of these, 153 have a predicate divided asunder by the subject. (1970, 37, underline added)

Then Buth comments on it:

This is a remarkable tendency that needs more of an explanation than saying that these are basic Predicate–Subject clauses. I submit that we are looking at pragmatic marking on only a part of the Predicate in 83% of the cases and on the whole predicate in 17%. A logical entailment follows. As soon as one recognizes a partial pragmatic marking on a fronted part of a predicate, what remains is a Subject–Predicate order at the core of the clause. (96)

His argument for the default S-P order is based on Andersen's statistics. Namely he argues that the fronted predicates in the divided predicate domain (i.e., the fronted P of the P-S-P structure) are marked and the rest is the default S-P clauses.

First of all we need to understand the context of Andersen's note and Table 5. They clearly indicate that "the kind" signifies long predicate phrases, which include "co-ordination, apposition, apposition of nominalised, modified participle, modification by adverb, modification by prepositional phrase" (Andersen 1970, 37 and 111). That is to say, Table 5 only deals with complex predicate phrases and what Table 5 indicates is that long complex predicate phrases tend to break up into two with the subject in-between: namely 83% of long predicates are divided into two. For the proportion of single predicate and divided predicate, one must look at Table 2 in p. 109. According to this table, Core P–S has

417 clauses and P...-S ...P (divided predicate domain) has 133. Namely the number of two-member P-S clauses are 3.14 times more than the clauses with the divided predicate domain (P-S-P). Buth comments that "Andersen also cannot explain why discontinuities [divided predicate domain] predominate in Predicate-Subject orders" (95). Andersen does not state its domination, instead Andersen states domination of P-S over P-S-P in Table 2. Therefore Andersen does not need to explain it. Buth might possibly have started his theory with a misreading of Andersen's tables.

5.7.2. Divided predicate domain

The second question is the nature of divided predicate domain. As I have briefly mentioned above,¹²⁶ long predicates in both the verbal clause and the nominal clause tend to break up into two. The clauses below are taken from Andersen's P...-S ...P clauses which are supposed to support Buth's default SP theory (see the quotation above):

(1) # 141 Gen. 23:6

שָׁמְעֵנּוּ אֲדֹנָי נְשִׂיא אֱלֹהִים אַתָּה בְּתוֹכֵנוּ

Hear us, my lord, you are a MIGHTY PRINCE AMONG US.

(2) #141 Gen. 24:24

וַתֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו בְּתֻבְתּוֹאֵל אֲנֹכִי בֶן־מִלְכָּה

And she said to him, "I am the DAUGHTER of BETHUEL, the son of MILCAH.

If we apply his theory to (2), בְּתֻבְתּוֹאֵל is fronted for pragmatic marking (either "Focus" or "CC") and the rest makes the default S-P sequence. Namely "the daughter of Bethuel" is fronted for either contrast, identification, enforcement, or contextualisation and the underlying clause is "I am the son of Milcah" although she is not at all the son of Milcah.

His theory does not seem to explain this clause well. As Andersen rightly indicates, the predicate domain stays together if this subject, אֲנֹכִי, is not necessary. He gives Gen. 24:47 for comparison:

(3) Gen. 24:47

בְּתֻמִּי אַתָּה

1 Whose daughter are you?

בְּתֻבְתּוֹאֵל בֶּן־נְחֹר אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָהּ לּוֹ מִלְכָּה

2 The daughter of Bethuel, Nahor's son,
whom Milcah bore to him.

Here the whole Line 2 is the predicate domain which stays together when the subject "I" is omitted.

What is happening in (2) is simply that the long comment or predicate domain is divided into two. The predicate core is fronted and the active structure ("I") follows for anaphoric grounding and finally arguments which belong to the predicate domain are placed after the active structure (PxX).

¹²⁶ See above 5.3.5 "Divided Predicate Domain" in pp. 103ff.

This phenomenon does not support Buth's default S-P sequence, but it presupposes that the fronted elements are the predicate, namely P-S and it also verifies our observation of the divided predicate domain with the active structure in the clause-second position.

5.7.3. P-S two-member clauses

The third question is the explanation of 417 P-S clauses in the Pentateuch. For this significant number of clauses, Buth gives only a few examples and simply notes that this clause type "leads to meaningful questions and possible interpretations" (98). Most of Buth's examples have the divided predicate domain (PxX). In order to verify his thesis, he needs to demonstrate clear pragmatic functions, "Focus" or "CC," in a substantial number of these two-member P-S clauses.

We have analysed many two-member P-S clauses in this chapter and observed that the P-S sequence, more precisely the Px predicate-focus structure in nominal clauses, is unmarked in terms of the most frequently used structure in high topic-continuity texts¹²⁷ and that the same structure is marked for commenting, but not for his "Focus" or "CC."

5.7.4. Pragmatic functions of S-P

The fourth question is concerned with the functions of S-P. Buth repeatedly mentions that S-P is the unmarked word order and by that he implies that it does not have pragmatic functions. However, contrary to Buth's theory, we will observe wide variety of pragmatic functions (other than commenting and identification) in the S-P sequence in chapter 7 "Clause-Focus Structure."

5.7.5. Methodology

The fifth question is concerned with his methodology in comparing allo-clauses.

Let us first examine the examples Buth gives (99). They are Judg. 7:2 and 4. The numbers in parenthesis on the left are added here.

(4) Judg. 7:2 רַב הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתָּךְ The people who are with you are (too) many.

(5) Judg. 7:4 עוֹד הָעָם רַב Still the people are (too) many.

Buth argues here that the underlying word order is S-P and that

Both clauses have a Predicate that describes or classifies the Subject. In Judg 7:2 the main point of the clause was the size of the people, and the appropriate part of the Predicate, רַב 'many,' was fronted. Judg 7:4, by contrast has marked the salient adverb 'still' as Focus. In so doing, the speaker/author no longer had any need to mark 'many' as Focus, and we find the order Subject-Predicate despite identical semantics with 7:2. (99)

¹²⁷ See above 5.6 "Pragmatics and Markedness of Predicate-Focus Structure" in pp. 111ff.

I agree with Buth that the elements are fronted for focus. However his notion that the normal word order is S-P is questionable in this particular case. I will argue below that Judg. 7:4 does not have S-P, but P-S.¹²⁸

In studying pragmatic functions, one needs to examine and compare allo-clauses, and their contexts and functions should be analysed as Buth himself proposes (80). However, the two clauses Buth presents above are not actually allo-clauses. **הָעָם רַב** in Judg. 7:2 should be compared with its allo-clause **רַב הָעָם**:

(6) Line 1 in Ezra 10:13-14

1	אַבְּל הָעָם רַב
2	וְהָעֵת גְּשָׁמִים
3	וְאִין כַּח לְעִמּוֹד בְּחוּץ
4	וְהַמְלָאכָה לֹא-לְיוֹם אֶחָד וְלֹא לְשְׁנַיִם
5	כִּי-הִרְבִּינוּ לְפָשַׁע בְּדָבָר הַזֶּה

6	יַעֲמִדוּ-נָא שְׂרִינֵנוּ לְכָל-הַקְהָל
7	וְכָל אֲשֶׁר בְּעָרֵינוּ הִהְשִׁיב נָשִׁים נְכַרְיֹת יָבֹא לְעֵתִים מְזֻמָּנִים
8	וְעִמָּהֶם זְקֵנֵי-עִיר וְעִיר וְשֹׁפְטֵיהָ
9	עַד לְהִשָּׁיב חֲרוֹן אַף-אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִמֶּנּוּ עַד לְדָבָר הַזֶּה פ

1 SP "But there are many people,

2 SP it is the rainy season,

3 Existential clause and we are not able to stand in the open.

4 SP Nor can the task be done in one or two days,

5 Vs for we have transgressed greatly in this matter.

Ezra 10:14

6 VSA "Let our leaders represent the whole assembly

7 SVA and let all those in our cities who have married foreign wives come at appointed times,

8 together with the elders and judges of each city,

9 until the fierce anger of our God on account of this matter is turned away from us."

Lines 1, 2 and 4 have the SP sequence. Line 3 is an existential clause. Line 5 is a causal clause subordinate to Line 4. Lines 1-5 as a whole function as a piece of background information for the two yiqtol optative clauses (Lines 6-9).¹²⁹ In other words the S-P sequence in this case demonstrate a pragmatic function of background information.¹³⁰

On the other hand, the context of (4) above does not show a particular pragmatic function other than commenting on the active referent, the people. By comparing proper two allo-clauses, we may further affirm our theory: the P-S is marked for commenting and

¹²⁸ I do not exclude a possibility that **עוֹד** may be intensified (loud voice) for emphasis, but this is not the issue here.

¹²⁹ The inversion of word order of the clause (Line 7-9) may possibly be for closure, for this clause closes the speech of the assembly. See 7.4.4 "Closure" in pp. 179ff.

unmarked for the frequency in a high topic-continuity texts; S-P is marked for other pragmatic functions.

Let us now turn our attention to (5), Judg. 7:4. I will repeat it for convenience.

(5) Judg. 7:4 עוֹד הָעַם רַב Still the people are (too) many.

According to Buth's theory, S-P is the normal word order and elements are fronted before S-P for "Focus" or as "Contextualizing Constituent." Judg. 7:4 appears to be the ideal example for Buth to demonstrate that עוֹד is fronted for "Focus" and the underlying sequence is S-P: רַב הָעַם רַב. However again, he needs to compare allo-clauses. In order to verify that עוֹד is fronted for special kind of "Focus," Buth needs to present an allo-clause in which עוֹד is not fronted for special kind of "Focus," Buth needs to present an allo-clause in which עוֹד is not "Focused" and thus not fronted, such as רַב עוֹד הָעַם. This clause, according to Buth's theory, would be the normal S-P clause and עוֹד is not fronted for "Focus." If he could present this type of clause and also demonstrate that there is no pragmatic functions which Buth considers in this S-P clause, his theory would be supported.

Unfortunately, there are no such clauses attested in Scripture. However, we may study of the usage of עוֹד in other combinations.

Let us first examine clauses with fronted עוֹד with an adjective הָיָה.

First, עוֹד is used as fronted predicates with affixed subjects:

(6) Gen. 43:27, 28 הֲעוֹדֶנּוּ הָיָה Is he still alive?
 עוֹדֶנּוּ הָיָה he is still alive.

(7) 1Kings 20:32

וַיֹּאמֶר הֲעוֹדֶנּוּ הָיָה אָחִי הוּא And he said, "Is he still alive? He is my brother."

Other examples of עוֹד with affixed subjects: Gen. 25:6, Gen. 46:30, Ex. 4:18, Deut. 31:27, 1Sam. 20:14, 2Sam. 18:14

It seems more natural to suppose that these עוֹד with suffixed subjects are functioning as the core predicates than to suppose that they are fronted for special kind of "Focus" in these 9 clauses. In other words, הָיָה seems to be an argument which belongs to the predicate domain, not the core predicate.

When the subjects have lexical forms, the subjects follow this predicative עוֹד:

(8) Gen. 45:28

וַיֹּאמֶר יִשְׂרָאֵל רַב 1 Then Israel SAID, "It is ENOUGH;
 עוֹד-יוֹסֵף בְּנִי הָיָה 2 my son Joseph is STILL ALIVE.

(9) Gen. 45:3

¹³⁰ Together with Lines 2-4, they form a clause-focus parallel construction. This is itemizing. See 8.3.1 "Itemizing" in pp. 185ff.

<u>וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹסֵף אֶל-אֶחָיו</u>	1 Then Joseph SAID to his BROTHERS,
<u>אֲנִי יוֹסֵף</u>	2“ I am JOSEPH!
<u>הֲעוֹד אָבִי חַי</u>	3 Is my father STILL ALIVE?'

All the clauses with עוֹד and חַי in Scripture have the fixed sequence of [עוֹד + subject + חַי]¹³¹ and the context of these clauses does not seem to present other pragmatic functions than commenting. This phenomenon is according to our Divided Predicate Domain: the long predicate is divided into two with an active structure in the clause-second position. Therefore it seems that (5) above is also a clause with the predicate-focus structure with the divided predicate domain and the active topic referent הָעָם in-between (PxX). In other words, עוֹד is the predicate proper and חַי is an argument which belongs to the predicate domain.

This understanding is further supported by the following clauses.

- (10) Gen. 29:7 וַיֹּאמֶר הֵן עוֹד הַיּוֹם גָּדוֹל
And he said, "Behold, it is STILL HIGH day, . . .

- (11) Josh. 14:11 עוֹדֵנִי הַיּוֹם חֹזֵק כַּאֲשֶׁר בְּיוֹם שְׁלַח אוֹתִי מֹשֶׁה

"I am STILL as STRONG today as I was in the day Moses sent me

In these clauses, "high" in (10) and "strong" in (11) have not appeared in the preceding contexts. It is not that only "still" is focused and "high" and "strong" are not focused. "Still high" appears as a set of new information added to the active referent "the day." "Still strong" is one new piece of information added to the active referent "I." עוֹד is the core predicate of the clauses, not גָּדוֹל nor חֹזֵק.

The examples we have analysed above seem to suggest that עוֹד is the core predicate of clause and the accompanying adjectives are arguments which belong to the predicate domain. In other words these clause have the predicate-focus structure and their context show no particular pragmatic implications other than commenting.

Finally let us examine some clauses of the inverted word order: S-P

- (12) Gen. 18:22

וַיִּפְּנוּ מִשָּׁם הָאֲנָשִׁים
וַיֵּלְכוּ סָדְמָה
וְאַבְרָהָם עוֹרֵנּוֹ עֹמֵד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה

1 Then the men TURNED AWAY from there

2 and went TOWARD SODOM,

3 while ABRAHAM was STILL STANDING before the LORD.

¹³¹ Gen. 43:7, Gen. 45:26, 2Sam. 12:22.

Let us pay attention to Line 3.¹³² It has the structure [the subject + עור + adjectival participle]. This inverted word order indicates a pragmatic implication of circumstantiality which stops the flow of the narrative and provides a simultaneous circumstantial information.

(13) 1Sam. 13:7

וְעִבְרִים עָבְרוּ אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן אֶרֶץ גָּד וְגִלְעָד
וְשָׁאֵל עֹדְנֵי בְגִלְגָל

1 Also some of the HEBREWS CROSSED the JORDAN into the LAND of GAD and GILEAD.

2 But as for SAUL, he was STILL in GILGAL.

Both Lines 1 and 2 have XP structure (SVO // S + עור + A). These two clauses are contrasting the whole proposition by juxtaposing two XP clauses.¹³³ This is a pragmatic implication which XP clauses can have.

(14) Num. 11:33

הַבָּשָׂר עֹדְנָה בֵּין שְׁנֵיהֶם טָרֵם יִכְרֹת
וְאַף יְהוָה חָרָה בָּעָם
וַיַּךְ יְהוָה בָּעָם מַכָּה רַבָּה מְאֹד

1 While the meat was STILL BETWEEN their TEETH, before it was CHEWED,

2 the ANGER of the Lord was KINDLED against the PEOPLE,

3 and the Lord STRUCK the PEOPLE with a VERY SEVERE PLAGUE.

Lines 1 (SP) has עור and provides a simultaneous circumstantial information for Line 2 (SVA). Lines 1 and 2 as a whole (XP structures) forms a setting for Line 3 (yiqtol: sequential verbal form¹³⁴).

We have seen in the three SP examples above that the inverted word order of עור demonstrates some pragmatic functions (circumstantiality and contrast of the whole proposition). This further supports that עור is considered as the main predicate in Biblical Hebrew, not an argument.

Finally in Biblical Hebrew there is no clause attested with the word order of fronted adjective followed by עור.

We may summarise our rather lengthy discussions in this section of methodology. Although Buth starts his essay by introducing allo-clauses and states the importance of analysing the difference in pragmatic functions (80), he does not seem to pursue it in his later discussion. Judg. 7:2-4 above is an example of it. Buth compares two clauses which are not actually allo-clauses. A more thorough analysis of allo-clauses of both Judg. 7:2 and 7:4 have further supported our hypothesis as follows.

¹³² Line 1 has the active referents "the men" and "there." "The men" has the lexical form for ambiguity resolution (See 5.3.2.1 "Ambiguity resolution" in pp. 89ff). Line 2 has the predicate-focus structure commenting on the affixed active referent "they."

¹³³ See 8.2.3 "Clause-Focus Parallel Construction" in pp. 184ff.

¹³⁴ See 1.2.4 "Sequential/non-sequential Verbal System" in pp. 32ff.

For Judg. 7:2

(4) Judg. 7:2 רב הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתְּךָ The people who are with you are (too) many.

1) The sequence P-S רב הָעָם is marked for commenting or unmarked for the most frequently used structure in a high topic-continuity text. P-S is the "underlying" word order, not S-P

2) The inverted word order S-P רב הָעָם shows a different pragmatic function: provision of background information. This clause-focus structure will be discussed in full detail in the following chapter 7.

For Judg. 7:4

(5) Judg. 7:4 עוד הָעָם רב Still the people are (too) many.

1) The word עוד is the predicate of a clause, not an argument, in nominal clauses.¹³⁵

2) עוד is fronted for commenting (the predicate-focus structure).

3) When the subject precedes the predicate, namely, in the clause-focus structure, clauses demonstrate pragmatic functions other than commenting. They are circumstantiality, and contrast of the whole proposition.

In short, contrary to Buth's thesis, the analysis of allo-clauses demonstrate that P-S is the "underlying" structure and S-P shows other pragmatic functions than commenting.

5.7.6. Conclusion

I share some of Buth's methods and value his contributions to the study of Biblical Hebrew word order, however, his presupposition that S-P is the unmarked order is questionable. The significance of P-S clauses indicated by Andersen's classification, Muraoka's description and Niccacci's predicative, should be fully considered. In order to capture the difference of pragmatic functions appropriately, we must say that the thorough analysis of allo-clauses is essential.

5.8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION OF "PREDICATE-FOCUS STRUCTURE"

We have analysed the information structure of clauses with fronted predicates, such as:

- | | | | |
|----------------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (1) Exod. 33:3 | | עם-קשה-עַרְף אַתָּה | you are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE |
| (2) Lev. 13:51 | a | צִרְעָת מַמְאֵרִת הַנִּגַּע | the mark is a leprous MALIGNANCY, |
| | b | טִמְאָה הִיא | it is UNCLEAN. |
| (3) Gen. 15:5 | | וַיֹּאמֶר | and he SAID, |
| (4) Gen. 31:21 | | וַיִּבְרַח הוּא וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ | So he FLED with ALL that he HAD |
| (5) Gen. 15:2 | | וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם | And Abram SAID, |

¹³⁵ The usage is different in verbal clauses.

- (6) Gen. 14:22 וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם אֶל־מֶלֶךְ סֹדֹם And Abram SAID to the KING of SODOM.
- (7) Gen. 39:1 וַיִּקְנֶהוּ פוֹטִיפָר סֵרִיס פַּרְעֹה Potiphar, one of Pharaoh's officials, BOUGHT him
- (8) Judg. 10:1 וַיָּקָם אַחֲרָי אַבִּימֶלֶךְ לְהוֹשִׁיעַ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל
תּוֹלַע בֶּן־פוּאָה בֶּן־דּוֹדוֹ אִישׁ יִשָּׁשְׂכָר
- After the time of Abimelech
 a man of Issachar, Tola son of Puah, the son of Dodo, ROSE to SAVE ISRAEL.
- (9) Gen. 43:7 הֲיֵשׁ לָכֶם אָח 'Do you have another brother?'
- (10) Num. 11:27 וַיָּרַץ הַנַּעַר וַיִּגֵּד לְמֹשֶׁה So a young man RAN and TOLD MOSES.

We have started our analysis in this chapter with a modest purpose to verify that the function of these clauses with fronted predicates is commenting, which will in turn support our theses that these clauses have the predicate-focus structure and that the clause-initial position is marked for focus. We have successfully verified this function within our data and therefore we have supported our theses though partially.

At the same time, however, we have faced more complex linguistic phenomena in this topic-comment relationship, such as, topic acceptability scale, the use of lexical form in place of proform, divided predicate domain, anchoring and the three ways to introduce brand-new referents.

In this conclusion, we shall attempt to view these issues and functions from a few specific perspectives, instead of simply summarising them in a list form. Although these phenomena appear complex, most of them seem to have developed from a few principles. They are activation cost (Chafe), anaphoric grounding (Givón), and the clause-second position for active structures (Givón).

Principle 1: the preference of low cognitive effort

We have observed that the cognitive cost paid to activate a referent may differ according to the activation state of the referent. The higher the activation state of the referent becomes, the lower the cognitive cost for activation becomes. This principle results in *the preference for active or accessible referents as the topic* (see above examples, #1-6: § 5.3.1). The writer is aware that clauses are more acceptable when the topic is higher in activation scale in the consciousness of the reader (active > accessible > inactive > brand-new: § 5.2). It follows that brand-new referents are best introduced prior to his utterance 1) in existential clauses (#9); 2) in comments of clauses; or 3) as the topics of Clause-Focus Structure (5.5). This prior introduction of a brand-new referent will make the utterance low cost in terms of cognitive effort for processing. However, probably for the sake of narrative flow, if the writer needs to make a brand-new referent as the topic of Predicate-Focus Structure which is not preferable due to its high cognitive cost, he links the referent to another for easier identification (*anchoring* #7-8: § 5.4.3). All of these structurings are results of the preference for low cognitive effort or more simply, for easier communication processes.

Principle 2: the clause-second position for active structures

The second principle is concerned with the clause-second position. The clause-second position, including the verbal affixation (#3) and suffixed objects (#7), is often used to link to an activated structure in the preceding context, either it is a person or an episode.

In most of the cases, this clause-second position is occupied by active topic referents (# 1-6). This is the preferred pattern.

This second principle is also demonstrated when a brand-new referent is introduced as the topic of a clause, which is not a preferable way (#7-8). In such a case, the writer not only uses anchoring (#7: 'one of Pharaoh's official'; #8 'the son of Dodo'), but often places active referents in the clause-second position in order to link the clause to the preceding referents and events (anaphoric grounding. 3ms direct object in #7, אֲבִימֶלֶךְ in #8: § 5.4.3).

Another manifestation is "divided predicate domain." If the clause becomes long, the writer breaks the clause into two and places active referents in the clause-second position for better narrative flow (PxX *divided predicate domain* #6: § 5.3.5).

These three points confirm a strong tendency for Biblical Hebrew to have an active structure in the clause-second position for anaphoric grounding in the topic-comment clauses (i.e., the predicate-focus structure).

Principle 3: anaphoric grounding

The third principle is anaphoric grounding. We may view some of the phenomena in this chapter as devices of anaphoric grounding. For example, the preference for active referents (#1-6) means that the writer prefers to link his utterance to the preceding active referents and events. If he needs to introduce a brand-new referent (#7-8), the writer attempts to link the clause to the preceding context by placing the active structures in the clause-second position.

These three factors, the preference for low cognitive effort, the clause-second position for active structures and anaphoric grounding, seem to be the underlying principles which affect information structuring of topic-comment clauses: the predicate-focus structure.

Below are other issues discussed in this chapter which are not directly related to the three principles above.

1) Lexical and proform

When the lexical form is chosen as the topic expression in place of the proform, there seem to be reasons. They are 1) to resolve ambiguity (ambiguity resolution), 2) to narrow down the topic, 3) literary rephrasing, 4) to announce theme (thematising) and 5) to keep the major protagonist central and focused (participant reference resources) (5.3.2). In verbal clauses, pronouns are redundant. Specification of accompaniment and emphasis are some of the purposes of this redundancy (p. 87).

2) Indefinite שִׁי

An indefinite שִׁי as the topic is not anchored, because it does not need to be identified (5.4.4).

3) The predicate-focus structure is marked for commenting. We may say it is unmarked as far as we understand that it indicates the most frequently used structure in a high topic-continuity texts.

Finally, this whole chapter on the predicate-focus structure may be expressed most briefly:

The predicate-focus structure has the fronted predicate for focus and its function is commenting. The clause-second position is in most cases occupied by an active or accessible structure (primarily the topic) for anaphoric grounding: Px.

6. ARGUMENT-FOCUS STRUCTURE

6.1. INTRODUCTION

We have analysed the first of the three types of clauses which has P-X sequence in the preceding chapter. Clauses we shall analyse in this chapter have the inverted sequence of X-P.

Since this type of clause has the same sequence as XP Clause-Focus Structure, and also the number of these clauses is not large compared to that of the clause-focus structure, this identificational clause has in the past not received the attention it deserves. Even scholars who recognise this function do not treat it as an independent clause type. As we have seen in the Introduction, Andersen's definition of his identification is far from its functional reality. Muraoka has correctly defined this function of identification. However, he does not distinguish this clause type from the rest of S-P clauses. As a result, he observes two functions within this XP sequence. Niccacci recognises this clause type, but classifies the type under his "predicative" naming it "marked predicative" clauses. Even the latest linguistic works in Hebrew contained in *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew* (1999) do not pay much attention to this phenomenon, except for a few cursory remarks. For example, K. Lowery follows Andersen's logical definition: "When both subject and predicate are substantives, the clause expresses *identity*" (1999, 254). E. van Wolde rightly criticises Andersen's logical definition of identification and proposes to bring a functional approach to this field following Givón. However, since she only utilises "given-new" and "the scale of definiteness" as the two main axes of his analysis, he does not recognise this particular clause type of identification (1999, 329ff). R. Buth recognises this function, but does not classify it as a distinct clause type and treats it as a subcategory of his "Focus" (1999, 81). W. Gross (1996) and C. van der Merwe (1999) share the notion with Buth.

Another feature in the past study of identificational clauses is that scholars tend to define this clause type by grammatical terms, such as, the statement of Lowery above. Muraoka similarly comments that "when the subject is a pron. dem., S-P can only signify identification" (10). It is an advance that van Wolde introduces "new-given" and "the scale of definiteness" to this field,¹³⁶ and that Buth pays attention to an aspect of focus for recognising identification. What we need for the study of this particular clause type is a functional approach accompanied with an integrated information-structure perspective which considers "given-new," "the scale of definiteness" and "focus."

¹³⁶ However, if the scale of definiteness depends on grammatical categories, it will again face the difficulties as Andersen's scale of definiteness did.

6.1.1. Focus structure

From our perspective, this type of clause has a distinct focus structure which is clearly different from other two types. Namely, only the argument is focused by fronting and probably also by pitch prominence, while the predicate is not focused because it is presupposed (given) between the interlocutors: Xp. The fronted argument is also "old" or "given," yet it is focused because it represents new information or assertion which connects two pieces of given information (i.e., the argument and the proposition). Compare this X-p with P-x of the predicate-focus structure and X-P of the clause-focus structure. Capitals mark focus by fronting and pitch prominence.¹³⁷

6.1.2. Function

The function of this focus structure is also distinct. It is identification. Identification relates or identifies a referent with a missing argument of the proposition (see Introduction under "Muraoka"). A typical one is "MIKE broke the window" as the answer to a question "who broke the window?" In this sentence, Mike is related or identified with the missing argument X in the presupposed proposition "X broke the window." This proposition is not focused (low pitch). However, Mike is focused by high pitch.

We have seen examples in the previous chapters:

Judg. 1:1	מִי יַעֲלֶה-לָנוּ	1 "Who will be the first to go up . . . ?"
	יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה	2 "JUDAH is to go."

Here Line 2 identifies "Judah" with X in the presupposed proposition of which the argument is missing: "X will be the first to go up."

Judg. 6:29	מִי עָשָׂה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה	"Who did this?"
	גִּדְעוֹן בֶּן-יֹאשׁ עָשָׂה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה	"GIDEON son of JOASH did it."

Similarly Judge. 6:29 relates Gideon with the missing argument of the presupposed proposition: "X did it." In these examples, the arguments are focused (fronted and high-pitched) and the presupposed elements are not. Thus Xp Argument-Focus Structure.

We must be reminded again that prepositional phrases and adverbs are also considered as arguments in our theory. We have seen an example,

Judg. 15:10	לָמָּה עָלִיתֶם עָלֵינוּ	1 "Why have you come up against us?"
	לְאַסֹּר אֶת-שַׁמְשׁוֹן עָלֵינוּ	2 "We have come up to BIND SAMSON . . ."

In Line 2, "come up" is presupposed and therefore not focused, while the prepositional phrase is fronted for focus. Line 2 identifies it with the missing argument of the presupposed proposition: "you come up to do X." Contrast is intended and becomes evident by the context.¹³⁸ Probably R. Buth, W. Gross and C. van der Merwe would not interpret this clause as identificational but simply as "Focus." However, if we do not take into

¹³⁷ See 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew" in p. 61.

¹³⁸ See 4 "Contrast, Emphasis and Focus" in pp. 66ff.

consideration the fact that "come up" is presupposed and not focused, we would not fully understand the information structure of this clause.

Let us look at some other examples within our data. The first one is #12 Exod. 16:15:

וַיֵּרְאוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־אָחִיו מִן הוּא
כִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ מַה־הוּא וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֲלֵהֶם
הוּא הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה לָכֶם לֶאֱכֹלָה

1 When the sons of Israel saw it, they said to one another, "What is it?"

2 For they did not know what it was. And Moses said to them,

3 "THAT is the bread which the Lord has GIVEN YOU to eat." [Shimasaki]

Here in Line 3, I propose that הוּא is focused while הַלֶּחֶם is not, because the bread which the Lord was going to give is repeatedly mentioned and thus activated in 16:4, 8 and 12. See v. 8 in particular where Moses specifically told the Israelites that

בַּתַּת יְהוָה לָכֶם בְּעֶרְבַּ בָּשָׂר לֶאֱכֹל
וּלְחֶם בַּבֶּקֶר לִשְׂבֹּעַ

when the Lord gives you meat to eat in the evening,

and bread to the full in the morning,

Moses relates הוּא, the thin flakes, with the bread which Moses mentioned to the Israelites in v. 8. הוּא is fronted for focus to be identified with X of "X is the bread which the Lord has given you to eat." The presupposed element הַלֶּחֶם is not focused. Thus Argument-Focus Structure. Notice here that הַלֶּחֶם is anchored¹³⁹ to the אֲשֶׁר clause¹⁴⁰ for reactivation¹⁴¹ (reminder) which has the predicate-focus structure. Within this subordinate clause, the fronted predicate נָתַן is focused by fronting and pitch prominence, and the latter predicate לֶאֱכֹלָה may also be focused by middle or high pitch. The active referent in lexical form (reactivation) יְהוָה probably has middle pitch.¹⁴²

We have observed some distinct features of this clause type: its focus structure and function. In the following sections, we shall see examples in which the clauses of this type are used in inter-clausal and text-unit levels.

Below are other examples.

From nominal clauses¹⁴³

¹³⁹ See 5.4.3 in p. 106 for anchoring.

¹⁴⁰ H. Parunak analyses אֲשֶׁר clauses from a text-linguistic perspective. Since his study does not deal with our question directly, he comments "that the relative construction put the modifier in focus" (107). By focus he means "a mechanism for drawing the reader's attention to a subject and insisting, "This is important. Pay attention" (1996, 107, n. 10).

¹⁴¹ See p. 44 for reactivation.

¹⁴² See p. 90 for "Middle pitch." Again this inference is from the principles of the clause-second position for the active structures. See the previous chapter for this principle, 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew" in pp. 61ff and 5.3.5 "Divided Predicate Domain" in pp. 103ff.

¹⁴³ #21 Gen. 27:24 and #21 Gen. 27:21 may have Clause-Focus Structure.

הוּא and הוּא: #19 Gen. 24:65 (my master, as an answer to "who" question), #3 Gen. 36:24 (Anah),¹⁴⁴ #12 Gen. 41:28 (the interpretation of the dream),¹⁴⁵ #18 Gen. 42:14 (being spies, cf. v. 12), #3 Exod. 6:26 (Aaron and Moses), #11 Exod. 12:42 (the vigil night), #3 Num. 26:9 (Dathan and Abiram), #12 Deut. 18:22 (הוּא in v. 22 is X of "X is the word which the Lord has not spoken in v. 21)

אֲנִי: #20 Num. 18:20 אֲנִי הִלְקֵךְ I am your portion.

הֵם: #17 Exod. 6:27¹⁴⁶ הֵם הַמְדַבְּרִים אֶל-פַּרְעֹה THEY were the ones who spoke to Pharaoh

הַמַּיִם: #8 Num. 20:13¹⁴⁷ הַמַּיִם מִי מֵרִיבָה THOSE were the waters of Meribah,

From verbal clauses

Fronted adverb: Gen. 39:9 (וְאֵיךְ interrogative), Gen. 43:16 (אֲתִי), Gen. 32:20 (כִּי־בָרַךְ הַיְהוָה); Fronted object (response): Gen. 37:16.

From Deuteronomy Deut. 5:3 (אֲתִינוּ)

6.2. WITH CONTRASTIVE MEMBERS

Argument-Focus Structure is often used to contrast arguments. For example, 1Sam. 8:7:

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל-שְׁמוּאֵל
שָׁמַע בְּקוֹל הָעָם לְכָל אֲשֶׁר-יֹאמְרוּ אֵלַיךְ
כִּי לֹא אֶתָּךְ מֵאֲסוּ
כִּי-אֲתִי מֵאֲסוּ מִמֶּלֶךְ עָלֵיהֶם

And the Lord said to Samuel,

1 "Listen to the voice of the people in regard to all that they say to you,

2 for they have NOT rejected YOU,

3 but they have rejected Me from being king over them.

Muraoka sees that לֹא אֶתָּךְ is fronted for contrast in this clause. To describe it more accurately, this phrase is fronted not for contrast but for identification. The proposition "they rejected X" is presupposed. Line 2 identifies "not you" with the X of the presupposed

¹⁴⁴ The אֲשֶׁר clause reminds the reader who Anah was (reactivation). This may have Clause-Focus Structure.

¹⁴⁵ Joseph identifies his interpretation (vv. 25-27) with the God's revelation he mentioned in v. 16.

¹⁴⁶ In Ex. 6:13 the Lord commanded Moses and Aaron to bring the Israelites out of Egypt. Then follows the family tree. This is the closing verse of the text-unit concerning the family background of Moses and Aaron.

¹⁴⁷ הַמַּיִם is anaphoric referring to the water which Moses brought out at Kadesh (vv. 1-13). The term, מֵי מֵרִיבָה the waters of Meribah, does not appear in the text-unit. However the sender seems to share with the receiver the common knowledge of the waters of Meribah, that the sender simply reidentifies the incident with the term.

proposition. Contrast becomes evident only from the context: "you" against "me."¹⁴⁸ Lines 2 and 3 form Argument Focus Parallel Construction.¹⁴⁹

An adverbial phrase may function as an argument in Argument-Focus Structure. Gen. 29:25

הֲלֹא בְּרַחֵל עָבַדְתִּי עִמּוֹךְ Was it NOT for RACHEL that I served with you?
Gen. 31:6 (not half-heartedly)

וְיָדַעְתָּן כִּי בְּכָל-כֹּחִי עָבַדְתִּי אֶח-אָבִיכֶן

"And you know that I have served your father with ALL MY STRENGTH.

These identificational examples show contrast by explicit (Leah in 29:25) or implicit (not half-heartedly) contrastive members.¹⁵⁰ The latter, the implicit contrast, seems to be used to express emphasis.¹⁵¹

Below are other examples

From nominal clauses

#29 Ptc Gen. 31:50 (אֵלֹהִים "X is with us to be witness" is presupposed. Contrasted with "man")

From verbal clauses

Judg. 13:22 (אֵלֹהִים רָאִינוּ we have seen God) Fronted subject: Judg. 7:2 ([not the Lord but] my own power), Judg. 8:23 (with contrastive members), Judg. 9:54 (not a man, but a woman. "Someone killed him" is presupposed and thus not focused.), Gen. 41:16, 1Sam. 14:45. Fronted object: Deut. 24:6 (nothing but life, emphasis may be detected), Judg. 9:36 (not men, but the shadow אַתָּה זֶלְהָרִים "you are seeing" is presupposed), Judg. 14:3 (nobody else but her); for Judg. 13:22 see p. 133. Fronted adverb: Gen. 34:31 (הַכּוֹזֵנָה <usual woman>), Gen. 42:9 (לְרֹאֵת <to pasture>), Gen. 43:9 (אֲנִי כִי <nobody else>), Gen. 45:5 (לֹא-תִהְיֶה <not to destroy>), Deut. 24:15 (וְאֵלֶּיךָ <nothing else>), Judg. 4:9 (בְּיַד-אַשָּׁרָה <Barak>), Judg. 9:15 (בְּאֵמֶת <falsely>), Judg. 14:15 (הַלֵּלְךָ לְשִׂנְיָהּ <for joy>), Judg. 20:28 (בְּיָמֵינוּ <v. 23>), 1Sam. 2:34 (בְּיָמֵינוּ <not on different days>).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 5:4 (not from distance, but face to face), Deut. 5:15 (not a free man but a slave), Deut. 5:27 (not God but you), Deut. 7:6 (you < out of all the peoples), Deut. 7:21 (not a weak god, but awesome Lord your God), Deut. 8:7 (nobody else but the Lord),¹⁵² Deut. 8:18 (< my power in v. 17), Deut. 9:6 (not because of your righteousness), Deut. 10:19 (you are not alien now but you were before), Deut. 11:2 (not with your sons but to you. see v. 7), Deut. 11:7 (עֵינֵינוּ כֹּהֵם "X has seen all the great work" is presupposed. Contrastive with v. 2, "not your sons").

¹⁴⁸ See also 4.2 "Contrast" in p. 66.

¹⁴⁹ See 8.2.2 "Argument-Focus Parallel Construction" pp. 184ff.

¹⁵⁰ See 4.2.4 "Implicit Contrast" in p. 71.

¹⁵¹ See 4.2.4 "Implicit Contrast" p. 71.

¹⁵² This can be the clause-focus structure (exclamatory/proclamatory).

6.3. CLOSING FORMULA

Let us now turn to a formula which is frequently used in Biblical Hebrew. This formula consists of a demonstrative pronoun followed by a noun phrase. This pronoun is used anaphorically,¹⁵³ and this formula has the Argument-Focus Structure. For example, #9 Gen. 36:17:

וְאֵלֶּה בְּנֵי רְעוּאֵל
בֶּן־עֵשָׂו אֱלוֹף נַחַת אֱלוֹף זֶרַח אֱלוֹף שַׁמָּה אֱלוֹף מִיִּזָּח
אֵלֶּה אֱלוֹפֵי רְעוּאֵל בְּאֶרֶץ אֱדוֹם

1 And THESE are the SONS of REUEL,

2 Esau's son: chief Nahath, chief Zerah, chief Shammah, chief Mizzah.

3 THESE are the chiefs descended from Reuel in the land of Edom;

Line 1: A text unit of a list starts with an introductory clause which consists of a demonstrative pronoun followed by a general category. This pronoun is cataphoric, namely, it refers to items following. This function and its information structure will be discussed in "Introductory Formula" in the following chapter.

Line 2: items of the list follow.

Line 3: the clause has the anaphoric אֵלֶּה which refers to the items preceding and therefore the subject אֵלֶּה is an active referent. The predicate אֱלוֹפֵי רְעוּאֵל is the same active referent used in Line 1. Namely both the subject and the predicate are active and presupposed. The function of the closing formula is to identify אֵלֶּה with X of the presupposed proposition "X are the chiefs descended from Reuel." אֵלֶּה is focused, while אֱלוֹפֵי רְעוּאֵל is not. This is Argument-Focus Structure.

Numerous lists in the Pentateuch have the structure represented in the clause above. Let us call the structure and function of the first clause "introductory formula" and the latter "closing formula."

I posit here that the introductory formula with a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun has Clause-Focus Structure, and the closing formula with an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun has Argument-Focus Structure.

This understanding may be exemplified in Shinkaiyaku, a modern Japanese translation. After the list of names of the descendants of Ham, Gen. 10:20 reads:

אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי־הֶם לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם לְשָׁנָתָם בְּאֶרְצוֹתָם בְּגוֹיֵיהֶם

THESE are the sons of Ham, according to their families, according to their languages, by their lands, by their nations.

Shinkaiyaku translates:

IJO ga . . . Hamuno shison de aru.

(ABOVE, focus-marker ga, . . . the descendants of Ham)

This translation represents identificational Argument-Focus Structure.

¹⁵³ See "Anaphoric grounding" in p. 89.

Muraoka comments on S-P clauses with a demonstrative pronoun that "when the subject is a pron. dem., S-P can only signify identification" (10). His rule may be applied to clauses in this section. I agree with Muraoka that S-P clauses with a demonstrative pronoun in this section (Line 3 of Gen. 36:17 above, for example) are identificational. However, I will argue in the following chapter that the introductory formula with a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun (Line 1 of Gen. 36:17 above, for example) may not be identificational, because they are not relating two active referents, but rather, introducing new referents. Introductory Formula has a different focus structure from Closing Formula, although the grammatical constructions are identical. This distinction can be observed only through the information-structure analysis.

Let us examine two more examples.

Deut. 5:22:

אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־כָּל־קְהֵלְכֶם

"THESE WORDS the Lord spoke to all your assembly.

"The Lord spoke X to all your assembly" is presupposed. The anaphoric

"הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה"¹⁵⁴ is identified with X. This verse closes the Decalogue in Deut. chapter 5.

Num. 7:12

At the dedication of the tabernacle, each leader of the 12 tribes brought his offering. The list starts with the day and the name of the leader as in Num. 7:12:

וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם הַפְּקֻדִים בַּיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן אֶת־קָרְבָּנוֹ
נַחֲשׁוֹן בֶּן־עַמִּינָדָב לְמִטֵּה יְהוּדָה

Now the one who presented his offering on the first day

was Nahshon the son of Amminadab, of the tribe of Judah;

Then comes a list of items presented, such as silver utensils and animals. This section of Nahshon ends with a clause, Num. 7:17:

זֶה קָרְבַּן נַחֲשׁוֹן בֶּן־עַמִּינָדָב

THIS was the offering of Nahshon the son of Amminadab.

זֶה refers to the items offered which are described in the immediately preceding text (anaphoric use). This clause relates זֶה, that refers to the items offered, with X of the activated proposition: "X was the offering of Nahshon." Thus this is identification of Argument-Focus Structure. The same structure is repeated for the twelve tribe leaders in #8

¹⁵⁴ The referent refers to the immediately preceding Decalogue. M. Weinfeld (1991, 323), E. Merrill (1994, 158) and J. Tigay (1996, 72) put this v. 22 as the beginning of the text-unit (vv. 22-33). However, Christensen place at the end of the Decalogue as the closure:

This verse functions as a summary conclusion to the "ten words" and as a bridge to what follows. (1991, 125)

Our observation of this formula seems to support Christensen. P. Craigie (1976, 165) has a similar understanding with Christensen.

Num. 7:17, Num. 7:23, Num. 7:29, Num. 7:35, Num. 7:41, Num. 7:47, Num. 7:53, Num. 7:59, Num. 7:65, Num. 7:71, Num. 7:77, Num. 7:83.

What we have observed is not insignificant, since numerous lists are summarised and closed with this particular formula (see below). The information-structure analysis with the aspect of focus structure has enabled us to recognise the distinct function of this clause type.

Other examples of Closing Formula:

With וְאֵלֶּיךָ (the number in the parenthesis indicates the verse number of its corresponding introductory formula): #16 Gen. 9:17 (12), #8 Lev. 7:35, #12 Lev. 7:37, #15 Lev. 11:46 (2), #15 Lev. 12:7, #15 Lev. 13:59, #18 Lev. 14:32 (2), #11 Lev. 14:54, #13 Lev. 14:57, #16 Lev. 15:32, #9 Num. 4:28 (24), #9 Num. 4:33 (31), #16 Num. 5:29, #16 Num. 6:21, #15 Num. 7:88, #12 Num. 34:13 (2), #12 Deut. 34:4, #26 Num. 28:14 (Sd-Pind).¹⁵⁵

With וְאֵלֶּיךָ (unless specified, these clauses have their corresponding introductory formula): #6 Gen. 9:19, #9 Gen. 10:20, #6 Gen. 10:29, #9 Gen. 10:31, #9 Gen. 10:32, #6 Gen. 25:4, #5 Gen. 25:16, #8 Gen. 35:26, #8 Gen. 36:5, #8 Gen. 36:12, #9 Gen. 36:16, #8 Gen. 36:17, #15 Gen. 36:21, #15 Gen. 36:30, #9 Gen. 36:43, #4 Gen. 36:16, #4 Gen. 36:19, #8 Gen. 46:15 (without introductory formula), #8 Gen. 46:18 (without introductory formula), #8 Gen. 46:22 (without introductory formula), #8 Gen. 46:25 (without introductory formula), #4 Exod. 6:15, #15 Exod. 6:19, #13 Exod. 6:24, #15 Exod. 6:25, #12 Exod. 19:6, #11 Lev. 11:31, #8 Lev. 23:37, #12 Lev. 26:46, #12 Lev. 27:34, #13 Num. 1:16, #12 Num. 1:44, #8 Num. 3:3, #14 Num. 3:21, #14 Num. 3:27, #5 Num. 3:33, #9 Num. 4:15, #16 Num. 4:37, #8 Num. 4:41, #8 Num. 4:45, #9 Num. 10:28, #16 Num. 13:16, #13 Num. 26:7, #9 Num. 26:37, #8 Num. 26:63, #12 Num. 30:17, #18 Num. 34:29, #12 Num. 36:13, #12 Deut. 4:45 (dubious, it can be the introductory formula with Clause-Focus Structure).

6.4. SUMMARY OF "ARGUMENT-FOCUS STRUCTURE"

The clauses we have analysed are smaller in number than other types of clauses and have not been recognised as an independent clause type. Nevertheless, we have discovered its distinct features in focus structure and in function.

In those clauses the non-predicate elements are fronted, and the predicates follow: X-P. The predicate here presents a presupposed or active proposition between the interlocutors. I have posited that the fronted argument is focused by fronting and by pitch prominence and the predicate is not focused: X-p.

The function of these clauses is identification, which relates the fronted argument with the missing argument of the presupposed proposition. Such as

Judg. 1:1	(מִי יַעֲלֶה-לָנוּ)	Who will be the first to go up . . .?)
	יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה	JUDAH is to go.

¹⁵⁵ Shinkaiyaku, a Japanese modern translation, marks the subjects of some of these clauses as focused by the focus marker *ga*. They are Lev. 11:46, #15 Lev. 12:7, #15 Lev. 13:59, #16 Lev. 15:32, #9 Num. 4:33, #16 Num. 5:29, #16 Num. 6:21, #15 Num. 7:88, #12 Num. 34:13, #12 Deut. 34:4. It appears that there is room for further study of this Focus Structure for more systematic employment of *ga*.

Here, the clause relates the argument (Judah) with X (the missing argument) of a proposition "X should go" which is presupposed between the interlocutors.

This Argument-Focus Structure is not only used in an answer which responds to the question which asks to identify the argument such as above, but also

1) to contrast arguments (6.2):

Gen. 29:25 הלא ברחל עבדתי עמך

Was it NOT for RACHEL that I served with you?

Gen. 31:6 (not half-heartedly)¹⁵⁶

ואתנה ידעתי כי בכל-כחי עבדתי את-אביך

"And you know that I have served your father with ALL MY STRENGTH.

2) and to close a list (Closing Formula 6.3):

Num. 7:17: זה קרבן נחשון בן-עמינדב

THIS was the offering of Nahshon the son of Amminadab.

Closing formula is of particular importance, since it appears to be an established device to close numerous lists in Biblical Hebrew.

¹⁵⁶ This implicit contrast may be used to express emphasis. See 4.3.4 "Emphasis by contrast" in p. 79.

7. CLAUSE-FOCUS STRUCTURE

7.1. INTRODUCTION

We have looked at the first and second focus structures in the preceding two chapters. This present chapter will consider the third and the last type, XP Clause-Focus Structure.

In verbal clauses, word-order inversion has been the object of extensive study among Hebraists in recent years and its pragmatic functions are well recognised.¹⁵⁷ Therefore the contents of this chapter are not unique in the treatment of verbal clauses except that we will classify those pragmatic functions according to three linguistic levels: information-level, inter-clausal level and text-unit (discourse) level. Although these distinctions are not absolute, they may resolve some terminological confusion.

This chapter, however, still hopes to contribute to the study of word order in two other respects. One is that it proposes the same framework for both nominal and verbal clauses and another is to offer a ground for multiple functions with a single focus structure.

First feature.

We have seen in Introduction that only a few have related these pragmatic functions to nominal clauses. Niccacci is one of those few. He observes similar functions between SP and XV. This chapter hopes to show that XV and SP share the same pragmatic functions. Namely, this whole chapter will demonstrate that XV in verbal clauses and SP in nominal clauses share the same pragmatic functions and constitute the single clause-focus structure of Biblical Hebrew.

Second feature.

The second possible contribution of this chapter is related to the reason for functional multiplicity of this focus structure. We have seen in Introduction that scholars have observed many pragmatic functions in a single type of verbal clause: the X-V sequence. Its diversity of implications and the number of technical terms attached to those implications strike us. Just to name a few, they include GKC's state, J-Muraoka's circumstantial clause, "at the very beginning of a statement," Muraoka's circumstantial clause, Lambdin's circumstantial use, explanatory or parenthetical use and initial use, circumstantial clause of *SBH* (Andersen), episode-initial, topic-shifting, Khan's marking of span boundaries, Niccacci's anteriority, simultaneity and circumstantial clause, and D-Gibson's marking off-line remarks and circumstantial clause. Though their observations and description of these pragmatic functions may be valid, no one has offered a possible reason for this phenomenon of great functional multiplicity for a single clause type. This chapter hopes to offer a possible reason for it.

¹⁵⁷ See 1.2 "Past Studies of Verbal clause word order" in pp. 27ff for detail.

7.1.1. Focus structure

First, we shall consider the focus structure of the clauses we are going to deal with.

The XP clause-focus structure may be easily distinguished from other two focus structures by the receiver. The fronted argument of Clause-Focus Structure announces its difference from Px of the predicate-focus structure (XP is different from Px). The focused predicate of Clause-Focus Structure announces its difference from the non-focused predicate of Argument-Focus Structure (XP is different from Xp). For native speakers there would have been minimum ambiguity, if any, between these three structures, just as there is none in English or other languages.

In English, only the argument is focused and high-pitched in Argument-Focus Structure. In Clause-Focus Structure, both the predicate and the argument are focused and high-pitched. English uses only pitch prominence to indicate focus:

Predicate-Focus Structure	John is my FRIEND.
Argument-Focus Structure	JOHN is my friend.
Clause-Focus Structure	JOHN is my FRIEND.

Even Japanese, which expresses focus by particles, uses pitch to distinguish Clause-Focus Structure from Argument-Focus Structure.¹⁵⁸ We may therefore infer that Biblical Hebrew also had high pitch on focused elements.¹⁵⁹ If this were the case, it would not have been difficult for native speakers of Biblical Hebrew to distinguish the two different focus structures in the clauses below when they heard them, because of the pitch prominence or its lack on the second elements:

- (1) יהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה
 (2) יהוּדָה יַעֲמֹד

(1) has pitch prominence on יהוּדָה, but not on יַעֲלֶה (Xv) while (2) has pitch prominence both on יהוּדָה and on יַעֲמֹד (XV). However, we cannot verify it due to the lack of the native speaker of the ancient Hebrew, and therefore, we need to recover the prominence or its lack from the textual context.

The context of (1) is:

Judg. 1:1	מִי יַעֲלֶה-לָנוּ	1 "Who will be the first to go up . . . ?"
	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה	2 The Lord answered, "JUDAH is to go."

Here, the proposition "X goes up" is presupposed, and therefore "יַעֲלֶה" is to go" is not focused, while יהוּדָה is focused because it is the argument identified with X. Thus Xv Argument-Focus Structure.

In (2), Josh. 18:5:

¹⁵⁸ See 3.3 "In other languages" in pp. 55ff.

¹⁵⁹ See 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew" in pp. 61ff for detail.

וְהִתְחַלְקוּ אֹתָהּ לְשִׁבְעָה חֲלָקִים
 יְהוּדָה יַעֲמֹד עַל-גְּבוּלָהּ מִנֶּגֶב
 וּבֵית יוֹסֵף יַעֲמֹדוּ עַל-גְּבוּלָם מִצְפּוֹן

1 And they shall divide it into seven portions;

2 JUDAH shall stay in its TERRITORY on the SOUTH,

3 and the house of JOSEPH shall stay in their TERRITORY on the NORTH.¹⁶⁰

In Line 2 and 3, the subjects are יְהוּדָה and בֵּית יוֹסֵף, and the predicates are "stay on the south" and "stay on the north." Line 2 and 3 form a clause-focus parallel construction where each clause has a fresh new start (independent or non-sequential to one another). This will be discussed in detail in the following chapter. I propose here that the subjects are focused by fronting and by high pitch and the predicates are focused by high pitch.

We need to admit that recovering high pitch or low pitch from the context cannot be freed from subjectivity completely. Nevertheless, the information-structure analysis (particularly active or non-active, here) incorporated with analysis of literary features (such as parallel construction), pragmatics (such as question-answer) and discourse analysis (such as onset functions) will enable us to distinguish Argument-Focus Structure from Clause-Focus Structure with considerable accuracy.¹⁶¹

To sum up, I propose that the clause-focus structure has the fronted argument which is focused by fronting and high pitch and the following predicate is also focused by high pitch. Both the argument and the predicate are focused: XP.

7.1.2. Function of Clause-Focus Structure

Let us now turn to the functions of this focus structure.

7.1.2.1. Marked for a high-cost cognitive effort

I propose to apply Chafe's "activation cost" to understand this structure and posit that in Biblical Hebrew the clause-focus structure is marked¹⁶² for the need of a high-cost cognitive effort, while the other two signal its absence (unmarked). This understanding may offer a possible reason for multiplicity of functions indicated by this clause type.

Clause-Focus Structure indicates that the receiver needs to make a high-cost cognitive effort to perceive some pragmatic implications or functions from the context other than commenting and identification.

Let us consider this point using an English example. A native English speaker can clearly distinguish the three focus structures below:

¹⁶⁰ See p. 47 for English End-Focus.

¹⁶¹ See 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew" in pp. 61ff for our understanding of the Massoretic accentual system.

¹⁶² in the sense of #1 of markedness. See 5.6.3 "Markedness" in pp. 116ff.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| (1) Predicate-Focus Structure | "John is my FRIEND,"
or "He is my FRIEND." |
| (2) Argument-Focus Structure | "JOHN is my friend," or "JOHN is." |
| (3) Clause-Focus Structure | "JOHN is my FRIEND."
(capitals are high-pitched) |

If uttered out of the blue, (1) and (2) do not make sense, because (1) and (2) presuppose that they are informationally dependent on the preceding information. However in (3), the receiver will attempt to understand the sentence, seeking some clues from the verbal or non-verbal context. The receiver may ask himself instantly, "Is the speaker going to give a talk on his friend called John?" "Is the speaker proclaiming it?" "Has the speaker been thinking of John and is it an out-burst?" In short, (3) expects the receiver to make a high-cost cognitive effort in order to identify the pragmatic implications or functions from the context that are not commenting or identification. If the receiver, then, hears the speaker continue that "he had a car accident yesterday," the receiver immediately understands that (3) was topicalising and initiating a new episode. The sentence (3) indicated a need of a high-cost cognitive effort which resulted in perceiving some pragmatic functions.

The process above may be schematised as follows:

- 1 Fronted Argument and Dual-foci (XP)
- 2 —> Expects high-cost cognitive effort (deviation from commenting)
- 3 —> Results in perceiving its contextual implications or pragmatic functions

Figure 3: High-cost cognitive effort and Implications

7.1.2.2. Marked for other pragmatic functions

To put it more plainly, the clause-focus structure is marked for pragmatic implications or functions other than commenting and identification. This understanding is particularly important, because it gives a reason why scholars observed a wide range of functions under one category.

Status of the clause-initial position

This interpretation of the clause-focus structure needs further elaboration in reference to the prominence of the clause-initial position. One may ask if the fronted element of the clause-focus structure signifies more prominence than the rest of the clause. The answer is no, while that of other two focus structures does mean that it is more prominent.

Muraoka and Niccacci point out that not all the fronted elements are emphatic in XP clauses. Muraoka (1985) observes non-emphatic S in some of SV clauses.¹⁶³ He also

¹⁶³ They are "avoidance of the waw consecutive" (which includes circumstantial clauses), 'is being subject, God being subject, and chiasmus (34-36).

observes non-emphatic objects in some of OV clauses.¹⁶⁴ Niccacci similarly comments on his S-P (or X-P) presentative clauses:

No emphasis falls on the first element of the presentative sentence simply because the sentence is not predicative, i.e., there is no predicative nexus in it between (grammatical) subject and (grammatical) predicate. (220)

According to Niccacci, in predicative clauses (P-S and V-X), a certain importance falls on the first element, however, it does not happen to the first element of presentative clauses. The function of the third type of clause is not predicating the subject, but it has a pragmatic function in addition to predicating the subject.

I agree with them that our clause-focus structure does not imply more emphasis or even more of informational prominence on the fronted element than the others. Unlike other two focus structures where the fronted elements have more informational prominence, the dual foci of the clause-focus structure are so marked to indicate deviation from other focus structures. Lambrecht also argues against the notion that the focus on the subject indicates that the subject is more informationally prominent. He claims that this "inversion" (320) is necessary because otherwise "it would necessarily result in predicate-focus construal of the proposition" (321). In order to indicate other pragmatic implications or functions, the dual foci are needed.

In circumstantial clauses

One may further question the status the clause-initial position in circumstantial clauses. The fronted argument of a circumstantial clause does not seem to be focused. For example, #1 Gen. 14:7:

וַיָּשׁוּבוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶל-עֵין מִשְׁפַּט הוּא קָדֵשׁ וַיִּכְּפוּ

Then they turned BACK and came to EN-MISHPAT (that is KADESH), and CONQUERED. In English the pitch of "that" in (that is Kadesh) may not be as high as Kadesh, however, it is not as low as "It" in a sentence "It is Kadesh." Besides, in order to indicate that it is parenthetical, English translations sometimes put it in parenthesis or to put commas. Namely, English has some means to indicate the pragmatic implication of parenthetical "that is Kadesh." Hebrew, I propose, indicates this parenthetical pragmatic implication by the clause-focus structure: the whole clause is focused. The pitch on the argument may not be as high as the predicate, however, I infer that it is still higher than non-focused הוּא in the predicate-focus structure, such as הוּא in "טָמֵא הוּא" it is UNCLEAN."¹⁶⁵ Above all, הוּא is focused by word order here.

The question raised is also related the definition of focus. Our focus does not mean intensification, emphasis or contrast.

¹⁶⁴ They are chiasmus, avoidance of waw consecutive, response to question, cognate object and peculiarity with the legal texts (39, 40).

¹⁶⁵ See 3.4.2 "Focus by pitch prominence in Hebrew" in pp. 61ff and "Middle pitch" in pp. 90ff.

In summary, even in circumstantial clauses, both the argument and the predicate are focused in order to indicate the need of a high-cost cognitive effort to look for some pragmatic implications from the context (other than commenting and identification).

7.1.2.3. Various implications of "independence"

The pragmatic functions or implications that scholars have observed in X-V verbal clauses may vary, however, they seem to have a character of "independence." This is probably because the clause-focus structure can be independent of the preceding information, while the other two structures are dependent on it.

Informational Independence

In the predicate-focus structure and the argument-focus structure, clauses are dependent on the old or presupposed information in the preceding context. They are the preferred active topic in Predicate-Focus Structure (P-x) and both the argument and the predicate in Argument-Focus Structure (X-p). However, in the clause-focus structure, a clause CAN have a brand-new referent or an inactive referent as the topic and at the same time it is not viewed as ill-formed (see the above English example: JOHN is my FRIEND).¹⁶⁶ This possible informational independence is indicated by Clause-Focus Structure which requires a high-cost cognitive effort.

Logical or Temporal Independence: Non-sequentiality

We will observe below in this chapter that clauses with Clause-Focus Structure are often logically or temporally independent of the preceding texts (non-sequential). For example, circumstantial clause and clauses with discourse functions (onset, background, peak and closure) stop the flow of a narrative and convey pragmatic implications which is beyond the propositional content of one clause. This non-sequentiality or logical and temporal independence is probably related to its possible informational independence. These implications are made possible by Clause-Focus Structure which requires a high-cost cognitive effort.

7.1.3. "Focus" of Functional Grammar

Before we start our examination of SP and XV clauses, it may be useful to compare our theory with Functional Grammar with special reference to "focus."

S. Dik, W. Gross and R. Buth distinguish the fronted "Focus" from the fronted "Topic" (or "Topic placement," "Contextualizing Constituent" or CC). They say only "Focus" is focused while "Topic" is not. I posit that both are focused in our theory.

Dik categorises languages into two types: prefield languages (SOV) postfield languages (VSO, including Hebrew). He gives the verb the central position and observes particular functions in the deviation from this normal pattern. One function of the fronting of non-verbal elements is highlighting:

¹⁶⁶ J. Pierrehumbert and J. Hirschberg relate high pitch with new information in English (1990). See specially 288-89.

The Principle of Pragmatic Highlighting

Constituents with special pragmatic functionality (New Topic, Given Topic, Completive Focus, Contrastive Focus) are preferably placed in "special positions", including, at least, the clause-initial position. (1989, 343)

He comments further on the difference between "Focus" and "Topic placement":

The most common "extra-position" is the position immediately before the Verb. Languages which have this position typically use it for Focus constituents, while using P1 [clause-initial-position] for Topic placement. Such languages have two special positions in the Prefield; constituents without special pragmatic function end up in the Postfield. (1989, 365)

Gross adopts Dik's framework, quotes this latter comment in his essay (1999) and argues that Hebrew can have "nonfocused" [non-emphatic] (40) preverbal elements, such as, event-reporting, episode-initial, explanatory circumstantial clause, background information, authorial commentaries, narrative recourse and supplement information (1999, 40-45). Namely some non-verbal elements are fronted not for "Focus" but for these pragmatic functions and these fronted topical elements are "nonfocused."

It needs to be pointed out here that their definition of "Focus" is considerably different from ours. For R. Buth, focus is equivalent to "be contrastive" "to fill in . . . missing information" [identification], or for "special enforcement, through repetition" [emphasis] (1999, 81). W. Gross uses focus and emphasis interchangeably throughout his article (1999, 39-40). C. van der Merwe seems to follow Gross in its usage (1999, 345-47). Their "Focus" is associated with contrast, identification and emphasis.

However, as I have illustrated in chapter 4, "Contrast, Emphasis and Focus," contrast is not expressed by syntax or fronting but by the presence of contrastive members. Repetition may be one means of emphasis but it belongs to literary device not to syntax. Gross' use of "Focus" appears to have fallen back to the past when fronting was equated with emphasis. If W. Gross's emphasis means intensification (loud voice), intensification does not belong to syntax or word order but to prosody. If they suggest that "Focus" is used for identification, they need to show what is the missing argument of which proposition. To put it the other way around, they do not distinguish two distinct focus structures: the Xp argument-focus structure and the XP clause-focus structure.

In addition, their "Focus" does not capture the focus on the predicate in an ordinary comment clause, such as

Lev. 13:51 a צָרְעַת מִמְאֵרֶת הַפִּגְעַ the mark is a leprous MALIGNANCY,

b טָמֵא הֵיא it is UNCLEAN.

Gen. 15:5 וַיֹּאמֶר and he SAID,

According to our theory of focus structure, these fronted predicates are focused, even though they do not carry special "Focus" of identity, contrast or emphasis. Similarly they do not see our focus present in the "Topic" of event-reporting or episode-initial clauses, such as

#31 Gen. 6:9

אֵלֶּה הַדּוֹלָרוֹת נֹחַ
 נֹחַ אִישׁ צַדִּיק תָּמִים הָיָה בְּדוֹלָתוֹ
 אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים הִתְהַלֵּךְ־נֹחַ

1. THESE are the RECORDS of the GENERATIONS of NOAH.
2. NOAH was a RIGHTEOUS MAN, BLAMELESS in his TIME;
3. Noah walked with GOD.

Buth, Gross and van der Merwe may not see "Focus" in the fronted נֹחַ in Line 2. It is not for "Focus" but for pragmatic functions, such as, "Topic Placement," "Contextualizing Constituent," "episode-initial" and others. However, it is focused in our definition in order to indicate those pragmatic functions. Even in English, Noah in Line 2 "NOAH was a RIGHTEOUS MAN" is high-pitched, namely focused, to indicate topicalisation or initiation of an episode. L. Kumpf, who analysed pitch phenomena in the structure of stories of English, recognises pragmatic functions of this high pitch on the first word in English. She calls it "high onset" and its functions are initiation, surprise and evaluations on the event (1987, 210, 214). Noah in Line 2 may not be "Focused" by their definition, but it is focused in our terms for a pragmatic function of initiation or topicalisation both in English and in Hebrew.¹⁶⁷ We may infer that Hebrew also has this "high onset," that is, even the fronted "Topic" element is focused not only by fronting and also by pitch prominence in order to indicate its pragmatic function: topicalisation and initiation.

We have shown the different understanding of focus in those three scholars from our thesis. This difference is not insignificant, since it will affect the overall presentation of theory. It appears that "Focus" of Functional Grammarians probably needs further refinements so that "Focus" may be distinguished from the notions of contrast, emphasis and intensification and that it may capture focus on the predicates of commenting clauses and also on the topics of circumstantial clauses and episode-initial clauses. Our definition of focus, when used with the three focus structures, seems able to present complex word-order phenomena with manageable concision.

7.1.4. Summary of focus structure and function

In this introduction to the chapter, I have proposed that some clauses with fronted arguments may have the clause-focus structure. The argument of this structure is focused by fronting and high pitch and the predicate is focused by high pitch: XP. This distinct focus structure indicates to the reader the need of a high-cost cognitive effort in order to perceive pragmatic functions other than commenting and identification. To put it another way, the clause-focus structure is marked for other pragmatic functions or implications than commenting and identification. Many of these pragmatic implications seem to have a feature of independence

¹⁶⁷ Line 1 has the clause-focus structure (Introductory Formula). See below in this chapter. Line 3 probably has the argument-focus structure with implicit contrast "not others but with God." This in turn may be used for emphasis.

or non-sequentiality in terms of information, logic or time. This understanding of the clause-focus structure seems to offer a ground for functional multiplicity of this clause type.

Contrary to "Focus" in some of the latest linguistic works, our focus on the fronted element does not mean emphasis, contrast, intensification or identification, and the fronted topical elements in circumstantial clauses and others are also focused. Contrast belongs to contextual implicatures, intensification belongs to prosody and identification belongs to the argument-focus structure.

In the following sections we shall examine clauses with fronted arguments to verify the focus structure and functions of the clause-focus structure which is proposed in this introduction. The clauses will be classified into three: information level, inter-clausal level, and text-unit level .

7.2. INFORMATION-LEVEL IMPLICATIONS

Some clauses with fronted arguments seem to have a pragmatic implication on the information level: activation of inactive referent and introduction of a brand-new referent.¹⁶⁸

In commenting (predicate-focus structure), the clause prefers to have an active or accessible referent as its topic to comment on. Though the clause can have an inactive (unused) or a brand-new referent, it may be perceived as an ill-formed clause, particularly without anchoring.¹⁶⁹ This is why an inactive or a brand-new referent is often anchored to other referents for easier identification.

However, a clause with Clause-Focus Structure can have an inactive or a brand-new referent as the topic without being ill-formed. The reason is that Clause-Focus Structure expects the receiver to make a high-cost cognitive effort for processing. For example, #59 Exod. 32:17:

קוֹל מִלְחָמָה בַּמַּחֲנֶה "There is a SOUND of WAR in the CAMP."

Here a brand-new unanchored referent "sound of war" is introduced.

Judg. 11:1:

וַיִּפְתַּח הַגִּלְעָדִי הַזֶּה גִּבּוֹר חַיִּל Now JEPHTHAH the GILEADITE was a VALIANT WARRIOR.

Here a brand-new referent Jephthah is introduced and topicalised. This clause also initiates a new episode. Notice here the topic referent is anchored to the tribe name, the Gileadite, for easier identification.

XP Clause-Focus Structure with fronted אִישׁ and אִשָּׁה often introduce brand-new referents and also topicalise them. For example,

Judg. 14:2 אִשָּׁה רָאִיתִי בְּתִמְנָה מִבְּנוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים

"I saw a WOMAN in Timnah, one of the daughters of the Philistines;

Here Samson introduces a brand-new referent "a woman," initiates an episode and topicalises it.

¹⁶⁸ Lambrecht gives an example of "JOHN called" to present a new or an inactive referent to a discourse world. He calls this function, presentation (181).

In 1Sam. 2:33 וְאִישׁ is fronted probably for this purpose:

וְאִישׁ לֹא-אֶכְרִית לָךְ I will NOT CUT off ONE PERSON [Shimasaki].

This is often the case in casuistic laws in Leviticus to introduce a legal case, such as Lev. 20:11:

וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב אֶת-אִשְׁתּוֹ אֲבִיו 'If a MAN sleeps with his FATHER'S WIFE, . .

These clauses with brand-new topic referents are not considered to be ill-formed or difficult to process because they have Clause-Focus Structure which signals the need of a high-cost cognitive effort.

Similarly an inactive referent often appears as the topic of a clause with Clause-Focus Structure and is activated (see following examples in this chapter). This is not considered to be ill-formed or difficult to process because it has Clause-Focus Structure which signals the need of a high-cost cognitive effort.

We need to note two matters here. First, the activation of an inactive referent or introduction of a brand-new referent is itself a pragmatic implication of Clause-Focus Structure. However at the same time, we recognise that activation of an inactive referent or introduction of a brand-new referent is most often connected with other functions, such as initiation or topicalisation (Judg. 11:1 above), or. exclamation and initiation (Exod. 32:17 above). Since this is often the case, we do not mention this implication (activation of an inactive referent or introduction of a brand-new referent) in each clause, unless it requires special attention.

7.3. INTER-CLAUSAL LEVEL IMPLICATIONS

Some clauses with fronted arguments seem to have other various pragmatic implications on the inter-clausal level (other than commenting and identification). The examples we shall see below have close relationships with adjacent clauses rather than with the discourse structure. Their pragmatic functions are 1) exclamation/proclamation; 2) contrast of the whole proposition; 3) circumstantial clause; 4) inter-clausal climax; and 5) inter-clausal closure.

First, we shall examine clauses with an implication of exclamation/proclamation.

7.3.1. Exclamation/Proclamation

We have seen an English example

TONY BLAIR became the prime MINISTER.

This type of clause may be uttered out-of-the-blue, used in event-reporting or have independent character. It may also be used to express surprise, emotional outburst or to present a statement out of the context or to proclaim it solemnly. All of these features are treated under this exclamation/proclamation in our study.

¹⁶⁹ See 5.4.3 "Anchored and unanchored referents" in pp. 106ff.

Clauses with this structure have been often understood as emphatic in the past and our focus theory gives its ground because this explanatory/proclamatory implication of our clause-focus structure may be used as one means of emphasis in certain contexts. However, at the same time, we should not equate this implication with emphasis itself and it does not justify intensification.¹⁷⁰

"אֲנִי יְהוָה" I am the Lord" in Hebrew seems to fall in this category. Though both the subject and the predicate are often active in the receiver's mind in a text unit, it appears seemingly "out of the blue" anywhere in text units: at the beginning (#1 Exod. 6:6),

לְכֵן אָמַר לְבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל
אֲנִי יְהוָה וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם מִתַּחַת סְבִלַת מִצְרַיִם

"SAY, therefore, to the SONS of ISRAEL,

'I am the LORD, and I will BRING YOU out from under the BURDENS of the EGYPTIANS.

in the middle (#1 Lev. 18:5) and at the end of a speech (#1 Exod. 6:8), and it seems to be uttered as exclamation or proclamation.

It needs to be noted again that this focus structure does not necessarily justify intensification, though it may convey emphasis. For example, the two sentences with Clause-Focus Structure above, "TONY BLAIR became the prime MINISTER," and "אֲנִי יְהוָה," can be uttered quietly.

#29 Ptc Num. 11:27¹⁷¹ seems to have an exclamatory implication:

וַיֵּרָץ הַנֶּעֱר וַיִּגְדַּל לְמֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר
אֵלֶיךָ וּמִיָּדָךְ מִתְנַבְּאִים בַּמַּחֲנֶה

So a YOUNG MAN RAN and TOLD MOSES and SAID,

"ELDAD and MEDAD are PROPHECYING in the CAMP."

There are other similar examples:

#1 Gen. 41:44	אֲנִי פַרְעֹה	"I am PHARAOH, . . ."
#1 Gen. 45:3 and #3 Gen. 45:4:	אֲנִי יוֹסֵף	"I am JOSEPH! . . ."
#3 Gen. 27:19 ¹⁷²	אֲנִכִּי עֶשָׂו בְּכֹרֶךָ	"I am ESAU your FIRST-BORN . . ."

¹⁷⁰ See 4.3 "Emphasis" in pp. 74ff.

¹⁷¹ See p. 106 for the topic status of הַנֶּעֱר.

¹⁷² This structure needs some comments. This is an answer to Isaac's question מִי אַתָּה בְּנִי Who are you, my son?" in Gen. 27:18. This question and answer are repeated between Isaac and Esau in #20 Gen. 27: 32: "מִי אַתָּה? Who are you?" "אֲנִי בְּנִיךָ בְּכֹרֶךָ עֶשָׂו" I am your son, your first-born, Esau."

There are two kinds of who-questions: one is asking to identify a missing argument in the presupposed proposition (identification: who is the prime minister?), another is asking to add new information to the already active or accessible referent (commenting: who are you?). The question, "who are you," is asking to comment on "you," and therefore the answer has Predicate-Focus Structure, such as in 2Sam. 1:8 whose answer is עַמְלִיקִי אֲנִכִּי I am an Amalekite. However, we encounter the reversed word order for the same question in Gen. 27:19, 32 above and in Ruth 3:9 where the answer is S-P אֲנִכִּי רוּת אַמְתֶּךָ. I am Ruth, your servant.

Since Muraoka has the same definition of identification as ours, the word order in these two cases raises a problem for him as well. Arguing against Andersen's definition of identification in this "who" issue, he

#1 Gen. 16:13 אַתָּה אֱלֹהֵי רְאִי "THOU art a GOD who SEES"
 #19 Exod. 15:2¹⁷³ זֶה אֱלֹהֵי THIS is my GOD,

Below are other examples of this implication: exclamation or proclamation.

From nominal clauses

#53 Ptc Gen. 4:10 (the voice of your brother's blood)

Other examples of אֲנִי יְהוָה: #1 Exod. 6:2, #1 Exod. 6:29,¹⁷⁴ #1 Exod. 12:12, #3 Exod. 29:46, #1 Lev. 18:6, #1 Lev. 18:21, #1 Lev. 19:12, #1 Lev. 19:14, #1 Lev. 19:16, #1 Lev. 19:18, #1 Lev. 19:28, #1 Lev. 19:30, #1 Lev. 19:32, #1 Lev. 19:37, #1 Lev. 21:12, #1 Lev. 22:2, #1 Lev. 22:3, #1 Lev. 22:8, #1 Lev. 22:30, #1 Lev. 22:31, #1 Lev. 22:33, #1 Lev. 26:2, #1 Lev. 26:45, #1 Num. 3:13, #1 Num. 3:41, #1 Num. 3:45.

Other phrases with divine subjects are: אֲלֹהֵיכֶם יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה Initial: #3 Lev. 18:2, #3 Lev. 25:38, #3 Lev. 26:13; Interim: #3 Lev. 18:4; Terminal: #3 Lev. 18:30, #3 Lev. 19:3, #3 Lev. 19:4, #3 Lev. 19:10, #3 Lev. 19:25, #3 Lev. 19:31, #3 Lev. 19:34, #3 Lev. 19:36, #3 Lev. 20:8, #3 Lev. 20:24, #3 Lev. 22:9, #3 Lev. 22:32, #3 Lev. 22:33, #3 Lev. 23:22, #3 Lev. 23:43, #3 Lev. 25:55, #3 Num. 10:10, #3 Num. 15:41.

notes that the normal word order for "I am Esau" as the answer to the question "who are you" should be אֲנִי עֵשָׂו בְּכֶרֶךְ אֲנִי (19-20). He calls this structure description. This is in our terms Px Predicate-Focus Structure. This is because the question is asking to add new information to the already active or accessible referent. Muraoka reasons that the actual reversed order (XP) of Jacob's answer is due to his "eagerly self-assertive form of the reply he chose" (19). In our terms it has exclamatory/proclamatory connotation. For Ruth 3:9, Muraoka interprets it as "I am Ruth, of whom you must have heard" (19, n. 48). Namely, Ruth identifies herself with the missing argument of a proposition "someone is Ruth" (there is someone called Ruth working in Boaz's field). This proposition is presupposed, active or highly accessible. This is identificatory Xp Argument-Focus Structure. Muraoka's solution is very likely valid.

Agreeing with Muraoka, I tentatively propose that "אֲנִי עֵשָׂו," in Gen. 27:19, and 32 may have exclamatory connotation (XV Clause-Focus Structure). It may read: "Who are you?" (Of course) I (FOCUSED) am ESAU!!" Ruth 3:9 may also have exclamatory connotation due to the circumstance, or as Muraoka suggests, it may be identificatory: Xp Argument-Focus Structure: "I (focused) am Ruth who you must have heard about."

173	<u>עָזַר וְזִמְרָת יְהוָה</u> <u>וַיְהִי־לִי לִישׁוּעָה</u> <u>זֶה אֱלֹהֵי</u> <u>וְאֶגְדָּלֵהוּ</u>	1 "The LORD is my strength and song, 2 And He has become my salvation; 3 This is my God, 4 and I will praise Him;
-----	---	--

The whole verse seems to have a peculiar construction. The topic of this verse (and the whole song of Moses) is apparently the Lord. The referent Lord is activated in v. 1. Thus Line 1, 2 and 4 have Px Predicate-Focus Structure. However Line 3 is problematic, because it is the only S-P clause. For plain communication, P-S such as Line 1 would be appropriate: זֶה אֱלֹהֵי. We may assume, therefore, that this clause has some other purpose than plain commenting. There are two possibilities. First, it has identificational Argument-Focus Structure with contrastive implication, namely "THIS (nothing else) is my God" as the answer to the question, "who is your God?" Second, it is proclamational Clause Focus: "THIS is my GOD," which can appear "out of the blue" as proclamation or exclamation. It is difficult to choose, and both possibilities seem to fit well in the context.

¹⁷⁴ This clause is followed by imperative. It may have an implication of circumstantial clause.

All the following clauses are episode-initial. אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר #3 Gen. 15:7, #3 Exod. 20:2, #3 Deut. 5:6; אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתְכֶם #3 Gen. 28:13; אֲנִי אֵל שְׂדֵי #1 Gen. 17:1, #1 Gen. 35:11; אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ #22 Exod. 3:6; אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתְכֶם #8 Gen. 26:24; אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ #11 Gen. 31:13; אֲנִי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ #11 Gen. 46:3; אֲנִי מִגֵּן לְךָ (I am a shield to you) #25 Gen. 15:1.

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 5:6 and Deut. 5:9 אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ "I am the LORD your GOD, . . .," Deut. 7:14 בָּרוּךְ תְּהִיָּה מִכָּל-הָעַמִּים "You shall be blessed above all peoples . . .,"¹⁷⁵ Deut. 7:20 ("the hornet"), Deut. 8:17 ("My power has produced this wealth").

Summary

The clauses we have seen in this section have a proclamatory or exclamatory connotation which can appear out of the blue. In other words they show possible informational, logical or temporal independence. This pragmatic implication seems to be indicated by XP Clause-Focus Structure. This understanding gives the ground that those clauses above have been often understood as emphatic. However, it does not justify intensification (loud voice).

7.3.2. Contrast of the whole proposition

The second inter-clausal implication of Clause-Focus Structure we shall examine is contrast of the whole proposition.

A clause with Clause-Focus Structure can have a contrastive connotation, if the context suggests it. While clauses with Predicate or Argument-Focus Structure contrast only focused elements, clauses with Clause-Focus Structure contrast the whole proposition,¹⁷⁶ because its dual-focus indicates that there is no presupposition shared with its preceding text.¹⁷⁷ An example from verbal clauses is Gen. 6:8:

וַנָּח מָצָא חֵן בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה NOAH found FAVOR in the EYES of the LORD.

The immediately preceding text Gen. 6:7 is:

And the Lord said, "I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the land, from man to animals to creeping things and to birds of the sky; for I am sorry that I have made them."

¹⁷⁵ This is a XV clause. The word order in the predicate-focus structure is haya + ptc.

For example, Jer. 20:14: יֹם אֲשֶׁר-יִלְדֶתְנִי אִמִּי אֵל-יְהוָה בָּרוּךְ

Let the day not be blessed when my mother bore me!

Ruth 2:19 יְהִי מְכִירְךָ בָרוּךְ May he who took notice of you be blessed.

Prov. 5:18 יְהִי-מִקְוֶיךָ בָרוּךְ Let your fountain be blessed.

See also 2Sam. 20:3, Ezk. 44:2 and Ps. 73:14.

The word order in Deut. 7:14 is reversed: ptc + hayah. Namely the argument is fronted. The clause seems to have an exclamatory implication.

¹⁷⁶ See 4.2 "Contrast" in pp. 66ff.

¹⁷⁷ See above for the function of this focus structure.

The theme of this verse 7 is "I will blot out man . . . I am sorry that I have made them."

v. 7 I will blot out man.

v. 8 Noah found favour in the eyes of the Lord

The lexical form Noah is used for reactivation. The referent Noah is introduced and activated in the previous chapter (5:29), but a new episode has started in 6:1 without mentioning Noah till this verse. Thus Noah may be peripherised. However, reactivation does not require fronting (focusing) the referent. The peripherised (accessible) referent may be reactivated simply by using the lexical form. The reason for fronting is not for reactivation or for topicalisation (as in v. 9), but for contrasting the whole proposition:

I will blot out man . . .
Noah found favor in the eyes of the Lord.

Since the whole proposition, including both the subject and the predicate, is presented anew (namely there is no shared information between the two verses), both the constituents are focused. Thus Clause-Focus Structure. The contrast becomes evident to the receiver only by its semantic context.

An example from the verbal clause is

1Sam. 1:22	<u>וַיַּעַל הָאִישׁ אֱלְקָנָה</u>	1 Then <u>the man Elkanah</u> <u>went up</u> . . .
	<u>וְחַנָּה לֹא עָלְתָה</u>	2 but HANNAH did NOT GO UP

Line 1 (VS) has Px predicate-focus structure. The topic Elkanah (v. 19) is probably deactivated by the birth of Samuel (vv. 20) and here in v. 22 it is reactivated by the lexical form. Or this may be announcing a new theme.¹⁷⁸ Elkanah is anchored to "the man" or "the husband" probably not for identification, but for some literary effect. The word order of Line 2 (SV) is inverted and probably the whole clause is high-pitched (XP clause-focus structure). This structure stops the flow and presents this Line 2 as an independent clause. Contrast becomes evident from the context. Here, these two clauses are contrasting the whole propositions.¹⁷⁹

Another example is Deut. 8:5:

<u>כַּאֲשֶׁר יִסֵּר אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ</u>	1 as a man DISCIPLINES his SON,
<u>יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִיִּסְרֶךָ</u>	2 so the LORD your GOD disciplines YOU.

Here Line 2 contrasts the whole proposition. This is contrastive and may be used for emphasis. Compare with two clauses with Predicate-Focus Structure in Deut. 1:31:

<u>נִשְׂאתָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ</u>	1 the LORD your GOD CARRIED YOU,
<u>כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂא אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ</u>	2 just as a man CARRIES his SON

In Line 1, the topic of the text unit is the Lord and the clause is simply commenting on the Lord and therefore Predicate-Focus Structure.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ See 5.3.2 "Lexical form for topic" in pp. 88ff.

¹⁷⁹ The negated verb is in contrast to the non-negated one.

¹⁸⁰ For the unanchored אִישׁ, see 5.4.4 "Indefinite unanchored topic 'iš" in pp. 108ff.

Below are other examples.

From verbal clauses

Gen. 4:2¹⁸¹ וַיְהִי-הֶבֶל רֹעֵה צֹאן 1 And Abel was a KEEPER of FLOCKS,

וְקַיִן הָיָה עֹבֵד אֲדָמָה 2 but CAIN was a TILLER of the GROUND.

GKC sees "state" in Line 2 and rightly observes "circumstantial appendage" which involves "antithesis" (§142 d). Line 2 is contrasting the whole proposition. The same structure repeats two more times following this pair. The predicate-focus structure followed by the contrastive clause-focus structure (v. 2a Abel \diamond v. 2b Cain; v. 3 Cain \diamond v. 4a Abel: v. 4b Abel \diamond v. 5 Cain). As a whole we may observe a chiasmic chain here.

Judg. 6:39

יְהִי-נָא חֶרֶב אֶל-הַגֹּזֵה לְבָדָה let it now be DRY ONLY on the FLEECE,

וְעַל-כָּל-הָאָרֶץ יִהְיֶה-טַל and let there be DEW on ALL the GROUND."

Judg. 1:25 (וְאֶת-הָאִישׁ), Judg. 7:7 (וְכָל-הָעָם \diamond בְּשֵׁלֶשׁ), Judg. 20:42,¹⁸² Judg. 10:13 (עַמּוֹ \diamond וְיָמֵם).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 5:31 (וְאַתָּה פֹּה עֹמֵר עִמָּדִי) "But as for YOU, STAND HERE by ME" in contrast to "the people should go back to the tents" in Deut. 5:30), Deut. 6:23 (וְאַתָּה הוֹצִיאָנוּ מִשָּׁם) XP and He brought US OUT FROM THERE" probably in contrast to the proposition "the Lord punished Egypt" v. 22), Deut. 9:29 (וְהֵם עַמֶּךָ וְנַחֲלָתְךָ) XP "Yet they are THY PEOPLE, even THINE INHERITANCE," in contrast with v. 28 "the Lord is going to destroy them"), Deut. 10:15 (רַק בְּאֲבֹתֶיךָ \diamond all the heavens and the earth belong to the Lord in v. 14)

To sum up, the XP clause-focus structure may imply contrast of the whole proposition. This pragmatic implication is related to the feature of informational, logical or temporal

¹⁸¹ Unlike the following chiasmic chain, 4:2a seems to indicate a text-unit boundary. We may note also that וַיְהִי introduces background information which is not sequential to the preceding verbal clauses such as in 2Sam. 8:15

וַיִּמְלֹךְ דָּוִד עַל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל 1 David reigned over ALL ISRAEL,

וַיְהִי דָוִד עֹשֶׂה מִשְׁפָּט וְצְדָקָה לְכָל-עַמּוֹ 2 doing what was JUST and RIGHT for ALL HIS PEOPLE.

וַיְהִי seems to introduce a circumstantial clause. The word order S + Ptc may indicate the clause-focus structure to enforce the connotation of circumstantiality, however, as we will see in the chapter of Exception, we cannot conclude the significance of the word order of the participle clause.

Also in 1Kings 5:24:

וַיְהִי חִירֹם נָתַן לְשִׁלְמֹה עֵצֵי אֲרָזִים וְעֵצֵי בְרוֹשִׁים כָּל-חֲפָצָיו

In THIS way Hiram kept SOLOMON supplied with ALL the CEDAR and PINE LOGS he WANTED.

¹⁸² The clause seems to have XV Clause-Focus Structure with contrastive connotation (וְהַפְּלִקְתָּמָה הַדְּבִיקְתָּהּ) and XV Clause-Focus Structure of circumstantial clause (simultaneity וְאֲשֶׁר יִמְהַעְרִים).

independence. A whole proposition is presented anew by this structure, and therefore it has the clause-focus structure. Contrast becomes evident by the presence of contrastive members.

7.3.3. Circumstantial clause

The third pragmatic implication is circumstantial clause.

Hebrew does not seem to have ample ways to express subordination (such as, simultaneity, anteriority, cause, gloss), parenthetical and explanatory information, or paraphrase. English expresses such subordinative, parenthetical or explanatory information by using subordinating conjunctions and relative pronouns, such as, "since," "while," "because," "though," "which."¹⁸³ Such English sentences have a distinct function in that they are suspending the flow of a narrative and provide circumstantial information.

In Hebrew, this circumstantiality is implied by Clause-Focus Structure. The term circumstantial clause in our study covers a wide range of connotations, including anteriority, simultaneity, cause, gloss, parenthetical or explanatory clauses, condition and concession. These semantic connotations are derived from their contexts (contents and grammar).

Since English can express this circumstantiality through morphological means, such as "when" and "while," prosodic focus in English in examples below (small capital) does not correspond to Hebrew focus (underline) as it does in other types of clauses.¹⁸⁴

We follow Andersen that we understand participles as nominal predicates. This understanding does not affect our theory, because we understand participles, nominal predicates and finite verbs as predicates (P).¹⁸⁵ Hebrew examples are:

Simultaneity: #23 Ptc Deut. 5:5

פְּנִים בְּפָנִים דִּבֶּר יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם בְּהָר מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ
 אֲנֹכִי עֹמֵד בֵּין-יְהוָה וּבֵינֵיכֶם בְּעַת הַהוּא
 לְהַגִּיד לָכֶם אֶת-דְּבַר יְהוָה
 כִּי יִרְאַתֶּם מִפְּנֵי הָאֵשׁ וְלֹא-עֲלִיתֶם בְּהָר

The Lord spoke to you face to face at the mountain from the midst of the fire,

5:5 while I was standing between the LORD and YOU at THAT TIME,

to declare to you the word of the Lord; for you were afraid because of the fire and did not go up the

¹⁸³ English can express cause or simultaneity without conjunctives and relative pronouns. Below is a sentence found in a letter to customers from a book company. This circumstantiality is not simple commenting.

p.s. Now we're operating from our new Distribution Centre near London we can deliver books to you faster ever before. (dated 15th October, 1998, from amazon.co.uk.)

Here without specific conjunctions or particles, the first sentence is providing cause for the latter sentence.

Notice the protasis ends with a rising pitch. See J. Pierrehumbert 1990 for pitch contours and their pragmatic functions.

¹⁸⁴ See the introduction of this chapter for the discussion of focus on the clause-initial position of circumstantial clause.

¹⁸⁵ See 10.3 for "Peculiarities of Participle" in pp. 227ff.

mountain.

Circumstantiality, is indicated by the structure עֲמֹד עֲנֹכִי (SP), and simultaneity is implied by the context and the participle. Thus the translation is "while."

Gloss or parenthesis:

הוּא and הוּא are often used circumstantially. #1 Gen. 14:7:

וַיָּשׁוּבוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶל-עֵין מִשְׁפַּט הוּא קְדֵשׁ וַיִּכְּפוּ

Then they TURNED BACK and CAME to EN-MISHPAT (THAT is KADESH), and CONQUERED. Its function is often similar to an English embedded clause with a relative pronoun, "that," "who," or "which." The high pitch on "that" in English may not be certain, but its parenthetical nature is conveyed by the actual parenthesis. In Hebrew הוּא is probably higher than the active pronoun in the predicate-focus structure.

שָׁם can function as a relative pronoun "where:" #115. Gen. 2:12

וַיִּזְהַב הָאָרֶץ הַהִוא טוֹב
שָׁם הַבְּרִלָח וְאֲבֵן הַשֹּׁהַם

1. And the gold of that land is good;
2. where the BDELIUM and the ONYX STONE are. [Shimasaki]

Andersen understands this clause as Pind-Sd. However שָׁם is not indefinite but definite in nature, since it specifies the place which has become active in the preceding text, Havilah (v. 11). The fronting of this adverb seems to indicate circumstantiality, stopping the flow. There are at least seven verbal clauses in the Pentateuch with שָׁם which we can translate as "where." An example is

Num. 9:17: שָׁם יַחֲנּוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל where the SONS of ISRAEL would CAMP [Shimasaki]
One may understand this implication as background information, however, it seems to be happening in the inter-clausal level: subordination or circumstantial clause.

Other verbal clauses with fronted שָׁם: Gen. 25:10, 50:5, Exod. 15:25, Deut. 10:6, 31:13 (with infinitive), 32:47 (with infinitive).

Explanatory/paraphrasing: Gen. 39:8¹⁸⁶

וַיִּמָּאן וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-אִשְׁתּוֹ אֲדֹנָי
הֵן אֲדֹנָי לֹא-יָדַע אֶתִּי מִהַבַּיִת
וְכָל אֲשֶׁר-יֵשׁ-לּוֹ נָתַן בְּיָדִי

- 1 But he refused.
- 2 "With me in charge," he told her, "my master does not concern himself with anything in the house;
- 3 EVERYTHING he OWNS he has ENTRUSTED to MY CARE. (NIV)

¹⁸⁶ An example of "waw cons. avoided" in Muraoka (40). See also SBH, 37.

Line 3 has OVA. The direct object is fronted to indicate circumstantiality. Line 3 has XP clause-focus structure and is paraphrasing or explaining Line 2.

Concession: #25 Num. 9:7

וַיֹּאמְרוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים הַהֵמָּה אֵלָיו
 אֲנַחְנוּ טִמְאִים לְנֶפֶשׁ אָדָם
 לָמָּה נִגְרַע לְבַלְתִּי הַקָּרֵב אֶת־קָרְבַּן יְהוָה

1 And those men said to him,

2 "Though we are UNCLEAN because of the DEAD PERSON,

3 why are we restrained from presenting the offering of the Lord

"We" in Line 2 in English is not high-pitched, because concession is expressed by the word "though." In Hebrew this concession is implied by the XP clause-focus structure. Line 2 is also initiation (see onset functions at the text-unit level implications below). Compare with ordinary commenting clause in

Gen. 42:11 כְּנִים אֲנַחְנוּ we are HONEST MEN. . ."

where the referent "we" is contextually activated in the immediately preceding clauses (vv. 9-10), and the same topic continued here in verse 11. The focus structure is Px.

Cause

Some of Muraoka's emphatic clauses are not emphatic but circumstantial clauses. An example is Gen. 31:42:

לוֹלִי אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם וַיַּחַד יִצְחָק הָיָה לִי
 כִּי עָתָה רִיקָם שְׁלַחְתָּנִי
 אֶת־עֲנָנִי וְאֶת־יְגִיעַ כַּפֵּי רֵאָה אֱלֹהִים
 וַיִּזְכַּח אֱמֹשׁ

1 "If the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the fear of Isaac, had not been for me,

2 surely now you would have sent me away empty-handed.

3 GOD has seen my AFFLICTION and the TOIL of my HANDS,

4 so He rendered judgment last night."

Line 3 has OVS. This is the XP clause-focus structure. Muraoka sees emphasis in the object, אֶת־עֲנָנִי וְאֶת־יְגִיעַ כַּפֵּי. However, it seems that this object phrase is fronted for circumstantiality (cause "because . . .").¹⁸⁷

Chiastic Construction with circumstantial clause

Some chiastic clauses have circumstantial clauses as the second clause. For example, Lev. 19:4:

אֲלֹהֵיכֶם אֲלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
 וְאֱלֹהֵי מִסְכָּה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם

¹⁸⁷ Line 1 (XV) shows topicalisation or topic-shift. Line 2 (XV) shows exclamation/proclamation with emphasis by עָתָה כִּי. Line 4 (Vx) sequential to Line 3.

1 (VA) Do NOT TURN to IDOLS

2 (OVA) or MAKE for YOURSELVES MOLTEN GODS;

A command is understood as a comment on "you." The active topic referent "you" is affixed in the verb in both Lines 1 and 2. Therefore Line 1 has Predicate-Focus Structure (Px). In Line 2 the object is fronted (OVA), thus it is XP clause-focus structure. Lines 1 and 2 have a chiastic construction (Px//XP). Line 2 may be viewed as a clause of Clause-Focus Structure which stops the flow of commands and expounds Line 1. See the similar text-unit structure in v. 2.

Other examples of the chiastic construction which has Predicate-Focus Structure followed by Clause-Focus Structure of circumstantial clause [explanation, paraphrasing or amplifying]: Fronted subject: Judg. 6:28; Fronted object: Judg. 6:25 אֶת־הָאֱשֵׁרָה, Judg. 9:45 וְאֶת־הָעַם, Judg. 13:6 וְאֶת־שָׁמוֹ, Deut. 5:24 וְאֶת־קִלּוֹ שָׁמַעְנוּ מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה), Deut. 7:15 (וְכָל־מִדּוֹי מִצְרַיִם הָרָעִים), Deut. 11:17 אֶת־יְבוּלָהּ).

Below are other examples of circumstantial clauses.

From nominal clauses

#23 Gen. 38:25 (simultaneity) הוּא מוּצֵאת It was while she was being BROUGHT OUT

#46 Num. 2:17¹⁸⁸ מִחַנֵּה הַלְוִיִּם בְּתוֹךְ הַמַּחֲנֵת

with the CAMP of the LEVITES in the MIDST of the CAMPS;

#17 (and #13) Num. 7:2¹⁸⁹ הֵם נְשִׂאֵי הַמִּשָּׁת they were the LEADERS of the TRIBES.

¹⁸⁸ Andersen understands that Line 2 to be an independent clause: "the camp of the Levites is in the middle of the camps." This clause may well be an adverbial accusative as translated above. However, there is a possibility that this clause is functioning as a circumstantial clause, "the camp of the Levites being in the midst of the camps." If we put this into a more idiomatic English translation, it may be translated into an adverbial phrase such as above.

¹⁸⁹ Num. 7:2 is one of those clauses where the distinction between Argument-Focus Structure and Clause-Focus Structure is difficult.

The border line between circumstantial (gloss) Clause-Focus Structure and identificational Argument-Focus Structure is fine here. In S-P clauses, if the comment referent is activated in the mind of the receiver, only the topic is focused (Argument Focus), but if the comment referent is inactive, the sender focuses it to remind the receiver (Clause Focus). When the comment is grammatically indefinite, such as adjective in the previous section, it is easier to distinguish them. However, here, where the comment is grammatically definite and the context does not clearly suggest the activation state of the comment in the consciousness of the receiver, the only way we could be certain of the difference would probably by the pitch prominence on the comment by a native speaker which we cannot know.

Here it is more likely Clause Focus, because the term "the leaders of the tribe" and the proposition "the ones who were over the numbered men" do not appear in the immediately preceding text unit, and these comments are more of reminder than identification.

The ambiguity is present in the example of the water of Meribah and the reference to Moses and Aaron above (#8 Num. 20:13, #17 Exod. 6:27) and in the reference to the water of Meribah in #9 Num. 27:14. Similarly in #12 Gen. 6:4 (the Nephilim).

Note here that in either case the subjects are fronted for focus to indicate deviation from commenting.

#29 Ptc Num. 24:8¹⁹⁰ אל מוציאו ממצרים כחועפת ראם לו

"GOD who BRINGS HIM OUT of EGYPT is for him like the HORNS of the WILD OX.

הוא and הוּא (gloss or parenthetical)

Places: #17 Gen. 2:13 (Gihon which flows around), #17 Gen. 2:11 (Pishon which flows around), #17 Gen. 2:14 (Tigris which flows around), #10 Gen. 10:12 (Nineveh and Calah; that is the great city), #13 Gen. 14:3 (the Valley of Siddim, that is the Salt Sea), #13 Gen. 14:17 (En Mishpat, that is, Kadesh), #3 Gen. 23:2 (Kiriath-arba, that is, Hebron), #3 Gen. 23:19 (Mamre, that is, Hebron), #1 Gen. 35:6 (Luz, that is, Bethel), #1 Gen. 35:19 (Ephrath. that is, Bethlehem), #3 Gen. 35:27 (Mamre of Kiriath-arba, that is, Hebron), #12 Num. 21:16 (Beer, that is the well where . . .), #1 Num. 33:36 (Zin, that is, Kadesh), #1 Deut. 4:48 (Mount Sion, that is, Hermon).

Persons: #1 Gen. 14:2 (the king of Bela, that is, Zoar), #1 Gen. 14:8 (the king of Bela, that is, Zoar), #1 Gen. 36:1 (Esau, that is, Edom), #1 Gen. 36:19 (Esau, that is, Edom), #3 Gen. 36:43 (Edom, that is, Esau . . .), #2 Exod. 6:27 (who was (the same) Moses and Aaron).

Others: #20 Exod. 22:26 (the only covering which is his cloak),¹⁹¹ #13 Lev. 6:2 (Eng. v.9).¹⁹²

From verbal clauses

Verbal clauses of GKC's "state" "approximate closely in character to noun-clauses" (§142 a). GKC understands that XV is not carrying the main narrative line but stops the flow and expresses anterior or simultaneous fact. Examples of circumstantial clause taken from GKC are: Gen. 3:18 (cause), Gen. 20:4 (cause and anteriority), Gen. 24:56 (cause and anterior), Gen. 26:27 (cause), Gen. 30:40 (הִתְקַשְׁבִּים anterior), Gen. 39:1 (anterior and topicalisation or initialisation), Gen. 41:10 (initiation and background information), Judg. 18:3 (two clauses, 18:3a & b), Judg. 19:11, 1Sam. 14:27 (cause and anterior and topicalisation), 1Sam. 9:15 (anterior and initiation), Job 21:22b (gloss);¹⁹³ Psa. 50:17 (cause and anterior to v. 16).

Fronted subject; 1Sam. 3:2 ([gloss]: "whose eyes had begun"), 1Sam. 14:15 (expounding), 1Sam. 18:25 (closure or circumstantial clause: "since . . ."), Judg. 16:20

¹⁹⁰ This clause is functioning as a circumstantial clause for the following triumphal statement (the latter part of the verse). Note Deut. 33:17 where Joseph is pictured to be destroying the nations with the horns of the wild ox.

¹⁹¹ Andersen seems to have the second הוּא in his mind. These two הוּא clauses may be circumstantial or list. The category is dubious.

¹⁹² זאת חורת העלה This is the law for the burnt offering:

הוא העלה על מוקדה על-המזבח the burnt offering itself shall remain on the hearth on the altar

Some translations indicate that הוּא is reflexive: "the burnt offering itself." However, a reflexive use of הוּא which precedes what is referred to is not attested elsewhere in our data. Our observation thus far indicated that הוּא here is more probably of the relative function:

זאת חורת העלה
הוא העלה על מוקדה על-המזבח כל-העלה ער-הבקר

"This is the law for the burnt offering,
that is the burnt offering which shall remain . . ."

¹⁹³ 22a has Argument-Focus Structure. לֵאמֹר is the missing argument of the inferable proposition "he will teach someone knowledge."

([simultaneity]: "while . . .," or "because"). Judg. 3:24 (וְהוּא יִצָּא)¹⁹⁴ seems to be a circumstantial clause rather than "attraction or chiasmus."

Fronted "emphatic" objects; Gen. 39:8 (וְכָל [paraphrasing or explanation for clause]), Gen. 42:18 (Line 1: Introductory Formula; Line 2: אֲתֵּי אֵלֵהֶם [cause] "because . . ."), Gen. 48:11 (וְרָאָה initiation and [anteriority] and contrast?: "though I had not expect to see your face"), Judg. 2:2 (מִזִּבְחוֹתֵיהֶם [explanatory]),¹⁹⁵ Judg. 12:1 (וְלָנוּ לֹא [simultaneity] "while"; בְּיַתְדָּךְ: exclamation/proclamation),¹⁹⁶ Judg. 21:11 (כָּל-זֶכֶר clause is amplifying the command of verse 10. [explanatory]), 1Sam. 1:15 (וַיִּיָּן: [explanatory]). The first and the last clause are commenting on Hannah. The fronting of the object יָיִן may be due to contrast with Eli's statement in v. 14). Fronted adverb; Lev. 25:41 (וְאֶל-אַחֲזָתָה result, purpose), Judg. 14:4 (וּבְעֵת simultaneity), 1Sam. 6:12-13 (בֵּית בְּיַת שְׂמֶשׁ simultaneity).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 5:5 ([simultaneity] עֹמֵד אֲנִי while I was standing), Deut. 5:23 ([simultaneity] בְּעֵר בְּאֵשׁ),
Deut. 9:7 ([paraphrasing] עִם-יְהוָה),
Deut. 9:10 ([gloss] אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם), Deut. 9:15
([simultaneity with parallel construction] וְהִקְוֶה clause and וְשָׁנִי clause), Deut. 9:24
([paraphrasing, or summarising] מִמָּוֶתֶם), Deut. 10:22 ([anteriority] עֵינַי יְהוָה אֶלְהֵיךָ [gloss]), Deut. 11:12 ([gloss] בְּשָׂבָעִים נֶפֶשׁ יָרְדוּ אֲבֹתֶיךָ מִצְרָיִמָה), Deut. 11:25 ([explanatory/paraphrasing] יְהוָה יִתֵּן וּמִוֶּרְאֵכֶם יִתֵּן יְהוָה), Deut. 11:31 (probably [cause] כִּי אֲתֵם).

Summary

We have observed circumstantiality in the examples above. These clauses stop the flow of narrative and function as circumstantial clauses. This pragmatic function, circumstantiality, seems to be indicated by XP Clause-Focus Structure. We have also observed that some clauses with Chiastic Construction have circumstantial clauses as the second clause.

¹⁹⁴ [עֲבָדְךָ יְיָ] is probably topicalisation.

¹⁹⁵ This clause may be theme-shifting with the same topic of "you." See Ex. 34:12, 13. אֲנִי clause (XV) is in contrast to the immediately preceding clause, "I will never break My covenant with you" in v. 1.

¹⁹⁶ "Your house" is fronted instead of "we," probably because it has a contrastive connotation between "without US" and "YOUR house."

7.3.4. Inter-clausal Climax

The fourth pragmatic implication indicated by XP clause-focus structure is inter-clausal climax.

In certain cases, clauses with Clause-Focus Structure are used to stop the flow of a narrative and state a situation in such a way as to give the readers a sense of climax. One may read these clauses with slow and solemn tone.

Judg. 20:34

וַיָּבֹאוּ מִנֶּגֶד לַגִּבְעָה עֲשָׂרַת אֲלָפִים אִישׁ בְּחֹר מְכֹל־יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְהַמִּלְחָמָה כְּבֵדָה
וְהֵם לֹא יָדְעוּ כִּי־נִגְעַת עֲלֵיהֶם הָרָעָה כֹּ

1 then ten thousand choice men from all Israel CAME AGAINST GIBEAH,

2 the BATTLE became FIERCE;

3 but THEY did NOT KNOW that disaster was CLOSE to THEM. [Shimasaki]

The subject of Line 1 is not a brand-new referent. "The Israelites" is an active referent in v. 33. The lexical form is chosen here for narrowing down the topic (Px predicate-focus structure).¹⁹⁷ Muraoka suggests that Lines 2 and 3 are circumstantial clauses (1985, 34), however they seem to indicate slow movement by the independent nature of the clause-focus structure. This may be for the climactic effect.

The distinction between inter-clausal level climax and text-unit level climax is often opaque. See text-unit level climax below.

7.3.5. Inter-clausal Closure

Finally, a pragmatic implication indicated by XP clause-focus structure in the inter-clausal level is closure.

Khan and *SBH* refer to a discourse function of SV which they name "span closure" (Khan, 87-88) or "episode-final circumstantial clause" (*SBH*, 80-82). For Endo this function is not due to the word order, but it is a function of the non-sequential verbal conjugation which may be used as a discourse function (147-48). Endo names it

"goal/explicative clause" and "the term "goal" used here simply means "full stop." It does not connote "purpose" or "consequence." It is used strictly syntactically rather than semantically. (148, n. 50)

While I do not disagree with Endo that the non-sequential verbal conjugation has an implication of "stop" or non-sequentiality, it appears that the clause-focus structure has a function of the "full stop" or "closure."

SBH (81) gives an example of Gen. 9:23:

וַיִּקַּח שָׁם וַיָּפֶת אֶת־הַשְּׂמֵלָה וַיְשִׂימוּ עַל־שָׂכְם שְׂנֵיהֶם
וַיֵּלְכוּ אַחֲרָיִת וַיִּכְסּוּ אֶת עֵרוֹת אֲבֵיהֶם
וּפְנֵיהֶם אַחֲרָיִת
וְעֵרוֹת אֲבֵיהֶם לֹא רָאוּ

¹⁹⁷ See 5.3.2.2 "Narrowing down the topic" in pp. 94ff.

But Shem and Japheth took a garment and laid it upon both their shoulders
and walked backward and covered the nakedness of their father;

1 (SP) and their FACES were TURNED AWAY,¹⁹⁸

2 (OVS affixed) and they did NOT SEE their FATHER'S NAKEDNESS.

Note here that both Lines 1 and 2 have XP Clause-Focus Structure and seem to form a parallel construction (cumulative).¹⁹⁹ The two clauses seem to indicate a closure as *SBH* comments. The lexical topic expression Noah in the immediately following verse 24 indicates theme-shift and this further supports *SBH*'s claim.

Another example is Gen. 41:11

וַנַּחְלֵמָה חֲלוֹם בְּלַיְלָה אֶחָד אֲנִי וְהוּא
אִישׁ כַּבְּתָרוֹן חֲלָמוֹ חֲלָמָנוּ

And we had a dream on the same night, he and I;

(SAOV) EACH of us dreamed according to the INTERPRETATION of his OWN DREAM.

Endo understands this as closure. The deictic phrase ׀ at the beginning of v. 12 (contextualisation, see below) further supports Endo's observation. See also Judg. 4:3 (from Khan).

Our example is Sd-Pd #126 Deut. 32:9

כִּי חֶלֶק יְהוָה עַמּוֹ
יַעֲקֹב חֶבֶל נַחֲלָתוֹ

1 For the LORD'S PORTION is His PEOPLE;

2 JACOB is the ALLOTMENT of His INHERITANCE.

Andersen understands Line 2 as classification (P-S) and translates it "his patrimonial allotment is Jacob." This is contrary to his understanding that the more definite word is the subject. He does not give any reason for this understanding here. Andersen's interpretation is in our terms Predicate Focus and it reads:

His patrimonial allotment is JACOB.

Andersen is correct in that Jacob is in focus, however, the clause has more likely either Argument-Focus Structure or Clause-Focus Structure.

The clause may be a clause with Argument-Focus Structure. Jacob is probably activated both by "עַמּוֹ his people" in v. 9 and by the broader context (Moses' song about the Israelites, vv. 1-43). The inheritance נַחֲלָתוֹ is activated in v. 8 and thus חֶבֶל נַחֲלָתוֹ (the allotment of his inheritance) is presupposed. Therefore this clause can be identificational Xp Argument-Focus Structure which identifies Jacob as the Lord's inheritance, and it may have contrastive implication. In English it reads:

JACOB is the allotment of his inheritance.

However, the context does not necessarily indicate the need of identification. It seems that the clause above simply proclaim a proposition with focus on the predicate as well (Clause-Focus Structure). The clause demonstrates the character of chiasmic construction.

¹⁹⁸ Line 1 may be an adverbial phrase for the preceding verbal clause.

¹⁹⁹ See 8.2.3 "Clause-Focus Parallel Construction" in pp. 184ff.

Nonetheless, the presence of כִּי suggests that there may be other reason for this inversion. I propose that this inversion is primarily due to its function to indicate the end of a text unit (termination or closure). The change of theme from sonship (vv. 8-9) to loving care (vv. 10ff) appears to support this interpretation.

Chiastic construction with the second clauses of closure.

In addition to the above verse (Deut. 32:9), there are other clauses with chiastic construction which have second clauses of closure.

Is. 3:17

וְשֵׁפַח אֲדָנִי קִדְקֹד בְּנוֹת צִיּוֹן
וַיְהִי פָתְחָן יְעָרָה ס

(VSO) Therefore the Lord will afflict the scalp of the daughters of Zion with scabs,

(SOV) And the Lord will make their foreheads bare.”

Other examples of chiastic construction: Is. 5:17, Is. 11:8, Is. 18:5, Is. 28:17, Psa. 6:10, Psa. 34:22. All of these have the sequence of Ps//XP with an indication of closure detected in the second clause.

Summary

We have seen the XP clauses of closure. This pragmatic function is implied by Clause-Focus Structure. Some clauses with chiastic construction have the second clauses of closure. This is observed on both inter-clausal and text-unit levels.

7.4. TEXT-UNIT LEVEL IMPLICATIONS (DISCOURSE FUNCTIONS)

The clauses we have examined in the preceding section have relationship primarily with adjacent clauses, such as contrast of the whole proposition, exclamation/proclamation (independent of the adjacent clauses) and circumstantiality (including subordination). However, the clause-focus structure seems to be able to flag some discourse level functions also, such as onset, background information and closure.²⁰⁰

7.4.1. Onset Functions

Topicalisation

The function to announce the topic of a new text unit is long recognised by the name of "topicalization" (Creider 1979, 4). Lambrecht (1994, 184) quotes Enç's variant of the text originally from Givón (1976). Below is its modified version:

Once there was a WIZARD. He was very wise, rich, and was married to a beautiful witch. He lived in a magnificent mansion by the lake, had forty-nine servants, and owned an impressive collection of rare books.

Now the WIZARD was very ambitious. He had been planning for years to conquer the world and finally he was ready.

²⁰⁰ Following the classification by Khan (86).

Both the first and the second Wizard are focused. The first one is focused in an existential sentence which introduces a brand-new referent. At the beginning of the second paragraph the referent Wizard is active and therefore it would have been continued by Predicated Focus Structure, "He was very ambitious." However, the form is lexical and it is focused by pitch prominence. This sentence at the beginning of the second paragraph indicates a start of a new episode and presents the referent as the topic of the episode at its beginning. In our study the term topic announcement or topicalisation is used to indicate this particular usage of the text-unit (discourse) level phenomenon. This is another pragmatic function.

Theme-shifting and topic-shifting

We may look at this phenomenon from a slightly different perspective of "shifting." We may say that Wizard is focused because of shifting a theme under the larger text unit with the same topic Wizard. The second paragraph can start:

Now the WITCH had 7 dogs. She took care of them by herself.

The word witch is focused for topicalisation (announcement of the topic of a text unit). However, we may also say this is "topic-shifting" which indicates that the episode changed to a different topic (usually it is not a brand-new referent). The term topic-shifting is used here to indicate the shifting of a topic of any level. It may be the topic-shift on the inter-clausal level or on the text-unit level.

Initiation

Another way of looking at this phenomenon is that Clause-Focus Structure indicates the start of a new text unit which does not necessarily announce the topic of a text unit. Lambdin uses the term "initial" (164), and J-Muraoka "at the very beginning of a statement" (§155 nd). I shall use the term initialisation following Lambdin to indicate the discourse function which indicates simply the start of a new text unit.

It is not the purpose of our thesis to argue for one particular set of discourse terms or for a specific perspective in analysing discourse phenomena. These terms are used freely in our thesis depending on a particularly strong feature found in a particular text, though topicalisation and initiation are used more frequently.

Onset

G. Khan uses the term "Span onset" to include various discourse functions used at the beginning of a text unit. They are (1) beginning of a speech; (ii) shift to new topic constituent; (iii) continuity of topic referent but shift to new theme or episode; (iv) shift to background information (86). Following Khan, we shall include some discourse functions under one term "onset." It includes topicalisation, initiation, topic-shifting, theme-shifting, contextualisation and introductory formula (see below in this chapter).

It may be worth noticing that all of these onset functions are not advancing the flow of a narrative or an episode. Namely they are non-sequential or independent in character. These are pragmatic implications different from commenting and identification. Hence they employ Clause-Focus Structure.

7.4.1.1. Topicalisation and Initiation

First we shall analyse 4 nominal clauses and 2 verbal clauses of topicalisation or initiation.

#26 Exod. 33:5

אתם עם-קשה-עֵרָב
רַגַע אֶחָד אֶעֱלֶה בְּקִרְבְּךָ וְכִלִּיתִיךָ

1 'YOU are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE;

2 should I go up in your midst for one moment, I would destroy you.

Line 1 is one of the allo-clauses we used in the Introduction. This 33:5 initiates a text unit and topicalises it. Compare it with Exod. 33:3, Line 3:

אֶל-אֶרֶץ זָבַח חֶלֶב וְדָבָשׁ
כִּי לֹא אֶעֱלֶה בְּקִרְבְּךָ
כִּי עִם-קִשְׁיֵה-עֵרָב אַתָּה
פֶּן-אֶכְלֶךָ בְּדַרְךָ

"Go up to a land flowing with milk and honey;

for I will not go up in your midst,

because you are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE,

lest I destroy you on the way."

Line 3 adds new information to the already active referent "you." Line 3: In this predicate-focus structure, only the predicate is focused by fronting and high pitch, while the topic is not focused.

The second example of the nominal clause of topicalisation is #31 Gen. 6:9:

אלה תולדת נח
נח איש צדיק
תמים היה בדרתיו
את האלהים התהלך נח

1. THESE are the RECORDS of the GENERATIONS of NOAH.

2. NOAH was a RIGHTEOUS MAN,

3 BLAMELESS in his time;

4 Noah walked with GOD.

For Andersen Line 2 (Sd-Pind) is an exception to his rule, because a definite subject cannot appear prior to an indefinite predicate in a normal sentence. Therefore Andersen proposes that this clause may be a phrase "Noah, a righteous man" or a circumstantial clause "Noah being a righteous man" (43). Andersen's two suggestions obscure the pragmatic structure of

the text. Line 1 introduces a new referent in a comment.²⁰¹ Noah is now activated at the beginning of Line 2. Therefore we may expect אִישׁ צְדִיק הוּא, Predicate-Focus Structure. Yet it has the lexical form and it is focused by fronting. In Line 2 Noah is pronounced as the topic of the following large text unit. This is topicalisation.²⁰²

For the same reason, Andersen understands #32 Gen. 11:10 as a circumstantial clause:

אֱלֹהַ תּוֹלְדֹת שֵׁם
שֵׁם בְּנִמְאֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־אַרְפַּכְשָׁד

These are the records of the generations of Shem.

SHEM was ONE HUNDRED YEARS OLD, and became the father of Arpachshad

This again has Clause-Focus Structure with an implication of topicalising Shem.

#50 Gen. 19:31²⁰³ אֲבִינוּ זָקֵן Our FATHER is OLD.

This clause starts a new episode: initiation. For Andersen this clause is an exception to his rule, because a definite subject cannot appear prior to an indefinite predicate in a normal sentence. Therefore he understands this clause to be circumstantial (43). It cannot be denied that the implication here is a circumstantial clause. However, this is not an exception, but shows typical implications (initiation or circumstantial clause) of Clause-Focus Structure.

Gen. 16: 1

וַיֵּשְׁרֵי אִשְׁתּוֹ אַבְרָם לֹא יָלְדָה לוֹ
וַיֵּלֶךְ שָׁפְחָה מִצְרַיִת
וַיִּשְׁמָהּ הָגָר

1 (SV) Now SARAI, ABRAM'S WIFE, had BORNE him NO CHILDREN.

2 (SP) But she had an EGYPTIAN MAIDSERVANT

3 (SP) named HAGAR;

GKC gives Line 1 as an example of a "state." However, its implications seem to be multiple. All these three clauses have Clause-Focus Structure (XP//XP//XP) with different implications. Line 1 activates the inactive referent Sarai, which last appeared in Gen. 13:1, initiates a new episode, and topicalises it. Line 2 has a pragmatic subject and a pragmatic predicate,²⁰⁴ and it functions as a gloss for Sarai (וַיֵּלֶךְ). Line 3 is a gloss for Line 2. The three clauses as a whole function as background information for the episode (vv. 3ff). Hence all the clauses have Clause-Focus Structure (XP).

²⁰¹ This is the Introductory formula, a function of the clause-focus structure which we will discuss below.

²⁰² Lines 3-4 also have XP clause-focus structure which give background information. As a whole, Lines 1-4 are functioning a setting for the episode which starts with the wayyiqtol in v. 10. Line 3: Adjective + Verb (haya) + Prepositional phrase; Line 4: OVS

²⁰³ Andersen understands זָקֵן is adjectival nominative as in "וַיֵּשְׁלֵנוּ אִבְרָם זָקֵן" We have an old father" (Gen. 44:20). Though it may be a Qal verb, it is certainly an indefinite predicate.

²⁰⁴ וַיֵּלֶךְ is a pragmatic subject. See 3.5 "Pragmatic Predicate and Pragmatic Subject" in pp. 63ff.

Some of Muraoka's clauses with emphatic objects are not emphatic but have onset functions. For example, Gen. 43:11-13:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲבִיהֶם
 1 אִם־כֵּן אֶפֹּא
 2 וְאַתָּה עֲשֵׂה OV
 3 קַחוּ מִזִּמְרַת הָאָרֶץ בְּכַלְיֶכֶם Vs
 4 וְהוֹרִידוּ לְאִישׁ מִנְחָה Vs
 5 מֵעֵט צָרִי וּמֵעֵט דְּבַשׁ נִכְאֹת וְלֵט בְּטָנִים וְשִׁקְרִים OV
 6 וּכְסָף מִשְׁנָה קַחוּ בְיָדְכֶם
 7 וְאֶת־הַכֶּסֶף הַמּוֹשָׁב בְּפִי אֲמַתְחֹתֵיכֶם תְּשִׁיבוּ בְיָדְכֶם OV
 8 אֲוִלִי מִשְׁנָה הוּא Ps
 9 וְאֶת־אֶחֱיֶיכֶם קַחוּ OV
 10 וְקוּמוּ שׁוּבוּ אֶל־הָאִישׁ Vs

Then their father Israel said to them,

1 "If it must be so, then

2 (OV) do this:

3 (Vs) take some of the best products of the land in your bags,

4 (Vs) and carry down to the man as a present,

5, 6 (OV) take in your hand a little balm and a little honey, aromatic gum and myrrh,

pistachio nuts and almonds and double the money [Shimasaki]

7 (OV) as to the money that was returned in the mouth of your sacks, take it back in your hand;

8 (Ps) perhaps it was a mistake.

9 (OV) as to your brother take also,

10 (Vs) and arise, return to the man; [Shimasaki]

The object אֶת־אֶחֱיֶיכֶם in Gen. 43:13 Line 9 is not necessarily emphasised as Muraoka comments. It is probably topicalising as the clause starting with הַמּוֹשָׁב topicalises it. Let us analyse the whole text-unit. Line 2 is Introductory Formula, Line 3 and 4 have Predicate-Focus Structure (commands). Line 5 is probably not an appositional noun phrase for "the best products" in Line 3, but instead Line 5 and 6 are one clause with the fronted object which starts from מֵעֵט צָרִי and ends with מִשְׁנָה וּכְסָף. The clause (Line 5-6) has XV Clause-Focus Structure which expounds Lines 3-4 (circumstantial clause [explanatory]) and is chiasmic to Lines 3-4: "take A, A' take." Line 7 is topicalisation: "as to the money, take back." Line 8 comments on the money (thus Predicate-Focus Structure). Line 9 is topicalising: "as to your brother, take." Line 10 is Predicate Focus, since it is sequential to the command to take gifts, the money and Benjamin. Therefore אֶת־אֶחֱיֶיכֶם in

Line 9 seems to be more topicalising (topic-shift or List Structure²⁰⁵) than emphasis. Notice here the fronted argument is a direct object. An argument is not necessarily a subject. See examples of Fronted objects below.

Below are other examples onset functions.

From nominal clauses

#36 Gen. 18:20 (the out cry of Sodom and Gomorrah) (initiation and topic-shift)

55 Gen. 27:27²⁰⁶ רָאָה רִיחַ בְּנֵי פְרִיחַ שָׂדֵה אֲשֶׁר בְּרָכוּ יְהוָה

"See, the SMELL of my SON is like the SMELL of a FIELD which the Lord has BLESSED;

#39 Ptc Gen. 31:48 הַגֵּל הַזֶּה עֵד "This HEAP is a WITNESS²⁰⁷

#47 Gen. 35:10 (your name is Jacob) (topicalisation),²⁰⁸

#54 Gen. 47:8-9 יְמֵי שְׁנֵי מִגֹּרֵי שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאָת שָׁנָה

"The YEARS of my SOJOURNING are ONE HUNDRED and THIRTY;

#118 Num. 3:21²⁰⁹ Pd-Sd (Pragmatic Sd- Pragmatic Pd)

לְגֵרְשׁוֹן מִשְׁפַּחַת הַלִּבְנִי Of GERSHON was the FAMILY of the LIBNITES

#33 Num. 14:17-18 יְהוָה אַרְךְּ אַפַּיִם וְרַב־חֶסֶד

The LORD is SLOW to ANGER and ABUNDANT in LOVINGKINDNESS.

²⁰⁵ See "List Structure" in pp. 195ff.

²⁰⁶ "My son," who Jacob thought was Esau, is the topic of Jacob's blessing (vv. 27-29). It is fronted for topicalisation. רָאָה is placed to intensify the proposition.

²⁰⁷ Probably both initiation and exclamation/proclamation. Compare with
Gen. 31:52 הַגֵּל הַזֶּה עֵד (This heap is a witness)

where Laban is simply commenting. Thus Predicate-Focus Structure.

²⁰⁸ Andersen classifies these clauses under Sd-Pind, except this "Sd-Pd" שְׁמֶךָ יַעֲקֹב "Your name is Jacob. "You name" is inferable but not activated in Jacob's consciousness at the time of this utterance. Thus it is activation of an inactive referent. It appears to have a circumstantial effect as well, and we may render "although your name is Jacob." Since "your name" is the topic of this whole utterance(vv. 9-15), we may say it is topicalising. Notice here the implications are multiple.

²⁰⁹ Andersen assumes that prepositional phrases are the lowest in definiteness (109). However some of those, such as Num 3:21 above, are definite. Pd-Sd here introduces a new topic of the new text unit (v. 21-26). Topicalization can be done by definite predicates which are actually the topics (pragmatic subjects). It is noteworthy that *wayhi* in v. 17 marks a larger text unit. We may assume here that *wayhi* is a topic marker that marks larger text-unit division than fronted topics. See other examples in the same text unit: Num. 3:27, 33.

127 Deut. 32:35²¹⁰ (Pragmatic Sind and Pragmatic Pind)

לִי נִקְמָה וְשָׁלֹם 'VENGEANCE is MINE, and RETRIBUTION,

#125 Deut. 33:8 (תְּפִיךָ וְאוֹרֵיךָ [initiation]),²¹¹

From verbal clauses

GKC: Gen. 3:10 (initiation and background information. Contrast may be implied: "not someone else's voice but your voice"), Gen. 9:13 (topicalisation), Gen. 8:17 (topicalisation or topic-shift by fronting the object), Gen. 18:18 (topicalisation), Judg. 1:16 (initiation and background information), 1Sam. 15:1 (initiation and background information),²¹² 1Kings 1:1 (initiation and/or topicalisation), 2Kings 23:19 (initiation and topicalisation),²¹³ 2Kings 22:8 (activation of inactive referent, out-of-the-blue or exclamatory utterance, and topicalisation)

Fronted subject: J-Muraoka states that "At the beginning of a statement, we usually find the order S—V" (§155 nd). Many of their examples certainly have the onset functions (initiation or topicalisation): Job 1:1, Job 1:14, Job 1:16, Job 1:17, Psa. 93:1, 1Kings 8:12, Hag. 1:2, Gen. 36:2 (including activation of an inactive referent), Ezek. 29:18 (including activation of an inactive referent), and Prob. 18:16. Others: Gen. 39:1

²¹⁰ The verses 32 to 33 tell about destructive powers. The topic continues in v. 34:

הֲלֹא־הוּא כְּמִסַּע עֲמֹרֵי	'Is it not laid up in store with Me,
תְּחָם בְּאוֹצְרוֹתַי	Sealed up in My treasuries?

The new information here is that the destructive powers in v. 32, 33 are stored in the Lord. The two subjects are fronted for cumulation (List Structure).

In v. 34, the topic switches to the Lord by fronting the pragmatic subject (topicalisation), which is followed by inactive referents (a new comment = the pragmatic predicate): vengeance and retribution. Here the new theme of this new text unit is "the Lord has vengeance and retribution." This clause, לִי נִקְמָה וְשָׁלֹם, may have contrastive implication: not others, but mine.

²¹¹ Andersen understands that it is a clause with a prepositional phrase followed by a suffixed noun: "your tummim are for Levi." However, since there is אָמַר between וְלֵלֵוִי and תְּפִיךָ, it seems better to translate as below.

וְלֵלֵוִי אָמַר	And of Levi he said,
תְּפִיךָ וְאוֹרֵיךָ לְאִישׁ חַסִּידְךָ	"Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim belong to Thy godly man."
²¹² וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂמוּאֵל אֶל־שָׂאוּל	Then Samuel said to Saul,
אֲתִי שָׁלַח יְהוָה לְמַשְׁחָה לְמֶלֶךְ	1 "The LORD sent me to anoint you as king
עַל־עַמּוֹ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל	over His people, over Israel;
וְעַתָּה שְׁמַע	2 now therefore, listen to the words of the LORD.

The inverted word order, XV, of Line 1 initiates a new text unit (vv. 1-3) and gives background information for the following commands of the Lord. This implication of Clause-Focus Structure can be conveyed by SVO: אֲתִי שָׁלַח יְהוָה, which is the normal word order for background information, initiation and topicalisation. The reason for this variation (OVS) may be due to specific elevation of the object ("me") for some reason. Contrast (not others but me) may be detected. If this is the case, we may say that contrast on the fronted element is the secondary indication of this particular structure. This needs further study.

²¹³ Verses 12, 13 and 15 have the word order of OV which present new topics:

- v. 12 the altars in the Jerusalem Temple.
- v. 13 the high places in Jerusalem.
- v. 15 the alter and the high place in Bethel

(יְיוֹסֵף initiation), Gen. 37:3 (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה topic-shift), Gen. 50:24 (וְאֱלֹהִים contrast of the whole proposition, or topic-shift), Judg. 13:5b (וַיִּמְזַוְרָה topic-shift).

Fronted objects: Gen. 29:9 (וַיִּרְחַל topicalising), Judg. 1:21 (וְאֶת־הַיְבוּסִי topic-shift. Possibly contrast with 1:1-18, not only with v. 20. See also the similar structure in Josh. 15:20-63), Judg. 6:20 (אֶת־הַפְּזָרְקִי topic-shift or termination). In "Waw cons. avoided": Judg. 7:25 (וְרֹאשׁ־עַרְבֵי topicalisation, termination and background information), Judg. 14:2 (אֲשֶׁה topicalisation), 1Sam. 2:33 (אִישׁ topicalisation). Fronted adverb: Gen. 45:9 (כֹּה אָמַר בְּנֵךְ יוֹסֵף 'Thus says your son Joseph).

J-Muraoka's additional clause: Deut. 18:15 (נָבִיא topicalisation, introduction of a brand-new referent).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 5:2 [אֱלֹהֵינוּ initiation, topicalisation], Deut. 6:21 [עֲבָרִים הֵינֵנוּ initiation. The predicate-focus structure would be Vx], Deut. 7:25 [topicalisation], Deut. 8:1 [initiation, topicalisation], Deut. 9:1 [circumstantial clause initiation, background information], Deut. 10:6 [topic-shift], Deut. 10:10 [topic-shift].

We have analysed six clauses, both nominal and verbal, which indicate topicalisation or initiation in the body and there are other numerous examples as I list above. These pragmatic functions are implied by the clause-focus structure.

7.4.1.2. Introductory Formula

The second category of the onset functions we shall observe is "Introductory Formula." This is a distinct feature in Biblical Hebrew which announces a title of a text unit. This "titling" function is made possible because of the clause-focus structure. We may call this "Introductory Formula" which consists of a demonstrative pronominal subject and a following noun phrase.

An example is #9 Gen. 36:17:

וְאֵלֶּה בְּנֵי רְעוּאֵל
בְּנֵי־עֵשָׂו אֱלֹוֹף נַחַת אֱלֹוֹף זֶרַח אֱלֹוֹף שַׁמָּה אֱלֹוֹף מִצָּה
אֵלֶּה אֱלֹוֹפֵי רְעוּאֵל בְּאֶרֶץ אֲדוֹם

1 And THESE are the SONS of REUEL,

2 Esau's son: chief Nahath, chief Zerah, chief Shammah, chief Mizzah.

3 These are the chiefs descended from Reuel in the land of Edom;

Line 1 is a clause with introductory Clause-Focus Structure with cataphoric אֵלֶּה. This demonstrative pronominal subject is cataphoric (referring to the upcoming). This means the pronoun is not active. Though its noun phrase (predicate) is often formally and semantically definite, it is not active either. This means the formula appears out of the blue or independently (not being sequential to the preceding text). Its function is to introduce a new text unit and announce its general character.

Line 2: Items of the list follow.

Line 3: The text unit of the list ends with a closing clause which consists of the same demonstrative pronoun followed by the same general category. This Line 3 was dealt with under Closing Formula in the function of Argument-Focus Structure.²¹⁴

Introductory Formula (Line 1) is similar to our modern idea of a title. This special feature is indicated by Clause-Focus Structure. Since this formula is used to introduce new commandments or a set of new names at the beginning of a new text unit, we may include this formula under "onset" discourse function.

Muraoka does not distinguish these two formulae, Introductory Formula and Closing Formula, and understands both of them as identificatory. Let us look at an example: #12 Exod. 16:16

זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה
לְקַטֹּף מִמֶּנּוּ אִישׁ לְפִי אֲכָלוֹ

1 "THIS is what the LORD has COMMANDED,

2 'Gather of it every man as much as he should eat . . ."

According to Muraoka Line 1 would be identificational. This is because זֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה is determinate.²¹⁵ However, this is not identificational, because the proposition "X is what the Lord has commanded" is not an active referent in the mind of the receiver. Unlike the bread itself, the commandments about the bread have not been discussed or mentioned, namely this proposition, though it may be inferable, is not activated in the mind of the receiver. If this clause is uttered with Argument-Focus Structure, it would sound as ill-formed as "MIKE broke the window" if uttered out of the blue. It appears that this referent, the אֲשֶׁר clause, is more likely of general nature which is equivalent to a phrase such as "the Lord's commandments."

The interpretation of זֶה is another matter. We may say that at the time of utterance this cataphoric זֶה is not activated in the consciousness of the receiver, either pragmatically or contextually. זֶה is actually a brand-new referent, because it is introduced here for the first time. To put it more precisely, זֶה can be used to introduce a brand-new referent, because it has special indexical (or deictic) nature which points to the referent as if it is present in front of the interlocutors.

This clause is not identificational but has Clause-Focus Structure. It is similar to "JOHN is my FRIEND" which introduces a brand-new referent John, recognises it as the topic of the clause, and makes a comment about it. Similarly the Hebrew clause above introduces a new referent זֶה, recognises it as the topic of the clause and makes a comment about it. זֶה refers to

²¹⁴ See 6.3 "Closing Formula" in pp. 134ff.

²¹⁵ See p. 41 for the definition.

the following commandments. Therefore this clause with Clause-Focus Structure introduces a new set of commandments. The clause reads: "THIS is what the LORD has COMMANDED."²¹⁶

This interpretation is further supported by the fact that this particular type of clause is placed at the beginning of a new text unit to introduce new episodes. This demonstrates further that it is not identifying or commenting. An example is #7 Gen. 5:1:

זֶה סֵפֶר הַיְּלֻדוֹת אָדָם THIS is the book of the GENERATIONS of ADAM.

In this clause both the constituents are not activated in the reader's consciousness. The clause is "out-of-the-blue" or non-sequential to the preceding texts and introduces a large text unit. The cataphoric זֶה seems to refer to the entire text unit which covers from here till the next occurrence of הַיְּלֻדוֹת (Gen. 6:9).²¹⁷ We may recognise that this function resembles our chapter title at the head of a chapter: "The Book of the Generation of Adam." Our title informs us of the beginning of a new text unit (chapter, section, episode, book, etc.) and at the same time announces its general character. This type of clause in Biblical Hebrew seems to have the similar features to our title.

The prime example of this "titling" function of Introductory Formula (Clause-Focus Structure) is Deut. 1:1:

אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה אֶל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל

THESE are the WORDS which MOSES SPOKE to ALL ISRAEL

It is apparent that neither of the referents, אֵלֶּה or הַדְּבָרִים, is active at the time of the utterance. These are brand-new unidentifiable referents, and both the referents are focused. The clause has Clause-Focus Structure. English would read "THESE are the WORDS which" This clause informs us of the beginning of a book and at the same time announces its general character. Since the function of this clause is introduction of a new referent with a new comment, let us continue to use the term "introductory formula" for this function. This particular pragmatic function is indicated by the clause-focus structure.

What I have tried to demonstrate here in "Introductory Formula" is as follows.

1. Muraoka remarks that all S-P clauses with a demonstrative pronominal subject are identificatory. However, our theory of focus structure can classify them into two groups: the introductory formula and the closing formula.
2. The closing formula has an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun and closes a text unit. It has the function of identification and has Xp Argument-Focus Structure, namely, the focused argument followed by the non-focused comment;

For example, Gen. 10:20 אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי-חָם These (above) are the sons of Ham.

²¹⁶ The pitch prominence does not necessarily fall on the entire constituent. Here probably both "Lord" and "commanded" have pitch prominence and the latter has higher pitch. This is according to the rule "End-Focus" of English. For End-Focus, see p. 47.

²¹⁷ G. Wenham 1987, 121.

3. The introductory formula has a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun and introduces a text unit with "titling" function. It has XP Clause-Focus Structure (dual-foci) with non-commenting or non-sequential character.

For example, Deut. 1:1 **אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה אֶל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל**

These (below) are the words which Moses spoke to all Israel.

Below are other examples

From nominal clauses

זֶה

Introducing new commandments: #12 Exod. 16:32, #12 Exod. 35:4, #12 Lev. 17:2, #12 Lev. 8:5, #12 Lev. 9:6, #12 Num. 30:2, #12 Num. 36:6.

Introducing other items: the offering by fire: #12 Num. 28:3; interpretation of dreams²¹⁸: #19 Gen. 40:12, #19 Gen. 40:18; temple tax: #18 Exod. 30:13²¹⁹; kindness: #20 Gen. 20:13.

זֹאת

#16 Gen. 9:12, #20 Gen. 17:10, #13 Exod. 12:43, #17 Lev. 6:2 (Eng. v.9), #13 Lev. 6:18 (Eng. v. 25), #12 Lev. 11:2, #9 Num. 4:24, #9 Num. 4:4, #18 Num. 8:24, #16 Num. 19:2, #16 Num. 31:21, #12 Num. 34:2, #12 Deut. 14:4.

אֵלֶּה

See p. 134 for #9 Gen. 36:17 and p. 170 for #12 Deut. 1:1.

Other examples are: #4 Exod. 6:14, #7 Gen. 36:15, #8 Gen. 36:18, #16 Exod. 38:21, #8 Lev. 23:4, #9 Num. 26:42, #8 Num. 33:1, #12 Deut. 12:1, #16 Deut. 28:69 (dubious, it can be identificational Argument Focus). Clauses which introduce **הַזֹּלָתָה**: #15 Gen. 2:4 (the heavens and the earth), #4 Gen. 6:9 (Noah), #4 Gen. 11:10 (Shem), #4 Gen. 37:2 (Jacob).²²⁰

הוּא and **היא**

#18 Exod. 16:23,²²¹ #18 Lev. 10:3.

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 4:44

זֹאת הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר-שָׂם מֹשֶׁה לִפְנֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

THIS is the LAW Moses set BEFORE the ISRAELITES.

Other examples: Deut. 4:45 (**אֵלֶּה הַעֲדוֹת**), Deut. 6:1 (**זֹאת הַמִּצְוָה**), Deut. 7:5 (**לָהֶם**), Deut. 10:12 (**כֹּה תַעֲשֶׂה**). Notice also Deut. 10:12 with the interrogative **כֹּה** seems to introduce a text unit:

²¹⁸ "To interpret" is activated in v. 8. These may be a clause with identificational Argument-Focus Structure.

²¹⁹ Andersen understands this as \emptyset asher nominal clause. It can be a verbal clause.

²²⁰ Other clauses with **הַזֹּלָתָה** are not included here because they are with waw which are categorised as coordinated clauses. They are not within our data.

²²¹ **הוּא אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה** "This is what the Lord meant." The instruction about the mana on sabbath is not mentioned prior to this utterance. This means that the **אֲשֶׁר** clause is not contextually activated. This shows **הוּא** can be used as the topic of an introductory Clause Focus clause just as **זֶה** is used. This is rare.

וְעַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל מִה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ שָׂאל מִעַמּוֹךְ

And now, Israel, WHAT does the LORD your GOD REQUIRE from YOU

To summarise, Introductory Formula informs us of the beginning of a text unit (a book, an episode, a paragraph, etc.) and at the same time announces its general character. This is similar to our title.

This introductory formula is one pragmatic function that clause-focus structure can indicate. This introductory formula has grammatically the identical structure with the closing formula, and therefore the difference between them has not been well recognised. However, our information-structure analysis reveals the difference of their focus structures and functions.

7.4.1.3. Contextualisation (deictic phrases)

The third onset function which is indicated by the clause-focus structure is contextualisation.

Some deictic phrases follow the verb in the predicate-focus structure. For example, Gen. 2:2:

וַיִּשְׁבֹּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי and He rested on the seventh day

However, when it is fronted, it seems to have a discourse function which provides information of a context, temporal or spatial framework, in which a new text unit occurs.

For example, #118 Lev. 23:34

בַּחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר יוֹם לַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי הַזֶּה
חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת שִׁבְעַת יָמִים לַיהוָה

On the FIFTEENTH of this SEVENTH MONTH

(it) is the FEAST of BOOTHS for seven DAYS to the Lord. [Shimasaki]

By this XP focus structure, a different pragmatic function is indicated. Namely the flow is stopped and the clause provides the framework or the context for the following text unit. This may be a sub-category of Background Information below. However, it is included under "onset," because it often indicates the onset of a new text unit.

Andersen understands that Lev. 23:34 has the sequence of P-S. We may interpret these clauses as pragmatic subjects (topics) followed by pragmatic predicates (comments) in List Structure (see below).

Pragmatic subject (topic) + pragmatic predicate (comment)

On the fifteenth is the Feast of Booths.

This interpretation may be supported by other clauses with fronted prepositional phrases (see 2.6 p. 51).

However, there is another option. The clause consists of a fronted time phrase followed by an existential clause:

Deictic phrase + Existential clause

On the fifteenth there is the Feast of Booths.

In Leviticus chapter 23, there are instructions about the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles. Each major section starts with the dates of the seventh month. These clauses are either verbal or nominal clauses:

- v. 24 verbal clause: on the first day of the seventh month
- v. 27 nominal clause: on the tenth day of the seventh month
- v. 34 nominal clause: on the fifteenth day of the seventh month
- v. 39 verbal clause: on the fifteenth day of the seventh month

The fact that either a verbal or a nominal clause is following this deictic phrase seems to suggest that unlike the examples in List Structure,²²² these phrases may not be predicates (or pragmatic subjects), but phrases which are fronted for focus for the discourse function. Let us see the verbal clause in Lev. 23:24:

בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי בְּאַחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ
יְהִי לָכֶם שַׁבָּתוֹן זְכוֹרוֹן תְּרוּעָה מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ

In the SEVENTH month on the FIRST of the month,

you shall have a rest, a reminder by blowing of trumpets, a holy convocation.

Here a non-verbal element precedes the verb to signify the deviation from commenting. The implication of this deviation in this context is that it stops the flow of the text and the fronted deictic phrase is providing a time frame (context) for the following text unit (discourse) of how you celebrate the first day.

This understanding seems to suit better the nominal clause with which we are now dealing. It follows that this clause does not belong to our data, since we have limited our study to nominal clauses without margins (the two-member clauses). Nonetheless, we shall keep this clause, since this usage is significant for our study. It appears that in both nominal and verbal clauses, a deictic phrase is fronted for focus which signifies a pragmatic function other than commenting. The implication here is to stop the flow of the texts and provide the time frame for the following text unit (discourse or episode).

Let us look at two more examples.

Gen. 1:1 בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ

In the BEGINNING GOD CREATED the HEAVENS and the EARTH.

Here the fronting of the deictic clause has a discourse function. It provides a temporal framework for the following text unit. This "contextualisation" is implied by XP Clause-Focus Structure.

The last example is Judg. 20:4:

וַיַּעַן הָאִישׁ הַלֵּוִי אִישׁ הָאִשָּׁה הַנִּרְצָחָה וַיֹּאמֶר
הַנִּבְעָתָה אֲשֶׁר לְבְנֵימִן בְּאֶתִי אָנִי וּפִילְגָשִׁי לָלוֹן

So the Levite, the husband of the woman who was murdered, answered and said,

"To Gibeah I came with my concubine to spend the night, which belongs to Benjamin. [Shimasaki]

²²² See the following chapter.

Muraoka comments on הַגְּבֻעָה that it seems to be emphatic with a connotation of "the guilty village!" (43). However, it seems to be contextualisation which provides the temporal and locational framework of a text unit (an episode or an utterance).

Below are other examples.

From verbal clauses

Fronted adverb: Gen. 31:38 (זֶה עֲשָׂרִים שָׁנָה), Gen. 31:41 (זֶה־לִּי), Gen. 40:13 and Gen. 40:19 (בְּעוֹד שְׁלֹשָׁת יָמִים), Gen. 41:17-18 (בְּחֶלְמִי), Judg. 11:40 (בְּיָמֵי יִמְיָה), Judg. 18:1 (בְּיָמֵי הָהֵם initiation, too), Judg. 18:10 (כָּבֹאֲכֶם), 1Sam. 21:8 (וְשָׂם).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 9:8 (וּבְחֹרֵב at Horeb), Deut. 9:9 (בְּעֹלְתִי when I went up) Deut. 9:22 (וּבְחַבְעֹנָה at Taberah), Deut. 9:23 (וּבְשִׁלְחַת יְהוָה when the Lord sent), Deut. 10:1 (בְּעֵת הַהוּא at that time), Deut. 10:8 (בְּעֵת הַהוּא at that time).

To sum up, many of deictic phrases seem to be fronted for a discourse function. They initiate a new text unit (discourse) and at the same time provide a temporal or spatial framework for the following text unit. This discourse function is indicated by the clause-focus structure.

We have observed three types of onset functions: topicalisation/initiation, Introductory Formula and contextualisation. They all indicate a start of a new text unit. In addition to this indication, topicalisation announces the topic of the new text unit, Introductory Formula functions as our modern title and contextualisation provide temporal or spatial framework for the following text unit by deictic phrases. These onset functions are some of pragmatic functions indicated by the clause-focus structure.

7.4.2. Background Information

We shall now pay attention to background information. This is our second category of the discourse functions.

Some clauses provide circumstantial information not only for the main clause but for the following or preceding text unit (discourse). In other words, we can observe circumstantiality at two levels of Hebrew: at the inter-clausal level and at the text-unit (discourse) level. We have named the former "circumstantial clause." We may call this text-unit level circumstantiality "background" or "off-line information." A clause of background information may have connotations of anteriority, simultaneity, cause and so on depending on its context (contents and grammar) just as a circumstantial clause may. The distinction between inter-clausal level circumstantiality (circumstantial clause) and text-unit-level circumstantiality (background information) often becomes obscure. In either level, XP

Clause-Focus Structure indicates circumstantiality, a pragmatic implication of the clause-focus structure.

For example, #23 Ptc Deut. 20:3, Line 2:

שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל
אַתֶּם קֹרְבִים הַיּוֹם לַמִּלְחָמָה עַל-אֵיבֵיכֶם
 אַל-יֵרֶךְ לְבַבְכֶם
 אַל-תִּירָאוּ וְאַל-תִּחַפְּזוּ וְאַל-תִּעַרְצוּ מִפְּנֵיהֶם

1 'Hear, O Israel,

2 YOU are APPROACHING the BATTLE against your ENEMIES TODAY.

3 Do not be fainthearted.

4 Do not be afraid, or panic, or tremble before them,

This is a new speech (vv. 3 and 4) and the topic (you) is announced (topicalisation). The clause is circumstantial to the following commandments, that is, providing background information for the whole text unit (vv. 3 and 4).

It is not difficult to assume that some background information also signals the onset of a text unit. There are cases where circumstantial clause and background information are difficult to distinguish. Here again, these discourse terms are not rigidly exclusive of one another.

Background information with כָּל subject phrases

Andersen argues that כָּל draws the subjects in front. However, our examples show background information.

#45 Num. 35:7

כָּל-הָעָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּתְּנוּ לַלְוִיִּם אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה עִיר

ALL the CITIES which you shall GIVE to the LEVITES shall be FORTY-EIGHT CITIES.

This clause stops the flow of the commands (starting from v. 2) and gives background information which is the total number of the cities. Here, the כָּל subject phrase is fronted, not because כָּל draws items in front, but because of the non-sequential character of background information. This deviation from commenting is indicated by XP Clause-Focus Structure.

Another example of the fronted כָּל phrase is

#25 Deut. 3:5:²²³ כָּל-אֵלֶּה עָרִים ALL THESE were CITIES.

²²³ Verses 1-7 are a text unit which narrates how the Israelites conquered the kingdom of Og in Bashan. The story develops by waw-consecutives and when it comes to the description of the towns that they destroyed (vv. 4b and 5), it diverts from the waw-consecutives: a qal clause (v. 4b) and the nominal clause with the Clause-Focus Structure above (v. 5). This description is a piece of background information. The כָּל subject phrase is fronted, not because of כָּל, but of the clause's non-sequential character of background information.

2Sam. 20:8 Line 2

GKC sees "state" in Line 2 of 2Sam. 20:8 below: וַעֲמָשָׂא בָּא לְפָנֵיהֶם (GKC §142 e).

הֵם עִם־הָאֶבֶן הַגְּדוֹלָה אֲשֶׁר בְּגִבְעוֹן
וַעֲמָשָׂא בָּא לְפָנֵיהֶם
וַיֹּאבֵב חֲגוּר מְדוּ לְבָשׁוֹ
וַעֲלוֹ [וְ] [עָלְיוֹ] חֲגוּר חָרֵב מִצְמַרְתָּ עַל־מִתְנֵיוֹ בַּתְּעָרָה
וְהוּא יָצָא
וַתִּפֹּל

- 1 (SP) When THEY were at the LARGE STONE which is in GIBEON,
- 2 (SVA) AMASA came to MEET THEM.
- 3 (SVA) Now JOAB was DRESSED in his MILITARY ATTIRE,
- 4 (SP) and OVER IT was a BELT with a SWORD in its SHEATH FASTENED at his WAIST;
(Pragmatic subject and pragmatic predicate)
- 5 (SV) and as he WENT FORWARD,
- 6 (Vs) it FELL OUT.

We may notice that it is not only Line 2 that has the inverted word order but all the clauses but one in this verse. Line 1 to 5 have XP Clause-Focus Structure. Line 1 suspends the narrative and gives a setting for the text unit (v. 8). Line 2 shifts the topic to Amasa who is inactivated by the mission of David given to Joab and other warriors (vv. 6-7). Line 3 topicalises Joab. Line 4 (pragmatic subject and pragmatic predicate: "on which there was a belt") is subordinate to Line 3. Line 5 is subordinate (circumstantial clause) to Line 6 (as he went forward). Line 6 has Predicate-Focus Structure, commenting on the active referent, the sword, sequential to Line 5, logically and temporally. The whole text unit, Line 1 to Line 6, namely the whole verse 8 is a piece of background information which connects Joab's departure from Jerusalem in v. 7 and Joab's killing Amasa in vv. 9 and 10 which starts with a waw consecutive clause. All of these pragmatic functions, circumstantial clause, topic-shift, topicalisation, background information are indicated by the clause-focus structure.

Let us look at the last example of background information.

Judg. 11:23²²⁴

וַעֲתָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הוֹרִישׁ אֶת־הָאֲמֹרִי מִפְּנֵי עַמּוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְאַתָּה תִירָשֶׁנּוּ

- 1 'Now the LORD, the GOD of ISRAEL, DROVE OUT the AMORITES from before His PEOPLE ISRAEL,
- 2 and YOU are going to POSSESS it. [Shimasaki]

Muraoka comments that וְהָיָה in Line 1 is fronted because it is "contr.[asted] to Kemosh" (33). It appears, however, וְהָיָה and וְאַתָּה are fronted because they provide background information for the statement in v. 24 which has a paralleled extraposition (casus pendens) in Judg. 11:24:

²²⁴ See 9.2 "Conjunctive words and phrases" in pp. 215ff for the fronted element וְאַתָּה.

הלא את אשר יורישך כמוש אלהיך
 אותו תירש
 ואת כל-אשר הוריש יהוה אלהינו מפנינו
 אותו תירש

'Do you not possess what Chemosh your god gives you to possess?

So whatever the Lord our God has driven out before us, we will possess it.

By this paralleled extraposition (*casus pendens*), "we will possess the land" is emphasised. The two clauses of XV Clause-Focus Structure in v. 23 are background information for this emphatic statement. The fronting of יהוה is not for the contrast with Chemosh of v. 24 (which is in contrast to יהוה of v. 24), but it is for background information.

Below are other examples of background information

From nominal clauses

#23 Ptc Deut. 9:1 [topicalisation, background information]

שמע ישראל Hear, O Israel!

אתה עבר היום את-הירדן YOU are CROSSING over the JORDAN TODAY

#23 Ptc Deut. 20:3 [topicalisation, background information]

שמע ישראל 'Hear, O Israel,

אתם קרבים היום למלחמה YOU are APPROACHING the BATTLE.

#49 Ptc Gen. 33:13 [topicalisation and background information]

אדני ידע כי-הילדים רפים "My LORD KNOWS that the CHILDREN are FRAIL

#23 Ptc Gen. 49:29

אני נאסף אל-עמי I am ABOUT to be GATHERED to my PEOPLE.

#23 Ptc Deut. 2:4

אתם עברים בגבול אחיכם YOU will PASS through the TERRITORY of your BROTHERS

#23 Ptc Deut. 2:18 [topicalisation and background information]

אתה עבר היום את-גבול מואב את-ער

YOU shall CROSS over AR, the BORDER of MOAB, TODAY.

#48 Deut. 4:3 (and #48 Deut. 3:21)

עיניכם הראת את אשר-עשה יהוה Your EYES have SEEN what the LORD has DONE.

#23 Ptc Deut. 29:9 [topicalisation and background information]²²⁵

אתם נצבים היום כלכם לפני יהוה אלהיכם

"YOU are STANDING TODAY, ALL of YOU, before the LORD your GOD:

From verbal clauses

GKC's "state": 1Sam. 28:3:²²⁶ ושמואל מת ויספרו-לו כל-ישראל

Now SAMUEL was DEAD, and all Israel had LAMENTED him

²²⁵ Focus on "you" is intensified by כִּלְכֶם. This "you" clause is functioning semantically as a circumstantial clause for the following ל + inf. const (v. 12) and למען (v. 13) purpose clauses. It is not advancing the flow of the speech, but gives background information.

²²⁶ The clause provides background information (both causal, anterior) for the text unit which starts at v. 6.

Gen. 18:17 (background information, inserted monologue), Gen. 24:1 (background information), Gen. 38:25 (background information וְהָיָא שְׁלֵחָה),²²⁷ Gen. 44:3-4 (background information),²²⁸ 1Sam. 25:21 (background information and circumstantial clause [anterior]).

Fronted subject: Judg. 9:44²²⁹ (Abimelech), Judg. 20:34 (וְהַפְּלִחָמָה) and the following verse).

Fronted object: Judg. 14:4 (תִּצְנֶה).²³⁰

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 11:26 (וְנָתַן לְךָ בְּרָכָה אִם יִשְׁמָעוּ אֶת קוֹל יְהוָה) [setting and background for the blessing and curse in vv. 27-29])

All of these clauses above are flagged as background information by the XP clause-focus structure. We may note again that background information has non-sequential and independent character.

7.4.3. Climax

We have seen onset functions and background information as discourse functions indicated by the clause-focus structure. This section deals with Climax. Climax is observed more frequently on the text-unit level than the inter-clausal level. Climax or "Dramatic Pause" is described by R. Buth:

The story marks a slow-down of events in the grammar in the same way that a movie may freeze the action or slow it down at a critical point. (1990, 13)

Esth. 3:15 is an example Buth gives:

הַרְצִים יֵצֵאוּ דְחוּפִים בְּדַבַּר הַמֶּלֶךְ
וְהָדַת נִתְּנָה בְּשׁוֹשַׁן הַבִּירָה
וְהַמֶּלֶךְ וְהַמֶּן יֵשְׁבוּ לַשְּׂחֹת
וְהַעִיר שׁוֹשַׁן נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר פ

²²⁷ V. 25 as a whole functions as background information which connects Judah's order to kill her (v. 24) and his admission of his fault (v. 26). Namely it provides the reason for Judah's change. Line 1 may be understood as subordinative, too.

²²⁸ Four clauses in these two verses connect Joseph's order to put silver in the sack of Benjamin in vv.1, 2 and his accusation in vv. 4-6.

²²⁹ This is our background information. The two verses, 44 and its following verse 45 which also starts with וְנִצְנַח אֲבִימֶלֶךְ expound how Abimelech "rose against them and slew them" in v. 43. Then these two verses 44-45 bridge v. 43 to v. 46.

²³⁰ וְנִצְנַח introduces the reason or background of this happening. The three clauses have XV Clause-Focus Structure. Line 1 shifts the topic. Line 2 and 3 give background information. The fronting of וְנִצְנַח (not וְהָיָא) may be due to its contrastive connotation (nothing but an occasion).

The COURIERS WENT OUT IMPELLED by the king's COMMAND
and the DECREE was ISSUED in SUSAN the CAPITAL;
and the KING and HAMAN sat DOWN to DRINK,
and the CITY of SUSAN was in CONFUSION. [Shimasaki]

Here all the clauses have XP Clause-Focus Structure. Climax is indicated by this focus structure, probably because this structure conveys non-sequential or independent connotation. By giving a break in each clause, it gives a sense of slow but vivid description.

Other examples from verbal clauses

Climactic or topic-shift: Judg. 20:39, Judg. 20:40 and Judg. 20:41.²³¹

7.4.4. Closure

The last discourse function we shall see is "closure." When an episode ends, English expresses the end of the episode by a declining pitch contour and lengthening of some last words, such as "and they lived happily ever after."²³² Languages seem to have means to indicate the end of an episode and Hebrew appears to indicate it by the clause-focus structure. It might have been accompanied by a declining pitch contour. See also "Closure" in inter-clausal level above (p. 159).

The first example is Deut. 5:33:

בְּכָל־הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אַתְּכֶם תֵּלְכוּ
לְמַעַן תַּחְיֶוּ וְטוֹב לָכֶם

"YOU shall WALK in ALL the WAY which the LORD your GOD has COMMANDED you,
that you may LIVE, and that it may be WELL with YOU,

This clause closes the text unit (vv. 23-33).²³³ This interpretation is supported by the fact that the following verse 6:1 starts a new text unit by the introductory formula:

וְזֹאת הַמִּצְוָה הַחֲקִים וְהַמְשָׁפְטִים אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם

Now THIS is the COMMANDMENT, the STATUTES and the JUDGMENTS which the LORD your GOD has COMMANDED

The clause-focus structure can indicate the end of a text unit.²³⁴

The second example is Deut. 6:25:

וְצַדִּיקָה תְהִיָּה לָנוּ כִּי־נִשְׁמַר לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת

"And it will be RIGHTEOUSNESS for US, if we are careful to observe all this commandment

²³¹ the fronted non-verbal elements: וְהָאָרֶב in v. 37, וְהַמּוֹעֵד in v. 38, וּבְנִימָן in v. 39, וְהַמְשָׁחָה in v. 40, וְהָאִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל in v. 41.

²³² J. Pierrehumbert and Julia Hirschberg recognise that the longer the duration of sentence-final becomes, the more of finality it indicates. Lowering of pitch also accompanies this finality (1990, 279).

²³³ "The Narrative Relating the Sinai Revelation and Israel's Response" (E. Merrill, 1994: 157).

²³⁴ This clause, v. 33 may be contrasting the whole proposition with v. 32 (not turning aside to the right or to the left).

This XV clause²³⁵ closes the text unit (6:1-25 or 4-25). This interpretation is also supported by the fact that the following 7:1 starts a new text unit by Clause-Focus Structure (אל־הָאָרֶץ [contextualisation]).²³⁶

Below are other examples.

From verbal clause

Gen. 46:32 (וְהָאֲנָשִׁים termination or circumstantial clause; the first clause וְהָאֲנָשִׁים theme-shift to "their occupation").

In summary, the clause-focus structure can indicate the end of an episode or a text unit. This function of closure also has non-sequential or independent nature.

7.4.5. Summary of "Text-unit level implications"

We have analysed some clauses of the XP clause-focus structure which have demonstrated discourse functions, such as onset functions, background information, climax and closure. Within the onset functions we have observed Introductory Formula (titling), contextualisation as well as topicalisation/initiation.

We may need to note that these discourse terms are not rigidly exclusive of one another. They may be overlapping conceptually. A good example is Judg. 6:33.

וְכָל־מִדְיָן וְעַמְלֵק וּבְנֵי־קָדָם נֶאֶסְפוּ יַחְדָּו
וַיַּעֲבְרוּ וַיַּחֲנוּ בְּעֵמֶק יִזְרְעֵאל

1 Then ALL the MIDIANITES and the AMALEKITES and the SONS of the EAST assembled themselves;
2 and they CROSSED over and CAMPED in the VALLEY of JEZREEL.

This verse 33 starts a new episode (initiation) at the same time it provides background information for this new episode (vv. 33ff). This verse may also be translated as a temporal subordinate clause (when . . .) (circumstantial clause).

7.5. SUMMARY OF "CLAUSE-FOCUS STRUCTURE"

We have analysed the information structure of some clauses with fronted arguments such as,

Exod. 6:6 אֲנִי יְהוָה I am the LORD

Exod. 33:5 אַתֶּם עִם־קִשָּׁה־עֲרָף YOU are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE.

We have observed that these clauses have pragmatic functions which may be classified into three levels. They are:²³⁷

²³⁵ In the predicate-focus structure, the verb הָיָה is fronted before an adjective. Here the nominal adjective is fronted for focus to indicate the clause-focus structure. See the structure in Deut. 24:13 where "for you" is fronted for focus. 24:13 may have the argument-focus structure in which "for you" is emphasised through implicit contrast.

²³⁶ For this text division, see M. Weinfeld (357), D. Christensen (152ff) and E. Merrill (176).

Information level: activation of inactive referents, introduction of brand-new referents (7.2);

Inter-clausal level: exclamation/proclamation, contrast of the whole proposition, circumstantial clause, inter-clausal climax, inter-clausal closure (7.3);

Text-unit level: onset functions (topicalisation, initiation, Introductory Formula, contextualisation), background information, climax and closure (7.4).

All of these pragmatic functions indicate deviation from commenting and identification. We may say also that most of them have a character of non-sequentiality or independence.

This observation leads us to conclude that there is much justice in our understanding of the clause-focus structure as proposed at the beginning of this chapter. Namely, these clauses have an argument focused by fronting and by high pitch and a following predicate focused by high pitch (7.1.1). The function is to expect the receiver to make a high-cost cognitive effort to perceive implications from the context which are other than commenting or identification (7.1.2.1). In other words, this structure indicates and is marked for pragmatic functions other than commenting or identification (7.1.2.2).

In the preceding chapters 5, 6 and this chapter 7 we have examined the information structure and functions of most of the clauses from our data. Each chapter has demonstrated

²³⁷ This list of pragmatic functions is not meant to be exhaustive and there may be other implications which may be derived from other contexts. These implications may be overlapping conceptually or a clause may have multiple implications. This phenomenon may be compared with the semantic polysemy (one word having multiple meanings, in contrast to "homonymy," See M. Silva 1983, 113-14) or with "deliberate ambiguity" (it intentionally constructs a sentence in order that it leaves multiple meanings to be interpreted. See Silva 1983, 149-150). Although it is not the purpose of our study to present and to argue for a new set of discourse terms and conceptions, and our categories may be imperfect, it seems to have served our purpose to show pragmatic functions which are different from commenting and identification.

that the clause-initial position of Biblical Hebrew is marked for focus and that Biblical Hebrew has the three focus structures just as other languages have.

We need, however, to look at some more clauses we have not yet examined in our data. In the following chapter 8 we shall examine clauses with parallelism. In chapter 9 we shall discuss some problems of our theory and finally chapter 10 will present apparent exceptions to our theory.

8. PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION AND LIST STRUCTURE

8.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is going to deal with parallelism. This phenomenon cuts across the difference of the three focus structures and therefore an independent chapter is needed. The aim of this chapter is not a full-scale study of parallelism which may involve a wide range of literary analysis including metre, syllable number, word-pair and pivot word.²³⁸ Instead we shall look at a group of clauses from the perspective of focus structure in the hope of solving some problems raised in past studies of word order. A parallel construction in this thesis consists of two or more juxtaposed clauses whose constituents are placed with the same sequence, such as XP//XP//XP. We shall employ the term "parallel construction" in place of parallelism to imply the perspective of this focus structure.

Before we go into discussion, I shall present here a typical example of the problems that the past studies have not solved in relation to parallel construction.

#30 Deut. 6:4:

שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל	"Hear, O Israel!
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ	1 The LORD is our GOD,
יְהוָה אֶחָד	2 the LORD is ONE!

This verse is highly controversial. *IBHS* comments that "The problem posed by the Shema (Deut. 6:4) are numerous," (135) and lists five possibilities of interpretation:

1. YHWH is our God (identifying clause S-P), YHWH is one (classifying S-P); 2. Our one God is YHWH, YHWH; 3. YHWH our God is one YHWH; 4. YHWH, our God, YHWH is one; 5. YHWH is our God, YHWH alone. *IBHS* comments further that "it is agreed that no closely comparable passage occurs" (135) and it quotes from Gerald Janzen "the Shema does not conform exactly to any standard nominal sentence pattern." C. Miller similarly comments that this verse "resists any simple resolution" (1999, 4).

This chapter on parallelism with a perspective of focus structure may shed light on this issue and other related problems.

8.2. PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION IN THREE FOCUS STRUCTURES

First of all, parallel construction seems to be found in each of the three different focus structures.

²³⁸ For such wider treatments see for example W. Watson's works (1984 and 1994).

8.2.1. Predicate-Focus Parallel Construction

A group of juxtaposed clauses may have the same Predicate-Focus Structure (Px//Px//Px), such as Is. 19:13 (GKC §142 f, an example of his emphasis).

נוֹאֲלוּ שְׂרֵי צֹעַן
 נִשְׂאוּ שְׂרֵי מִצְרַיִם
 הִתְעוּ אֶת־מִצְרַיִם פְּנַת שִׁבְטֵיהֶן

The princes of Zoan have ACTED FOOLISHLY,

The princes of Memphis are DELUDED;

Those who are the cornerstone of her tribes have LED EGYPT ASTRAY.

These three clauses comment on the same topic which is activated in v. 11. Hence Predicate-Focus Structure. We may detect the middle pitch on the subjects here (dotted line).²³⁹

8.2.2. Argument-Focus Parallel Construction

A group of juxtaposed clauses may have the same Argument-Focus Structure. For example, 1Sam. 8:7

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־שְׁמוּאֵל
 שְׁמַע בְּקוֹל הָעָם לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יֹאמְרוּ אֵלֶיךָ
 כִּי לֹא אֶתְּךָ מֵאֲסוּ
 כִּי־אֶתִי מֵאֲסוּ מִמֶּלֶךְ עָלֵיהֶם

And the Lord said to Samuel,

1 "Listen to the voice of the people in regard to all that they say to you,

2 for they have NOT rejected YOU,

3 but they have rejected ME from being king over them.

The proposition "they rejected X" is presupposed in the preceding context. Line 2 identifies "not you" with the X. Line 3 identifies "me" with the X. Juxtaposition of these two clauses of Argument-Focus Structure contrasts "You" with "me." Line 2 and 3 form Argument-focus parallel construction.

Another example is Deut. 8:3:

כִּי לֹא עַל־הַלֶּחֶם לִבְדּוֹ יִחְיֶה הָאָדָם
 כִּי עַל־כָּל־מוֹצֵא פִי־יְהוָה יִחְיֶה הָאָדָם

that man does not live on BREAD ALONE_

but on EVERY WORD that comes from the MOUTH of the LORD.

"The man lives on X" is presupposed²⁴⁰ and thus not focused while the arguments are fronted. This parallel construction has contrastive connotation.

8.2.3. Clause-Focus Parallel Construction

It appears, however, that we find more cases of a parallel construction with juxtaposed clauses of Clause-Focus Structure. In this construction, though these clauses are not

²³⁹ See "Middle pitch" in pp. 90ff.

semantically unrelated, the latter clause is not sequential to the former logically, temporally or informationally. Each clause has a fresh new start. Hence Clause-Focus Structure.

Clause-focus parallel construction may be classified into three sub-categories according to its semantic connotation: Itemizing, Contrast and Cumulation. Again, these classifications are only provisional. The thrust of this section is to demonstrate that a clause with Clause-Focus Structure indicates deviation from commenting.

Chiasmus is also related to parallel construction. Chiasmus, in our terms "chiastic construction," is in the same literary category, but in opposition to parallel construction. It can have the sequence, XP//PX or PX//XP. Both parallel construction and chiastic construction belong to the inter-clausal syntactic relations, but they have opposing word order. Chiastic construction will be discussed as an exception to our thesis in 10.2 "Chiastic Construction" in pp. 225ff.

8.3. THREE TYPES OF CLAUSE-FOCUS PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION

We shall look at three types of the clause-focus parallel construction.

8.3.1. Itemizing

In a list, every item has a fresh new start (non-sequential to its predecessor). Although the referents in a list are already activated in general, they are focused. For example, an answer to a question, "what did your children do yesterday?" would be:

JOHN went to play FOOTBALL,
MIKE went shopping in TOWN and
LEAH helped me GARDENING.

Though the children may be active referents in the minds of the interlocutors who might have been talking about these three children, their names are focused because each proposition needs to be non-sequential to each other. Each proposition has a different topic and its comment. This is another instance of deviation from commenting.

A Hebrew example is #29 Num. 13:29. This is a list of surrounding peoples.

עמלק יושב בארץ הנגב
והחתי והיבוסי והאמורי יושב בהר
והכנעני יושב על-הים ועל יר הירדן

"AMALEK is LIVING in the land of the NEGEV
and the HITTITES and the JEBUSITES and the AMORITES are LIVING in the HILL country,
and the CANAANITES are LIVING by the SEA and by the SIDE of the Jordan."

Another example of itemizing is #38 Gen. 31:43:²⁴¹

²⁴⁰ We may say this proposition is accessible.

²⁴¹ Wilfred G. E. Watson suggested at an interview in Edinburgh, UK in June 1999 that the sequence [daughters > children > flocks] is not arbitrary, but follows an expected pattern. However, since each clause has a different topic, we may still say it is itemizing.

הַבָּנוֹת בְּנֹתַי

"The DAUGHTERS are my DAUGHTERS,

וְהַבָּנִים בְּנֵי

and the CHILDREN are my CHILDREN,

וְהַצֹּאֵן צֹאֲנֵי

and the FLOCKS are my FLOCKS, . ."

#44 Exod. 38:17 (from hanging instruction)²⁴²

וְהָאֲדָנִים לְעַמּוּדִים נְחֹשֶׁת

וְיֵי הָעַמּוּדִים וְחֲשׂוּקֵיהֶם כֶּסֶף

וְצַפְוֵי רֹאשֵׁיהֶם כֶּסֶף

And the SOCKETS for the PILLARS were of BRONZE,

and the HOOKS of the PILLARS and their BANDS were of SILVER;

and the OVERLAYING of their TOPS were of SILVER,

In these verses, each item has a fresh new start and they are not commenting on the same referent. Thus Clause-Focus Structure (XP//XP//XP).

It appears that this feature of itemizing has not been well recognised in the past. For example, #35 Gen. 46:8

בְּכֹר יַעֲקֹב רְאוּבֵן JACOB'S FIRST-BORN is REUBEN

Andersen would classify this clause as identification, because both the subject and the predicate are definite. Moreover, the predicate is more definite than the subject here which is another exception. Hoftijzer does not discuss clauses with a definite predicate. Muraoka would classify the verse above as identification, because both the constituents are "determinate."

We have a different approach. The clause above is not identificatory, since the predicate is not active in the minds of the receiver: the context does not show that the interlocutors have been talking about Reuben. Second, we will take the broader context into consideration. The purpose of the text unit which starts from v. 8 and continues to v.26 is not to identify Reuben as a son of Jacob, but to present the names of sons of Jacob who went to Egypt in a list form. The following verse, Gen. 46:9, reads:

וּבְנֵי רְאוּבֵן חֲנוּךְ וּפְלִיאָה וְחֲצֵרוֹן וְכַרְמִי

And the SONS of REUBEN are HANOCH and PALLU and HEZRON and CARMÍ.

This list (vv. 8-26) as a whole, which contains 66 names, follows the same pattern: "the sons of X are A, B and C" in Clause-Focus Structure. Namely the whole list has a clause-focus parallel construction.

²⁴² Instructions for hangings וְהַצִּיָּר, whether they are the hangings (or curtains) of the courtyard, the hangings of the tabernacle or the hangings of the gates of the courtyard, have a different grammatical structure from other parts of the tabernacle (the ark, the table, the boards for the tabernacle, the altar, the breastpiece, the horn of the alter, the alter of incense, the altar of incense, the altar of burnt offering). They employ fronted subjects, while other parts are generally described by Predicate-Focus Structure as we have seen in chapter on Predicate-Focus Structure. This is probably due to the stylistic difference in description. In the instructions about these hangings, the itemizing is employed to describe the building structure while clauses in other passages are more of narration. Scholars and translators seem to understand these clauses in two ways: either as adverbial accusative phrases as in #50 Exod. 26:32 or as items in a list. The difference of translation, either adverbial accusative phrases or itemizing in a list, is not significant. The structure we have is Clause-focus parallel construction.

Let us consider GKC's understanding of Gen. 1:2. GKC understands that היה of Gen. 1:2 is a copula:

וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תְּהוֹמוֹ וְרֵקָה And the EARTH was FORMLESS and VOID.

We can explain its XV word order by our theory. We may view Gen. 1:1-3 as follows:

בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ
וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תְּהוֹמוֹ וְרֵקָה
וַחֲשֹׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְּהוֹמוֹ
וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם
(וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי־אוֹר)

Gen. 1:1 (AVSO) In the BEGINNING GOD created the HEAVENS and the EARTH.

Gen. 1:2a (SVA) And the EARTH was FORMLESS and VOID,

Gen. 1:2b (SP) and DARKNESS was over the SURFACE of the DEEP;

Gen. 1:2c (SP)²⁴³ and the SPIRIT of GOD was moving over the SURFACE of the WATERS.

(Gen. 1:3 (VSO) Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light.)

I propose that all these four clauses in Gen. 1:1 and 2 have XP clause-focus structure. In Gen. 1:1, the deictic time phrase (בְּרֵאשִׁית) is fronted for focus to indicate non-commenting. Its implication is to provide the frame for the following text unit (vv. 1 and 2) (contextualisation). Gen. 1:2a-c The subjects are fronted for focus to indicate non-commenting. These clause seem to have a clause-focus parallel construction (itemizing). These four clauses (1:1 and 2abc) as a whole function as background information²⁴⁴ for the following text unit which starts from verse 3. The main narrative starts with 1:3 Px which has the sequential verbal conjugation.²⁴⁵

Pragmatic subject

This clause-focus parallel construction of itemizing may have pragmatic subjects as fronted arguments.²⁴⁶

#118 Num. 26:29

<u>בְּנֵי מְנַשֶּׁה</u>	The sons of Manasseh:
<u>לְמַכִּיר מִשְׁפַּחַת הַמַּכִּירִי</u>	1 of MACHIR, the FAMILY of the MACHIRITES;
<u>וּמַכִּיר הוֹלִיד אֶת־גִּלְעָד</u>	2 and MACHIR became the FATHER of GILEAD:
<u>לְגִלְעָד מִשְׁפַּחַת הַגִּלְעָדִי</u>	3 of GILEAD, the FAMILY of the GILEADITES.

The fronted prepositional phrases are pragmatic subjects. For example, Line 1:

Topic: Machir
 Comment: he is the origin of the Machirites

The pragmatic subject, namely the topic, is fronted for focus. In English also, though the constituents are prepositional phrases, they are focused in a list.

²⁴³ The participle is considered to be an adjectival noun following Andersen.

²⁴⁴ R. Buth arrives at the same conclusion by the verbal system which is based on his foreground/background marking theory. (Buth 1990, 10)

²⁴⁵ See 1.2 "Past Studies of Verbal clause word order" for the sequential/non-sequential verbal system.

²⁴⁶ See p. 63 for "pragmatic subject."

I gave a DOLL to LEAH,
and I gave a BICYCLE to JOHN,
and I gave a BASKETBALL to Mike.

Here, "I" is not the topic. The topics are the children and the comments are "I gave him/her a gift X" or "he received a gift X from me."

Another example: #131 Lev. 7:7²⁴⁷

Some prepositional phrases are used as deictic time phrases, and they seem to function as the pragmatic subjects or the topics.

127 Lev. 23:39

תִּחַגְּדוּ אֶת־חַג־יְהוָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים
בַּיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן שְׁבַתוֹן
וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁמִינִי שְׁבַתוֹן

you shall celebrate the feast of the Lord for seven days,
1 with a REST on the FIRST DAY
2 and a REST on the EIGHTH DAY.

Andersen takes all prepositional phrases as indefinite. Thus these clauses are categorised by him as Pind-Sind. However these prepositional phrases are grammatically definite (ה) and contextually activated in vv. 35 and 36. These two prepositional phrases can be understood as existential clauses with deictic phrases. Thus literally "on the first day there is a rest and on the eighth day there is a rest." We may also understand them as topics with pragmatic subjects as NIV translates: "the first day is a day of rest, and the eighth day also is a day of

²⁴⁷ כַּחֲטָאת כְּאֲשֶׁם תּוֹרַת אֶחָת לָהֶם
הַכֹּהֵן אֲשֶׁר יִכְפֹּר־בּוֹ לֹא יִהְיֶה

The guilt offering and the sin offering alike, there is one law for them;
the priest who makes atonement with it shall have it.

The text unit (vv. 1-7) contains the regulations for the guilt offering. The regulations are mostly in XV verbal clauses (v. 2: two XV clauses, v. 3: one XV, v.4: one XV, v. 5: waw + pf, v. 6: two XV clauses and a predicate focus clause). This idiomatic expression,

כַּחֲטָאת כְּאֲשֶׁם, is used adverbially (c.f. Deut. 1:17, 3:24, 15:22, 16:17, 29:12, 32:2). This phrase here may be understood as the topic and תּוֹרַת אֶחָת לָהֶם is the comment:

Topic: As to the guilt offering and the sin offering
Comment: the same law applies to them.

This understanding is in accordance with Line 2, which fronts the subject:

הַכֹּהֵן אֲשֶׁר יִכְפֹּר־בּוֹ לֹא יִהְיֶה

Namely, these two clauses appear to construct the clause-focus parallel construction.

In this text unit, most of verbal clause instructions have the inverted word order XV:

v. 2 In the place where they slay . . .they are to slay the guilt offering . . .

v. 3 all its fat he shall offer from it . .

v. 4 and the two kidneys he shall remove with the kidneys.

v. 6 Every male . . . may eat of it.

In a holy place it shall be eaten.

This also suggests that the whole text unit consists of clauses with Clause-Focus Structure which has an implication of Clause-focus parallel construction of itemizing.

rest." These clauses are itemizing, therefore these pragmatic subjects are fronted (Clause-Focus Structure).

Another example of deictic time phrases used in itemizing: # 127 Lev. 23:5.

Below are other examples.

From nominal clauses

#42 Gen. 2:11 (the names of the rivers), #42 Gen. 4:19 (Lamech's two wives), #35 Gen. 10:2 (the grandsons of Noah), #35 Gen. 10:22 (the sons of Shem), #35 Gen. 11:29 (the wives' names of Abram and Nahor), #42 Gen. 29:16 (Laban's two daughters), #35 Gen. 35:23 (the sons of Leah), #35 Gen. 35:24 (the sons of Rachel), #45 Gen. 46:27 (the son of Joseph // all the persons of the house of Jacob), #60 Exod. 26:21 (This is list or these phrases are adverbial accusatives. Again this may be a peculiarity of the Tabernacle instruction.), #60 Exod. 36:26, #41 Num. 5:8 (the restitution // also every contribution).²⁴⁸ #42 Num. 11:26 (two elders), #29 Ptc Num. 13:29 (see p. 185),

Hangings Instruction with fronted arguments²⁴⁹: #45 Exod. 26:2, #45 Exod. 26:8, #50 Exod. 26:32, #50 Exod. 26:37, #44 Exod. 27:9-10, #44 Exod. 27:11, #52 Exod. 27:12, #52 Exod. 27:14, #52 Exod. 27:15, #52 Exod. 27:16, #50 Exod. 27:17, #45 Exod. 27:18, #45 Exod. 36:9, #45 Exod. 36:14-15, #50 Exod. 36:36, #52 Exod. 38:10, #44 Exod. 38:10, #52 Exod. 38:11, #44 Exod. 38:11, #44 Exod. 38:12, #52 Exod. 38:12, #52 Exod. 38:14, #52 Exod. 38:15, #50 Exod. 38:19.

From verbal clauses

GKC: Gen. 2:6 (itemizing with v. 5 and background information [setting]);

Muraoka:

Gen. 3:14 עַל־בֶּטֶן תֵּלֵךְ On your BELLY shall you GO.

(כָּל־יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ) וְעָפָר תֹּאכַל And DUST shall you EAT (All the days of your life).

Gen. 6:16, Gen. 31:39 (טָרַףּהָּ itemizing, see v. 38), Gen. 34:21 (their daughters-take // our daughters-give), Judg. 11:24 (what Chemosh gives-you take // what the Lord gives-we take), Judg. 12:9 (וְשָׁלַטְיִם בְּנוֹת) [itemizing]), Judg. 13:14 לֹא clauses,²⁵⁰ Judg. 20:5 (וְאַת־פִּילְגֶשֶׁי//אוֹתִי), Is. 13:18.

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 7:3 וְלֹא תתַחַתֵּן בָּם 1 "Furthermore, you shall NOT INTERMARRY with them;

בְּתָרְךָ לֹא־תתַן לְבָנֶךָ 2 you shall NOT give your DAUGHTERS to their SONS,

וּבְתוֹךְ לֹא־תִקַּח לְבָנֶךָ 3 nor shall YOU take their DAUGHTERS for your SONS.

Line 1 has the predicate-focus structure (PxX. x is affixed). Line 2 and 3 form a Clause-focus parallel construction (itemizing). These two clauses are expounding the commandment in Line 1 (circumstantial clauses).

Deut. 8:4 (שָׂמַלְתָּךְ and וְרִגְלֶךָ), Deut. 8:12 (טוֹבִים וְרַבִּים itemizing with v. 13).

²⁴⁸ v.8b וְהָאֵשׁ//v. 9 וְהָרִמָּה//v. 10a וְהָאֵשׁ//v. 10b וְהָאֵשׁ=XP//XV//XV//XV

²⁴⁹ Some of the items in these clauses have more than one clause. See List Structure.

²⁵⁰ Muraoka comments on this verse that "There is some likelihood that negative injunctions occasionally display the abnormal word order" (39, n. 96). However, the first three clauses of this verse seem to have a typical Clause-focus parallel construction (itemizing). The last clause is closing the commands (closure).

To summarise, these clauses above have a function of itemizing, forming a list of items. Each item has a fresh new start, being non-sequential to the preceding one, and not commenting on the same referent. This is deviation from commenting, and therefore it is marked as such by XP Clause-Focus Structure.

8.3.2. Contrast

We have seen some clauses with the clause-focus parallel construction (XP//XP) which are itemizing. The second type of the clause-focus parallel construction is contrast. When two or more clauses of Clause-Focus Structure with the opposing semantic values are juxtaposed, they seem to contrast the whole proposition.

Another possible answer to the same question above, "what did your children do yesterday?" would be:

JOHN went to play FOOTBALL, but
LEAH helped me GARDENING.

We have to note here that both subjects and predicates are focused because the whole propositions are presented without any common presupposition.

A Hebrew example is #41 Deut. 29:28:

הַסֵּתֵרִים לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְהַגִּלּוֹת לָנוּ וּלְבָנֵינוּ עַד-עוֹלָם

The SECRET THINGS belong to the LORD our GOD,
but the THINGS REVEALED belong to US and to our SONS FOREVER.

Here the two subjects are fronted and probably high-pitched for focus and the two predicates are probably high-pitched for focus (XP//XP). These dual foci with the fronted argument indicate deviation from commenting. The same structure is observed in the following examples:

#34 Gen. 12:8 בֵּית-אֵל מְזִיִּם BETHEL is on the WEST (with Bethel on the west)
 וְהָעִי מִמְּקָרָם and AI is on the EAST; (and Ai on the east;)²⁵¹

#37 Gen. 27:22²⁵² הַקֹּל קוֹל יַעֲקֹב "The VOICE is the voice of JACOB,
 וְהַיָּדִים יְדֵי עֵשָׂו but the HANDS are the hands of ESAU."

Gen. 50:20 וְאַתֶּם חָשַׁבְתֶּם עָלַי רָעָה And as for YOU, you meant EVIL AGAINST ME,
 אֱלֹהִים חָשַׁבָה לְטוֹבָה but GOD meant it for GOOD

²⁵¹ These clauses can be interpreted as adverbial accusative phrases (bracketed). One may not detect contrast here.

²⁵² Muraoka gives the first clause as an example of a construct phrase being not determinate (9). Hence this clause is description according to him. Here again he does not see the multi-clausal construction of a list. In a list, the subjects are focused to indicate deviation from simple commenting. Each item has a fresh new start. Contrast becomes evident only from the semantic context.

#109 Exod. 9:27²⁵³ יְהוָה הַצַּדִּיק the LORD is the RIGHTEOUS one,
וְאֲנִי וְעַמִּי הַרְשָׁעִים and I and my PEOPLE are the WICKED ones.

Prov. 13:16 כָּל-עֲרוּם יַעֲשֶׂה בְדַעַת EVERY PRUDENT MAN ACTS with KNOWLEDGE,
וְכַסִּיל יַפְרֵשׁ אִוֵּלָת But a FOOL DISPLAYS FOLLY.

Below are other examples.

From verbal clauses

GCK: Gen. 4:4 (contrastive with v. 3), Gen. 13:12 (itemizing or contrast and probably termination), Gen. 29:17 (contrast of the whole proposition), Jer. 14:15 (contrastive).

Muraoka: Gen. 32:11 (בְּמִקְלִי contrast \diamond עִתָּהּ), Gen. 42:19 (וְאַתֶּם \diamond אֶחָד), Gen. 48:19 (אֶחָיו \diamond הוּא), Judg. 7:7 ("I will deliver with the 300 men" \diamond "all the other people go"), Deut. 23:21 (לְנִכְרִי \diamond וְלְאֶחָיִךְ).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 7:7, Deut. 7:8 (לֹא מִרְבִּבְכֶם \diamond כִּי מֵאַהֲבַת \diamond כִּי אֶתֶּם clause is circumstantial clause [cause]), Deut. 9:4 (not because of my righteousness but of the wickedness of the nations), Deut. 9:5 (לֹא \diamond כִּי clause.)

We should note here that contrast does not directly result in fronting these arguments. The arguments are focused (by fronting and pitch prominence) and the predicates are also focused (by pitch prominence) in order to indicate deviation from commenting. The purpose of this focus structure is not to indicate contrast but to indicate the non-sequentiality or independence of the clause. The contrast is indicated only by the presence of contrastive members.²⁵⁴

8.3.3. Cumulation

The third type of clause-focus parallel construction is cumulation.

²⁵³ Andersen understands Line 2 as a classification clause:

Yahweh hassaddiq, "the one in the right is YHWH" (Exod. 9:27). Translations like RSV "the Lord is in the right" have missed the point. The question is, "Who is in the right" so hassaddiq is the subject of the answer. (#109)

His reasoning shows the difference in the definition of identification. If Line 2 was the answer to the question, "who is in the right," the answer should be nothing else but identificational in our term. It would read "the LORD is the righteous one." The context appears to support his understanding of identification (Andersen calls it classification!), since the question is: who is righteous, Pharaoh or the Lord? However this clause is not identificational but its intention is to present the contrast between the Lord's being righteous and the Egyptians' being wicked: Line 2 and Line 3 constitute a multi-clausal list structure (Clause Focus, both the subjects and the predicates are focused). The contrast is intended and becomes evident by the semantic context.

See Neh. 9:33 for a similar context and construction.

²⁵⁴ See 4.2 "Contrast" in p. 66 for contrast of the whole proposition.

The nightingale does sit so late
 And Studying all the summer night
 Her matchless songs does mediate;²⁵⁵

When two or more clauses that have the same syntactic construction with the same topic referent²⁵⁶ are placed in parallel, they seem to have an intensifying effect. The receiver reads or hears the semantic repetition where he expects a new clause because of the dual foci, which in turn intensifies the proposition. We may call this structure cumulation. We do not often find this type of clause in daily life conversation, but in poetry. Hebrew examples are #34 Num. 23:21

<u>יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי עַמּוֹ</u>	The LORD his GOD is WITH HIM,
<u>וַתִּרְוַעַת מֶלֶךְ בֵּין</u>	And the SHOUT of a KING is AMONG THEM.

#36 Gen. 18:20

<u>זַעֲקַת סֹדֶם וְעִמּוֹרָה פִּי־רַבָּה</u>	"The OUTCRY of SODOM and GOMORRAH is INDEED GREAT,
<u>וַחֲטֵאתָם פִּי כְבֹדָה מְאֹד</u>	and their SIN is EXCEEDINGLY GRAVE.

#20 Exod. 3:15

<u>זֶה־שְׁמִי לְעֹלָם</u>	THIS is My NAME FOREVER,
<u>וְזֶה זִכְרִי לְדֹר דֹּר</u>	and THIS is My MEMORIAL-NAME to ALL GENERATIONS.

These clauses above are generally called synonymous parallelism. From our perspective, this may not be a simple juxtaposition of synonymous clauses, but it seems to indicate some emphatic force because of the repetition of the same topic and similar predicate in place of a different proposition with a new topic and comment.

Another example is Deut. 9:9 (and also Deut. 9:18):

וְאִשָּׁב בְּהָר אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעִים לַיְלָה
לֶחֶם לֹא אָכַלְתִּי
וּמַיִם לֹא שָׁתִיתִי

then I remained on the mountain forty days and nights;

1 ["while" Shimasaki] I NEITHER ate BREAD

2 NOR drank WATER.

We may notice that the cumulative parallel construction here (Lines 1-2) form a set of circumstantial clauses [simultaneity or manner].

These clauses above have a cumulative, intensifying effect caused by the parallel construction with the same topic referent.

We need to note that the difference between the Predicate-focus parallel construction (such as Is. 19:13 in p. 184 above) and this cumulation may not be significant.

²⁵⁵ in "The Mower to the Glowworms" by Andrew Marvell in M. Ferguson 1970, 441.

²⁵⁶ Notice here the term "the same topic referent." In the example of Deut. 33:3, "All Thy holy ones are in Thy hand, and they followed in Thy steps," these two subjects (underlined) are different in expression, they refer to the same entity.

Let us consider some Hebrew examples discussed by other scholars.

- # 32 Exod. 15:3 יְהוָה אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה 1. The LORD is a WARRIOR;
#28 #119 יְהוָה שְׁמוֹ 2. The LORD is His NAME.

For Andersen both of these clauses are exceptional, because his rule states that classification must be Pind-Sd. For the exceptional case of Line 1, he first classifies Line 1 as S-P (#32), then proposes two solutions to this exception: (i) apposition "Yahweh, the one of battles," (ii) an isogloss of the title *yahweh šebā'ōt* "he who causes the men of battle to come into existence" (44). For Line 2, Andersen proposes two possibilities: #28 (S-P) and #119 (P-S). Andersen prefers to understand this clause as P-S and translates "His name is YHWH" (#119). These exceptions and proposals are not necessary, since Lines 1-2 are not exceptional but form a clause-focus parallel construction (cumulation).

Another problematic clause is #30 Deut. 6:4:

- שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל "Hear, O Israel!
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ 1 The LORD is our GOD,
יְהוָה אֶחָד 2 the LORD is ONE!

We have seen this verse at the beginning of this chapter as an example that past studies could not solve. *IBHS* comments that "The problem posed by the Shema (Deut. 6:4) are numerous," (135) and lists five possibilities of interpretation. *IBHS* comments further that "it is agreed that no closely comparable passage occurs" (135) and quotes from Gerald Janzen "the Shema does not conform exactly to any standard nominal sentence pattern."

We say, however, that Deut. 6:4 does have other "closely comparable passage[s]," and that the Shema does "conform exactly to" a "standard nominal sentence pattern," which is the cumulative clause-focus parallel construction. Deut. 6:4 has two clauses of which word order is S-P. This is a parallel construction where each item has a fresh new start, non-sequential to the preceding text. The fronting and high pitch of the subjects and the high pitch of predicates indicate deviation from simple commenting (XP//XP). It is basically a list. In this verse, repeating the same subject, where a new subject is expected, creates intensifying effect on the utterance. It appears that the observation of phenomena beyond the clause level and the analysis of the information structure with the focus structure enable us to see "a standard nominal sentence pattern" which the previous studies appear to have missed.

For Gen. 31:38-39, Muraoka indicates that the objects, וְאֵילֵי צֹאנֶךָ (Line 3) and טֶרְפָּה (Line 4), are fronted for emphasis (p. 33):

- 1 זֶה עֲשָׂרִים שָׁנָה אֲנֹכִי עִמָּךְ
2 רַחֲלִיקָה וְעִזֶיךָ לֹא שָׁפְלוּ
3 וְאֵילֵי צֹאנֶךָ לֹא אֲכַלְתִּי
4 טֶרְפָּה לְאֶהֱבֹאתִי אֵלֶיךָ
5 אֲנֹכִי אֲחַטְּנָה
6 מִיָּדִי תִּבְקָשׁנָה גְּנֹבְתֵי יוֹם וְגְנֹבְתֵי לַיְלָה

- 1 ASP THESE TWENTY YEARS I have BEEN WITH YOU;
- 2 SV your EWES and your FEMALE GOATS have NOT MISCARRIED,
- 3 OVS NOR have I EATEN the RAMS of your FLOCKS.
- 4 OVSA That which was TORN of BEASTS I did NOT BRING to YOU;
- 5 SV I bore the LOSS of it MYSELF.

6 AVSO You REQUIRED it of MY HAND whether STOLEN by DAY or STOLEN by NIGHT.

It appears, however, that there are other reasons for the fronting. Notice here that all the six clauses have the XV clause-focus structure.

Line 1 is a circumstantial clause (simultaneity, while . . .).

Lines 2-3 forms a clause-focus parallel construction (itemizing, notice *waw* to connect the two clauses)

Line 4 topicalises that "As to that which was torn of beasts."

Lines 4-5 form a clause-focus parallel construction (contrast)

Lines 4-6 forms a clause-focus parallel construction (cumulation) contrasting sharply "nobody else, but I bore the loss."

By juxtaposing independent and non-sequential clauses one after another, the whole text unit has slow but climactic and emphatic connotation. The two objects Muraoka has in mind are not fronted for emphasis, but for focus.

Other examples of climactic connotation: Gen. 42:36 (fronted names of children).

Below are other examples:

From nominal clauses

#60 Gen. 25:23²⁵⁷ (Line 3)

<u>שְׁנֵי גֵיִים [גוֹיִם] בְּבֶטְנִי</u>	1 "TWO NATIONS are in YOUR WOMB;
<u>וְשְׁנֵי לְאֻמִּים מִמֶּעֵיךָ יִפְרְדוּ</u>	2 And TWO PEOPLES shall be SEPARATED from YOUR BODY;
<u>וְלֹאִם מִלְּאִם יֵאָמֵץ</u>	3 And ONE PEOPLE shall be STRONGER than THE OTHER;
<u>וְרֵב יַעֲבֹד צְעִיר</u>	4 And THE OLDER shall SERVE the YOUNGER."

#34 Num. 23:21

<u>יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו עִמּוֹ</u>	The LORD his GOD is WITH HIM,
<u>וַיִּתְרוּעַת מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ</u>	And the SHOUT of a KING is AMONG THEM.

#19 Deut. 10:21 <u>הוּא תְהִלָּתְךָ</u>	"HE is YOUR PRAISE
<u>וְהוּא אֱלֹהֶיךָ</u>	and HE is YOUR GOD,

#118 Deut. 21:17 (Pragmatic Sd- Pragmatic Pd)

<u>כִּי־הוּא רֵאשִׁית אָנּוּ</u>	for HE is the BEGINNING of his STRENGTH;
<u>לּוֹ מִשְׁפַּט הַבְּכֹרָה</u>	to HIM belongs the RIGHT of the FIRST-BORN.

#55 Deut. 33:3

<u>כָּל־קֹדְשֵׁי בְיָדְךָ</u>	ALL THY HOLY ONES are in THY HAND,
<u>וְהֵם תָּכּוּ לְרַגְלֶיךָ</u>	And THEY FOLLOWED in THY STEPS;

²⁵⁷ Line 1 and 2 consist a cumulative Parallel Construction and Line 3 and 4 consist another. We can see here that our cumulative Parallel Construction of Clause-Focus Structure in the analysis of Information Structure is one kind of synonymous parallelism.

From verbal clauses

Muraoka

Psa. 51:5 כִּי־פָשַׁעִי אֲנִי אֲדַע For I KNOW my TRANSGRESSIONS,

וְחַטָּאתִי נִגְדִי תָמִיד And MY SIN is EVER BEFORE ME.

Gen. 49:31 (שָׁמָּה x3), Judg. 9:16 (אִם x3), Psa. 11:5 (itemizing and cumulation).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 6:13 (אֶת־יְהוָה // וְאֶת־וְיָבוֹ // וְיָבוֹשׁוּ), Deut. 9:2 (אֶתָּה // אֶתָּה), Deut. 10:20

(וְיָבוֹשׁוּ // וְיָבוֹ // אֶת־יְהוָה // אֶת־הַיָּדָיִם), Deut. 11:10 and Deut. 11:11 (כִּי הָאָרֶץ clause

// וְהָאָרֶץ clause²⁵⁸), Deut. 11:24 (כָּל־הַמְּקוֹם clause // מִן־הַמֶּדְבָּר clause).

8.3.4. Summary

To summarise, the clause-focus parallel construction, which consists of clauses with Clause-Focus Structure, seem to have three different types: itemizing, contrast of the whole proposition and cumulation. This is because the clause-focus parallel construction requires a set of independent, non-sequential clauses placed in parallel.

8.4. LIST STRUCTURE

Let us consider a special device "list structure" in this section. This is a text-unit level phenomenon and one of the onset functions which initiates a text unit or discourse (a paragraph or its kind). For example,

#30 Gen. 49:5 שִׁמְעוֹן וְלֵוִי אֲחֵים "SIMEON and LEVI are BROTHERS.

This clause has the clause-focus structure and initiates a paragraph (or a text unit). Therefore this is typical topicalisation, announcing the topic of the text unit at the beginning. Nevertheless, this clause has a relationship with clauses at the beginning of other paragraphs, starting with the names of the 12 tribes. This clause, along with other clauses at the beginning of other paragraphs, form a list whose items are large paragraphs.

Before discussing this further, let us turn our attention back to the itemizing clauses of the clause-focus parallel construction. These items construct a list.

We may notice that some lists have items which have more than one clause. For example, #35 Exod. 6:17 (the sons of Gershon) with Exod. 6:18 and Exod. 6:19:

בְּנֵי גֵרְשׁוֹן לְבְנֵי וְשִׁמְעֵי לְמִשְׁפַּחָתָם
וּבְנֵי קָהָת עֲמֶרָם וַיִּצְהָר וְחִבְרוֹן וְעִזִּיאֵל
וּשְׁנֵי חַיִּי קָהָת שְׁלֹשׁ וּשְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאֵת שָׁנָה
וּבְנֵי מֵרָרִי מִחֲלֵי וּמִוֹשִׁי

²⁵⁸ We may consider that 11:10 as a whole is a clause and so is 11:11. 11:10 is a Casus Pendens and 11:11 has Clause-Focus Structure (XV). If we consider the Casus Pendens as a variation of Clause-Focus Structure, we may understand that these two clauses form a XP//XV Clause-focus parallel construction.

1 The SONS of GERSHON: LIBNI and SHIMEI, according to their FAMILIES.

2 And the SONS of KOHATH: AMRAM and IZHAR and HEBRON and UZZIEL;

3 and the LENGTH of KOHATH'S LIFE was

ONE HUNDRED and THIRTY-THREE YEARS.

4 And the SONS of MERARI: MAHLI and MUSHI.

Line 1, 2, and 4 constitute a list by itemizing. Line 3 gives background information for Kohath's life by Clause-Focus Structure. This demonstrates that although the writer intends to present a list, he can insert a clause to give more information on one item. One item in a list can have an extra clause to expound the item.

Here, one item in a list can be a larger text unit, such as a paragraph. Let us come back to the example above:

#30 Gen. 49:5 שִׁמְעוֹן וְלֵוִי אֶחָיו "SIMEON and LEVI are BROTHERS.

In Jacob's Blessing, many of the names of the 12 tribes are fronted in the beginning of their text units (paragraphs). The name is fronted for topicalisation and Jacob's blessing as a whole is constructed in a list of text units or paragraphs. Those fronted names are: #33 Gen. 49:14 (Issachar), #31 Gen. 49:21 (Naphtali), #31 Gen. 49:27 (Benjamin). Let us call this List Structure in which each item in one list is a larger text unit such as a paragraph.

This list structure is not widely noticed among Hebraists. For example, we have another list structure observed in Moses' blessing on the 12 tribes:

#32 Deut. 33:22 דָּן גִּוַר אַרְיָה "DAN is a LION'S WHELP,
and #32 Deut. 33:23 (Naphtali). These clauses with the XP clause-focus structure start paragraphs, and those paragraphs are items in a large list of Moses's blessing. Since these clauses above are not in accordance with Andersen's binary model (classification must have the P-S sequence), he suggests that these clauses are non-clause (44). For example Andersen translates

Gen. 49:27 בְּנֵימִין זֶאֵב יִטְרֹף "Benjamin: A wolf ravens . . ." (p. 44)

The deviation from his binary model does not necessarily justify this interpretation. The traditional translation that takes parallelism and metre²⁵⁹ into consideration appears to be more valid. According to our theory, these clauses form a list structure. Andersen's interpretation of non-clause is not only unnecessary but obscures this structure in Biblical Hebrew.

Another example is Muraoka's interpretation of Judg. 1:29:

וְאֶפְרַיִם לֹא הוֹרִישׁ אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי Neither did Ephraim drive out the Canaanites

²⁵⁹ בְּנֵימִין זֶאֵב יִטְרֹף 1 Benjamin is a ravenous wolf;

בְּבֹקֶר יֹאכַל עֵד 2 In the morning he devours the prey,

וּלְעֶרֶב יַחְלֹק שָׁלַל 3 And in the evening he divides the spoil.

Word metre: 3-3-3. Syllabic metre: 7-6-6. waw is not counted. עֶרֶב is counted as one. See D. Stuart 1976.

M. O'Connor, who questions the concept of parallelism and extensively reconsiders poetry in Classical Hebrew, understands these six clauses (Gen. 49:5, 14, 21, 27, Deut 33: 22, 23) to be clauses. For example, Gen. 49:27: "Benjamin is a wolf that ravens." (1980, 178).

Here, Ephraim is not fronted for "the reproachful tone" as Muraoka suggests (33, n. 81), but because of a list structure (see other fronted tribe names in v. 30, 31 and 33).

Clauses with כָּל subject phrases

We have another issue raised by Andersen which is related to our list structure. He understands that a clause which has כָּל has the special effect of drawing the subject to the front.²⁶⁰ This notion is questionable. First of all, we have a clause which has the P-S sequence in our data: #120 Deut. 29:22 (Eng. 23):

בְּפִרִית וּמִלַּח שָׂרָפָה כָּל־אֶרֶצָהּ

All its land is BRIMSTONE and SALT, a BURNING WASTE.

This clause has the ordinary Predicate-Focus Structure which is commenting on "the land" activated in the immediately preceding verse, v. 21. This כָּל does not draw the subject phrase in front.

Let us then analyse other clauses with fronted כָּל subject phrases which are 17 in our data. If we can detect some pragmatic functions in these clauses with fronted כָּל subject phrases, we will know the reason for fronting.

Since two clauses have been already analysed to have background information,²⁶¹ we shall concentrate on the 15 clauses.

First example is Numbers chapter 2. It presents the numbers of the armies according to the tribes. The first item is the army of Nahshon: Num. 2:4:

וַיִּצְבְּאוּ וַיִּפְקְדוּהֶם אַרְבַּעַה וּשְׁבַעִים אֶלֶף וּשְׁשׁ מֵאוֹת

and his ARMY, even their NUMBERED MEN, 74,600.

After two more tribes with their numbers, the list gives a sub-total, which is #45 Num. 2:9:

כָּל־הַפְּקָדִים לְמַחֲנֵה יְהוּדָה
מֵאֵת אֶלֶף וּשְׁמֹנִים אֶלֶף וּשְׁשַׁת־אַלְפִים וְאַרְבַּע־מֵאוֹת

The TOTAL of the NUMBERED MEN of the CAMP of JUDAH is 186,400.

Its overall structure is as follows (vv. 3-9)

Those who camp on the east side toward the sunrise shall be of the standard of the camp of Judah,

and the leader...Nahshon and his army ...74,600.

The tribe of Issachar, and the leader...Nethanel and his army ...54,400.

The tribe of Zebulun, and the leader...Eliab and his army ..57,400.

The (sub) total . . . of the camp of Judah: 186,400.

All these clauses have XP Clause-Focus Structure and form a list of the camp of Judah.

These clauses are itemizing. Num. 2:9 has the same XP sequence, not because כָּל draws the subject phrase, but because of itemizing (the clause-focus structure). The chapter has three

²⁶⁰ According to his binary model, classification must be Pind-Sd. However, clauses with כָּל subject phrases tend to have the S-P sequence. Hence exceptions for Andersen:

(i) Rule 3 is not followed when S contains *kol* (see p. 41). Examples are found in ##25 and 26. (43-44)

²⁶¹ See "Background Information" in the preceding chapter.

other subsections which have the same construction as this vv. 3-9, and they as a whole form a large list structure.

Another example is Exodus chapter 46. It lists the names of people who came to Egypt according to their four mothers: the children of Leah (vv. 8-15), Zilpah (vv. 16-18), Rachel (vv. 19-22), and Bilhah (vv. 23-25). Each section lists names (Gen. 46:21), gives sub-total (#58 Gen. 46:22) and finally the grand-total (#58 Gen. 46:26). See also #58 Gen. 46:15 (Leah) and #58 Gen. 46:25 (Bilhah). All these clauses, including clauses without לְ, have Clause-Focus Structure and form a list structure as a whole. The fronting of the לְ subject is not due to its special character, but to List Structure.

Other examples of list structure with fronted לְ: #45 Num. 2:16 (Reuben), #45 Num. 2:24 (Ephraim), and #45 Num. 2:31 (Dan). #52 Num. 3:22 (similarly v. 34), Num. 3:33-37 (Merari's number and duties in a list structure) and the sub-total in #45 Num. 3:39, #45 Num. 26:43 (All the families of the Shuhamites),²⁶² Exod. 27:3 and # 127 Exod. 27:19 (לְ phrase as a pragmatic subject),²⁶³ #26 Exod. 25:36 (all of it shall be one piece),²⁶⁴ #43 Exod. 27:17 (the pillars around the court), #26 Exod. 37:22 (the bulbs and branches of the candle stand), #44 Exod. 38:16 (the hangings).

Other examples of list structure

From nominal clauses

More than one clause in items

#42 Gen. 10:25 (Eber's two sons), #35 Gen. 36:15 (the sons of Eliphaz), #35 Gen. 46:19 (the sons of Jacob's wife Rachel), #35 Exod. 6:14 (the sons of Reuben), #35 Num. 26:19 (the sons of Judah).

Paragraphs as items

#128 Lev. 23:35 (and v. 36 with pragmatic subjects "on the first day," etc.), #128 Lev. 23:8 (on the seventh day), #128 Num. 28:18 (on the first day, see vv. 16-17).

From Deuteronomy

Deut. 5:13 and Deut. 5:14 (six days // the seventh days), Deut. 9:20 and Deut. 9:21 ("as for Aaron . . . , as for your sinful thing . . .").

²⁶² the result of the census of the Israelites in Num. chapter 26 is presented in the List Structure, לְ-מִשְׁפַּחַת הַנְּשִׂימָי is fronted, not because of לְ, but of the non-sequential character of the List Structure.

²⁶³ According to GKC, לְ here does not function as a preposition but it "serves the same purpose as the *casus pendens* beginning the sentence, as Nu 18:8" or "an emphasising particle" (§143e) and GKC gives Gen. 9:10, 23:10, Ex. 27:3, Ez 44:9 as other examples. The text unit is about the construction of the court of the tabernacle (vv. 9-19). This unit starts with waw + qal (וַעֲשִׂיתָ אֵת הַחֲצֵר הַמִּשְׁכָּן) And you shall make the court of the tabernacle) followed by its description in a list structure and ends with the clause above (v. 19). This clause (v. 19) has a fronted לְ subject, not because of לְ, but of the List Structure.

²⁶⁴ The text unit vv. 31-36 is the instruction for the candle stand. It starts with a command: "וַעֲשִׂיתָ מִנְרֵת זָהָב טָהוֹרָה" Then you shall make a lamp stand of pure gold." This is followed mostly by nominal clauses with the Clause-Focus Structure which describe the candle stand. The כֹּל clause which also describes the candle stand has the SP sequence, not because of כֹּל, but of the List Structure.

8.5. SUMMARY

This chapter specifically dealt with some usages of the clause-focus structure. First, we have viewed parallelism from the perspective of focus structure. Parallelism may be classified according to three focus structures: predicate-focus parallel construction (Px//Px//Px), argument-focus parallel construction (Xp//Xp//Xp), and clause-focus parallel construction (XP//XP//XP).

Clause-focus parallel construction seems to have three types: itemizing, contrast and cumulation, however, the distinction is semantic and provisional. All of these three types exhibit a feature of clause-focus structure: independence of an each item or non-sequentiality. Itemizing parallel construction has items which have new topics and new comments:

#38 Gen. 31:43:

<u>הַבָּנוֹת בְּנֹתַי</u>	"The DAUGHTERS are my DAUGHTERS,
<u>וְהַבָּנִים בְּנֵי</u>	and the CHILDREN are my CHILDREN,
<u>וְהַצֹּאֵן צֹאֲנֵי</u>	and the FLOCKS are my FLOCKS, . . ."

Contrastive parallel construction contrasts whole propositions:

#41 Deut. 29:28:

הַסֵּתֵר לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְהַנִּגְלֹת לָנוּ וּלְבָנֵינוּ עַד-עוֹלָם

The SECRET THINGS belong to the LORD our GOD,
but the THINGS REVEALED belong to US and to our SONS FOREVER.

Cumulative parallel construction cumulates propositions with the same topic referent. One of the controversial verse is #30 Deut. 6:4:

<u>יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ</u>	1 The LORD is our GOD,
<u>יְהוָה אֶחָד</u>	2 the LORD is ONE!

This belongs to the third type of the clause-focus parallel construction.

Chiastic construction will be discussed as an exception which overrides information structure in 10.2 "Chiastic Construction" in pp. 225ff.

The above categories may be schematised as follows.

A Parallel Construction:

- 1 Predicate-Focus Structure (Px//Px//Px)
- 2 Argument-Focus Structure (Xp//Xp//Xp)
- 3 Clause-Focus Structure (XP//XP//XP)
 - a Itemizing
 - b Contrast
 - c Cumulative

B Chiastic Construction: (XP//PX or PX//XP)

Figure 4: Parallel and Chiastic Constructions

We have also observed List Structure which utilises both topicalisation and itemizing of the clause-focus structure. In a list structure, such as the blessing on the 12 tribes by Jacob and Moses, each item is a paragraph which starts with a clause of clause-focus structure announcing the topic of the paragraph.

9. SOME PROBLEMS FOR THE THEORY OF FOCUS STRUCTURE

We have analysed most of the clauses within our data, which exhibit conformity with our focus-structure analysis. Nevertheless, we still have some clauses which seem to contradict our thesis. Muraoka's "five categories of peculiarities" is the major one. We also have fronted adverbs and adverbial phrases which do not seem to fit into our framework. There are some clauses in reported speeches that do not follow the ordinary information structuring.

9.1. MURAOKA'S FIVE PECULIARITIES

The first problem we encounter is Muraoka's five categories of the word order inversion. They apparently contradict our thesis. They are Religious Sentiment, the word וְאֵל, a special group of verbs, cognate object and peculiarity with the legal texts. We shall examine those clauses closely.

9.1.1. Religious Sentiment

The first peculiarity is related to religious manifestation.

J-Muraoka notes "In some cases religious sentiment may account for the initial position of the word for God or an agent of his" (§155 ne). Muraoka remarks:

It is possible that in certain expressions with the divine name or a divine messenger as the subject, a kind of religious psychology in which God occupies the dominant place determines the arrangement of words giving S the initial position. (35)

Muraoka comments further that "This happens when one blesses another asking for divine protection as in Gn 28:3" (35).

וְאֵל שְׁדֵי יְבָרֶךְ אֶתְךָ וַיַּכְרֶךְ וַיַּרְבֶּךְ

(SVO) And may GOD ALMIGHTY BLESS YOU and MAKE YOU FRUITFUL and MULTIPLY YOU.

He gives other examples where God or his agents are fronted.²⁶⁵ Nevertheless, Muraoka comments that "Objection may be raised in view of conflicting examples like Exod. 5:21" (35) where the sequence is V-S

יְרֵא יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם (VSA) may the Lord LOOK UPON YOU

Muraoka's other conflicting examples of V-S sequence are Num. 6:24, 25, 26, 2Kings 8:7, and Ruth 1:8, 9 where the verb is fronted in blessing. He concludes that

Although we are not able to attain absolute certainty, no alternative explanation with more plausibility seems to suggest itself at present. (35)

Here Muraoka faces an inexplicable irregularity that the same wish for God takes two different word orders. The theory of focus structure may shed light on this phenomenon.

²⁶⁵ See the Appendix.

First of all, we need to recognise there are a few different types within optative clauses.

As J-Muraoka comments, many optative clauses have the sequence of V-S (§155 ne and §155 l), such as Exod. 5:21 quoted above.

יִרְאָ יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם (VSA) may the Lord LOOK UPON YOU

The reason that many optative clauses have this sequence may be explained by our theory. The topic is usually an active or highly accessible referent (God) and the wish expressed is new information added to the topic referent (see also Ruth 1:8-9). Namely Exod. 5:21 above has our Px predicate-focus structure. It also happens when the utterance is a monologue (e.g., Gen. 1:3) where the topic referent is active in the speaker's mind. This is true not only with optative, but with imperative as well. In commands, the topic referents ("you") are usually considered to be active, and thus the verbs (imperative) are fronted. The active topic referent is often affixed to the verb. We may say that optative verbs, along with imperative and other wayyiqtol verbs, tend to take Px Predicate-Focus Structure, because those clauses are adding new information (either it is a wish or a command) to active or highly accessible referents (God is a highly accessible referent). In short Px Predicate-Focus Structure is the unmarked²⁶⁶ structure also for optative.

It follows that if we can find other pragmatic implications where the inverted word order occurs, our theory may explain this phenomenon.

Exclamation/proclamation: Benediction

The inversion occurs, as Muraoka observes, "when one blesses another asking for divine protection." For example, Gen. 43:14:

וְאֵל שְׂרָדִי יִתֵּן לָכֶם רַחֲמִים לְפָנַי הָאִישׁ
וְשַׁלַּח לָכֶם אֶת־אֲחֵיכֶם אַחֵר וְאֶת־בְּנֵימִין

1 (SVAO) and may GOD ALMIGHTY grant you COMPASSION in the SIGHT of the man,

2 (VAOO) that he may RELEASE to you your OTHER BROTHER and BENJAMIN.

This verse is uttered at the end of Jacob's speech which starts from v. 11. This verse gives a sense of climax and closure. As we have observed, XP clause-focus structure gives a sense of stopping the flow and are often used to close a group of clauses or an episode.²⁶⁷ This pragmatic implication is observed in this verse above.

In addition to its function of closure, we may also detect a sense of exclamation/proclamation. We have discussed in the previous chapters that XP clause-focus structure has a pragmatic implication to convey exclamation/proclamation.²⁶⁸ For example,

TONY BLAIR became the PRIME MINISTER.

²⁶⁶ See p. 116 for the term marked and unmarked, and also 5.6.2 "Markedness of Predicate-Focus Structure" in pp. 112ff.

²⁶⁷ See 7.3.5 "Inter-clausal Closure" in pp. 159ff and also 7.4.3 "Climax" in pp. 178ff.

²⁶⁸ See 7.3.1 "Exclamation/Proclamation" in pp. 147ff.

This clause can be uttered out of the blue with surprise, strong sense of emotion, solemnity or proclamation.²⁶⁹ The activation of the referents does not count here. Even if the referents are brand-new, they can be uttered without being ill-formed.²⁷⁰ Or even when the referent is the main topic of an episode, it can be repeated with this connotation (e.g., Exod. 6:6 וַיְהִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). When this pragmatic implication is applied to optative clauses, it will create a sense of solemnity. For example, 1Sam. 24:20:

וַיְהִי יְשׁוּבָה טוֹבָה תַּחַת הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ לִּי

(SVOO) May the LORD therefore REWARD YOU with GOOD in return for what you have DONE to me THIS DAY.

The clause closes the speech of Saul to David. We may say this is similar to a "benediction" in a worship service. This understanding is further supported by the fact that this type of blessing often occurs at the end of a speech.²⁷¹

Just as we distinguish our wish from a benediction at services, there seems to be a distinction also in Biblical Hebrew. The benediction by Eli and Jacob have XP Clause-Focus Structure. On the other hand Ruth's blessing on her daughters-in-law (Ruth 1:8-9) and the people's complaints against Moses (Exod. 5:21) are uttered in a simple optative mood and have Px Predicate-Focus Structure.²⁷²

We may conclude that the word order is inverted in these examples above because of its exclamatory/proclamatory pragmatic implication such as in benediction.

Contrast of the whole proposition

The inversion takes place in some clauses, not because of "a kind of religious psychology," but of contrast on the whole proposition. Muraoka's another example is Gen. 31:29:

יֵשׁ-לְאֵל יָדִי לַעֲשׂוֹת עִמָּכֶם רָע 1 It is in MY POWER to do you HARM,

וְאֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיכֶם אָמַשׁ אָמַר אֵלַי 2 but the GOD of YOUR FATHER spoke to me LAST NIGHT,

Line 2 has XP clause-focus structure (SAVA), because of the presentation of a proposition which is independent of and non-sequential to the preceding clause, Line 1. Here we can detect contrast from the presence of contrastive members. The fronting of God is not due to a special religious psychology.

Another example of contrast: Gen. 44:16.²⁷³

²⁶⁹ Not necessarily with loud voice.

²⁷⁰ See 7.2 "Information-Level Implications" in pp. 146ff for introduction of brand-new referents by the clause-focus structure.

²⁷¹ For example, Gen. 28:3-4, Gen. 31:53, Gen. 48:16, Gen. 43:29 (This is a single utterance. We can detect an emotional response here: an exclamatory/proclamatory independent utterance) and 1Sam. 1:17.

²⁷² Num. 6:24-26 is apparently a benediction. However, since it consists of a parallel construction which comments on the same topic reference, it takes Predicate-Focus Structure (Predicate Focus Parallel Construction).

²⁷³ The clause may have a connotation of closure or exclamation as well.

Discourse functions (text-unit level implications)

Muraoka's remaining examples, which are supposed to demonstrate the fronting of divine subjects, show that the subjects are fronted not due to their religious nature but for discourse functions.

Gen. 48:3 [initiation, background information]

וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב אֶל-יֹזֶפֶךָ
אֵל שְׂדֵי נְרָאָה-אֵלֵי בְלוּז בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתִי

1 Then Jacob said to Joseph,

2 "GOD ALMIGHTY APPEARED to ME at LUZ in the LAND of CANAAN and BLESSED me . . .

Line 2 initiates a new speech. It is also background information for the statement of Jacob that the two sons of Joseph would become sons of Jacob. These are discourse function we have observed in XP clause-focus structure.²⁷⁴

Another example is Judg. 13:6-8 (אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים [initiation, activation of an inactive reference]).

9.1.1.1. Summary

"Religious sentiment" or "a kind of religious psychology" does not affect the word order. What affects it is pragmatic functions and their corresponding focus structures. We may say that optative clauses, including some blessings, are "commenting," because they are adding new information to active or highly accessible referents. Hence Px predicate-focus structure. On the other hand when a sense of solemnity or closure is meant such as in benediction, XP clause-focus structure is used. The clause-focus structure is also used to contrast the whole propositions and for discourse function.

9.1.2. The word 'אישׁ

The second peculiar reason of fronting that Muraoka proposes (34) is the word 'אישׁ.

J-Muraoka notes,

The word 'אישׁ (or אִשָּׁה) used in indefinite sense, "someone," "everyone" or "nobody" in a negative clause, fairly frequently occupies the initial slot in the clause. (§155 nf)

Muraoka detects this peculiarity of 'אישׁ in his examples.²⁷⁵

Close examination of wider range of 'אישׁ clauses will reveal that the fronting of 'אישׁ is not due to its peculiarity, but rather to indicate pragmatic functions (other than commenting and identification). The following discussion is divided into two parts. First section will study the use of phrases which contain 'אישׁ and the second section will concentrate on clauses where 'אישׁ alone is used as the subject or the object.

²⁷⁴ See 7.4 "Text-unit Level Implications (discourse functions)" in pp. 161ff.

²⁷⁵ See the Appendix.

9.1.2.1. 'iš phrases

First we shall look at *ʾiš* phrases. We shall observe below that the fronted *ʾiš* phrases seem to have pragmatic functions. They are onset functions, background information, closure and clause-focus parallel construction.

Onset functions

Some clauses show the onset functions. For example, *ʾiš* in Judg. 21:1 is fronted for initiation.

וְאִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִשְׁבַּע בְּמִצְפָּה לֵאמֹר
אִישׁ מִמֶּנּוּ לֹא יִתֵּן בָּתוּלָתוֹ לְבְנֵימִן לְאִשָּׁה

1 Now the men of Israel had sworn in Mizpah, saying,

2 "NONE of us shall give his daughter to BENJAMIN in marriage."

Line 2 initiates a speech. This initiation is one of pragmatic discourse functions indicated by XP clause-focus structure.²⁷⁶

Other examples of onset clauses: *ʾiš* אֶל-יֵרַע in 1Sam. 21:3 (initiation), Jer. 36:19 (notice closure), and Jer. 38:24 (initiation).

Background information

In Gen. 41:11

וַנַּחֲלֶמָה חֲלוֹם בְּלַיְלָה אֶחָד
אֲנִי וְהוּא אִישׁ כַּפְתָּרוֹן חֲלֵמֵנו חֲלֵמֵנו

1 "And we had a dream on the same night,

2 HE AND I; each of us DREAMED according to the INTERPRETATION of his own DREAM.

Line 2 has the fronted subject אֲנִי וְהוּא. This fronting here indicates that this clause provides background information (or circumstantial clause: explicatory). Then an adverbial *ʾiš* phrase (אִישׁ כ) follows, preceding the verb. The clause as a whole has XP clause-focus structure which provides background information (or circumstantial clause).²⁷⁷

Closure

Another pragmatic function that the fronted *ʾiš* phrase has is closure.²⁷⁸ The idiomatic expression לֵאשׁ לִפְנֵי פֶה as an adverbial phrase is fronted in Exod. 12:4 and 16:18.

Exod. 16:18: אִישׁ לְפִי-אֲכָלוֹ לְקִטּוֹ EVERY MAN GATHERED as MUCH as he should EAT.

This phrase is found in two more verses in Scripture (Exod. 16:16 and 18).²⁷⁹ Muraoka seems to indicate that this idiom is fronted because of its nature to be placed at the

²⁷⁶ See 7.4.1.1 "Topicalisation and Initiation" in pp. 163ff.

²⁷⁷ See 7.4.2 "Background Information" in pp. 174ff.

²⁷⁸ See 7.4.4 "Closure" in pp. 179ff.

beginning of a clause. But first we should notice that this phrase follows a verb in Exod. 16:16:

לְקַטּוּ מִמֶּנּוּ אִישׁ לְפִי אֲכָלוֹ GATHER of it EVERY MAN as MUCH as he should EAT.

In this clause we can observe that the subject (you) is activated and the clause adds new information (a command here), and thus the verb is fronted (Predicate-Focus Structure).

Note also that this phrase is used "in indefinite sense, 'someone,' 'everyone'" in which אִישׁ is supposed to be fronted according to J-Muraoka (§155 nf). However, it follows the verb here.

Let us return to Exod. 16:18 above.

Exod. 16:18

וַיִּמְדוּ בְעֹמֶר
וְלֹא הָעֲדִיף הַמְרֵבָה
וְהַמִּמְעִיט לֹא הַחֲסִיר
אִישׁ לְפִי-אֲכָלוֹ לְקַטּוּ

- 1 When they MEASURED it with an OMER,
- 2 HE who had GATHERED MUCH had NO EXCESS,
- 3 and HE who had GATHERED LITTLE had NO LACK;
- 4 EVERY man GATHERED as MUCH as he should EAT.

Lines 2-3 has a chiasitic construction. Line 4 seems to summarise what is described in Lines 2-3 and closes this text unit. This summary or exposition is a pragmatic function indicated by XP clause-focus structure. The clause with אִישׁ לְפִי phrase in Exod. 12:4 and Num. 26:54 also have an indication of closure or summary.

What we have observed is that the idiom, אִישׁ לְפִי + noun, follows the finite verb in commenting clauses (Predicate-Focus Structure) and it is fronted when the clause has an indication of closure (Clause-Focus Structure).

Other examples of closure with אִישׁ לְפִי are Judg. 17:6 and Judg. 21:25.

We shall look at another אִישׁ phrase, אִישׁ אֶל אֶחָיו. Muraoka gives Is. 9:18 as an example of the peculiarity of אִישׁ (35):

Is. 9:18

בְּעִבְרַת יְהוָה צָבָאוֹת נִעְתָּם אֲרָץ
וַיְהִי הָעָם כְּמִאֲכֻלֵּת אֵשׁ
אִישׁ אֶל-אֶחָיו לֹא יַחְמְלוּ

- 1 By the fury of the Lord of hosts the land is burned up,
- 2 And the people are like fuel for the fire;
- 3 NO MAN SPARES his BROTHER.

²⁷⁹ Prov. 27:21 is not included in this figure, since אִישׁ לְפִי in the verse seems to be a clause (SP) than an adverbial phrase. The whole verse forms the parallel construction (list or contrast).

However, out of thirteen אֵל-אִישׁ adverbial phrases attested in Scripture, this clause is the only one where this phrase is fronted. In all other clauses,²⁸⁰ this phrase follows the verb as in

Gen. 37:19 אֵל-אִישׁ וַיֹּאמְרוּ

and these clauses are commenting on the active or accessible referents. Therefore we may recognise they have Px predicate-focus structure. It follows, therefore, that Is. 9:18 is not an example to show the peculiarity of אֵישׁ. Is. 9:18 has the inverted word order and its focus structure seems indicate a pragmatic function of closure.²⁸¹

Clause Focus Parallel Construction

The final pragmatic function we can observe is Clause Focus Parallel Construction.²⁸² Muraoka gives Job 41:9 as an example of the peculiarity of אֵישׁ (35).

אֵישׁ-בְּאֶחָיו יִדְבְּקוּ "They are JOINED one to ANOTHER;

יִתְלַכְדוּ וְלֹא יִתְפָּרְדוּ They CLASP each other and CANNOT be SEPARATED.

However, we find the use of the same idiomatic expression in Px Predicate-Focus Structure in Lev. 26:37:

אֵישׁ-בְּאֶחָיו וְכָשְׁלוּ They will therefore STUMBLE over each OTHER

This means that אֵישׁ is not necessarily drawn to the front. If we look at the wider context of Job 41:9, we recognise that vv. 8-9 (Eng. 16-18) form a XP//XP//XP Clause Focus Parallel Construction. It describes Leviathan in a clause-focus parallel construction (itemizing).²⁸³

Other examples of itemizing are Lev. 18:23,²⁸⁴ Joel 2:8,²⁸⁵ and Jer. 31:30.²⁸⁶

²⁸⁰ modifying subjects: Gen. 37:19, Gen. 42:21, Gen. 42:28, Ex. 16:15, Num. 14:4, 2Kings 7:6, Jer. 23:35, Ezek. 24:23; modifying objects: Jer. 13:14, Jer. 25:26 The main verb is וְנִשְׁקָה in v. 17; modifying an adverbial noun phrase: Ex. 25:20=Ex. 37:9 commenting on the activated referent: the cherubim in vv. 18-19. Notice that the last clause of this verse, אֶל-הַכַּפְּרֹת יִהְיוּ פְּנֵי הַכְּרֻבִים, the faces of the cherubim are to be turned toward the mercy seat, closes this text-unit with XV Clause-Focus Structure.

²⁸¹ See the last clause of the following verse (v. 19) for the similar effect.

²⁸² See 8 "Parallel Construction and List Structure" in pp. 183ff.

²⁸³ v. 8 אֶחָד בְּאֶחָד יִגְשֶׁה (SAV) One is so near to another,

וְרוּחַ לֹא-יָבוֹא בֵּינֵיהֶם (SVA) That no air can come between them.

²⁸⁴

וּבְכָל-בְּהֵמָה לֹא-תִתֵּן שְׂכֻבְתָּהּ לְטִמְאָה-בָּהּ
וְאִשָּׁה לֹא-תִעַמֵּד לְפָנָי בְּהֵמָה לְרִבְעָה

1 (AVA) Also you shall not have intercourse with any animal to be defiled with it,

2 (SVA) nor shall any woman stand before an animal to mate with it.

The pragmatic subject בְּכָל-בְּהֵמָה is fronted in Line 1 and the subject is fronted in Line 2. We can observe XP//XP here of itemizing.

²⁸⁵ Verses 7, 8 and 9 have 4 clauses in each verse. Verse 7 has a XP//XP//XP//לֹאV pattern. The exactly same pattern is repeated in v. 8. All the clauses in verse 9 have XP: XP//XP//XP//XP. Namely these verses have XP Clause Focus Parallel Construction (list or cumulation) to describe the fearfully destructive force in the last days.

Summary

The idiomatic adverbial phrases with אִישׁ follow our theory of focus structure. These phrases follow the verb when the clause comments on an active or accessible referent (Predicate-Focus Structure), and precede it when other pragmatic functions are indicated (Clause-Focus Structure).

9.1.2.2. 'iš by itself

We shall now turn to clauses which have אִישׁ alone as the subject or the object.

Contrary to Muraoka's proposal, אִישׁ often follows a verb. For example, Deut. 34:6:

וַיִּקְבֹּר אֹתוֹ בְּנֵי בְּאֶרֶץ מוֹאָב מוֹל בֵּית פְּעוֹר
וְלֹא־יָדַע אִישׁ אֶת־קְבֻרָתוֹ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה

He buried him in Moab, in the valley opposite Beth Peor,
but to THIS day NO ONE KNOWS where his GRAVE is.

2Kings 4:29 has two clauses with אִישׁ. One is a subject, and another is an object. Both follow the verbs.

כִּי־תִמְצָא אִישׁ לֹא תִבְרַכְנוּ
וְכִי־יִבְרַכְךָ אִישׁ לֹא תִעֲנֶנּוּ

(VO) If you meet ANYONE, do NOT GREET him,
(VS) and if ANYONE GREETs you, do NOT ANSWER.

These clauses have the predicate-focus structure. We have observed in chapter 5 that a brand-new referent is generally least acceptable as the topic of the predicate-focus structure. However the unanchored אִישׁ appears often as the topic of Predicate-Focus Structure. This is not considered to be ill-formed, because of its indefinite nature (someone, anyone, nobody) or its generic nature (a man in general as in Gen. 2:24).²⁸⁷

Other examples of Predicate-Focus Structure with אִישׁ: Exod. 16:29, Exod. 34:24, Lev. 27:26, Deut. 7:24, Deut. 11:25, Deut. 23:1, Josh. 1:5, Josh. 10:8.

When אִישׁ is fronted, it is not due to its peculiar nature. We can observe pragmatic functions in those clauses.

Exclamation/Proclamation²⁸⁸

Hos. 2:12

וַעֲפָה אֲגֹלָה אֶת־נִבְלָתָהּ לְעֵינַי מֵאֶתְבִּיָּהּ
וְאִישׁ לֹא־יִצְלִיֶנָּה מִיָּדִי

²⁸⁶ All five clauses in vv. 29 and 30 have the X-P sequence and form XP//XP Clause Focus Parallel Construction for literary effect.

²⁸⁷ See 5.4.4 "Indefinite unanchored topic 'iš" in pp. 108ff.

²⁸⁸ See 7.3.1 "Exclamation/Proclamation" in pp. 147ff.

1 So now I will expose her lewdness before the eyes of her lovers;

2 NO ONE will take her OUT of my HANDS.

Line 2 does not relate to Line 1 directly, but it is rather an exclamatory utterance of the Lord.

This independent feature of the clause is indicated by the clause-focus structure.

Other examples: 2Kings 10:19, 1Kings 18:40 (exclamatory?), Jer. 38:24 (and initiation).

Onset²⁸⁹

Judg. 4:20

וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֶיהָ עֲמִיד בְּפֶתַח הָאֹהֶל
וְהָיָה אִם-אִישׁ יָבוֹא וְשָׁאַלְךָ
וְאָמַר הֲיִשְׁכַּח אִישׁ וְאָמַרְתָּ אֵין

And he said to her, "Stand in the doorway of the tent,
and it shall be if ANYONE COMES and INQUIRES of YOU,
and says, 'Is there anyone here?' that you shall say, 'No.'"

□ clause initiates a short text-unit about the possible pursue of the enemy.

Other examples: Exod. 16:19 (initiation), Exod. 34:3 (topicalisation, parallel construction), 1Sam. 21:3 (initiation and contrast?), Zech. 2:4 (topicalisation).

Circumstantial clause or Background information²⁹⁰

Gen. 24:16

וְהַנְּעֹרָה טִבַּת מְרֻאָה מְאֹד בְּחַוְלָהּ
וְאִישׁ לֹא יָדָעָהּ
וְחָרָד הָעֵינָהּ וְחָמְלָה כְּדָהּ וְחָעַל

1 The girl was very beautiful, a virgin;

2 NO MAN had EVER LAIN with her.

3 She went down to the spring, filled her jar and came up again.

Line 2 stops the flow of the narrative and expounds "a virgin."

Other examples: 2Kings 10:25 (paraphrasing), 2Kings 23:18 (paraphrasing), Jer. 36:19 (paraphrasing), Jer. 40:15, Jer. 41:4 (circumstantial clause "which no one knows about"), Ezek. 44:2.

Closure²⁹¹

Is. 40:26

מִלִּב אֲוֹנִים וְאֲמִיץ כֹּחַ 1 Because of his great power and mighty strength,
אִישׁ לֹא נֶעְדָּר ס 2 NOT ONE of them is MISSING.

Line 2 closes the short text unit of v. 26 which tells God's power of creation.

²⁸⁹ See 7.4.1 "Onset Functions" in pp. 161ff.

²⁹⁰ See 7.3.3 "Circumstantial clause" in pp. 153ff and also 7.4.2 "Background Information" in pp. 174ff.

²⁹¹ See 7.4.4 "Closure" in pp. 179ff.

Parallel construction and chiastic construction²⁹²

Exod. 34:3 וְאִישׁ לֹא-יֵעֶלֶה עִמָּךְ NO ONE is to COME WITH YOU

וְגַם-אִישׁ אֶל-יִרְאָה בְּכָל-הָהָר or NO ONE is to be SEEN ANYWHERE on the MOUNTAIN;

This verse has a clause-focus parallel construction.

Other examples: Ezek. 18:16 (see v. 14, 15), Exod. 34:3, 1Sam. 2:33, Ezek. 18:7.

Chiastic Construction: Hos. 4:4

9.1.2.3. Summary

וְאִישׁ idiomatic phrases follow verbs when the clauses comment on the active or accessible referents (commenting of Predicate-Focus Structure). When these idiomatic phrases are fronted, we can observe other pragmatic implications. Their implications are clause-focus parallel construction, and discourse functions (onset and closure).

Similarly, when וְאִישׁ is used by itself as a subject or as an object, it follows a verb for commenting. Though וְאִישׁ is not anchored, it is not considered to be ill-formed because of its indefinite or generic nature. When it is fronted, we can observe other pragmatic functions, such as exclamation and discourse functions.

9.1.3. A special group of verbs

We have looked at two peculiar reasons of fronting that Muraoka suggests: "Religious sentiment" and "וְאִישׁ." We shall now discuss the third reason of fronting. It is a special group of verbs. Muraoka notes that

It appears that in certain places the use of a special group of verbs — chiefly verbs of movement and knowledge — is responsible for the otherwise inexplicable fronting of the subject. (36)

The examples that Muraoka lists²⁹³ show, however, that a special group of verbs is not responsible for the fronting of the subjects. We can observe two functions in these examples. They are identification (Xv Argument-Focus Structure) and other pragmatic functions (XV Clause-Focus Structure).

9.1.3.1. Argument-Focus Structure

First we shall look at

Gen. 47:4 "לָגוּר בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם" We have come to SOJOURN in the LAND."

Muraoka proposes that this prepositional phrase is fronted because of the peculiarity of the movement verb גָּר. Let us look at its context closely. First, this utterance is a part of Jacob's response to Pharaoh's question "What is your occupation?" Here Jacob's coming to Egypt is shared knowledge between Pharaoh and Jacob. The assertion of Jacob's utterance is to tell Pharaoh the purpose of their coming to Egypt. Jacob identifies "to sojourn in the land" with

²⁹² See 8 "Parallel Construction and List Structure" in pp. 183ff.

X of the presupposed proposition "we have come for X." Thus this clause has Xp argument-focus structure of identification. The argument (the prepositional phrase) is fronted not because of the peculiarity of the verb בא, but of its function of identification.

9.1.3.2. Clause-Focus Structure

The rest of Muraoka's clauses have other pragmatic functions.

Inter-clausal Level Implications²⁹⁴

1Sam. 4:6

מָה קוֹל הַתְּרוּעָה הַגְּדוֹלָה הַזֹּאת בְּמַחֲנֵה הָעִבְרִים
וַיֵּדְעוּ כִּי אָרוֹן יְהוָה בָּא אֶל-הַמַּחֲנֶה

1 "What does the noise of this great shout in the camp of the Hebrews mean?"

2 Then they understood that the ARK of the LORD had COME INTO the CAMP.

Line 2 כִּי clause is a response to the question "What does the noise mean?" of Line 1. Line 2 reports an event which was unknown to the Philistines. This has a typical "event-reporting"²⁹⁵ implication. We use the term "proclamatory"²⁹⁶ for this implication. Hence XV Clause-Focus Structure. The word order is inverted not due to the peculiarity of the verb בא, but to an inter-clausal level pragmatic function.

Other examples:

Exclamation/Proclamation: Judg. 4:14 (הֲלֹא יְהוָה יִצָּא).

Contrast of the whole proposition:²⁹⁷ Judg. 4:16, Judg. 14:4, Judg. 16:20 (יְהוָה סָר).

Circumstantial clause:²⁹⁸ Judg. 3:20 (anteriority) and 1Sam. 6:14 (וְהָעִגְלָה בָּאָה anteriority).

Text-unit Level Implications (Discourse Functions)²⁹⁹

Onset³⁰⁰

Judg. 4:17 וְסִיסְרָא נָס בְּרַגְלָיו אֶל-אֶהֱל יַעֲל

Now SISERA FLED AWAY on FOOT to the TENT of Jael . . .

The active referent Sisera is fronted not because of the peculiarity of the verb נס, but to announce the referent as the topic of the text-unit (topicalisation).

Other examples of onset functions: Gen. 42:10 (topicalisation rather than contrast), Gen. 46:31 (topicalisation, activation of an inactive referent), Gen. 47:1 (topicalisation and

²⁹³ See Appendix.

²⁹⁴ For the inter-clausal pragmatic functions which include contrast of the whole proposition and circumstantial clause below, see 7.3 "Inter-clausal Level Implications" in pp. 147ff.

²⁹⁵ This event-reporting is recognised by Niccacci (1993, 219-221), Lambrecht (1994, 222) and Gross (1999, 40-45).

²⁹⁶ See 7.3.1 "Exclamation/Proclamation" in pp. 147ff.

²⁹⁷ See 7.3.2 "Contrast of the whole proposition" in pp. 150ff.

²⁹⁸ See 7.3.3 "Circumstantial clause" in pp. 153ff.

²⁹⁹ See 7.4 "Text-unit Level Implications (discourse functions)" in pp. 161ff.

³⁰⁰ See 7.4.1 "Onset Functions" in pp. 161ff.

activation of an inactive referent), Gen. 47:5 (topicalisation), Gen. 48:2 (topicalisation, activation of an inactive referent) Judg. 16:23 (topic-shift), 1Sam. 16:14 (initiation), Gen. 39:8 (topicalisation). Note that Judg. 13:6 seems to introduce a brand-new referent "הַאֱלֹהִים אִישׁ" a man of God" in addition to topicalisation.

Other examples of text-unit level implications (discourse functions)

Background information³⁰¹

Gen. 34:7 (background information. see Hamor in v. 6 and v. 8) and Judg. 6:33 (initiation, and background information).

Closure³⁰²

Judg. 6:21 (the clause "וַיִּמָּוֶט אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה הַלַּיְלָה מֵעֵינָיו" Then the angel of the Lord vanished from his sight" closes the utterance).

Summary

All of these examples of Muraoka to prove that certain verbs draw arguments in front can be explained more simply. The subjects and objects are fronted in these classes because of two focus structures. One is the argument-focus structure whose pragmatic function is identification, another is the clause-focus structure which have other pragmatic functions including exclamation/proclamation, contrast of the whole proposition, circumstantial clause, and discourse functions (onset, background information, and closure). The word order is inverted not due to the peculiarity of a special group of verbs, but for the argument-focus structure and the clause-focus structure.

9.1.4. Cognate Object

The fourth peculiar reason of fronting is "cognate object." Muraoka comments that "In the following two places [Judg. 7:13 and 14:16] a cognate object [חֵלֶם] precedes, very likely without any specific reasons." However, there is a specific reason. It is to indicate pragmatic functions other than commenting and identification.

Predicate-Focus Structure

First we may say, contrary to Muraoka, that cognate objects follow the verb when the sender comments on the active or accessible referent (Px Predicate-Focus Structure). For example, in Gen. 37:9,³⁰³ the narrator comments on the active or accessible referent Joseph.

וַיְחַלֵּם עוֹר חֵלֶם אַחֵר Now he had STILL ANOTHER DREAM.

The active topic referent is expressed in an affixed form in the verb: PxX.

³⁰¹ See 7.4.2 "Background Information" in pp. 174ff.

³⁰² See 7.4.4 "Closure" in pp. 179ff.

³⁰³ Its information structure is apparently for the narrator and the listener, because Joseph's second dream is activated in Line 1 for the listener. This is probably another instance of "Pseudo-direct Speech." See 9.3 "Pseudo-direct Speech" in pp. 219ff. וַיְחַלֵּם עוֹר חֵלֶם אַחֵר "Lo, I have had still another dream, . . ."

Other examples:

(1) Gen. 37:5 וַיִּחְלֶם יוֹסֵף חֲלוֹם Then Joseph had a DREAM.

(2) Gen. 40:5 וַיִּחְלְמוּ חֲלוֹם they had a DREAM

(3) Gen. 41:11³⁰⁴ וַנְּחַלְמֵהּ חֲלוֹם And we had a DREAM

An active referent Joseph in (1) may have middle pitch.³⁰⁵ Other active topic referents are expressed in the affixation of the verbs.

However, these cognate objects are fronted to indicate other pragmatic implications.

Judg. 7:13:

וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה חֲלוֹם חֲלֵמְתִי
וְהִנֵּה צָלוּל [צָלִיל] לָחֶם שְׁעָרִים מִתְהַפֵּךְ בְּמַחֲנֵה מִדְיָן

And he said, "Behold, I had a DREAM;

a loaf of barley bread was tumbling into the camp of Midian, . . ."

Here the sender starts his episode. By fronting the non-predicate element, חֲלוֹם, the sender introduces a brand-new referent, activates it, topicalises it and starts a new episode (initiation³⁰⁶).

Other examples of initiation are:³⁰⁷

Gen. 40:8 וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו חֲלוֹם חֲלֵמְנוּ they said to him, "WE HAVE had a DREAM, "

Gen. 41:15 וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה אֶל-יוֹסֵף חֲלוֹם חֲלֵמְתִי
And Pharaoh said to Joseph, "I HAVE had a DREAM, . . ."

Dan. 2:3 וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם הַמֶּלֶךְ חֲלוֹם חֲלֵמְתֵי And the king said to them, "I had a DREAM,"

The same phenomena are observed in Muraoka's second example of the cognate object "a riddle."

Predicate-Focus Structure: Judg. 14:12, Judg. 14:13, Ezek. 17:2

Clause-Focus Structure: Judg. 14:16 (circumstantial clause)

Summary

The cognate objects follow the verbs when the clauses are commenting on the active or accessible referents. However, the cognate objects are fronted to indicate other pragmatic implications, such as initiation and circumstantial clause.

³⁰⁴ Notice that the following clause has XV Clause-Focus Structure, because it stops the flow of the narrative and expounds on the dream (circumstantial clause): "אִישׁ כְּפִתְרוֹן חֲלֵמוֹ הִלְמִנוּ" each of us dreamed according to the interpretation of his own dream."

³⁰⁵ See "Middle pitch" in pp. 90ff for a suggestion for the middle pitch.

³⁰⁶ See 7.4.1 "Onset Functions" in pp. 161ff for the term initiation and topicalisation.

³⁰⁷ In Joel 3:1 the subject precedes the cognate object for list (Clause Focus Parallel Construction). Dan. 2:1 has this sequence: a deictic phrase, verb, subject, cognate object. This is Clause-Focus Structure (Contextualisation).

9.1.5. Peculiarity with the legal texts (fronted object)

Muraoka's fifth and final peculiar reason for fronting is "Peculiarity with the legal texts."

Muraoka comments:

Our examination of the selected legal texts has produced plenty of examples (some sixty!) in which the preceding object is inexplicable on any ground mentioned above. (1985, 40)

Fronting of objects in the legal texts is easily explicable through our theory. Let us first look at Exod. 21:31-32.

It is well known that in casuistic laws כִּי introduces a case and ׀ introduces its subcategory, that is, an exceptive clause or a proviso. We can observe this structure in Exodus, Leviticus³⁰⁸ and Deuteronomy.³⁰⁹ The most concentrated usage of this structure is found probably in Exodus chapters 21 and 22. The two examples Muraoka gives, Exod. 21:31 and 32, are parts of such a structure. The case of a goring ox is introduced by כִּי in v. 28:

וְכִי־יִגַּח שׁוֹר אֶת־אִישׁ אוֹ אֶת־אִשָּׁה וָמֵת "And if an ox GOES a MAN or a WOMAN to DEATH This clause³¹⁰ is followed by Px Predicate-Focus Structure and its general principle closes with XP Clause-Focus Structure (contrast of the whole proposition): וְבַעַל הַשׁוֹר נִקְיִי but the owner of the ox shall go unpunished."

Then in v. 29 ׀-clause follows introducing an exceptive clause:

וְאִם שׁוֹר נִגַּח הוּא מִתְּמוּל שְׁלָשָׁם
וְהוּעַד בְּבַעְלָיו
וְלֹא יִשְׁמְרֵנוּ
וְהָמִית אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה
הַשׁוֹר יִסְקַל
וְגַם־בְּעַלָיו יוּמָת

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 1 PSA | "If, however, it has been a goring ox, |
| 2 VA | and its owner has been warned, |
| 3 VSO | yet he does not confine it, |
| 4 VS | and it kills a man or a woman, |
| 5 <u>SV</u> | <u>the OX shall be STONED</u> |
| 6 <u>SV</u> | <u>and its OWNER ALSO shall be PUT to DEATH.</u> (Shimasaki) |

Lines 1 to 4 have the predicate-focus structure, because they comments on the active referent, the ox. Then the whole exceptive clause closes with the two clause-focus clauses.

Notice this structure in which one exceptive unit is initiated by ׀ and closed with XP. The

³⁰⁸ For example, Lev. 1:2 (כִּי)-3, 10, 14 (׀); 2:4 (כִּי)-5, 7 (׀).

³⁰⁹ For example, Dt. 20:10 (כִּי)-11 (׀); 21:10 (כִּי)-14 (׀); 22:13 (כִּי - ׀); 23 (כִּי)-25 (׀); 24:1 (כִּי - ׀); 10 (כִּי)-12 (׀); 25:1 (כִּי)-2 (׀); 5 (כִּי)-7 (׀).

³¹⁰ This clause has an anchored brand-new referent as the verse 26 does. This is probably that the division is clearly marked by כִּי in both verses.

second exceptive clause (vv. 30 and 31) and the third exceptive clause (v. 32) are initiated by $\text{אם} + \text{XP}$ and closed by XP.

The examples Muraoka gives are in the second and the third exceptive clauses. Exod. 21:31 is the latter half of the second exceptive clause (Line 1: introduction; Line 2: closure):

אֹזֶבֶן יִגָּח אוֹ-בֵת יִגָּח OV "Whether it gores a son or a daughter,
כַּמִּשְׁפָּט הַזֶּה יַעֲשֶׂה לוֹ AV it shall be done to him according to the same rule.

Exod. 21:32 is the third exceptive clauses (Line 1: introduction; Line 2 and 3: closure):

אִם-עֶבֶד יִגָּח הַשּׂוֹר אוֹ אַמָּה 1 OVS "If the ox gores a MALE or FEMALE SLAVE,
כֶּסֶף שְׁלֹשִׁים שֶׁקֶלִים יִתֵּן לְאֲדֹנָיו 2 OVA the owner shall give his or her MASTER
THIRTY SHEKELS of SILVER,
וְהַשּׂוֹר יִפְקַל 3 SV and the OX shall be STONED.

Notice here that all these five clauses have fronted arguments (non-predicate elements). What we have observed above is that exceptive clauses in legal texts in Exodus are often initiated and terminated by XP Clause-Focus Structure.

Now Muraoka comments "almost no example of the sort [the inversion in legal texts] is found in Dt" (40). However, we can find XP clauses in casuistic laws in Deuteronomy: Deut. 20:10-11

כִּי-תִקְרַב אֶל-עִיר לְהִלָּחֵם עָלֶיהָ
וְקָרְאתָ אֵלֶיהָ לְשָׁלוֹם
וְהִיא אִם-שָׁלוֹם תַּעֲנֶנָּה וּפְתַחְתָּהּ לָךְ
וְהִיא כָּל-הָעָם הַנִּמְצָא-בָּהּ יִהְיוּ לְךָ לַמָּוֶס
וְעָבְדוּךָ

- 1 "When you approach a city to fight against it,
- 2 you shall offer it terms of peace.
- 3 (v. 11) "And it shall come about, if it agrees to make PEACE with you and OPENS to you,
- 4 then it shall be that ALL the PEOPLE who are FOUND in it shall BECOME your FORCED LABOR
- 5 and shall serve you.

כי in Line 1 introduces the case and אם in Line 3 introduces a proviso. This proviso is initiated by XP (Line 3) and closed by XP (Line 4). We may understand וְהִיא in Line 3 and 4 provides a future setting. Deut. 24:13 and Deut. 25:3 are other examples of XP clauses in casuistic laws in Deuteronomy (probably closure).

The question still remains, however, as to why Exodus has more of the XP sequence in casuistic laws than Deuteronomy. The reason may possibly be that Exodus casuistic laws follow more of the tradition of legal texts than Deuteronomy, as Muraoka proposes. He explains this phenomenon as an influence of "the tradition of Accadian juridical parlance" (41). Though we cannot verify this influence, we can easily observe that Exodus provisions are terser and have more subcategories or provisos within one case³¹¹ than those of Deuteronomy. This might have necessitated for Exodus to use more of the function of

³¹¹ For example, Ex. 21:2-6 has three אם introducing subcategories, 21:7-11 has four אם, and 21:28-32 has three.

initiation and closure to indicate boundaries more clearly.³¹² Casuistic laws in Deuteronomy are generally less terse, have fewer subcategories and seem to have more of a style of exhortation.³¹³

Other examples:

Gen. 17:9 (topicalisation), Lev. 19:8 (initiation of subcategory), Lev. 19:28 (itemizing), Lev. 20:11 (initiation of subcategory), Lev. 20:17 (XV introduction and XV closure), Lev. 20:20 (initiation of subcategory), Judg. 17:6 (Closure), Judg. 21:25 (Closure).

Summary

Inversion is often found in Exodus in casuistic law. Muraoka comments that the reason is "inexplicable on any ground mentioned above." However, the reason is to indicate the boundaries of cases and clauses (subcategories). These functions, initiation and closure, are typical pragmatic implications of Clause-Focus Structure.

9.1.6. Conclusion for the five peculiarities

We have analysed the information structure of the five peculiarities, namely, religious sentiment, the word $\psi^{\prime}א$, a special group of verbs, cognate object and peculiarity with the legal texts. Our analysis has demonstrated that the reason for the fronting of subjects and objects is not peculiar, contrary to the explanation of Muraoka and J-Muraoka. All clauses have one of the three focus structures and they show legitimate pragmatic functions and implications.

9.2. CONJUNCTIONAL WORDS AND PHRASES

The second problem for our theory is peculiarities of certain words and phrases.

Many adverbs, adverbial phrases and prepositional phrases behave as arguments and they follow the predicate proper in the predicate-focus structure, but precede in the argument-focus structure or in the clause-focus structure. For example, in Gen. 2:8 the verb is fronted, and an adverb $\psi^{\prime}א$ follows it.

$\text{וַיִּשֶׂם שָׁם אֶת־הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר יָצַר}$

and there He PLACED the MAN whom He had FORMED.

This word order indicates that this is a clause of Predicate-Focus Structure. This clause is commenting on the active referent, God, and we can observe sequentiality. However in Gen. 11:9, $\psi^{\prime}א$ is fronted.

³¹² Compare Ex. 21:28-32 with the Code of Hammurabi 241-256, 250-252 in particular.

³¹³ E. Merrill notes:

We have noted repeatedly that one of the features that marks Deuteronomy off from standard covenant texts attested to from the ancient Near East is the regular interruption of technical covenant material by that of other genres such as narrative and parenthesis. (1994, 157)

עַל־כֵּן קָרָא שְׁמָהּ בְּבָבֶל
כִּי־שָׁם בָּלַל יְהוָה שְׂפָת כָּל־הָאָרֶץ
וּמְשָׁם הִפְיָצָם יְהוָה עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ כ

Therefore its name was called Babel,

because THERE the Lord confused the language of the whole earth;

and from THERE the Lord scattered them abroad over the face of the whole

Here, **עַל־כֵּן** is fronted for focus to form a clause-focus parallel construction.³¹⁴ The fronting of **עַל־כֵּן** is due to this pragmatic function. **עַל־כֵּן** is an adverb which operates as an argument which directly affects the information structure and their position, either pre-predicate or post-predicate, determines the focus structure.

Nevertheless certain words and phrases seem to be always fronted. For example, **עַל־כֵּן** in Gen. 21:31:

עַל־כֵּן קָרָא לַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא בְּאֵר שָׁבַע
כִּי שָׁם נִשְׁבְּעוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם

1 Therefore he called that place Beersheba;

2 because there the two of them took an oath.

The question raised here is whether we should interpret **עַל־כֵּן** as an argument in our theory or not. Is Line 1 X-P or P-X?

W. Gross faces the same problem. He similarly observes that certain words do not act as an argument which is an essential constituent of a clause. His solution is to divide the preverbal position into two. First he names the pre-verbal position "Vorfeld" following Dik (1989, 365) and divides it into two areas: "Konjunktion" and "Konstituente." For example, **עַתָּה**, **הֵנָּה** and **לְכֵן** belongs to the former and other non-verbal elements, including other adverbial phrases, in the latter (1996, 139). I agree with Gross that certain words and phrases do not belong to "argument" (in Gross' term "Konstituente") but to "conjunction." We use the term "conjunctive words and phrases" or "conjunctive" by which we mean that those words and phrases are not considered as arguments or do not belong to the clause domain in terms of the focus structure. In other words, we do not consider them as essential constituents of one clause in terms of the focus structure, because their initial position does not affect the focus structure or alter the function.

I will argue for this distinction between the argument and the conjunction below.

First example is **עַל־כֵּן** in Gen. 21:31 we have looked at above.

עַל־כֵּן קָרָא לַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא בְּאֵר שָׁבַע
כִּי שָׁם נִשְׁבְּעוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם

1 Therefore he CALLED THAT PLACE BEERSHEBA;

2 because THERE the TWO of them took an OATH.

³¹⁴ See 8.2.3 "Clause-Focus Parallel Construction" in pp. 184ff.

I propose that עַל־כֵּן is not an argument. It stands outside of the clause domain in terms of the focus structure. It is a conjunctive adverbial phrase. The rest of the clause has Px predicate-focus structure.

We may support this interpretation, because Line 1 does not show any sign of pragmatic functions (other than commenting), while Line 2 does [closure]. The great majority of עַל־כֵּן clauses in the historical books have this Predicate-Focus Structure.

However in Gen. 26:33:

וַיִּקְרָא אֶתֶּה שִׁבְעָה
עַל־כֵּן שִׁם־הָעִיר בְּאֶר שְׁבַע עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה ס

1 So he CALLED it SHIBAH;

2 XP therefore the NAME of the CITY is BEERSHEBA to THIS day.

Line 2 has XP Clause-Focus Structure for closure.³¹⁵ We may support this interpretation, because Line 2 is the end of an episode.

These two clauses with עַל־כֵּן have two different focus structures: Gen. 21:31 has the predicate-focus structure and Gen. 26:33 has the clause-focus structure. This demonstrates that these conjunctive words, such as עַל־כֵּן, do not affect the focus structure but are placed out of the clause domain in terms of the focus structure.

Similar usage is found with other adverbs and adverbial phrases. Gross admits that there are more of these "Konjunktion" than עַתָּה, הֵנָּה and לָכֵן. I will add וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן and אָז and אֲפֹאֵר as conjunctive words and phrases.

9.2.1. Idiomatic expressions

Some idiomatic phrases behave similarly to the conjunctive adverbs above. Let us take כִּי עֲתָה for example.

Predicate-Focus Structure

Out of 28 occurrences,³¹⁶ 23 clauses comment on the active or accessible referent, and they take Predicate-Focus Structure after כִּי עֲתָה. For example,

Num. 22:29 לֹא יִשְׁחַרְבֵּנִי בְיָדִי כִּי עֲתָה הִרְגַּתִּיךָ
If there had been a SWORD in my HAND, I would have KILLED you by now."

³¹⁵ See 7.4.4 "Closure" in pp. 179ff.

³¹⁶ Predicate-Focus Structure: Gen. 22:12, Gen. 26:22, Gen. 29:32, Gen. 43:10, Ex. 9:15, Num. 22:29, 1Sam. 2:16, 1Sam. 13:13, 1Sam. 14:30 (negated qal), Is. 49:19, Hos. 5:3, Hos. 10:3, Mic. 4:10, Mic. 5:3, Zech. 9:8, Job 3:13, Job 4:5, Job 6:3, Job 6:21, Job 7:21, Job 8:6, Job 13:19, Dan. 10:11; Argument-Focus Structure: Gen. 31:42 (רִיקָם [contrast]), 2Sam. 16:11 (כִּי־הִי־מִיָּנִי [contrast with בְּנִי]); Clause-Focus Structure (contrast of the whole proposition <> "they will not care about us"): Num. 22:33, 2Sam. 18:3; Chiastic Construction: Job 14:16.

2Sam. 18:3 follows LXX. MT has כִּי־עֲתָה כָּמֹנִי עֲשָׂרָה אֲלָפִים. LXX reads אַחַה instead of עֲתָה. We may say that MT has Predicate-Focus Structure with the omitted "you."

Argument-Focus Structure

2Sam. 16:11 has Argument-Focus Structure.

בן-הַיְמִינִי כִּי־עָתָה כִּי־עָתָה how much more now this BENJAMITE

This clause relates "this Benjamite" with X of "X seeks my life." This proposition is presupposed by the preceding clause "My son who came out from me seeks my life" and therefore omitted.

Clause-Focus Structure

Num. 22:33 אִלֵּי נָשָׂתָה מִפְּנֵי כִּי עָתָה גַם־אֶתְּכָה הֲרַגְתִּי
וְאוֹתָהּ הֲחַיִּיתִי

If she had not turned aside from me, I would surely have KILLED YOU just now,
and LET HER LIVE."

This clauses have a clause-focus parallel construction.³¹⁷ Two clause-focus structure clauses are juxtaposed and contrasted. Here the whole proposition is contrasted.

We may notice that if we exclude כִּי עָתָה from our analysis of the focus structure of a clause, we can observe the three focus structures and their pragmatic functions in their contexts. This set of clauses demonstrates that this idiomatic phrase is placed out of the clause domain in terms of the focus structure and does not affect it.

Another example is כִּן . . . כִּי־אֶשָׁר.³¹⁸

9.2.2. Certain adverbs

We have more examples which stand outside the clause domain and function as if they are conjunctions. We shall first look at הִנֵּה, though Gross has already listed.

Predicate-Focus Structure

In Gen. 37:9 below we do not consider הִנֵּה as the first element in the clause:

וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה חֲלֹמֹתַי חֲלוֹם עוֹד and said, "Lo, I have had STILL ANOTHER DREAM . . ."

This clause has the fronted verb, commenting on the active referent Joseph. Joseph and his dreaming are still active in the mind of the receiver.³¹⁹

Clause-Focus Structure

Likewise in Judg. 7:13 we do not consider הִנֵּה as the first element of the clause:

וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה חֲלוֹם חֲלֹמֹתַי And he said, "Behold, I HAD a DREAM;

³¹⁷ See 8.2.3 "Clause-Focus Parallel Construction" in pp. 184ff.

³¹⁸ There is no clause attested with a noun or a pronoun following כִּי־אֶשָׁר in this idiomatic expression. Namely this idiom כִּן . . . כִּי־אֶשָׁר always have fronted verbs. This may be due to the nature that the first clause mostly refers to the preceding event and takes Predicate-Focus Structure. Deut. 22:26 introduces a brand-new referent אִשׁ by Predicate-Focus Structure following כִּי־אֶשָׁר. See 5.4.4 (p. 108) for the unanchored indefinite topic of אִשׁ. Deut. 8:20 has an idiom כִּן . . . כִּי, and the phrase seems to have Predicate-Focus Structure. The overall usage of this idiom is not certain.

³¹⁹ See v. 8. For pseudo-direct speech, see the section 9.3 in p. 219.

may assume that there are at least three ways to activate this referent and to comment on it, in order to initiate Judah's response to Jacob.

First is the most natural one. For example, in a sentence below,

1 Father, do you remember the ruler of Egypt whom we met?

2 He solemnly warned us,

Line 1 activates the referent in Predicate-Focus Structure and then Line 2 comments on it also by Predicate-Focus Structure. This is more likely the conversation which actually took place. This structure requires least cognitive efforts for process, because both the topic referents are already activated in the receiver's mind at the time of the utterance ("you" and "he").

Second is to use XV Clause-Focus Structure which we often encounter in Scripture in order to activate the referent, to initiate a new speech and to comment on it at the same time.³²⁰ This requires a "high cost" cognitive effort on the part of the receiver (imaginary clause):

הָאִישׁ הָעֵד הָעֵד בְּנֹו (SVA) The man solemnly warned us,

However, this structure does not seem to reflect the actual conversation. We may assume that it took at least a few months to consume the grain that they bought in Egypt, and the referent "the ruler in Egypt" is certainly unused for a long period of time. Though Jacob is now talking about buying grain in Egypt, and the referent is not impossible to infer, the unanchored term "the man" (without any title or description by אִשׁר clause) is still too ambiguous to identify in actual conversation.³²¹

Third is the most unnatural one and it is the recorded structure in our text (Gen. 43:3):

הָעֵד הָעֵד בְּנֹו הָאִישׁ (VAS) The man solemnly warned us,

The infinitive absolute is for emphasis and the first two verbal forms may be understood to form a verb. This structure hardly reflects actual conversation. Here "the man" presupposes its topic status suggesting that they have been talking about "the man," and it has been identified and active in the mind of the receiver. The use of infinitive absolute for emphasis seems to further indicate that the man has been the topic.

There may be two possible reasons for this peculiarity. First, in order to shorten the account for the sake of space, the more natural and actual conversation is summarised and many parts are omitted. Second, the information structure follows that of the narrator-listener rather than that of the two participants. For the listener, the third structure (Gen. 43:3) does not cause too much difficulty in identification, since the referent Joseph is activated in Gen. 42:33 and he is the major participant in the episode.

What we have discussed and observed in this example is that the recorded direct speech in Scripture does not necessarily always reflect actual conversation but is often summarised and its information structure sometimes follows that of the narrator-listener rather than that of participants. This idea is further supported by the use of the lexical use

³²⁰ See 7.2 "Information-Level Implications" in pp. 146ff for this pragmatic function of reactivating an inactive referent or introducing a brand-new referent by the clause-focus structure.

³²¹ See 5.4.3 "Anchored and unanchored referents" in pp. 106ff for anchoring

"the man." If Jacob and Judah have been talking about the ruler in Egypt, Judah would have used a proform "he." If "the man" has not been the topic or activated between Jacob and Judah, the term "the man" would have been anchored to his title or the description by אִשָּׁר (e.g., the man who rules Egypt). The use of this inactive and unanchored referent "the man" in Predicate-Focus Structure is a further evidence for our assumption above.

Let us examine some more clauses to validate our assumption that some reported speeches are summary statements and reflect the information structure of the narrator-listener rather than that of the two participants. J-Muraoka list some clauses with Px Predicate-Focus Structure which start direct speeches. They propose that the VS sequence at the beginning of a statement is due to "reporting news" (§155 nd). The analysis of their information structure shows that most of them are simply commenting on the active or accessible referents in the minds of the participants and therefore Predicate-Focus Structure. However, there are a few cases where the topic referents are inactive in the minds of the participants. If we analyse these cases, we find that they are also examples of summary statements which reflect the information structure of narrator-listener rather than that of the two participants. The first example is 2Sam. 3:23:

וַיֹּאבֵב וְכָל־הַצָּבָא אֲשֶׁר־אִתּוֹ בָּאוּ וַיִּגְדּוּ לְיֹאבָב לֵאמֹר
בָּא־אַבְנֵר בֶּן־נֵר אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ
וַיִּשְׁלַחֵהוּ וַיֵּלֶךְ בְּשָׁלוֹם

When Joab and all the army that was with him arrived, they told Joab, saying,
"Abner the SON of NER CAME to the KING,
and he has sent him away, and he has gone in peace."

If this clause with בָּא־אַבְנֵר was spoken directly at Joab, it would have started with אַבְנֵר בֶּן־נֵר (XV Clause-Focus Structure for topicalisation and activation of an inactive referent³²²). However, it is Px here. It is probably because this clause is rather a summary statement of what was told to Joab than the record of a direct speech. That is to say, the information structure of this clause is not that between Joab and the reporter, but rather that between the narrator (writer) and the listener (reader). Since the topic referent is activated for the reader of this narrative in the preceding texts where Abner is the central figure, this clause with an accessible topic referent with Predicate-Focus Structure does not sound ill-formed to the listener.³²³

The nature of this summary statement is clearer in 2Kings 8:7 with the passive of נִגַּד:
Predicate-Focus Structure:

³²² Abner is probably an unused referent for Joab during Joab's campaign.

³²³ Abner is anchored to "the son of Ner" here. If the information structure is merely for the narrator-listener, this anchoring is not needed. The purpose of this anchoring seems to make the utterance sound more of the actual speech.

וַיָּבֹא אֵלִישָׁע דַּמָּשֶׁק
 וּבֶן-חֲדָד מֶלֶךְ-אַרָם חָלָה
 וַיִּגְדֹּל-לוֹ לֵאמֹר בָּא אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים עִד-הַנֶּזֶה

1 Then Elisha came to Damascus.

2 Now Ben-hadad king of Aram was sick,

3 and it was told him, saying,

4 "The man of God has come here."

Line 4 seems to fall in this category, namely, the clause with this Px (VSA) Predicate-Focus Structure: בָּא אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים עִד-הַנֶּזֶה is not the literal record of a direct speech addressed at Ben-hadad, but rather a summary of what was told. The direct speech would have taken Clause-Focus Structure (initiation and topicalisation):

אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים בָּא עִד-הַנֶּזֶה

Even this XP (SVA) Clause-Focus Structure could still sound unnatural for conversation. In other words, the clause in 8:7 follows the information structure between the narrator and the listener, rather than Ben-hadad and the messenger. Elisha is activated in the mind of the listener (reader) in the preceding clause, Line 1. From this perspective, Muraoka's observation that the verb tends to come at the beginning of a statement in "reporting news," namely in the case of the summary statement, seems valid.

Another example is Gen. 39:17 ("The Hebrew slave, whom you brought to us, came in to me to make sport of me").

Summary

What is proposed in this section is as follows. Some of the recorded direct speeches in Scripture are summary statements and their information structure does not always follow that of the two participants but rather that of the narrator and the listener. This needs further study in relation to other fields of text-linguistics.³²⁴

³²⁴ For example, see C. Miller 1996, pp. 62ff for the analysis of direct and indirect speech in Biblical Hebrew.

10. EXCEPTIONS

This chapter will discuss three cases that are not in accordance with our theory. They are clauses with *hāyāh* division marker, some clauses with chiasmic construction and some clauses with participles.

10.1. HAYA DIVISION MARKER AND EXISTENTIAL CLAUSES

According to our theory, when the predicate is fronted, we understand that it has the predicate-focus structure and its function is to comment preferably on an active or accessible referent. However, some clauses with *היה*, and existential clauses with *יש*, though fronted, seem to have a different function from commenting.

We have looked at some clauses which introduced brand-new referents to the world of discourse. They are

1) *היה* existential clause

Judg. 13:2 *וַיְהִי אִישׁ אֶחָד מִזְרָעָה מִמְּשֻׁפַּחַת הַדָּנִי וְשֵׁמוֹ מְנוּחָה*

There was a man of Zorah, from the clan of the Danites, whose name was Manoah,

2) *יש* existential clause

Gen. 42:1 *יֵשׁ-שָׂבָר בְּמִצְרָיִם* there was grain in Egypt

Gen. 43:7 *הֲיֵשׁ לָכֶם אָח* 'Do you have another brother?'

Although these fronted *היה* and *יש* seem to function as the predicate of the clauses, the function is not to comment but to introduce new referents.

Some other *היה* clauses do not have the function of commenting but mark a text-unit boundary, particularly when it is followed by spatial or temporal phrases. We have three examples in our data.

Deut. 5:23

וַיְהִי כִשְׁמַעְכֶם אֶת-הַקּוֹל מִתּוֹךְ הַחֹשֶׁךְ
וַהֲהָר פֶּעַר בָּאֵשׁ
וַתִּקְרְבוּן אֵלַי כָּל-רָאשֵׁי שְׁבִטֵיכֶם וְזִקְנֵיכֶם

1 Now when you HEARD the VOICE from the MIDST of the DARKNESS,

2 while the MOUNTAIN was BURNING with FIRE,

3 you CAME NEAR to ME, ALL the HEADS of your TRIBES and your ELDERS. [Shimasaki]

Line 1 with *hāyāh* provides a temporal framework for the following text. This function is similar to contextualisation by deictic phrases, a text-unit level pragmatic function.³²⁵ Line 2

³²⁵ See 7.4.1.3 "Contextualisation (deictic phrases)" in pp. 172ff.

is a circumstantial clause (XP clause-focus structure). Lines 1-2 form a setting for the episode starting from Line 3.³²⁶

The second example is Deut. 9:11:

וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וָאַרְבָּעִים לַיְלָה
נָתַן יְהוָה אֵלַי אֶת־שְׁנֵי לַחֹת הָאֲבָנִים לַחֹת הַבְּרִית

1 "And it came about at the end of forty days and nights

2 that the Lord gave me the two tablets of stone, the tablets of the covenant.

Line 1 provides a temporal framework (contextualisation). Line 2 has the predicate-focus structure. The active referent has the lexical form יְהוָה, probably for maintaining the Lord as the central figure.³²⁷

The third example is Deut. 11:29:

וְהָיָה כִּי יְבִיאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ

"And it shall come about, when the LORD your GOD brings you into the LAND.

This clause provides a temporal and spatial framework for the following text (vv.29-30).

This peculiarity for our theory³²⁸ and its similarity to one of the functions of Clause-Focus Structure is probably due to the special nature of the verb *hāyāh*. C. Sinclair (1999) introduces a notion that *hāyāh* is a semantically empty 'dummy verb' which can be omitted when unnecessary (55). Then she argues that the nominal clause is a subcategory of the *hāyāh* verbal clause in which *hāyāh* is omitted because the nominal clause does not need to express aspect, tense, agreement or mood (75).³²⁹ Her argument suggests a need of re-evaluation of the verb *hāyāh*, and provides a ground to observe a functional similarity between the *hāyāh* clauses above and those clauses without *hāyāh* classified under Contextualisation of the clause-focus structure.

A question still remains as to why the three clauses above do have *hāyāh*, while they may function without it as the clause-focus structure. It appears the existence of *hāyāh* signifies the difference of level of division. For example, clauses with *hāyāh* may indicate a stronger dividing force for the reader than the clause-focus structure. This needs further inquiry.

Summary

³²⁶ Px predicate-focus structure. The active referent "you" is affixed to the verb. To specify its accompaniment, the other topic referents appear in the lexical form. See 5.3.2.1 "Ambiguity resolution" in pp. 89ff; 5.3.5 "Divided Predicate Domain" in pp. 103ff.

³²⁷ See 5.3.2.5 "Participant Reference Resources" in pp. 98ff.

³²⁸ This phenomenon is also observed by text-linguists such as Longacre (1989 p. 26, §3.1.3).

³²⁹ She investigates the difference between the verbal clause and the nominal clause, including the copula with/without הָיָה. Her conclusion may be controversial:

they are not really two clause-types at all but, rather, variants of a single type in which the verb occurs when it is needed to support various clausal morpheme markers [aspect/tense, agreement and mood] but is otherwise simply omitted. (75)

We have observed that some clauses with fronted predicates do not have the function of commenting, but other pragmatic functions: introduction of brand-new referents and contextualisation. This observation seem to suggest that there may be certain groups of clause which do not belong to the major three clause types. Existential clauses and הִיָּה division marker may belong here. I leave the matter open.

10.2. CHIASTIC CONSTRUCTION

The second case of exception is Chiastic Construction, XP//PX or PX//XP.

Not all but some clauses with chiastic construction override the information structure for literary effect. For example, Sd-Pind #51 Deut. 32:32:

כִּי־מִגִּפְּן סֹדֶם וְפָנִים
וּמִשְׂדֵּי־חַמָּה עֲמֹרָה
עֲנַבְמוֹ עֲנַב־רוֹשׁ
אֲשֶׁכֶּלֶת מְרֹרֶת לָמוֹ

1 (PS) "For their vine is from the VINE of SODOM,

2 (Pø) And from the FIELDS of GOMORRAH;

3 (SP) their GRAPES are GRAPES of POISON,

4 Their clusters, bitter.

Line 1 has Px predicate-focus structure. "Their vine" is a literary rephrase³³⁰ for the active referent: the enemy of Israel.³³¹ The subject is omitted in Line 2. In Line 3 עֲנַבְמוֹ, their grapes, is fronted for chiastic construction. The clause has XP clause-focus structure. However from the point of view of information structuring, it could well be PS: עֲנַב־רוֹשׁ עֲנַבְמוֹ as in Line 1 since the topic is active.

There can be two ways to look at this phenomenon. One is to detect closure or explanation/paraphrase. We can observe closure or explanation/paraphrase in the second clause of a chiastic construction in many verses. For example, Is. 3:17 (an example of GKC's emphasis from §142 f):

וְשֵׁפַח אֶלְנֵי קַדְקֹד בְּנוֹת צִיּוֹן
וַיְהִי פָתְחָן יְעָרָה

1 (VSO) Therefore the Lord will AFFLICT the SCALP of the DAUGHTERS of ZION with SCABS,

2 (SOV) And the Lord will make their FOREHEADS BARE."

Here the two clauses seem to form a chiastic construction. Line 1 (Vx predicate-focus structure) is sequential to the preceding texts (v. 16) and Line 2 (XV) is chiastic to the first and at the same time closes the text-unit.³³²

³³⁰ 5.3.2.3 "Literary Rephrasing" in pp. 95ff.

³³¹ For this interpretation, see S. R. Driver 1901, 371-72; J. Tigay 1996, 311.

³³² This clause belongs to a small unit of vv. 16-17 which appears to be a part of vv. 1-7. Verse 18 starts a new text unit.

Other examples of Vx//XV chiastic parallel construction with an implication of closure or explanation/paraphrase that are found in examples where GKC detect emphasis: GKC §142 f: Is. 5:17, Is. 11:8, Is. 18:5, Is. 28:17, Psa. 6:10, Psa. 34:22.

However, we find examples of chiastic construction where we do not necessarily detect closure or explanation/paraphrase such as Deut. 32:32 above.

Nevertheless, it does not necessarily indicate the failure of Information Structure. In our daily life, we often encounter a dialogue with an ill-formed sentence in terms of the information structure. Such as:

- 1 John: "Leah, I've GOT it!"
2 Leah: "What?"

The proform without pitch prominence "it" in Line 1 presupposes an already active or accessible referent. However, Line 1 is an "out-of-the-blue" sentence for Leah without any active or accessible referent between the interlocutors. This is not a sign of the deficiency of the information structure, but instead, it demonstrates how it works. John deliberately uttered an unacceptable or ill-formed sentence in terms of the information structure, in order to draw a question from Leah. Smooth information flow is not the only way in our life. Particularly in a conversation or in poetry where the writer intentionally uses unexpected grammatical structure for literary effects. It suggests that in poetry unexpected grammar or ill-formed information structure may indicate where the writer expects some literary effects or functions. Some clauses with chiastic construction do not operate independently from the information structure, but they deliberately override it for literary effect. Closer examination is called for concerning the relationship between various literary devices and Information Structure, such as AXB pattern³³³ and the use of pivot words or phrases.³³⁴

One example of chiastic construction which overrides the information structure is Is. 29:13 in GKC's "state":

יַעַן כִּי נִגַּשׁ הָעָם הַזֶּה בְּפִי
 וּבִשְׂפָתָיו כִּבְרוּנִי
 וּלְבָבוֹ רָחַק מִמֶּנִּי
 וּתְהִי יִרְאַתָּם אֵתִי מִצֹּת אֲנָשִׁים מִלְּמֹדָה

1 (VSA) "Because this people DRAW NEAR with their WORDS

2 (AVsO) And HONOR Me with their LIP SERVICE,

3 (OVsA) But they REMOVE their HEARTS FAR from ME,

4 (VSA) And their REVERENCE for Me consists of TRADITION LEARNED by ROTE,

Line 3 and 4 (XP clauses) may be forming a Clause Focus Parallel Construction and function as circumstantial clauses as GKC indicates. However, it may not be denied that the whole verse may be structured as VX//XV//XV//VX whose literary structure overrides the information structure.

Another example is Prov. 13:5:

³³³ See Tsumura 1983 and 1996.

³³⁴ See for example, D. Sivan 1994.

דְּבַר־שֶׁקֶר יִשְׂנֵא צַדִּיק
וְרָשָׁע יִבְאִישׁ וַיַּחְפִּיר

(OVS) A RIGHTEOUS man HATES FALSEHOOD,

(SVV) But a WICKED man acts DISGUSTINGLY and SHAMEFULLY.

צַדִּיק and רָשָׁע function as pivot words. Though these two clauses have the same sequence in our terms (XP//XP), they are considered as chiasitic in general.

Another example of Chiasitic construction which overrides the information structure:
Deut. 7:10

Summary

Chiasitic construction or chiasmus in general seems to be a device which may deliberately override the information structure for a literary effect in some clauses. We need to mention that many clauses with the chiasitic construction do not override the information structure with Vx//XV sequence where the latter has an implication of closure or circumstantial clause [explanation/paraphrase].

10.3. PECULIARITIES OF PARTICIPLE

The third type of exception to our theory is the participial clause.³³⁵ Participial clauses have some apparent peculiarities in terms of their word order. First, we shall look at some participial clauses which behave within our theory.

10.3.1. Regular usage

Andersen proposes that subjects are fronted when they are used as predicates:

Rule 7: When the predicate is a participle (phrase), the sequence is S-P in declarative clauses. (1970, 47)

However, participles are often placed before their subjects to be focused in Predicate-Focus Structure. For example, Gen. 19:13:³³⁶

כִּי־מִשְׁחַתִּים אֲנִיחֵנוּ אֶת־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה for we are about to DESTROY this PLACE

The participle here is the predicate of the predicate-focus structure which comments on the active referent "we."

When an argument is fronted before the participle, it has a pragmatic function other than commenting. For example, Gen. 37:7:

וַהֲנִיחַ אֲנַחְנוּ מֵאֱלֹמִים אֱלֹמִים בְּתוֹךְ הַשָּׂדֶה
וַהֲנִיחַ קִמָּה אֱלֹמֹתַי וְגַם־נִצְבָּה

³³⁵ Following Andersen we have treated participles as nominal predicates in our study.

³³⁶ Other examples are Gen. 29:9, 30:1, 31:5, 31:20, 32:12, Lev. 27:8, Num. 22:22, 25:18, Deut. 5:25 and 19:6.

1 (S-Ptc) for behold, while we were BINDING SHEAVES in the FIELD,

2 (VS) and lo, my sheaf ROSE UP and also STOOD ERECT. [Shimasaki]

Line 1 has the clause-focus structure, since it has a function of circumstantial clause [simultaneity]. Line 2 has the predicate-focus structure with the lexical inferable topic referent, my sheaf (ambiguity resolution).³³⁷ The dotted line indicates a possibility of the middle pitch.³³⁸

Many other examples we have seen in the preceding chapters follow the information structure such as above.

10.3.2. Peculiarities

However, there are cases where participial clauses do not follow our theory. The reason is not obvious. Below are examples of this.

10.3.2.1. Participles in the אשר clause

All אשר clauses have a fixed word order when they have a participle with its pronominal or lexical subject.³³⁹ It is אשר + subject + participle. The subjects are always fronted even when deviation from commenting is not indicated. Examples are:

Deut. 5:16:

וְלִמְעַן יֵיטֵב לָךְ עַל הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לָךְ ס

and that it may go well with you on the land which the Lord your God gives you.

Deut. 6:2:

אֶת-כָּל-חֻקֹּתָיו וּמִצְוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּךָ

all His statutes and His commandments, which I command you.

10.3.2.2. Other peculiarities of participial word order

We can observe other types of peculiarities. The second type of peculiarities is seen when a participle is used with היה.

First we shall look at the regular usage. When a participle is used with היה, the participle behaves as an argument. For example, Deut. 28:34:

וְהָיִיתָ מְשֻׁעַ מִפְּרֵאתָ עֵינֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר תִּרְאֶה

And you shall be DRIVEN MAD by the SIGHT of what you SEE.

³³⁷ See 5.3.2.1 "Ambiguity resolution" in pp. 89ff.

³³⁸ See p. 90 for Middle pitch.

³³⁹ In our corpus of Deuteronomy: Deut. 5:1, Deut. 5:16, Deut. 5:31, Deut. 6:1, Deut. 6:2, Deut. 6:6, Deut. 7:1, Deut. 7:11, Deut. 7:16, Deut. 7:19, Deut. 8:1, Deut. 8:11, Deut. 8:20, Deut. 10:13, Deut. 11:8, Deut. 11:10, Deut. 11:11, Deut. 11:12, Deut. 11:13, Deut. 11:17, Deut. 11:22, Deut. 11:27, Deut. 11:28, Deut. 11:29, Deut. 11:31, Deut. 11:32.

There is no clause attested in the Scripture which has a different word order in this particular combination of אשר + subject + participle.

The finite verb *hāyāh* comments on the active referent "you" which is affixed to the verb. Then the rest of the predicate follows: PxX.³⁴⁰

But when we see some pragmatic functions other than commenting or identification, the word order is inverted. For example,

Deut. 9:7:

זכר אל-תשכח
את אשר-הקצפת את-יהוה אלהיך במדבר
למן-היום אשר-יצאת מארץ מצרים עד-באכם עד-המקום הזה
ממרים הייתם עם-יהוה

1 "Remember, do not forget

2 how you PROVOKED the LORD your GOD to WRATH in the WILDERNESS;

3 from the DAY that you LEFT the LAND of EGYPT until you ARRIVED at this PLACE,

4 you have been REBELLIOUS against the LORD.

Lines 1 and 2 form one clause (VsO) and Lines 3 and 4 form another clause (deictic phrase + ptc + היה). Lines 3-4 are paraphrasing or expounding Lines 1-2. Lines 1-2 have the predicate-focus structure while Lines 3-4 have the clause-focus structure.

Similarly, Deut. 9:22 has the clause-focus structure:

ובתבערה ובמסה ובקברת התאוה
מקצפים הייתם את-יהוה

1 "Again at TABERAH and at MASSAH and at KIBROTH-HATTA AVAH

2 you PROVOKED the LORD to WRATH.

Lines 1 and 2 form a clause of the clause-focus structure where the deictic time phrase and the participle are fronted before the finite verb *hāyāh*.

These examples demonstrate that in these clauses *hāyāh* is the core predicate and other elements including the participle are arguments which are fronted before *hāyāh* to indicate the clause-focus structure.

However, when a participle is used without *hāyāh*, the participle is the core predicate. For example,

Deut. 19:6:

כי לא שנא הוא לו מתמול שלשום since he had NOT HATED him PREVIOUSLY.

This is a typical clause of the predicate-focus structure which comments on the active referent "he" and the participial predicate is fronted.

But, for other pragmatic functions, the arguments are fronted. For example,

Deut. 2:4:

אתם עברים בגבול אחיכם בני-עשו

YOU will PASS THROUGH the TERRITORY of your BROTHERS

The subject is fronted for background information. This has the clause-focus structure.

Deut. 9:5

לא בצדקתך ובישר לבבך אתה בא לרשת את-ארצם

³⁴⁰ See 5.3.5 "Divided Predicate Domain" in pp. 103ff.

כִּי בְרִשְׁעַת הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מוֹרִישֶׁם מִפְּנֶיךָ

1 "It is NOT for your RIGHTEOUSNESS or for the UPRIGHTNESS of your HEART that you are going to POSSESS their LAND,

2 but it is because of the WICKEDNESS of these NATIONS that the LORD your GOD is DRIVING them OUT BEFORE YOU.

In this Clause Focus Parallel Construction with contrastive connotation (XP//XP), both the prepositional phrases and the subjects are fronted before the participial predicates.

To sum up, the examples we have dealt with above fall in our theory that the predicate is fronted for commenting and the argument is fronted for other pragmatic functions. When the participle is used with *hāyāh*, *hāyāh* is the core predicate and the participle behaves as an argument.

Nevertheless we have one example of peculiarity: Deut. 9:4:

בְּצַדִּיקְתִּי הֵבִיאֲנִי יְהוָה לְרִשְׁתִּי אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת
וּבְרִשְׁעַת הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה יְהוָה מוֹרִישֶׁם מִפְּנֶיךָ

1 (AVS) Because of my RIGHTEOUSNESS the Lord has BROUGHT ME in to POSSESS THIS LAND,'

2 (ASptc) but it is because of the WICKEDNESS of these NATIONS that the LORD is DISPOSSESSING them BEFORE YOU.

In this Clause Focus Parallel Construction [contrastive], Line 1 has the A-V-S sequence, while Line 2 has the A-S-Ptc sequence. One may understand this phenomenon as chiasmus, however, it may be due to the peculiar inclination of the participle to follow the subject.

Summary

We have analysed the information structure of participial clauses. We have verified that the majority of the clauses in our data fall within the theory of the focus structure. However at the same time we also have found exceptions. The first type of exception is that when a participle is used in the אֲשֶׁר clause, the subject is always fronted. The second type of exception is that the subject precedes the participle for an unclear reason. This needs further study probably from a different perspective, Givón's diachronic approach, for example,

since we have limited ourselves to a synchronic approach.³⁴¹

Givón explains this peculiarity from a perspective of drift. He proposes that the drift from VSO of Early Biblical Hebrew to SVO of Late Biblical Hebrew is mainly due to the topic-shifting. He understands that the participial clause had drifted toward SV syntax the most progressively, probably because it requires independent subject pronouns which are often used for topic-shift. (Givón 1977, 211). If his theory is verified, it will well demonstrate the need and importance of the both approaches, synchronic and diachronic, for a better understanding of Biblical Hebrew.

³⁴¹ See Introduction for methods and presuppositions.

11. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have examined all the clauses from our data which include 528 two-member nominal clauses from the Pentateuch, 296 clauses taken from GKC, Muraoka and J-Muraoka in particular and all the clauses from Deuteronomy 4:44-11:32 (476 clauses). We have employed information-structure analysis to examine the inter-clausal and text-unit level phenomena. One particular characteristic of our information-structure analysis is a new concept of "focus."

Focus

To focus is to mark an item as informationally prominent, or highlight it (2.3.1, 2.3.2). Not only new information but also old information may be focused for functional purposes (2.3.4). This focus can be expressed prosodically, morphologically or syntactically (3.3).

It seems reasonable to conclude that the analysis of our data in our thesis has verified our two hypotheses. The first hypothesis concerned the clause-initial position.

Clause-initial position

Biblical Hebrew utilised word order and pitch prominence to express focus. I posit that its clause-initial position is focused, whether it is old or new information, a predicate or an argument (a non-predicate element), either in nominal or verbal clauses (3.4).

The second hypothesis is that there are three kinds of focus structures in Biblical Hebrew (3.4.3).

Three Focus Structures

1 Predicate-Focus Structure (chapter 5)

Exod. 33:3 עִם־קִשָּׁה־עֲרָף אַתָּה you are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE

Lev. 13:17 טָהוֹר הוּא he is CLEAN

In Px Predicate-Focus Structure, the predicate is fronted for focus. The function is commenting. The clause-second position is mostly occupied by an active or accessible structure (primarily the topic but also others including affixed object) for anaphoric grounding (linkage to referents activated in the preceding texts).

2 Argument-Focus Structure (chapter 6)

Imag. אַתֶּם עִם־קִשָּׁה־הָעֲרָף YOU are the obstinate people.

Judg. 1:1 (מִי יַעֲלֶה־לָנוּ) Who will be the first to go up . . .?)

יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה JUDAH is to go.

Here, only the argument is focused by fronting and probably by pitch prominence, while the predicate (more precisely proposition) is presupposed and thus not focused (Xp). The function of this structure is identification, that is, to relate the argument (Judah) with X (the missing argument) of a presupposed proposition "X should go." This structure may be used to contrast arguments (6.2) and to close a list (Closing Formula 6.3).

3 Clause-Focus Structure (chapter 7)

Exod. 6:6 אֲנִי יְהוָה I am the LORD

Exod. 33:5 אַתֶּם עַם-קָשָׁה-עֲרָף YOU are an OBSTINATE PEOPLE

Here both the argument and the predicate are focused by fronting and/or high-pitch (XP). Its function is to expect the receiver to make a high-cost cognitive effort to perceive pragmatic implications from the context which are different from commenting or identification (7.1.2). In other words, this structure is not to indicate that X is more informationally prominent than P, but to indicate deviation from commenting and identification (non-commenting).

These implications include:

Information level: activation of inactive referents, introduction of brand-new referents (7.1.4);

Inter-clausal level: exclamation/proclamation, contrast of the whole proposition, circumstantial clause, inter-clausal climax, inter-clausal closure (7.3);

Text-unit level: onset functions (topicalisation, initiation, Introductory Formula, contextualisation), background information, climax and closure (7.4);

Most of these implications demonstrate the character of informational, logical or temporal independence or non-sequentiality of the preceding texts (0).

The three structures above are schematised as follows:

<u>Focus Structure</u>	<u>Word order</u>	<u>Function</u>
Predicate Focus	Px	commenting
Argument Focus	Xp	identification
Clause Focus	XP	other pragmatic functions

(mainly non-sequential or independent)

Parallel Construction and List Structure (chapter 8).

We have studied parallel construction and list structure in a separate chapter because parallel construction cuts across the boundary of the three focus structures. Parallel construction may be classified according to three focus structures: predicate-focus (Px//Px//Px), argument-focus (Xp//Xp//Xp), and clause-focus (XP//XP//XP).

Clause-focus parallel construction seems to have three types: itemizing, contrast and cumulation. Itemizing parallel construction has items which have new topics and new comments. Contrastive parallel construction contrasts whole propositions. Cumulative parallel construction cumulates propositions with the same topic referent.

We have also observed List Structure. It utilises both topicalisation and itemizing of the clause-focus structure. In a list structure, such as the blessing on the 12 tribes by Jacob and Moses, each item is a paragraph which starts with a clause of clause-focus structure announcing the topic of the paragraph.

Focus, Contrast, Emphasis Intensification (chapter 4)

Utilising information-structure analysis, we have distinguished four terms: emphasis, intensification, contrast and focus. We have given emphasis the position of "end" and intensification (loud voice) and contrast (implicit contrast in particular) that of "means" among others (4.3.1).

We have observed that only the focused element in each of the three focus structures may be contrasted (4.2.2) or intensified (4.3.2), namely focus is prerequisite for both contrast and intensification.

Contrast is made possible not by fronting but only by the presence of contrastive members. Contrast does not belong to syntax but to contextual implicatures (4.2.1). Intensification does not belong to syntax but to prosody (4.3.2). Therefore in the written form, detection of intensification is highly subjective, unless it is explicitly specified (4.3.3).

Subsidiary conclusion (chapter 9)

We have looked at some problems for the theory of focus structure. We believe investigation of these problems have, in turn, further consolidated our theses. Muraoka's five peculiar reasons for the inversion has not been verified. The examples may be explained by the theory of focus structure (9.1). Certain adverbial phrases and idiomatic expressions operate out of the clause domain just as conjunctions do (Conjunctive words and phrases 9.2). The information structure of some of the quoted speeches seems to follow the information structure of the narrator-listener rather than that of the participants (9.3).

Exceptions (chapter 10)

There are apparent exceptions to the theory of focus structure. Existential clauses with היה and יש and also היה division marker do not have the function of commenting even though היה and יש are fronted. It appears there are certain types of clauses which do not belong to the three major focus structures (10.1). Some clauses with the chiasmic construction deliberately override the information structure for literary effects (10.2). Some clauses with participles seem to behave inconsistently with our theory. (10.3). This may need different approaches such as a diachronic approach.

For further study

The information-structure analysis with the theory of focus structure needs to be applied to other texts of Biblical Hebrew beyond our data. This theory may also be applicable to other ancient Semitic languages. It may give a different point of view on

extraposition (casus pendens) and copula: I made some provisional remarks on them in the Excursus below. The study of pitch contours seems to be one of the fields to which our theory may contribute.

Our analysis was helpful in deciding the text-unit boundaries in Deut. 4:44-11-32. The clause-focus structure is often used as boundary markers, such as initiation, topicalisation, topic-shift, introductory formula, contextualisation and closure. The argument-focus structure marks the closing formula of a text boundary. By means of this analysis, combined with other types of boundary markers such as היה clauses of space or time, and special phrases (such as שָׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל), we can become fairly confident of the intended text-unit boundaries. I have attached at the end of the appendix an example of the outline of Deuteronomy 4:44-11:32 which is based on the focus structures and those boundary markers.

Finally it needs to be reminded that our theory, even though it may appear more comprehensive and coherent than other models at present, remains provisional and probabilistic and awaits not only correction and improvement but a better theory which describes the reality of languages more accurately (see Limitation in the Introduction).

EXCURSUS

EXTRAPOSITION (CASUS PENDENS)

Extrapolation,³⁴² or more traditionally, casus pendens³⁴³ is not the object of our present study. However, since it relates to the centre of our discussion, and we have a few extrapositional clauses in our data, we shall make a cursory note on extrapolation in relation to the information structure. I understand that the so-called copula, and Muraoka's tripartite clause (1999) belong to this field.

We may notice that extrapolation has two types of word order. One is that the redundant pronoun follows the extraposed element, which some scholars call "copula" or "pleonastic pronoun." Another is that the redundant pronoun appears after the predicate.

Type A Extraposed element + Resumptive pronoun + noun phrase

Type B Extraposed element + noun phrase + Resumptive pronoun

Muraoka argues against the notion of "copula" and proposes to study both copula and extrapolation under the category of "the tripartite" clause (1999), calling the former type A, the latter type B. Muraoka's underlying principle is that those pronouns give prominence to the preceding element both in A and B types and he proposes four functions in such pronouns: identification of the preceding element (A), topicalisation of the preceding element (A), prominence on the preceding element (B) and casus pendens (A).

R. Buth (1999) approaches this phenomenon from his theoretical framework. He proposes to understand the extraposed elements in both type A and B as Contextualizing Constituent, which is, "a constituent that orients the clause to the larger context" (81). This is similar to our topicalisation. Then he understands that the following noun phrase is the predicate in "Focus" (contrastive, identificational or enforcing, 81) and the resumptive pronoun is the subject.

I propose to view phenomena of copula, pleonastic pronoun or the tripartite clause through our focus structure. We may say that extraposed elements do not belong to the clause domain in terms of the focus structure and the rest forms a clause. This clause can have one of the three focus structures. In other words Type A has an extraposed element followed by the predicate-focus structure. Type B may be divided to two types: an

³⁴² We consider the structure of a clause as extrapolation only when the clause has a redundant pronoun which resumes the extraposed element. When the resumptive pronominal element is expressed in the verbal conjugation by an affix, we shall not consider it as extrapolation structure. It is simple inversion for us.

We have to note, however, that there is a possibility that verbal affixation may be viewed as resumption of the extraposed element as Khan suggested in an interview in Cambridge, UK, in July 1998.

³⁴³ Extrapolation is named in various other ways, such as dislocation, Pendenskonstruktion (Gross 1987), cleft sentence and left dislocation (Gundel 1975).

extraposed element followed by the argument-focus structure or by the clause-focus structure.

Predicate-Focus Structure

As Muraoka observes prominence on the noun phrase which is followed by the pronoun (see Type B above), the extraposed element may be followed by the predicate-focus structure. For example Deut. 11:10:

הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה בֹא־שָׂמָה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ לֹא כְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם הִוא

the LAND, into which you are ENTERING to POSSESS IT, is NOT like the land of EGYPT [Shimasaki] The land phrase is extraposed. Since the topic is established and activated, the clause domain takes the predicate-focus structure. The predicate is focused but the pronoun is not: extraposition + P + x. Now compare with the following verse, Deut. 11:11:

וְהָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם עֹבְרִים שָׂמָה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ
אֶרֶץ הַרִימִים וּבִקְעוֹת לְמַטֵּר הַשָּׁמַיִם תִּשְׁתָּהּ-פָּנִים

But the land into which you are about to cross to possess it,

a land of hills and valleys, drinks water from the rain of heaven,

These two clauses, vv. 10 and 11, are juxtaposed in a list structure to describe the land. This extraposition seems to be for the list structure rather than for topicalisation.

Argument-Focus Structure

As Muraoka observes identification in Type A (1999), I propose that extraposition may also be followed by Argument-Focus Structure. In #12 Deut. 18:22:

אֲשֶׁר יִדְבַר הַנְּבִיא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה וְלֹא־יְהִיָּה הַדְּבָר וְלֹא יִבּוֹא
הוּא הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־דִבְּרוּ יְהוָה

1 When a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord if the thing does not come about or come true,

2 THAT is the thing which the Lord has not spoken.

This is the answer to the question in v. 21: "How shall we know the word which the Lord has not spoken?" Line 1 is the extraposed phrase and this is the core of the answer. Line 2 is the clause domain and הוּא identifies the argument (Line 1) with X of the presupposed proposition "X is the thing which the Lord has not spoken." Extraposition seems to have taken place here for enforcing or highlighting the core of the answer, rather than for topicalisation.

Another example of Argument-Focus Structure with an extraposed element is #21 Gen. 27:24

וַיֹּאמֶר And he said,

אַתָּה זֶה בְּנִי עֵשָׂו "Are YOU really my son ESAU?"

וַיֹּאמֶר אָנִי And he said, "I am."

The interpretation of זֶה here varies: emphatic (GKC §150a); "without any notable change in meaning" (J-Muraoka §143g); and emphatic "*Enclitic זֶה*" (IBHS 312). We may understand that אַתָּה is fronted as an extraposed topic (topicalisation), and placed outside the clause

domain. הַיְּ is fronted in the clause to identify the referent "you" with X of the presupposed proposition "X is my son" (activated in v. 19). This is identification with implicit contrast:³⁴⁴ nobody but the person in front of me, 'this.'³⁴⁵ The same construction is repeated in #21 Gen. 27:21.

These examples above have the extraposed element followed by the pronoun then the predicate. The clause domain identifies the extraposed element with the missing argument of the presupposed proposition. In these clauses the predicates are not focused: extraposition + X + p.

Clause-Focus Structure

Let us consider the clause-focus structure with extraposition.

G. Khan (1988) observes functional similarities between extraposition structure and SV-clauses particularly in marking span boundaries (95).³⁴⁶ T. Muraoka (1999 in Type A) and W. Gross (1987) observes topicalisation and S. Geller observes circumstantial clause [gloss] (1991).³⁴⁷

Within our data, we may verify this similarity. Those extraposition structures have similar implications to those of Clause-Focus Structure.

First we shall analyse #17 Gen. 42:6:

וְיֹסֵף הוּא הַשְּׁלִיט עַל-הָאָרֶץ
 הוּא הַמְּשַׁבֵּיר לְכָל-עַם הָאָרֶץ
 וַיָּבֹאוּ אָחֵי יוֹסֵף וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ-לוֹ אַפְּיָם אֲרָצָה

1 Now JOSEPH was the RULER over the LAND

2 who was SELLING to ALL the PEOPLE of the LAND. [Shimasaki]

3 And Joseph's brothers came and bowed down to him with their faces to the ground.

IBHS understands that Line 1 has extraposition and the pronoun is a "copula" or "pleonastic pronoun" which has single-out or contrastive force (297). J-Muraoka remarks that it is "extraposed and forming a cleft sentence" (§143 g). We may also understand the clause has an extraposition structure: יוֹסֵף is the extraposed topic, הוּא is the resumptive pronoun and the rest is the predicate. Line 1 seems to be for topicalisation and the second הוּא in Line 2 seems to have an implication of circumstantiality (gloss or simultaneity). We may therefore paraphrase: "Now, as to Joseph, he was the ruler over the land who was selling to all the people of the land. . . ."

³⁴⁴ Isaac has been doubting if the man in front is Esau (vv. 20-23), and probably this clause is made interrogative prosodically (raising tone at the end). If this interpretation is right, the high pitch on Esau is because of interrogative not focus.

³⁴⁵ See 4.2.4 "Implicit Contrast" in p. 71.

³⁴⁶ J. A. Naudé, on the other hand, based on Chomsky's Government-Binding, argues that the similarity between these two is "superficial" (1990).

³⁴⁷ His "topical reference." See his examples: Gen. 9:18, Ex. 16.36 (1991, 21-22).

This example shows that fronting of Joseph is for topicalisation. The fronting of the pronoun seems to enforce it. Notice here its focus structure. Unlike the argument-focus structure with extraposition, the predicate is not presupposed, but it is a new piece of information: extraposition + X + P.

Examples below also demonstrate that the structure, extraposition + X + P, has similar implications to those of the clause-focus structure. It appears therefore, the reason for extraposition with the clause-focus structure is to enforce pragmatic functions which the clause-focus structure already has.

Independent Utterance (Exclamation or Proclamation)

Deut. 7:9

וַיֵּדְעוּ כִּי־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים

"Know therefore that the LORD your GOD is GOD [Shimasaki].

Another example: Deut. 10:17

Contrast of the whole proposition

Deut. 10:9 (contrast to "Levi does not have inheritance")

עַל־כֵּן לֹא־הָיָה לְלֵוִי חֶלֶק וְנַחֲלָה עִם־אָחָיו
יְהוָה הוּא נַחֲלָתוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לוֹ

Therefore, Levi does not have a portion or inheritance with his brothers;
the LORD is his INHERITANCE, just as the Lord your God spoke to him.

Onset functions

#27 Gen. 24:27 (וְאֵלֶּיךָ תָּבוֹא) topic-shift)

#27 Gen. 40:16 (וְאֵלֶּיךָ תָּבוֹא) initiation, topicalisation, topic-shift)

Clause Focus Parallel Construction

Deut. 11:10-11 (וְהָאֲרָץ אֲשֶׁר // כִּי הָאֲרָץ) clause //

Deut. 9:3 (Parallel Construction and circumstantial clause הוּא x 3)

Summary

We have analysed a few extrapositional clauses within our data. Although this is not at all a thorough examination of extraposition, we may summarise a few observations we have made above. As far as the clause domain is concerned, which is the clause without the extraposed element, there seem to be three types of clause: Predicate-Focus Structure, Argument-Focus Structure and Clause-Focus Structure. The reason for extraposition does not appear to be as simple as Buth suggests. The reason may be for emphasis, list structure or enforcing the pragmatic function of the focus structure the clause has. In other words, the reason of extraposition appears to correspond to the pragmatic function of the focus structure that the clause domain has. This field calls for further investigation.

APPENDIX

DATA OF NOMINAL CLAUSES

Indefinite Predicate followed by Definite Subject:	Pind-Sd	115
Definite Subject followed by Indefinite Predicate:	Sd-Pind	87
Definite Predicate followed by Definite Subject:	Pd-Sd	32
Definite Subject followed by Definite Predicate:	Sd-Pd	266
Indefinite Predicate followed by Indefinite Subject:	Pind-Sind	15
Indefinite Subject followed by Indefinite Predicate:	Sind-Pind	13
	Total	528

Clauses with Indefinite Subject followed by Definite Predicate (Sind-Pd) or Definite Predicate followed by Indefinite Subject (Pd-Sind) are not attested in our data.

Pind-Sd (115 clauses)

Pronominal topic (70)

#94 1st and 2nd person: Gen. 42:11,13, 31, 42:9, 14, #26 Gen. 42:13³⁴⁸; 3pl: Lev. 11:13, 35, Num. 18:17; 3ms: Exod. 29:14, 30:32, Lev. 4:24, 5:9, 19, 7:5, 11:37, 13:13, 15, 17, 30, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 51, 14:44, 18:23, 23:36, Num. 19:20, 35:16, 17, 18, 21; 3fs: Lev. 2:6, 2:15, 5:12, 13:6, 13:8, 22, 25, 55, 15:25, 18:17, 22, 25:11, Num. 19:9. #95. Exod. 34:14, Lev. 13:44, #96. Deut. 32:4, #97. Lev. 6:18, 22, 7:1, 6, 13:3, 20, 25, 27, 49, 14:13, 16:4, Num. 5:18., # 98. Num. 18: 16, # 99. Exod. 2:6, # 100. Exod. 13:2 1, Gen. 29:4 1, #101. Deut. 30:12

Lexical topic (45)

#104. Exod. 4:22, 15:2; #105. Deut. 33:27; #106. Num. 23:19?; #107. Gen. 49: 9, Num. 24:20; S=Nd 14; #111. Lev. 13:51, Gen. 28:17; Deut. 29:23; #112. Deut. 1:14, 25.; #113. Exod. 28:17, 39:10; # 114. Exod. 30:13, Num. 3:47, Num. 11:21; # 116. Gen. 26:20; #117. Gen. 6:15, Exod. 26:16, 36:21; S=Ns 26; #120. Lev. 19:21, Num. 24:21, Deut. 26:5, 29:22, 33:25; #121. Gen. 49:5, 47:3; #122. Deut. 3:11, Gen. 6:15, 24:22, 42:13,

שָׁנִים עֲשָׂרָה עֲבָדֶיךָ	Your servants are twelve.
אַחִים אֲנַחְנוּ	We are brothers,

Andersen understands that "we" is the fronted element. NIV and NASB do not translate "we." It seems better to understand the verse as above. There may be two reasons for this division. First, we do not have to group "twelve" and "brothers" together, since it is not common to separate a predicate into two by a subject. Secondly, it seems more reasonable to understand "brother" in apposition to "the sons of one man." I propose that this construction belongs to Pind-Sd, and this has Predicate-Focus Structure for the active referent.

Exod. 25:10, 17, 25:23, 28:16, 27:1, 30:2, 37:1, 37:6, 10, 25, 38:1, 39:9; # 123. Exod. 30:2; #124. Num. 12:7.³⁴⁹

Sd-Pind (87 clauses)

#23: Gen. 38:25, 42:35, 9:29, Deut. 2:4, 2:18, 5:5, 9:1, 20:3, 29:9; #25: Num. 9:7, 13:2, Gen. 15:1, Deut. 3:5; #26: Exod. 25:36, 33:5, 37:22, Num. 28:14; # 27: Gen. 24:27, 40:16; #29: Gen. 31:50, Num. 11:27, 13:29, 24:8; #30: Gen. 49:5, Deut. 6:4; #31: Gen. 6:9, 49:21, 49:27; #32: Gen. 11:10, Exod 15:3, Deut. 33:22, 33:23; #33: Gen. 49:14, Num. 14:18; # 34: Num. 23:21, Gen. 12:8; #36: Gen. 18:20; #39: Gen. 31:48; #40: Gen. 1:4; #41: Deut. 29:28, Num. 5:8; #43: Exod. 27:17; #44 Exod 27:10, 11, 38:10, 11, 12, 16, 17; # 45: Gen. 46:27, Exod. 26:2, 8, 27: 18, 36:9, 15, Num. 2:9, 16, 24, 31, 3:39, 26:43, 35:7; #46: Num. 2:17; #49: Gen. 33:13; #50: Gen. 19:31, Exod 26:32, 37, 27:17, 36:36, 38:19; #51: Deut. 32:32; #52: Exod. 27:12, 14, 15, 16, 38:10, 11, 12, 14, 15, Num. 3:22; #53: Gen. 4:10; #54: Gen. 47:9; # 55: Deut. 33:3, Gen. 27:27; #119: Exod. 15:3.

Pd-Sd (32 clauses)

#90: Gen. 24:34, 32:3, Exod. 8:15, Num. 1:16; #91: Lev. 4:21, 13:23, 28, 30; #92: Gen. 12:12, 13, 19, 20:2, 5, 5, 13, 24:60, 26:7, 9, Lev. 15:3, 18:7, 11, 14; #93: Lev. 18:8, 12, 15, 16, Num. 1:16; #118: Lev. 23:34, Num. 3:21, Num. 26:29, Deut. 21:17; #115: Gen. 2:12; #119 is treated under Sd-Pind; #126 is treated under Sd-Pd.

Sd-Pd (264 clauses)³⁵⁰

#1: Gen. 14:2, 7, 8, 16:13, 17:1, 35:6, 11, 19, 36:1, 19, 41:44, 45:3, 48:7, Exod. 6:2, 6:6, 6:8, 6:29, 12:12, Lev. 18:5, 6, 21, 19:12, 14, 16, 18, 28, 30, 32, 37, 21:12, 22:2, 3, 8, 30, 31, 33, 26:2, 45, Num. 3:13, 41, 45, 33:36, Deut. 4:48; #2: Exod. 6:27; #3: Gen. 15:7, 23:2, 19, 27:19, 28:13, 35:27, 36:24, 43, 45:4, Exod. 6:26, 20:2, 29:46, Lev. 18:2, 4, 30, 19:3, 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36, 20:8, 24, 22:9, 32, 33, 23:22, 43, 25:38, 55, 26:13, Num. 10:10, 15:41, 41, 26:9, Deut. 5:6; #4: Gen. 6:9 , 11:10 , 36:16 , 19 , 37:2 , Exod. 6:14 , 15 ; #5: Gen. 25:16, Num. 3:33; #6: Gen. 9:19, 10:29, 25:4; #7: Gen. 5:1, 36:15; #8: Gen. 26:24, 35:26, 36:5, 12, 17, 18, 46:15, 18, 22, 25, Lev. 7:35, 23:4, 37, 38, Num. 3:3, 4:41, 45, 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 20:13, 26:63, 33:1; #9: Gen.

³⁴⁹ Andersen understands predicates in #115 and #118 as indefinite. However they are actually definite: #115 Gen. 2:12 <Adv-Nd> הַשֵּׁהָם וְאֶבֶן הַיְּסוּדִים הַשֵּׁהָם the bdellium and the onyx stone are there.

הַשֵּׁהָם is not indefinite but definite in nature, since it specifies the place which has become active in the preceding text, Havilah, in this example (v. 21). Thus this will be treated under Pd-Sd.

All the prepositional phrases in #118 such as לָו in Deut. 21:17 are not indefinite since they refer to entities which are activated in the preceding text. Thus they are treated under Pd-Sd.

³⁵⁰ Out of 264 Sd-Pd clauses there are 234 clauses with pronominal topic referents. They are: הֵן (32 clauses), הֵיאָה (30 clauses), הֵיאָה (60 clauses), הֵיאָה (68 clauses), הֵיאָה (3 clauses), הֵיאָה and הֵיאָה (35 clauses), הֵיאָה (1 clause), הֵיאָה (5 clauses)

10:5, 20, 31, 32, Gen. 36:16, 17, 43, Num. 4:4, 15, 24, 28, 33, 10:28, 26:37, 42, 27:14; #10: Gen. 10:12; #11: Gen. 31:13, 46:3, Exod. 12:42, Lev. 11:31, 14:54, 55, 56; #12: Gen. 6:4, 41:28, Exod. 16:15, 16, 32, 19:6, 35:4, Lev. 7:37, 8:5, 9:6, 11:2, 17:2, 26:46, 27:34, Num. 1:44, 21:16, 28:3, 30:2, 17, 34:2, 13, 36:6, 13, Deut. 1:1, 4:45, 12:1, 14:4, 18:22, 34:4; #13: Gen. 14:3, 17, Exod. 6:24, 12:43, Lev. 6:2, 18, Lev. 14:57, Num. 1:16, 7:2, 26:7; #14: Num. 3:21, 27; #15: Gen. 2:4, 36:21, 30, Exod. 6:19, 25, Lev. 11:46, 12:7, 13:59, Num. 7:88; #16: Gen. 9:12, 17, Exod. 38:21, Lev. 15:32, Num. 4:37, 5:29, 6:21, 13:16, 19:2, 31:21, Deut. 28:69; # 17: Gen. 2:11, 13, 14, 42:6, Exod. 6:27, Lev. 6:2, Num. 7:2; # 18: Gen. 42:14, 49:8, Exod. 16:23, 30:13, Lev. 10:3, 14:32, Num. 8:24, 34:29; # 19: Gen. 24:65, 40:12, 18, Exod. 15:2, Deut. 10:21; #20: Gen. 17:10, 20:13, 27:32, Exod. 3:15, 22:26, Num. 18:20; #21: Gen. 27:21, 24; #22: Exod. 3:6; #28: Exod. 15:3; #35: Gen. 10:2, 22, 11:29, 35:23, 24, 36:15, 46:8, 19, Exod. 6:14, 17, Num. 26:19; #37: Gen. 27:22; #38: Gen. 31:43; #42: Gen. 2:11, 4:19, 10:25, 29:16, Num. 11:26; #47: Gen. 35:10; # 48: Deut. 3:21, 4:3; #109: Exod. 9:27; #125: Deut. 33:8; #126: Deut. 32:9.

Pind-Sind (15 clauses)

#127: Exod. 27:19, Lev. 23:5, 39, Deut. 32:35; #128: Lev. 23:8, 35, Num. 28:18; #129: Gen. 2:18, 29:7, Deut. 1:6, 2:3; #130: Deut. 1:2; #131: Num. 15:15, Gen. 18:25, Lev. 7:7.

Sind-Pind (13 clauses)

#56: Gen. 49:15; #57: Gen. 43:28, Lev. 21:21, 22:25; #58: Gen. 46:15, 22, 25, 26; #59: Exod. 32:17; #60: Gen. 25:23, Exod. 26:21, Exod. 36:26, 27:16.

Different categories of nominal clauses

Below are the clauses in our data which do not seem to belong to the two-member nominal clauses. They are verbal clauses, an אֲשֶׁר clause, Extraposition structure, phrases. Two clauses Andersen categorises are not found. These clauses are not the object of our study in this chapter.

1. Verbal clauses

#102 Gen. 21:7³⁵¹

וְהֵאמֵר מִי מִלֵּל לְאַבְרָהָם
הֵינִיקָה בָּנִים שָׂרָה

And she (Sarah) said, "Who would have said to Abraham
that Sarah would nurse children?"

#92 Gen. 24:60³⁵² אַחְתָּנוּ אֵת הֵי לְאַלְפֵי רֶבְבָה

³⁵¹ הֵינִיקָה is hiphil perfect. This is a verbal clause. Notice, however, the principle discussed above is applicable in this verbal clause. Sarah is a contextually active and pragmatically present referent. Thus P-S. The proform "she" would be too ambiguous since the utterance "Sarah would nurse children" is the first utterance of the speech by the imaginary third party in response to the birth of Isaac.

"May you, our sister, Become thousands of ten thousands,
#131 Num. 15:15 (*hāyāh* verbal clause)

כְּכֶם כִּגְר יִהְיֶה לְפָנַי יְהוָה as you are, so shall the alien be before the Lord.

Other *hāyāh* verbal clauses: #131 Gen. 18:25, #23 Gen. 42:35

#40 Gen. 1:4³⁵³

וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאוֹר כִּי־טוֹב And God saw that the light was good;

#18 Gen. 49:8³⁵⁴ יְהוּדָה אַתָּה יוֹדוּךָ אַחֶיךָ "Judah, your brothers shall praise you;

#9 Gen. 10:5³⁵⁵ מֵאַלְהַ נִפְרְדוּ אֲזֵי הַגּוֹיִם בְּאַרְצֹתָם

From these the coastlands of the nations were separated into their lands.

#56 Gen. 49:15³⁵⁶

וַיֵּרָא מְנוּחָה כִּי טוֹב "When he saw that a resting place was good

2. אֲשֶׁר clause

#25 Num. 13:2³⁵⁷

אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי נֹתֵן לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל which I am going to give to the sons of Israel;

3. Extraposition

#27 Gen. 24:27³⁵⁸ אֲנִכִּי בַדְרֹךְ נָחַנִּי יְהוָה בֵּית אָחִי אֲדָנָי

as for me, the Lord has guided me in the way to the house of my master's brothers."

#1 Gen. 48:7³⁵⁹ וְאֲנִי בָבְאִי מִפְּדֵן מִתָּה עָלַי רַחֵל

³⁵² Andersen understands that אַתְּ אִשְׁתִּי is the predicate of אַתְּ (You are my sister). This may be a vocative and אִשְׁתִּי may be a part of the verbal clause. "Our sister, as for you, may you become . . ." See Gen 9:7 and 42:19 for fronted personal pronouns before imperatives which are functioning as *casus pendens*.

³⁵³ We should rather regard this clause as a verbal clause as J-Muraoka (§157d) and GKC (§117h) understand it. This is a peculiarity of *verba sentiendi* (verbs of sense perception): the object of the verbal clause is the semantic subject of the second clause.

³⁵⁴ Andersen understands that "You are Judah." Judah is more probably fronted as vocative or topicalisation in a list. "אַתָּה" is the extraposed element with the resumptive pronoun in the clause. Here אַתָּה seems to be extraposed for literary reason: parallelism. This is a verbal clause.

³⁵⁵ Andersen understands that מֵאַלְהַ in this verse has no מִן at the beginning and this is a nominal clause. This is a verbal clause with the verb נִפְרְדוּ and the subject אֲזֵי הַגּוֹיִם.

³⁵⁶ It seems to better to view this clause as a verbal clause, as D-Gibson comments on this particular clause: "It is common for the logical subj. of the object clause to be attracted as obj. into the governing clause" (111).

³⁵⁷ #25 is supposed to have a pronoun followed by an indefinite noun. The only pronoun in this verse is אֲנִי, which is in a relative clause. Thus this clause does not belong to our two-member nominal clauses.

³⁵⁸ Andersen categorised the last clause of this verse under Independent Declarative Clause without margins and translated as "I am on the road" (#27). It seems better to understand that it is a *casus pendens* of a verbal clause because there is a resumptive pronoun for the fronted אֲנִי in the main clause. GKC (§135e, §143b), D-Gibson (180), *IBHS* (77) also understand it as a *casus pendens*.

"Now as for me, when I came from Paddan, Rachel died, to my sorrow, . . ."

#27 Gen. 40:16³⁶⁰ אַךְ-אֲנִי בְחִלּוּמֵי וְהִנֵּה שְׁלֹשָׁה סִלֵי חֲרִי עַל-רֹאשִׁי

"I also saw in my dream, and behold, there were three baskets of white bread on my head;

4. Phrases

#60 Lev. 27:16 חֹמֶר שְׁעָרִים בְּחֲמֻשִׁים שֶׁקֶל כֶּסֶף

a homer of barley seed at fifty shekels of silver.

#130 Deut. 1:2³⁶¹

³⁵⁹ This should be categorised as a *casus pendens* construction since there is a resumptive proform in **בְּבֹאֲי** and **מִפְּדָן** and **בְּבֹאֲי מִפְּדָן** is a deictic phrase for the following verbal clause. **אֲנִי** is fronted for topicalisation.

³⁶⁰ Andersen classifies Line 1 as Sd-Pind: **אֲנִי בְחִלּוּמֵי**. It appears, however, **אֲנִי** an extraposed element for topicalisation and **בְחִלּוּמֵי** is fronted for contextualisation. Compare with Gen. 40:9.

³⁶¹ This clause seems difficult to interpret grammatically.

It is probably right to understand that the **דֶּרֶךְ** phrase is adverbial ("by the way of "). A slightly different construction, **דֶּרֶךְ + number + יָמִים**, is used as an adverbial accusative:

Gen. 31:23 וַיִּרְדֵּף אַחֲרָיו דֶּרֶךְ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים

and he pursued him a distance of seven days' journey;

Ex. 5:3 נִלְכָה נָא דֶּרֶךְ שְׁלֹשָׁת יָמִים בְּמִדְבָּר

Please, let us go a three days' journey into the wilderness;

Ex. 8:23 דֶּרֶךְ שְׁלֹשָׁת יָמִים נִלְךְ בְּמִדְבָּר

We must go a three days' journey into the wilderness.

Or as a direct object:

Gen. 30:36 וַיִּשְׂרֵם דֶּרֶךְ שְׁלֹשָׁת יָמִים בֵּינוֹ וּבֵין יַעֲקֹב

And he put a distance of three days' journey between himself and Jacob.

The **דֶּרֶךְ** phrase may be, though less likely, the subject: "The way of Mount Seir to Kadesh-barnea is 11 days from Horeb." If this is the case, the clause may have the Clause-Focus Structure, but this subject is not activated within the book.

Another possible interpretation is to understand the whole verse as a phrase. The immediately preceding clause is Deut. 1:1:

אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה אֶל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל
בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן
בְּמִדְבָּר בְּעֵרְבָה
מִזֶּה סוּף בֵּין-פָּאָרָן וּבֵין-הַתְּפֵל וְלָבָן וְחֲצֹרֹת וְרֵי זָהָב

1. These are the words Moses spoke to all Israel

2. in the east of the Jordan

3. — in the desert in the Arabah

4. opposite Suph, between Paran and Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth and Dizahab.

Line 3 and 4 is a phrase in apposition to Line 2 **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** (in the east of the Jordan), expounding the place. The verse two also seems to be a phrase in apposition to the place:

4 (v. 2) — eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir to Kadesh-barnea.

The verse 3 starts with a **וַיְהִי** clause with time reference. It is often used to indicated a start of a new episode.

This text-unit division further indicates that the verse two belongs to the preceding verse. We may say,

אַחַד עָשָׂר יוֹם מִחֶרֶב דֶּרֶךְ הַר־שֵׁעִיר עַד קָדֵשׁ בַּרְנֵעַ

It is eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir to Kadesh-barnea.

5. Not Found

#8 Lev. 23:38³⁶² and #93 Num. 1:16³⁶³

therefore, that the verse two is not a clause, but a phrase which is in apposition to **בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** (in the east of the Jordan).

³⁶² This clause is supposed to have a pronoun, but it is not found.

³⁶³ This clause is supposed to have a noun head followed by suffixed noun as the predicate. The phrase "מְשִׁחֵי מִשְׁחַת אֲבוֹתָם" the leaders of their fathers' tribes" in this verse is in apposition to the preceding clause and has no pronominal subject. Andersen seems to have understood that the above phrase is in apposition to the following clause "רָאשֵׁי אֲלֵפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הֵם" They were the heads of the clans of Israel" which contains a suffixed noun. This last clause of the verse is a Predicate Focus clause with the activated topic which adds new information to that topic referent: the 12 assistants for Moses and Aaron. The term "the heads of the clans of Israel" is not used prior to this verse in the book.

DATA OF VERBAL CLAUSES (296 clauses)

Verbal Clauses of GKC (70 clauses)

STATE (32 clauses):

Gen. 1:2 (Copula), 2:6, 4:2, 4:4, 6:8, 13:12, 16:1, 18:17, 18:18, 20:4, 24:1, 26:27, 29:17, 38:25, 39:1, 41:10, 44:3, 4, Judg. 1:16, 18:3, 19:11, 1Sam. 9:15, 14:27, 25:21, 28:3, 2Sam. 8:15, 20:8, 1Kings 1:1, 5:24, Is. 29:13, Jer. 14:15, Job 21:22b, Psa. 50:17.

EMPHASIS (38 clauses):

Subject-Verb: Gn3¹³ (it is not I who am to blame, but) *the serpent bequiled me. . .*" (§142 a),

Object-Verb-Subject: independent subject: Gen. 30:40, 37:4, 1Sam 15:1, 2King 23:19,

Object-Verb: Gen 3:10, 14, 18, 6:16, 8:17, 9:13, Ex 18:23, Judg 14:3, 1Sam 18:17, 20:9, 21:10, 2King 22:8, Prob. 13:5.

Verb-Object-Subject: Gen 21:7, Num 5:23, 1Sam 15:33, 2Sam 24:16, Is 19:13, Ps 34:22, Job 11:19

Subject-Object-Verb: Is 3:17, 11:8, 13:18, Ho 12:11, Ps 6:10, 11:5, Job 29:25

Object-Subject-Verb: 2King 5:13, Is 5:17, 28:17, Ps 51:5, Prob. 13:16

Complement: Is 18:5 (§142 f)

Verbal Clauses of Muraoka and Joüon-Muraoka (226 clauses)

(J-Muraoka's examples are underlined)

SUBJECT-VERB (134 clauses)

Emphasis or contrast: Gen. 31:38, 41:16, 42:19, 48:19, 50:20, 50:24, Judg. 1:29, 7:2, 7:7, 8:23, 9:54, 10:13, 11:23, 13:5, 1Sam. 1:22, 14:45.

Circumstantial clause: Gen. 37:3, 39:1, Judg. 3:5, 16:20, 20:34, 1Sam. 3:2, 18:25.

Avoidance of the Waw cons.: Judg. 9:44, 20:42.

At the very beginning of a statement: Job 1:1, Job 1:14, Job 1:16, Job 1:17, Ps 93:1, 1King 8:12, Hg 1:2, Gen. 36:2, Ezek. 29:18, Prob. 18:16.

Attraction or chiasmus: Judg. 3:24, 6:28, 20:39, 40, 41, 1Sam. 14:15.

Replies: Gen. 24:24, 27:19, 27:24, 27:32, 29:4, 37:32, 33, 48:8, 9, Judg. 1:1, 6:29, 13:11, 15:10, 17:9, 1Sam. 15:14, 15, 16:4, 2Sam. 2:20, 20:17, 1King.13:14, 18:7, 8, 2King. 1:7, 8.

Religious sentiment: Gen. 43:14, 29, 48:16, 1Sam 1:17, 24:20, Gen. 31:29, 48:3, Judg. 13:6, 8, Gen. 31:53, 44:16.

The word שִׁי: Judg. 21:1, 17:6, 21:25, 1Sam. 21:3, Jer. 36:19, 38:24, Lev. 18:23, Gen. 41:11, Judg. 7:7, Ex. 12:4, 16:18, Is. 9:18, Joel 2:8, Job 41:9 and Jer. 31:30. The idiom, שִׁי followed by לְמִקְנֹו, in Judg. 7:7 is attested twice in Scripture (Judg. 7:7 and 9:55). This idiom follows the verb in these two examples, and therefore we do not treat them here.

A special group of words: Gen. 34:7, 42:10, 46:31, 47:1, 47:4, 5, 48:2, Judg. 3:20, 4:14, 16, 17, 6:21, 33, 13:6, 16:20, 23, 1Sam. 4:6, 6:14, 16:14, Gen. 39:8 and Judg. 14:4.

Legal texts: Gen. 17:9, Exod. 21:31-32, Judg. 17:6, Lev. 19:8, 20:11, 20, Lev. 19:28, 20:17, Judg. 21:25

OBJECT-VERB (36 clauses)

Emphasis: Gen. 31:38, 29, 42, 42:18, 36, 43:13, 48:11, Deut. 24:6, Judg. 2:2, Judg. 12:1, 13:14, 13:22, 14:2, 3, 4, 20:5, 21:11, 1Sam. 1:15, 2:33.

Contrast: Gen. 34:21, Deut. 23:21, Judg. 1:21, 9:36, 11:24, 1Sam 8:7.

Chiasmus-attraction: Lev. 19:4, Judg. 1:25, 6:20, 25, 9:45, 13:6.

Waw cons. avoided: Gen. 39:8, 46:32, Judg. 7:25, 12:9.

Response: Gen. 37:16.

ADVERB-VERB (56 clauses)

Common adverbs: Gen. 45:9, Judg. 7:17, 1Sam. 1:7, Judg. 10:13, 11:8, Gen. 33:10, Deut. 24:18, 22, Gen. 32:20, 27:12, 32:21, Judg. 20:28, 19:5, Gen. 32:21 (אֵלַי), 32:21 (וְאֶחָדֵינוּ), 31:42, Judg. 8:3, 13:21, 14:4, 18:1, 11:40, 1Sam 4:4, 21:8

Emphasis or contrast: Gen. 29:25, 31:6, 38, 41, 39, 32:11, 34:31, 42:9, 43:9, 16, 45:5, 28, 49:31, Deut. 24:15, Judg. 4:9, 6:39, 7:7, 17, 9:15, 16, 14:15, 20:4, 1Sam 2:34, 18:12

Chiasmus-attraction: Gen. 40:13, 19, 41:17, 18, Lev. 25:41, Judg. 18:10, 1Sam 6:12, 13

Interrogatives: Gen. 39:9

DEUTERONOMY 4:44-11:32

Below are abbreviations used in this section to show focus structures in the corpus. The corpus has 361 clauses of the predicate-focus structure, 18 clauses of the argument-focus structure and 97 clauses of the clause-focus structure. 476 clauses in total. English translation is NIV unless otherwise stated.

Abbreviations according to the focus structures

Predicate-Focus Structure	PFS
participant reference resources	prp
ambiguity resolution	amb
Argument-Focus Structure	AFS
Closing Formula	C-F
Clause-Focus Structure	CFS
Information Level	
Introduction of a brand new referent	IBR
Inter-clausal Level	
Exclamatory/Proclamatory	Ex/Pr
Circumstantial Clause	CC
Contrast of the whole proposition	CWP
Text-unit Level	
Onset functions	
Initialization	INT
Topicalisation	TOP
Introductory formula	I-F
Contextualisation	CNT
Background Information	BI
List Structure	LS
Parallel Construction	PRL
Chiastic Construction	CHC
Extrapolation or Casus Pendens	EXP

Alphabetical list of abbreviations

<p>A Adjuncts</p> <p>act activation of an inactive referent</p> <p>AFS Argument-Focus Structure</p> <p>amb ambiguity resolution</p> <p>BI Background Information</p> <p>C-F Closing Formula</p> <p>CC Circumstantial Clause</p> <p>CFS Clause-Focus Structure</p>	<p>CHC Chiastic Construction</p> <p>cls closure</p> <p>cmd command</p> <p>cnj conjunction</p> <p>CTX Contextualisation</p> <p>ctr contrast</p> <p>cum cumulation</p> <p>CWP Ctr of the whole proposition</p>
---	--

emp	emphatic or emphasis	phr	phrase
Ex/Pr	Exclamatory/Proclamatory	PRL	Parallel Construction
EXP	Casus Pendens or Extraposition	prp	paraphrasing
hyh	<i>hāyāh</i> contextualising clause	prr	participant reference resources
I-F	Introductory formula	ptc	Participle
IBR	Introduction of a brand new referent	rea	reactivation of the referent
idm	idiomatic expression	rep	repetition
imp	implicit	S	Subject
INT	Initialization	sim	simultaneous
itm	itemizing	th-sht	theme-shifting
itr	interrogative	TOP	Topicalisation
LS	List Structure	to-sht	topic-shifting
O	Object	V	Verb
P	Predicate.	[]	<i>asher, ky</i> or <i>lemaan</i> subordinate clause
par	parenthetic	<>	in contrast with
PFS	Predicate-Focus Structure		

Examples

Example 1

5:28

PFS	וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה	“And the Lord heard
(amb),	אֶת־קוֹל דְּבָרֵיכֶם בְּדַבְּרְכֶם אֵלַי	the voice of your words when you spoke to me,
PFS (prr),	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי	and the Lord said to me,
PFS-O-	שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת־קוֹל דְּבָרֵי הָעָם הַזֶּה	‘I have heard the voice of the words of this people
[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר דָּבְרוּ אֵלַיךָ	which they have spoken to you.

Explanation

The first clause has the predicate-focus structure with the lexical form the Lord for ambiguity resolution. The second clause has the predicate-focus structure with the lexical form the Lord for participant reference resources. The third clause has the predicate-focus structure. The *asher* subordinate clause has the left-located object and the clause has the predicate-focus structure.

Example 2

4:44

CFS I-F	וְזֹאת הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר־שָׂם מֹשֶׁה	¶ This is the law Moses set
O-[PFS]	לְפָנַי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	before the Israelites.

Explanation

The first clause has the clause-focus structure. It is the Introductory Formula. The Law, the left-located object is anchored to the *asher* clause. The *asher* clause itself has the predicate-focus structure.

4:44		
CFS I-F	וְזֹאת הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר-שָׂם מֹשֶׁה	¶ This is the law Moses set
[PFS]	לְפָנַי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	before the Israelites.
4:45-6		
CFS I-F	אֵלֶּה הָעֲדוֹת וְהַחֻקִּים וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים	These are the stipulations, decrees and laws
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	Moses gave them
	בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם	when they came out of Egypt
	בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן בְּגִיא מוֹל	and were in the valley near Beth Peor east of the Jordan,
	בֵּית פְּעוֹר	
	בְּאֶרֶץ סִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ הָאֱמֹרִי	in the land of Sihon king of the Amorites,
S-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר יוֹשֵׁב בְּחֶשְׁבֹּן	who reigned in Heshbon
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר הִכָּה מֹשֶׁה וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	and was defeated by Moses and the Israelites
	בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרָיִם	as they came out of Egypt.
4:47-9		
PFS	וַיִּירְשׁוּ אֶת-אֶרְצוֹ	They took possession of his land
	וְאֶת-אֶרֶץ עֹג מֶלֶךְ-הַבָּשָׁן	and the land of Og king of Bashan,
	שְׁנֵי מְלָכֵי הָאֱמֹרִי	the two Amorite kings east of the Jordan.
	אֲשֶׁר בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן מִזֶּרֶחַ שְׂמֹשׁ	This land extended from Aroer on the rim of the Arnon
	מִזֶּרְעֵר אֲשֶׁר עַל-שִׁפְת־נַחַל אַרְנוֹן	Gorge
	וְעַד-הַר שִׂיאוֹן	to Mount Siyon
CFS-CC	הוּא חֶרְמוֹן	(that is, Hermon),
[par]	וְכָל-הָעֲרָבָה עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן מִזֶּרְחָהּ	and included all the Arabah east of the Jordan,
	וְעַד יָם הָעֲרָבָה	as far as the Sea of the Arabah,
	תַּחַת אֲשֵׁרֵת הַפִּסְגָּה פ	below the slopes of Pisgah.
5:1		
PFS [th-	וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה אֶל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל	Then Moses summoned all Israel,
sht v. 46]	וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם	and said to them,
	שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-הַחֻקִּים	“Hear, O Israel, the statutes
[S+ptc]	וְאֶת-הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים	and the ordinances
	אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי דוֹבֵר בְּאָזְנוֹיְכֶם הַיּוֹם	which I am speaking today in your hearing,
	וְלִמְדֻתָם אֲתֶם וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם לְעִשְׂתֶּם	that you may learn them and observe them carefully.
5:2		
CFS	יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ כָּרַת עִמָּנוּ	“The Lord our God made a covenant with us
INT, TOP	בְּרִית בְּחֹרֵב	at Horeb.
5:3		
AFS PRL	לֹא אֶת-אֲבוֹתֵינוּ כָּרַת יְהוָה	“The Lord did not make this covenant with our fathers,
(ctr)	אֶת-הַבְּרִית הַזֹּאת	
	כִּי אֲתָנוּ אֲנַחְנוּ אֵלֶּה כָּה הַיּוֹם	but with us, with all those of us alive here today.
	כָּלֵנוּ חַיִּים	
5:4		
AFS (imp	פָּנִים בְּפָנִים דִּבֶּר יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם	“The Lord spoke to you face to face at the mountain from
ctr, rep,	בְּהָר מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ	the midst of the fire,
emp)		

5:5		
CFS CC	אֲנֹכִי עֹמֵד בֵּין־יְהוָה וּבֵינֵיכֶם	while I was standing between the Lord and you
(sim)	בְּעֵת הַהוּא	at that time,
	לְהַגִּיד לָכֶם אֶת־דְּבַר יְהוָה	to declare to you the word of the Lord;
[PFS,	כִּי יִרְאַתֶּם מִפְּנֵי הָאֵשׁ	for you were afraid because of the fire and did not go up
PFS]	וְלֹא־עָלִיתֶם בְּהָר לְאֹמֵר ׀	the mountain. He said,
5:6		
CFS (E/P)	אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	¶ 'I am the Lord your God,
S-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ	who brought you out
	מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים	of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery.
5:7		
PFS (cmd)	לֹא יִהְיֶה־לְךָ	'You shall have
	אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל־פְּנֵי	no other gods before Me.
5:8		
PFS (cmd)	לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ כֶּסֶל	¶ 'You shall not make for yourself an idol, or any
	כָּל־תְּמוּנָה	likeness of
S-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל	what is in heaven above or
S-[PFS]	וְאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתַּחַת	on the earth beneath
S-[PFS]	וְאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם מִתַּחַת לָאָרֶץ	or in the water under the earth.
5:9-10		
PFS	לֹא־תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם	'You shall not worship them
PFS	וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם	or serve them;
[CFS E/P]	כִּי אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קַנָּא	for I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God, visiting the
	פֶּקֶד עוֹן אֲבוֹת עַל־בָּנִים	iniquity of the fathers on the children,
	וְעַל־שְׁלֹשִׁים וְעַל־רְבָעִים	and on the third and the fourth generations of those who
	לְשֹׂנְאֵי	hate Me,
	וְעוֹשֶׂה חֶסֶד לְאַלְפִים	but showing lovingkindness to thousands,
	לְאַהֲבָי וּלְשֹׂמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָי [מִצְוֹתַי] ׀	to those who love Me and keep My commandments.
5:11		
PFS	לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת־שֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	¶ 'You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in
	לְשׁוֹן	vain,
[PFS, prr]	כִּי לֹא יִנְקָה יְהוָה אֶת אֲשֶׁר־יִשָּׂא	for the Lord will not leave him unpunished who takes His
	אֶת־שְׁמוֹ לְשׁוֹן ׀	name in vain.
5:12		
PFS	שָׁמֹר אֶת־יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקֹדֶשׁ	'Observe the sabbath day to keep it holy,
[PFS-prr]	כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	as the Lord your God commanded you.

5:13-4

CFS שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד 'Six days you shall labor
 -PAR- וְעָשִׂיתָ כָּל-מְלֶאכֶתְךָ and do all your work,
 CFS וַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבַּת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ but the seventh day is a sabbath of the Lord your God;
 in it you shall not do any work,
 PFS (cmd) לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כָל-מְלָאכָה you or your son or your daughter or your male servant or
אָתָּה וּבִנְךָ-וּבִתְךָ וְעַבְדְּךָ וַאֲמָתְךָ your female servant or your ox or your donkey or any of
וְשׁוֹרְךָ וְחֹמְרְךָ וְכָל-בְּהֵמָתְךָ וְגֵרְךָ your cattle or your sojourner
 [PFS] אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ who stays with you,
לְמַעַן יָנוּחַ עַבְדְּךָ so that your male servant and your female servant may
וַאֲמָתְךָ כָּמוֹךָ rest as well as you.

5:15

PFS [AFS- (ctr), PFS- (pr)] וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי-עֶבֶד הָיִיתָ 'And you shall remember that you were a slave
בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם in the land of Egypt,
וַיֹּצֵאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִשָּׁם and the Lord your God brought you out of there by a
בְּיָד חֲזָקָה וּבְזֵרַע נְטוּיָה mighty hand and by an outstretched arm;
 PFS עַל-כֵּן צִוָּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ therefore the Lord your God commanded you to observe
לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת הַזֶּה the sabbath day.

5:16

PFS (cmd) כְּבוֹד אָבִיךָ וְאִמְךָ 'Honor your father and your mother, as the Lord your God
 [PFS (pr)] כִּפְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ has commanded you,
 [PFS] לְמַעַן יִאָּרְכּוּ יָמֶיךָ that your days may be prolonged,
 [PFS] וְלָמַעַן יֵיטֵב לָךְ עַל הָאָדָמָה and that it may go well with you on the land which the
 [S+ptc]] אֲשֶׁר-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לָךְ Lord your God gives you.

5:17

PFS (cmd) לֹא תִרְצַח 'You shall not murder.

5:18

PFS (cmd) וְלֹא תִנְאַף 'You shall not commit adultery.

5:19

PFS (cmd) וְלֹא תִגְנוֹב 'You shall not steal.

5:20

PFS (cmd) וְלֹא-תַעֲנֶה בְרַעְךָ עַד שְׂוֵא 'You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor.

5:21

PFS (cmd) וְלֹא תַחְמֹד אִשְׁתְּ רַעְךָ ¶ 'You shall not covet your neighbor's wife,
 PFS (cmd) וְלֹא תַחְמֹד אֹתָהּ בֵּית רַעְךָ and you shall not desire your neighbor's house, his field
 S-[PFS] שָׂדֶהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וַאֲמָתּוֹ or his male servant or his female servant, his ox or his
שׁוֹרוֹ וְחֹמְרוֹ donkey
וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לְרַעְךָ or anything that belongs to your neighbor.'

5:22

AFS C-F אֵת-הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה דִּבֶּר יְהוָה ¶ "These words the Lord spoke to all your assembly at
אֶל-כָּל-קְהֵלְכֶם בְּהָר מֹתוֹרָה the mountain from the midst of the fire, of the cloud and
הָאֵשׁ הָעֲנָן וְהָעֲרָפֶל קוֹל גָּדוֹל of the thick gloom, with a great voice,
 PFS וְלֹא יָסַף and He added no more.
 PFS וַיִּכְתְּבֵם עַל-שְׁנֵי לַחַת אֲבָנִים And He wrote them on two tablets of stone
 PFS וַיִּתֵּנָם אֵלַי and gave them to me.

5:2 3

hyh-CTX

וַיְהִי כְשָׁמַעְכֶּם

“And it came about, when you heard the voice from the
midst of the darkness,

אֶת־הַקּוֹל מִתּוֹךְ הַחֹשֶׁךְ

CFS CC

וְהָהָר בָּעֵר בָּאֵשׁ

while the mountain was burning with fire,

(sim)

וַתִּקְרְבוּן אֵלַי כָּל־רְאִשֵׁי

that you came near to me, all the heads of your tribes and

PFS

שְׁבִיטֵיכֶם וְזִקְנֵיכֶם

your elders.

5:2 4

PFS

וַתֹּאמְרוּ

“And you said,

PFS

הֵן הִרְאָנוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

Behold, the Lord our God has shown us His glory and His

אֶת־כְּבוֹדוֹ וְאֶת־גְּדֻלּוֹ

greatness,

AFS imp

וְאֶת־קוֹלוֹ שָׁמַעְנוּ מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ

and we have heard His voice from the midst of the fire;

ctr?,

הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה

we have seen today

PFS [PFS,

רְאִינוּ פִי־דְבַר אֱלֹהִים

that God speaks

PFS]

אֶת־הָאָדָם וְחַי

with man, yet he lives.

5:2 5

PFS [PFS

וַעֲתָה לָמָּה נָמוּת

Now then why should we die?

rea]

כִּי תֹאכְלֵנוּ הָאֵשׁ הַגְּדֹלָה הַזֹּאת

For this great fire will consume us;

PFS

אִם־יִסְפִּים אֲנַחְנוּ לְשָׁמֹעַ

if we hear the voice of the Lord our God any longer,

אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ עוֹד

PFS

וְנָמָתָנוּ

then we shall die.

5:2 6

AFS itr

כִּי מִי כָּל־בָּשָׂר

For who is there of all flesh,

S-[PFS]

אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַע קוֹל אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים

who has heard the voice of the living God

מִדְּבַר מִתּוֹךְ־הָאֵשׁ כְּמוֹנוּ

speaking from the midst of the fire, as we have,

PFS

וַיְחִי

and lived?

5:2 7

PFS

קְרַב אֵתָּה

Go near

PFS

וּשְׁמַע אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר

and hear all that

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ

the Lord our God says;

AFS [ctr]

וְאֵת תְּדַבֵּר אֵלֵינוּ אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר

then speak to us all that

“not Got

יְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵלֶיךָ

the Lord our God will speak to you,

but you”

וּשְׁמַעְנוּ וְעָשִׂינוּ

and we will hear and do it.

PFS

5:2 8

PFS

וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה

“And the Lord heard

(amb),

אֶת־קוֹל דְּבָרֵיכֶם בְּדַבְּרְכֶם אֵלַי

the voice of your words when you spoke to me,

PFS (pr),

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי

and the Lord said to me,

PFS-O-

שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת־קוֹל דְּבָרֵי הָעָם הַזֶּה

‘I have heard the voice of the words of this people which

[PFS],

אֲשֶׁר דְּבָרוּ אֵלֶיךָ

they have spoken to you.

PFS-O-

הֵיטִיבוּ כָּל־אֲשֶׁר דְּבָרוּ

They have done well in all that they have spoken.

[PFS]

5:29			
idm	מִי־יִתֵּן	'Oh that	
PFS	וְהָיָה לְבַבְכֶם זֶה לָהֶם לִירְאָה אֹתִי	they had such a heart in them, that they would fear Me,	
[PFS]	וְלִשְׁמֹר אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתַי כָּל־הַיָּמִים לְמַעַן יֵיטֵב לָהֶם וּלְבָנֵיהֶם לְעֹלָם	and keep all My commandments always, that it may be well with them and with their sons forever!	
5:30			
PFS cmd	לֵךְ אָמַר לָהֶם	'Go, say to them,	
PFS cmd	שׁוּבוּ לְכֶם לְאֹהֲלֵיכֶם	"Return to your tents."	
5:31			
CFS(CWP	וְאַתָּה פֹּה עִמּוֹד עִמָּדִי	But as for you, stand here by Me,	
< v. 30)	וְאֶדְבַּרְהָ אֵלֶיךָ אֵת כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה	that I may speak to you all the commandments and the	
PFS	וְהַחֲקִים וְהַמְשַׁפְּטִים	statutes and the judgments	
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר תִּלְמְדֵם	which you shall teach them,	
PFS	וְעָשׂוּ בָאָרֶץ	that they may observe them in the land	
O-[S-ptc]	אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי נֹתֵן לָהֶם לְרִשְׁתָּהּ	which I give them to possess.'	
5:32			
PFS	וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם לַעֲשׂוֹת	"So you shall observe to do just	
[PFS]	כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲתָכֶם	as the Lord your God has commanded you;	
PFS	לֹא תִסְרוּ יָמִין וּשְׂמָאל	you shall not turn aside to the right or to the left.	
5:33			
CFS O-	בְּכָל־הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה	"You shall walk in all the way which the Lord your God	
[PFS]	יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲתָכֶם תֵּלְכוּ	has commanded you,	
(<>v.32)	לְמַעַן תַּחְיֶוּ	that you may live,	
[PFS,	וְטוֹב לָכֶם	and that it may be well with you,	
PFS,	וְהֶאֱרַכְתֶּם יָמִים	and that you may prolong your days in the land which	
[PFS]]	בָּאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר תִּירְשׁוּן	you shall possess.	
6:1			
CFS (I-F)	וְזֹאת הַמִּצְוָה הַחֲקִים וְהַמְשַׁפְּטִים	¶ "Now this is the commandment, the statutes and the	
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לְלַמֵּד	which the Lord your God has commanded me	
A-[S+ptc]	אֲתָכֶם לַעֲשׂוֹת בָּאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם עֹבְרִים־ שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ	to teach you, that you might do them in the land where you are going over to possess it,	
6:2			
[PFS]	לְמַעַן תִּירָא אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	so that you and your son and your grandson might fear	
	לְשַׁמֵּר אֶת־כָּל־חֻקֹּתָיו וּמִצְוֹתָיו	the Lord your God, to keep all His statutes and His	
[S+ptc]	אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּךָ	which I command you, all the days of your life,	
[PFS]	אֶתָּה וּבִנְךָ וּבֶן־בִּנְךָ כָּל יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ וּלְמַעַן יֶאֱרַכְן יָמֶיךָ	and that your days may be prolonged.	

6:3		
PFS	וּשְׁמַעְתָּ יִשְׂרָאֵל	“O Israel, you should listen
PFS	וּשְׁמַרְתָּ לַעֲשׂוֹת	and be careful to do it,
[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר יִיטֵב לָךְ	that it may be well with you
[PFS]	וְאֲשֶׁר תִּרְבּוֹן מְאֹד	and that you may multiply greatly,
[PFS]	כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר	just as
	יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֶיךָ לָךְ	the Lord, the God of your fathers, has promised you,
	אֶרֶץ זָבַת חֵלֶב וְדָבָשׁ כִּי	in a land flowing with milk and honey.
6:4		
PFS	שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל	Hear, O Israel!
CFS-PRL-	יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ	The Lord is our God,
CFS(cum)	יְהוָה אֶחָד	the Lord is one!
6:5		
PFS	וְאָהַבְתָּ אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	“And you shall love the Lord your God
	בְּכָל-לִבְבְּךָ	with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your
	וּבְכָל-נַפְשְׁךָ וּבְכָל-מְאֹדְךָ	might.
6:6		
PFS (amb)	וְהָיוּ הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה	“And these words,
O-[S+ptc]	אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוְךָ הַיּוֹם	which I am commanding you today, s
	עַל-לִבְבְּךָ	hall be on your heart;
6:7		
PFS	וְשִׁנְנֵתֶם לְבָנֵיךָ	and you shall teach them diligently to your sons and
PFS	וְדַבַּרְתֶּם בָּם	shall talk of them
	בְּשִׁבְתְּךָ בְּבֵיתְךָ וּבְלִכְתְּךָ בַדֶּרֶךְ	when you sit in your house and when you walk by the way
	וּבְשֹׁכְבְּךָ וּבְקוּמְךָ	and when you lie down and when you rise up.
6:8		
PFS	וּקְשַׁרְתֶּם לָאוֹת עַל-יָדְךָ	“And you shall bind them as a sign on your hand
PFS	וְהָיוּ לְטָטְפֹת בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ	and they shall be as frontals on your forehead.
6:9		
PFS	וּכְתַבְתֶּם עַל-מְזוּזֹת בְּיַתְדְךָ	“And you shall write them on the doorposts of your house
	וּבְשַׁעְרֶיךָ ׀	and on your gates.

6:10-1

hyh [PFS
(amb,
pr)] [PFS]וְהָיָה כִּי יְבִיאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
אֶל-הָאָרֶץ¶ “Then it shall come about when the Lord your God
brings you into the land

O-[PFS]

אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְרָהָם
לְאַבְרָהָם לְיִצְחָק וְלְיַעֲקֹבwhich He swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and
Jacob,

O-[PFS]

לְתַתּוֹת לָךְ עָרִים גְּדֹלוֹת וְטֹבוֹת
אֲשֶׁר לֹא-בָנִיתָto give you, great and splendid cities
which you did not build,

O-[PFS]

וּבָתִּים מְלֵאִים כָּל-טוֹב
אֲשֶׁר לֹא-מָלֵאתָand houses full of all good things
which you did not fill,

O-[PFS]

וּבְרוֹת חֲצוּבִים
אֲשֶׁר לֹא-חֲצַבְתָּand hewn cisterns
which you did not dig, vineyards

O-[PFS]

וְזֵיתִים
אֲשֶׁר לֹא-נִטְעַתָּand olive trees
which you did not plant,

PFS

וְאָכַלְתָּ
וְשָׂבַעְתָּand you shall eat
and be satisfied,

6:1 2

PFS

הִשָּׁמֵר לָךְ פֶּן-תִּשְׁכַּח
אֶת-יְהוָהthen watch yourself, lest you forget
the Lord

S-[PFS]

אֲשֶׁר הוֹצִיאֲךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
מִבֵּית עֲבָדִיםwho brought you from the land of Egypt,
out of the house of slavery.

6:1 3

CFS

אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ תִירָא
וְאִתּוֹ תַעֲבֹד“You shall fear only the Lord your God;
and you shall worship Him,

CFS CFS

וּבְשֵׁמוֹ תִשָּׁבַע

and swear by His name.

(PRL)

6:1 4

PFS

לֹא תִלְכוּן אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים
מֵאֱלֹהֵי הָעַמִּים“You shall not follow other gods,
any of the gods of the peoples

S-[ptc]

אֲשֶׁר סְבִיבוֹתֵיכֶם

who surround you,

6:1 5

[PFS]

כִּי אֵל קַנָּא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּקִרְבְּךָ
פֶּן-יִחַרְה אַף-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָּךְfor the Lord your God in the midst of you is a jealous God;
otherwise the anger of the Lord your God will be kindled

PFS

against you,

PFS

וְהִשְׁמִידֶךָ מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ

and He will wipe you off the face of the earth.

6:1 6

PFS

לֹא תִנְסֶה אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיכֶם
כַּאֲשֶׁר נִסִּיתֶם בַּמַּסָּה¶ “You shall not put the Lord your God to the test, as you
tested Him at Massah.

[PFS]

6:1 7

PFS

שָׁמֹר תִּשְׁמְרוּן אֶת-מִצְוֹת
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם“You should diligently keep the commandments of the
Lord your God, and His testimonies and His statutes

וְעֲדוֹתָיו וְחֻקָּיו אֲשֶׁר צִוָּךְ

which He has commanded you.

6:18-9

PFS וְעָשִׂיתָ הַיָּשָׁר וְהַטּוֹב
 בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה
 [PFS, לְמַעַן יִיטֵב לָךְ
 PFS, וּבָאתָ
 PFS וְיָרַשְׁתָּ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ הַטֹּבָה
 O-[PFS]] אֲשֶׁר-נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לְאַבְתָּיִךְ
 לְהַרְךָ אֶת-כָּל-אֹיְבֶיךָ
 [PFS] מִפְּנֵיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה ׀

“And you shall do what is right and good in the sight of the Lord,
 that it may be well with you
 and that you may go in
 and possess the good land which the Lord swore to give your fathers,
 by driving out all your enemies from before you, as the Lord has spoken.

6:20-1

[PFS כִּי-יִשְׁאַלְךָ בֶּנְךָ מִחֵר לֵאמֹר
 itr מָה הָעֵדוּת וְהַחֻקִּים וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים
 O-[PFS]] אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶתְכֶם
 PFS וְאָמַרְתָּ לְבִנְךָ
 CFS עַבְדִּים הָיִינוּ לְפָרְעָה בְּמִצְרַיִם
 (INT), PFS וַיּוֹצֵיאֵנוּ יְהוָה מִמִּצְרַיִם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה

¶ “When your son asks you in time to come, saying, ‘What do the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments mean which the Lord our God commanded you?’ then you shall say to your son, ‘We were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt; and the Lord brought us from Egypt with a mighty hand.

6:2 2

PFS וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אוֹתוֹת
 וּמוֹפְתִים גְּדֹלִים וְרָעִים
 בְּמִצְרַיִם בְּפָרְעָה וּבְכָל-בֵּיתוֹ
 לְעֵינֵינוּ

‘Moreover, the Lord showed great and distressing signs and wonders before our eyes against Egypt, Pharaoh and all his household;

6:2 3

CFS וְאוֹתָנוּ הוֹצִיא מִשָּׁם
 CWP? ◊ לְמַעַן הָבִיא אֶתָנוּ
 the Lord לְתַת לָנוּ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ
 punished אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְתָּיִנוּ
 Egypt (v. 22).

and He brought us out from there in order to bring us in, to give us the land which He had sworn to our fathers.’

O-[PFS]

6:2 4

PFS וַיְצַוֵּנוּ יְהוָה
 לְעֲשׂוֹת אֶת-כָּל-הַחֻקִּים הָאֵלֶּה
 לְיִרְאָה אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 לְטוֹב לָנוּ כָּל-הַיָּמִים
 לְחַיֵּתָנוּ כִּהְיוֹם הַזֶּה

“So the Lord commanded us to observe all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God for our good always and for our survival, as it is today.

6:2 5

CFS (cls) וְצִדְקָה תִּהְיֶה-לָּנוּ
 [PFS] כִּי-נִשְׁמַר לְעֲשׂוֹת
 אֶת-כָּל-הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת
 לְפָנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 [PFS] כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּנוּ ׀

“And it will be righteousness for us if we are careful to observe all this commandment before the Lord our God, just as He commanded us.

7:1-2

[PFS,
[S-ptc],
PFS

כִּי יביאֲךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר־אַתָּה בָּא־שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ
וְנָשַׁל גּוֹיִם־רַבִּים מִפְּנֶיךָ
הַחִתִּי וְהַגִּרְגָּשִׁי וְהָאֱמֹרִי וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי
וְהַפְּרִזִּי וְהַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי
שִׁבְעָה גּוֹיִם רַבִּים וְעֲצוּמִים מִמֶּךָ
וַיִּנְחָנֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְפָנֶיךָ
וְהִכִּיתָם
הַחֲרֵם תַּחֲרִים אֹתָם
לֹא־תִכְרֹת לָהֶם בְּרִית
וְלֹא תִחַנֵּם

¶ “When the Lord your God shall bring you into the land where you are entering to possess it, and shall clear away many nations before you, the Hittites and the Girgashites and the Amorites and the Canaanites and the Perizzites and the Hivites and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and stronger than you, and when the Lord your God shall deliver them before you, and you shall defeat them, then you shall utterly destroy them. You shall make no covenant with them and show no favor to them.

7:3

PFS
CFS
CFS

וְלֹא תִתְחַתֵּן בָּם
בְּתֶךָ לֹא־תִתֵּן לְבָנֹו
וּבְתוֹ לֹא־תִקַּח לְבָנֶךָ

“Furthermore, you shall not intermarry with them; you shall not give your daughters to their sons, nor shall you take their daughters for your sons.

PRL(itm)

7:4

[PFS
PFS
PFS
PFS]

כִּי־יִסִּיר אֶת־בְּנֶךָ מֵאַחֲרַי
וְעָבְדוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים
וְחָרָה אַף־יְהוָה בְּכֶם
וְהִשְׁמִידֶךָ מִהָרָה

For they will turn your sons away from following Me to serve other gods; then the anger of the Lord will be kindled against you, and He will quickly destroy you.

7:5

CFS (I-F)
CFS
CFS
CFS (PRL-
itm)

כִּי־אִם־כֹּה תַעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם
מִזְבְּחֵיהֶם תִּהְיוּ
וּמִזְבָּחָם תִּשְׁבְּרוּ
וְאֲשֵׁירֵיהֶם תִּגְדְּעוּ
וּפְסִילֵיהֶם תִּשְׂרֹפוּן בְּאֵשׁ

“But thus you shall do to them: you shall tear down their altars, and smash their sacred pillars, and hew down their Asherim, and burn their graven images with fire.

7:6

[PFS]
AFS (ctr
<> all the
peoples)
S-[PFS]

כִּי עַם קָדוֹשׁ אַתָּה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
בְּךָ בָּחַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
לְהִיזֹת לּוֹ לְעַם סְגֻלָּה
מִכָּל הָעַמִּים
אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ ס

¶ “For you are a holy people to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for His own possession out of all the peoples who are on the face of the earth.

7:7-8

CFS
Vx2
(PRL)
[CFS]
CFS

לֹא מֵרַבְּכֶם מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים
חָשַׁק יְהוָה בְּכֶם
וַיִּבְחַר בְּכֶם
כִּי־אַתֶּם הַמְּעַט מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים
כִּי מֵאֲהַבַת יְהוָה אֶתְכֶם
וּמִשְׁמֵרוֹ אֶת־הַשְּׁבָעָה
אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאֲבֹתֵיכֶם
הוֹצִיא יְהוָה אֶתְכֶם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה
וַיִּפְדֶּךָ מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים
מִיַּד פַּרְעֹה מֶלֶךְ־מִצְרָיִם

“The Lord did not set His love on you nor choose you because you were more in number than any of the peoples, for you were the fewest of all peoples, but because the Lord loved you and kept the oath which He swore to your forefathers, the Lord brought you out by a mighty hand, and redeemed you from the house of slavery, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.

O-[PFS]
Vx2

7:9-10

EXP-CFS

(E/P)

וַיִּדְעַתָּה כִּי־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
 הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים הַאֵל הַנֶּאֱמָן
 שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד לְאַהֲבָיו
 וְלִשְׁמֵרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו
 [מִצְוֹתָיו] לְאַלֶּף דָּוָר
 וּמְשַׁלֵּם לְשֹׂנְאָיו אֶל־פְּנֵיו
 לְהַאֲבִידוֹ
 לֹא יִאֲחַר לְשֹׂנְאָו
 אֶל־פְּנֵיו יִשְׁלֹם־לוֹ

“Know therefore that the Lord your God,
 He is God, the faithful God,
 who keeps His covenant and His lovingkindness to a
 thousandth generation with those who love Him and keep
 His commandments;
 but repays those who hate Him to their faces,
 to destroy them;
 He will not delay with him who hates Him,
 He will repay him to his face.

PFS

CFS(CHC)

7:11

PFS

וְשָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת־הַמִּצְוָה וְאֶת־הַחֻקִּים
 וְאֶת־הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים
 אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה הַיּוֹם לַעֲשׂוֹתָם פ

“Therefore, you shall keep the commandment and the
 statutes and the judgments
 which I am commanding you today, to do them.

O-[S-ptc]

7:12-3

hyh cnj

(PFSx3)

וְהָיָה עֵקֶב תִּשְׁמָעוּן
 אֶת־הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים הָאֵלֶּה
 וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם
 וְשָׁמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְךָ
 אֶת־הַבְּרִית וְאֶת־הַחֶסֶד
 אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְתָּיִךְ

¶ “Then it shall come about, because you listen to these
 judgments
 and keep and do them,
 that the Lord your God will keep with you
 His covenant and His lovingkindness
 which He swore to your forefathers.

1 PFS

O-[PFS]

2-5 PFS

וְאַהֲבָךָ וּבֵרַכְךָ וְהִרְבֶּךָ
 וּבֵרַךְ פְּרִי־בִטְנְךָ
 וּפְרִי־אֲדָמָתְךָ דְגָנְךָ
 וְתִירְשֶׁךָ וְיִצְהָרְךָ
 שְׁגֵר־אֶלְפִיךָ וְעִשְׂתָּרֶת צֹאנְךָ
 עַל־הָאָדָמָה
 אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְתָּיִךְ לָתֶת לְךָ

“And He will love you and bless you and multiply you; He
 will also bless the fruit of your womb and the fruit of your
 ground, your grain
 and your new wine and your oil,
 the increase of your herd and the young of your flock,
 in the land
 which He swore to your forefathers to give you.

[PFS]

7:14

CFS

(E/P?)

PFS

בְּרוּךְ תִּהְיֶה מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים
 לֹא־יִהְיֶה בְּךָ עֶקֶר וְעֶקְרָה
 וּבְבִהֶמְתְּךָ

“You shall be blessed above all peoples;
 there shall be no male or female barren among you or
 among your cattle.

7:15

PFS-CHC-

CFS (CC)

PFS

וְהִסִּיר יְהוָה מִמֶּךָ כָּל־חֲלִי
 וְכָל־מַדּוּי מִצָּרִים הָרְעִים
 אֲשֶׁר יָדַעְתָּ לֹא יִשְׁיִמּוּ בְּךָ
 וְנָתַנּוּ בְּכָל־שֹׂנְאֶיךָ

“And the Lord will remove from you all sickness;
 and He will not put on you any of the harmful diseases of
 Egypt which you have known,
 but He will lay them on all who hate you.

7:16

PFS

O-[S+ptc]

PFS

PFS

[PFS]

וְאָכַלְתָּ אֶת־כָּל־הָעַמִּים
 אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ
 לֹא־תַחַס עֵינְךָ עֲלֵיהֶם
 וְלֹא תַעֲבֹד אֶת־אֱלֹהֵיהֶם
 כִּי־מוֹקֵשׁ הוּא לְךָ ס

And you shall consume all the peoples whom the Lord
 your God will deliver to you;
 your eye shall not pity them,
 neither shall you serve their gods,
 for that would be a snare to you.

7:17		
[PFS, PFS itr]	כִּי תֹאמַר בְּלִבְבְּךָ רַבִּים הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה מִפְּנֵי אֵיכָה אוֹכַל לְהוֹרִישָׁם	¶ “If you should say in your heart, ‘These nations are greater than I; how can I dispossess them?’
7:18-9		
PFS	לֹא תִירָא מֵהֶם	you shall not be afraid of them;
PFS	זָכֹר תִּזְכֹּר אֶת אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְפָרְעֹה וּלְכָל-מִצְרָיִם	you shall well remember what the Lord your God did to Pharaoh and to all Egypt:
O-[PFS]	הַמַּפְסֹת הַגְּדֹלֹת אֲשֶׁר-רָאוּ עֵינֶיךָ וְהָאֵתֹת וְהַמִּוִּפְתִּים וְהַיָּד הַמְּצֻקָה וְהַזְרֹעַ הַנְּטוּיָה אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאָךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּן-יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְכָל-הָעַמּוֹת	the great trials which your eyes saw and the signs and the wonders and the mighty hand and the outstretched arm by which the Lord your God brought you out. So shall the Lord your God do to all the peoples
A-[PFS]		
AFS	אֲשֶׁר-אַתָּה יָרָא מִפְּנֵיהֶם	of whom you are afraid.
O-[S+ptc]		
7:20		
CFS [E/P, to-sht?]	וְגַם אֶת-הַצְּרָעָה יִשְׁלַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָּם עַד-אַבֵּד הַנִּשְׁאָרִים וְהַנִּסְתָּרִים מִפְּנֶיךָ	“Moreover, the Lord your God will send the hornet against them, until those who are left and hide themselves from you perish.
PFS		
7:21		
PFS	לֹא תִירָא מֵהֶם	“You shall not dread them,
[CFS [E/P]]	כִּי-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּקִרְבְּךָ אֵל גָּדוֹל וְנוֹרָא	for the Lord your God is in your midst, a great and awesome God.
7:22		
PFS	וְנָשַׁל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת-הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵל מִפְּנֶיךָ מֵעַט מְעַט לֹא תוּכַל כַּלְתָּם מִהֵרָ פֶּן-תִּרְבֶּה עָלֶיךָ תַּיִת הַשָּׂדֶה	“And the Lord your God will clear away these nations before you little by little; you will not be able to put an end to them quickly, lest the wild beasts grow too numerous for you.
7:23		
PFS	וַיִּתְּנֵם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְפָנֶיךָ וְהָמָם מִהוֹמָה גְּדֹלָה עַד הַשְׂמָדָם	“But the Lord your God shall deliver them before you, and will throw them into great confusion until they are destroyed.
PFS		
7:24		
PFS	וַיִּתֵּן מַלְכֵיהֶם בְּיָדְךָ וְהָאֲבֹדָתָם אֶת-שְׁמֵם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם	“And He will deliver their kings into your hand so that you shall make their name perish from under heaven;
PFS		
PFS	לֹא-יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ בְּפָנֶיךָ עַד הַשְׂמָדָתָם אֹתָם	no man will be able to stand before you until you have destroyed them.
7:25		
CFS (TOP)	פְּסִילֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם תִּשְׂרֹפוּן בָּאֵשׁ	“The graven images of their gods you are to burn with fire;
PFS		
PFS	לֹא-תַחְמֹד כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב עֲלֵיהֶם וְלֹקַחְתָּ לָּךְ פֶּן תִּנְקַשׁ בּוֹ כִּי תוֹעֵבֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הוּא	you shall not covet the silver or the gold that is on them, nor take it for yourselves, lest you be snared by it, for it is an abomination to the Lord your God.
[PFS]		

7:26

PFS ולא־תביא תועבה אל־ביתך
 PFS והיית חרם כְּמִהוּ
 PFS שְׂקִץ תִּשְׂקֶזְנוּ
 PFS ותעב תִּתְעַבְנוּ
 [PFS] כִּי־חֵרֵם הוּא פ

“And you shall not bring an abomination into your house, and like it come under the ban; you shall utterly detest it and you shall utterly abhor it, for it is something banned.

8:1

CFS כֹּל־הַמִּצְוָה
 (INT) אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה הַיּוֹם
 [S+ptc] תִּשְׁמְרוּן לַעֲשׂוֹת
 [PFS x4] לְמַעַן תַּחְיִין וּרְבִיתֶם וּבִאתֶם
 וִירִשְׁתֶּם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ
 O-[PFS] אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לְאַבְתֵּיכֶם

¶ Be careful to follow every command I am giving you today, so that you may live and increase and may enter and possess the land that the Lord promised on oath to your forefathers.

8:2

PFS וְזָכַרְתָּ אֶת־כָּל־הַדְרֹךְ
 [PFS] אֲשֶׁר הִלִּיכְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
 זֶה אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה בַּמִּדְבָּר
 lex3 לְמַעַן עֲנֹתְךָ לְנִסְתָּךְ
 לְדַעַת אֶת־אֲשֶׁר בְּלִבְךָ
 הִתְשַׁמֵּר מִצְוֹתָיו [מְצֻוֹתָיו] אִם־לֹא

Remember how the Lord your God led you all the way in the desert these forty years, to humble you and to test you in order to know what was in your heart, whether or not you would keep his commands.

8:3

PFSx3 וַיַּעֲנֶךָ וַיַּרְעֲבֶךָ וַיֹּאכְלֶךָ אֶת־הַמָּן
 O-[PFSx2] אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדַעְתָּ
 וְלֹא יָדְעוּן אֲבֹתֶיךָ
 [PFS] לְמַעַן הוֹדִיעֶךָ
 [AFS-PRL] כִּי לֹא עַל־הַלֶּחֶם לִבְדּוֹ
 יַחְיֶה הָאָדָם
 (ctr)-AFS] כִּי עַל־כָּל־מוֹצֵא פִי־יְהוָה
 יַחְיֶה הָאָדָם

He humbled you, causing you to hunger and then feeding you with manna, which neither you nor your fathers had known, to teach you that man does not live on bread alone but on every word that comes from the mouth of the Lord.

8:4

CFS-PRL- שְׂמֹלְתְךָ לֹא בָלְתָה מֵעֲלֶיךָ
 CFS וְרַגְלֶיךָ לֹא בָצְקָה
 זֶה אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה

Your clothes did not wear out and your feet did not swell during these forty years.

8:5

PFS וַיָּדַעְתָּ עִם־לִבְךָ
 [PFS] כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר יִיסֵר אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ
 AFS] יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִיִּסְרֶךָ

Know then in your heart that as a man disciplines his son, so the Lord your God disciplines you.

8:6

PFS וְשָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
 לְלַכֵּת בְּדַרְכָּיו וּלְיִרְאָה אֹתוֹ

¶ Observe the commands of the Lord your God, walking in his ways and revering him.

8:7-9

[AFS (ctr)
or CFS-
(E/P)]

כי יהוה אלהיך מביאך
אל-ארץ טובה
ארץ נחלי מים עינת
ותהלות יצאים בבקעה ובקדר
ארץ חטה ושערה וגפן ותאנה
ורמון ארץ-זית שמן ודבש

For the Lord your God is bringing you
into a good land —
a land with streams and pools of water,
with springs flowing in the valleys and hills;
a land with wheat and barley, vines and fig trees,
pomegranates, olive oil and honey;

8:9

[CFS
CHC?PFS]
[PFS
CFS
(CHC)]

ארץ אשר לא במסכנת
תאכל-בה לחם
לא-תחסר כל בה
ארץ אשר אשר אבניה ברזל
ומהרריה תחצב נחשת

a land where bread will not be scarce
and you will lack nothing;
a land where the rocks are iron
and you can dig copper out of the hills.

8:10

PFSx2
PFS
O-[PFS]

ואכלת ושבעת
ויברכת את-יהוה אלהיך
על-הארץ הטובה אשר נתן-לך

¶ When you have eaten and are satisfied,
praise the Lord your God
for the good land he has given you.

8:11

PFS
PFS

השמר לך
פן-תשכח את-יהוה אלהיך
לבילתי שמר
מצותיו ומשפטיו וחקתיו
אשר אנכי מצוה היום

Be careful
that you do not forget the Lord your God,
failing to observe his commands, his laws and his
decrees
that I am giving you this day.

8:12-3

PFSx2
CFS CFS
CFS
CFS
(PRL itm)

פן-תאכל ושבעת
ובתים טובים תבנה וישבת
ובקרך וצאנך ירבין
וכסף וזהב ירבה-לך
וכל אשר-לך ירבה

Otherwise, when you eat and are satisfied,
when you build fine houses and settle down,
and when your herds and flocks grow large
and your silver and gold increase
and all you have is multiplied,

8:14-7

PFS
PFS
ptc 1

ורם לבבך
ושכחת את-יהוה אלהיך
המוציאך מארץ מצרים
מבית עבדים

then your heart will become proud
and you will forget the Lord your God,
who brought you out of Egypt,
out of the land of slavery.

ptc 2

המוליכך במדבר הגדל והנורא
נחש שרף ועקרב
וצמאון אשר אין-מים

He led you through the vast and dreadful desert, that
thirsty and waterless land, with its venomous snakes and
scorpions.

ptc 3

המוציא לך מים מצור החלמיש

He brought you water out of hard rock.

ptc 4

המאכלך מן במדבר

He gave you manna to eat in the desert,

O-[PFS]

אשר לא-ידעו אבותיך
למען ענתך ולמען נסותך
להיטבך באחריתך

something your fathers had never known,
to humble and to test you
so that in the end it might go well with you.

8:17

PFS

CFS (E/P)

וְאָמַרְתָּ בְּלִבְּךָ
כַּחַי וְעַצְמֵי יָדַי
עָשָׂה לִי אֶת־הַחַיִּיל הַזֶּה

You may say to yourself,
“My power and the strength of my hands
have produced this wealth for me.”

8:18

PFS

AFS (ctr

v.17)

[PFS O-

[PFS]]

וְזָכַרְתָּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
כִּי הוּא הַנּוֹתֵן לְךָ כֹּחַ לַעֲשׂוֹת חַיִּיל
לְמַעַן הִקְיָם אֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ
אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּע לְאֲבוֹתֶיךָ כִּי־וְהָיָה כֵּן

But remember the Lord your God,
for it is he who gives you the ability to produce wealth,
and so confirms his covenant,
which he swore to your forefathers, as it is today.

8:19

hyh PFS

PFS

PFS

PFS

PFS

PFS

וְהָיָה אִם־שָׁכַחַת תִּשְׁכַּח
אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
וְהִלַּכְתָּ אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים
וְעִבַדְתָּם וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ לָהֶם
הֵעֵרַתִּי בְּכֶם הַיּוֹם
כִּי אֶבֶד תֵּאבְדוּן

¶ If you ever forget the Lord your God
and follow other gods
and worship and bow down to them,
I testify against you today
that you will surely be destroyed.

8:20

[S+ptc]

PFS

Idiom

PFS

כַּגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה מֵאֲבִיר מִפְּנֵיכֶם
כֵּן תֵּאבְדוּן
עַקֵּב לֹא תִשְׁמָעוּן
בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם כֵּן

Like the nations the Lord destroyed before you,
so you will be destroyed
for not obeying
the Lord your God.

9:1-2

PFS

CFS (CC

INT, BI)

שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל
אִתָּה עֹבֵר הַיּוֹם אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן
לְבֹא לְרִשֵׁת גּוֹיִם גְּדֹלִים
וְעֲצָמִים מְמוֹדִים
עָרִים גְּדֹלֹת וּבְצֻרֹת בְּשָׁמַיִם
עִם־גְּדֹלֹל וָרֵם בְּנֵי עֲנָקִים
אֲשֶׁר אִתָּה יָדַעְתָּ
וְאִתָּה שָׁמַעְתָּ
מִי יִחַיֵּצֵב לְפָנַי בְּנֵי עֲנָק

¶ “Hear, O Israel!
You are crossing over the Jordan today
to go in to dispossess nations greater and mightier than
you,
great cities fortified to heaven,
a people great and tall, the sons of the Anakim,
whom you know
and of whom you have heard it said,
‘Who can stand before the sons of Anak?’

9:3

PFS

[EXP CFS

(PRL)

CFS

CFS

PFS

[PFS]

וְיָדַעְתָּ הַיּוֹם
כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
הוּא־הָעֹבֵר לְפָנֶיךָ אֵשׁ אֹכֶלֶת
הוּא יִשְׁמִירֵם
וְהוּא יִכְנִיעֵם לְפָנֶיךָ
וְהוֹרֵשְׁתָּם וְהֵאבַדְתָּם מִהָרָה
כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה לְךָ

“Know therefore today
that it is the Lord your God
who is crossing over before you as a consuming fire.
who will destroy them
and who will subdue them before you,
so that you may drive them out and destroy them quickly,
just as the Lord has spoken to you. [Shimasaki]

9:4

PFS

אֶל־תֹּאמַר בְּלִבְבְּךָ
בְּהֵרֵף יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
אַתֶּם מִלְּפָנֶיךָ לֵאמֹר

“Do not say in your heart
when the Lord your God has driven them out before you,

CFS

בְּצַדִּיקְתִּי הֵבִיאֲנִי יְהוָה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ

‘Because of my righteousness the Lord has brought me

PRL(ctr)

אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת

in to possess this land,’

CFS

וְכִרְשָׁעַת הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה יְהוָה

but it is because of the wickedness of these nations that

מִזְרֵי־שָׂרָם מִלְּפָנֶיךָ

the Lord is dispossessing them before you.

9:5

CFS

לֹא בְּצַדִּיקְתְּךָ וּבִישׁוּר לְבָבְךָ

“It is not for your righteousness or for the uprightness of

PRL(ctr).(

אַתָּה בָּא לְרִשְׁתָּהּ אֶת־אֲרָצָם

your heart that you are going to possess their land,

S+ptc)

כִּי בְּרִשְׁעַת הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה

but it is because of the wickedness of these nations that

[CFS]

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִזְרֵי־שָׂם מִלְּפָנֶיךָ

the Lord your God is driving them out before you,

9:6

PFS

וַיִּדְעָה

“Know, then,

AFS (ctr)

כִּי לֹא בְּצַדִּיקְתְּךָ

it is not because of your righteousness

יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ

that the Lord your God is giving you this good land to

הַטּוֹבָה הַזֹּאת לְרִשְׁתָּהּ

possess,

[PFS]

כִּי עִם־קִשְׁת־עֲרֹךְ אַתָּה

for you are a stubborn people.

9:7

PFSx2

זְכוֹר אֶל־הַשֹּׁכֶחַ

¶ “Remember, do not forget

[PFS]

אֶת אֲשֶׁר־הִקְצַפְתָּ

how you provoked

אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בַּמִּדְבָּר

the Lord your God to wrath in the wilderness; from the

CFS (CC

לְמַן־הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יָצָאתָ

day that you left

paraphrasi

מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם

the land of Egypt

ng)

עַד־בְּאַכְסֵם עַד־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה

until you arrived at this place,

מִמְרֵי־הַיָּתֶם עִם־יְהוָה

you have been rebellious against the Lord.

9:8

CFS

וּבְחֹרֵב הִקְצַפְתֶּם אֶת־יְהוָה

“Even at Horeb you provoked the Lord to wrath,

(CTX)

וַיִּתְאַנֶּף יְהוָה בְּכֶם לְהַשְׁמִיד אֶתְכֶם

and the Lord was so angry with you that He would have

PFS

destroyed you.

9:9

CFS

בְּעֹלְתִי הַהָרָה לָקַחַת

“When I went up to the mountain to receive the tablets of

(CTX)

לוֹחַת הָאֲבָנִים

stone,

לוֹחַת הַבְּרִית

the tablets of the covenant

O-[PFS]

אֲשֶׁר־פָּרַח יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם

which the Lord had made with you,

PFS

וְאָשַׁב בָּהָר

then I remained on the mountain

אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעִים לַיְלָה

forty days and nights;

CFSx2

לֶחֶם לֹא אָכַלְתִּי

[“while” Shimasaki] I neither ate bread

CC(PRL)

וּמַיִם לֹא שָׁתִיתִי

nor drank water.

9:10

CFS [CC
gloss]

הָאֲבָנִים כְּתוּבִים בְּאֶצְבַּע אֱלֹהִים
וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֵלַי אֶת־שְׁנֵי לוחֹת
אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם
וַעֲלִיָּהֶם כְּכֹל־הַדְּבָרִים
בְּהָר מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ בַּיּוֹם הַקָּהָל

“And the Lord gave me the two tablets of stone written by
the finger of God;
and on them were all the words which the Lord had
spoken with you
at the mountain from the midst of the fire on the day of
the assembly.

9:11

hyh

CTX

PFS

וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ
אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעִים לַיְלָה
נָתַן יְהוָה אֵלַי אֶת־שְׁנֵי
לוחֹת הָאֲבָנִים לְחוֹת הַבְּרִית

“And it came about at the end of
forty days and nights
that the Lord gave me the two
tablets of stone, the tablets of the covenant.

9:12

PFS

PFSx2

[PFS

[PFS]]

PFS

[PFS]

PFS

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי

קוּם רַד מִהָר מְזִיחַ

כִּי שָׁחַת עִמָּךְ

אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ מִמִּצְרָיִם

סָרוּ מִהָר מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ

אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתֶם

עָשׂוּ לָהֶם מַסֵּכָה

“Then the Lord said to me,
'Arise, go down from here quickly,
for your people whom you brought out of Egypt have
acted corruptly.
They have quickly turned aside from the way
which I commanded them;
they have made a molten image for themselves.'

9:13

PFS

PFS

PFS

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי לֵאמֹר

רָאִיתִי אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה

וְהִנֵּה עִם־קָשָׁה־עֵרֶךְ הוּא

“The Lord spoke further to me, saying,
I have seen this people,
and indeed, it is a stubborn people.

9:14

PFSx3

PFS

הֲרַךְ מִמֶּנִּי וְאַשְׁמִידֵם וְאַמְחָה

אֶת־שִׁמְם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם

וְאַעֲשֶׂה אוֹתָךְ

לְגוֹי־עָצוּם וְרַב מִמֶּנִּי

'Let Me alone, that I may destroy them and blot out their
name from under heaven;
and I will make of you a nation mightier and greater than
they.'

9:15

PFSx2

CFSx2

(CC and

PRL)

וָאָפִן וָאָרַד מִן־הָהָר

וְהָהָר בֹּעֵר בָּאֵשׁ

וּשְׁנֵי לוחֹת הַבְּרִית עַל שְׁתֵּי יָדַי

“So I turned and came down from the mountain
while the mountain was burning with fire,
and the two tablets of the covenant were in my two
hands.

9:16

PFSx2

PFS

PFS

[PFS]

וָאֵרָא וְהִנֵּה חָטֵאתֶם

לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם

עָשִׂיתֶם לָכֶם עֵגֶל מַסֵּכָה

סָרַתֶם מִהָר מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ

אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶתְכֶם

“And I saw that you had indeed sinned against the Lord
your God.
You had made for yourselves a molten calf;
you had turned aside quickly from the way
which the Lord had commanded you.

9:17

PFS

PFS

PFS

וָאֶחָפַשׁ בְּשְׁנֵי הַלוחֹת

וָאֲשַׁלְּכֶם מֵעַל שְׁתֵּי יָדַי

וָאֲשַׁבְּרֵם לְעֵינֵיכֶם

“And I took hold of the two tablets
and threw them from my hands,
and smashed them before your eyes.

9:1 8

PFS וְאֶתְנַפֵּל לִפְנֵי יְהוָה כְּרֵאשֹׁנָה
 אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעִים לַיְלָה
 לֶחֶם לֹא אָכַלְתִּי
 וּמַיִם לֹא שָׁתִיתִי
 O-[PFS] עַל כָּל-חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר חָטֵאתֶם
 לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה
 לְהַכְעִיסוֹ
 “And I fell down before the Lord, as at the first,
 forty days and nights;
 I neither ate bread
 nor drank water,
 because of all your sin which you had committed
 in doing what was evil in the sight of the Lord
 to provoke Him to anger.

9:1 9

[PFS] כִּי יִגְדַּתִּי מִפְּנֵי הָאֵף וְהַחֲמָה
 [PFS]] אֲשֶׁר קִצַּף יְהוָה עָלֵיכֶם
 לְהַשְׁמִיד אֶתְכֶם
 PFS וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֵלַי גַּם בַּפֶּעַם הַהוּא
 “For I was afraid of the anger and hot displeasure
 with which the Lord was wrathful against you
 in order to destroy you,
 but the Lord listened to me that time also.

9:20-1

CFS T- וּבְאַהֲרֹן הַתְּאֵנָף יְהוָה
 Shift LS מְאֹד לְהַשְׁמִידוֹ
 PFS וְאֶתְפַּלֵּל גַּם-בְּעַד
 אֶהֱרֹן בְּעַת הַהוּא
 CFS T- וְאֶת-חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם
 Shift, LS אֲשֶׁר-עָשִׂיתֶם אֶת-הָעֵגֹל לְקַחְתִּי
 (with v. וְאֲשָׁרְךָ אִתּוֹ בָּאֵשׁ וְאַכַּת אִתּוֹ
 20) טָחוֹן הַיֵּטֵב עַד אֲשֶׁר-יֵדַק לְעָפָר
 PFSx3 וְאֲשַׁלְּךָ אֶת-עָפָרוֹ
 אֶל-הַנַּחַל הַיֹּרֵד מִן-הָהָר
 “And the Lord was angry enough with Aaron
 to destroy him;
 so I also prayed for Aaron at the same time.
 “And I took your sinful thing,
 the calf which you had made,
 and burned it with fire and crushed it,
 grinding it very small until it was as fine as dust;
 and I threw its dust
 into the brook that came down from the mountain.

9:2 2

CFS וּבְתַבְעֵרָה וּבְמִסָּה
 (CTX) וּבְקִבְרוֹת הַתְּאֵנָה
 מִקְצָפִים הִייתֶם אֶת-יְהוָה
 ¶ “Again at Taberah and at Massah
 and at Kibroth-hattaavah
 you provoked the Lord to wrath.

9:2 3

CFS(CTX) וּבְשַׁלַּח יְהוָה
 אֶתְכֶם מִקְדָּשׁ בְּרַנֵּעַ לֵאמֹר
 PFSx2 עֲלוּ וּרְשׁוּ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ
 O-[PFS] אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לָכֶם
 PFS וְתִמְרוּ אֶת-פִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
 PFS וְלֹא הֶאֱמַנְתֶּם לוֹ
 PFS וְלֹא שָׁמַעְתֶּם בְּקוֹלוֹ
 “And when the Lord sent you from Kadesh-barnea,
 saying,
 ‘Go up and possess the land
 which I have given you,’
 then you rebelled against the command of the Lord
 your God; you neither believed Him
 nor listened to His voice.

9:2 4

CFS CC מִמֶּרְיִם הִייתֶם עִם-יְהוָה
 prp מִיּוֹם יָדַעְתִּי אֶתְכֶם
 “You have been rebellious against the Lord from the day
 I knew you.

9:2 5

PFS וְאֶתְנַפֵּל לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
 אֶת אַרְבָּעִים הַיּוֹם
 וְאֶת-אַרְבָּעִים הַלַּיְלָה
 O-[PFS] אֲשֶׁר הִתְנַפַּלְתִּי
 [PFS] כִּי-אָמַר יְהוָה לְהַשְׁמִיד אֶתְכֶם
 ¶ “So I fell down before the Lord
 the forty days and nights,
 which I did
 because the Lord had said He would destroy you.

9:26		
PFS	וַאֲתַפְּלֵל אֶל־יְהוָה	“And I prayed to the Lord,
PFS	וְאָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה	and said, O Lord GOD,
PFS	אַל־תַּשְׁחַח עַמֶּךָ וְנַחֲלָתְךָ	do not destroy Thy people, even Thine inheritance,
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר פָּדִיתָ בְּגִדְלֶךָ	whom Thou hast redeemed through Thy greatness,
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר־הוֹצֵאתָ	whom Thou hast brought
	מִמִּצְרַיִם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה	out of Egypt with a mighty hand.
9:27		
PFS	זָכֹר לְעַבְדֶּיךָ לְאַבְרָהָם	Remember Thy servants, Abraham, I
	לְיִצְחָק וְלְיַעֲקֹב	saac, and Jacob;
PFS	אַל־תִּבְּטֹן אֶל־קִשֵׁי הָעָם הַזֶּה	do not look at the stubbornness of this people or at their
	וְאֶל־רָשָׁעוֹ וְאֶל־חַטָּאתוֹ	wickedness or their sin.
9:28		
PFS	כִּי־יֹאמְרוּ הָאָרֶץ	Otherwise the land from
A-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָנוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם	which Thou didst bring us may say,
CFS	מִבְּלִי יִכְלֹת יְהוָה	“Because the Lord was not able to bring them
	לְהַבִּיאָם אֶל־הָאָרֶץ	into the land
[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר לָהֶם	which He had promised them
	וּבְשִׂנְאָתוֹ אוֹתָם	and because He hated them He has brought them out
main V	הוֹצִיאָם לְהַמָּוֶת בְּמִדְבָּר	to slay them in the wilderness.”
9:29		
CFS cls,	וְהֵם עַמֶּךָ וְנַחֲלָתְךָ	Yet they are Thy people, even Thine inheritance,
E/P	אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ בְּכַחֲךָ הַגָּדֹל	whom Thou hast brought out by Thy great power
O-[PFS]	וּבְזֵרְעֶךָ הַנְּשֹׂטֶה בִּי	and Thine outstretched arm.
10:1		
CFS(CTX)	בְּעֵת הַהוּא אָמַר יְהוָה אֵלַי	¶ “At that time the Lord said to me,
PFS	כָּסֹל־לָךְ	‘Cut out for yourself two tablets of stone
	שְׁנֵי־לוחֹת אֲבָנִים כְּרֵאשֵׁנִים	like the former ones,
PFS	וַעֲלֵה אֵלַי הַהָרָה	and come up to Me on the mountain,
PFS	וַעֲשֵׂתָ לָךְ אֲרוֹן עֵץ	and make an ark of wood for yourself.
10:2		
PFS	וְאֶכְתֹּב עַל־הַלְּחֹת אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים	And I will write on the tablets the words that were on the
S-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ עַל־הַלְּחֹת הַרֵאשֵׁנִים	former tablets
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר שִׁבַּרְתָּ	which you shattered,
PFS	וְשַׂמְתָּם בְּאֲרוֹן	and you shall put them in the ark.’
10:3		
PFS	וַאֲעֵשׂ אֲרוֹן עֵצֵי שִׁטִּים	“So I made an ark of acacia wood
PFS	וְאֶכְסַל שְׁנֵי־לוחֹת אֲבָנִים כְּרֵאשֵׁנִים	and cut out two tablets of stone like the former ones, and
PFS	וַאֲעַל הַהָרָה	went up on the mountain
CFS (CC)	וּשְׁנֵי הַלְּחֹת בְּיָדִי	with the two tablets in my hand.

10:4		
PFS	וַיִּכְתֹּב עַל-הַלְּחָת כַּמִּכְתָּב הַרְאִישׁוֹן	"And He wrote on the tablets, like the former writing, the
	אֵת עֲשֻׁרַת הַדְּבָרִים	Ten Commandments
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֵלֵיכֶם	which the Lord had spoken to you on the mountain from
	בְּהָר מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ בְּיוֹם הַקָּהָל	the midst of the fire on the day of the assembly;
PFS	וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֵלַי	and the Lord gave them to me.
10:5		
PFSx2	וָאָפֵן וָאָרַד מִן-הָהָר	"Then I turned and came down from the mountain, and put
PFS	וְאֵשֶׁם אֶת-הַלְּחָת בְּאָרוֹן	the tablets in the ark
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי	which I had made; and there they are, as the Lord
PFS [PFS]	וַיְהִי שָׁם כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוֵּנִי יְהוָה	commanded me."
10:6		
CFS (T- sht)	וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נָסְעוּ מִבְּאֵרֶת	¶ (Now the sons of Israel set out from Beeroth Bene-
	בְּנֵי-יַעֲקֹב מִזֹּסֶרָה	jaakan to Moserah.
CFS (CC)	שָׁם מֵת אַהֲרֹן	There Aaron died
PFS	וַיִּקָּבֵר שָׁם	and there he was buried
PFS (act)	וַיִּכְהֵן אֶלְעָזָר בְּנוֹ תַּחְתָּיו	and Eleazar his son ministered as priest in his place.
10:7		
CFS	מִשָּׁם נָסְעוּ הַגִּדְגָדָה	From there they set out to Gudgodah; and from Gudgodah
(CTX)	וּמִן-הַגִּדְגָדָה יִטְבַּחָה	to Jotbathah,
	אֶרֶץ נַחְלֵי מַיִם	a land of brooks of water.
10:8-9		
CFS	בַּעֵת הַהוּא הִבְדִּיל יְהוָה	At that time the Lord set apart
(CTX, CC)	אֶת-שֵׁבֶט הַלְוִי	the tribe of Levi
	לְשֵׂאת אֶת-אָרוֹן בְּרִית-יְהוָה	to carry the ark of the covenant of the Lord,
	לְעֹמַד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה	to stand before the Lord
	לְשָׁרְתוֹ וּלְבָרֵךְ בְּשֵׁמוֹ	to serve Him and to bless in His name
PFS	עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה	until this day.
	עַל-כֵּן לֹא-הָיָה לְלוֹוֵי חֵלֶק	Therefore, Levi does not have a portion or inheritance
CFS (EXP ctr)	וְנַחֲלָה עִם-אָחָיו	with his brothers;
(PFS)	יְהוָה הוּא נַחֲלָתוֹ	the Lord is his inheritance,
	כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל-מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר	just as the Lord your God spoke to him.)
10:10		
CFS (T- Sht)	וָאֲנֹכִי עֹמְדָתִי בְּהָר	¶ "I, moreover, stayed on the mountain
	כַּיְמֵי הַרְאִישׁוֹנִים	forty days and forty nights like the first time,
PFS	אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם וְאַרְבָּעִים לַיְלָה	and the Lord listened to me that time also;
PFS	וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֵלַי גַּם בַּפְּעַם הַהוּא	the Lord was not willing to destroy you.
	לֹא-אַבָּהּ יְהוָה הַשְׁחִיתֶךָ	
10:11		
PFS	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי	"Then the Lord said to me,
PFSx2	קוּם לֶךְ לְמַסַּע לִפְנֵי הָעָם	Arise, proceed on your journey ahead of the people, that
PFSx2	וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיִּרְשׁוּ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ	they may go in and possess the land
[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר-נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאֲבֹתָם	which I swore to their fathers
	לָתֵת לָהֶם פ	to give them.

10:12-3

	וְעַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל	¶ “And now, Israel,
itr S+ptc	מָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ שָׂאֵל מֵעֲמֶךָ	what does the Lord your God require from you,
le-phr 1	כִּי אִם-לִירְאָה אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	but to fear the Lord your God,
le-phr 2	לָלֶכֶת בְּכָל-דְּרָכָיו וּלְאַהֲבָה אֹתוֹ	to walk in all His ways and love Him,
le-phr 3	וּלְעֹבֵד אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	and to serve the Lord your God
	בְּכָל-לִבְבְּךָ וּבְכָל-נַפְשְׁךָ	with all your heart and with all your soul,
le-phr 4	לְשָׁמֹר אֶת-מִצְוֹת יְהוָה	and to keep the Lord’s commandments
	וְאֶת-חֻקֹּתָיו	and His statutes
O-[S+ptc]	אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מְצַוְךָ הַיּוֹם לְטוֹב לָךְ	which I am commanding you today for your good?

10:14-5

PFS	הֵן לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הַשָּׁמַיִם	“Behold, to the Lord your God belong heaven
	וּשְׁמַי הַשָּׁמַיִם הָאָרֶץ וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-בָּהּ	and the highest heavens, the earth and all that is in it.
CFS	רַק בְּאַבְתָּיִךְ חָשַׁק יְהוָה	Yet on your fathers did the Lord set His affection
(CWP)	לְאַהֲבָה אוֹתָם	to love them,
PFS	וַיִּבְחַר בְּזַרְעָם אַחֲרֵיהֶם	and He chose their descendants after them, even you
	בְּכֶם מִכָּל-הָעַמִּים כִּי־וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם	above all peoples, as it is this day.

10:16

PFS	וּמְלַחְתֶּם אֶת עַרְלַת לִבְבְּכֶם	“Circumcise then your heart,
CFS(CHC	וְעַרְפְּכֶם לֹא תִקְשׁוּ עוֹד	and stiffen your neck no more.
prp)		

10:17-8

EXP (CFS	כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	“For the Lord your God
E/P)	הוּא אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱלֹהִים	is the God of gods and the Lord of Lords, the great, the
	וְאֲדֹנֵי הָאֲדֹנִים הָאֵל הַגָּדֹל הַגִּבּוֹר	mighty, and the awesome God
	וְהַנּוֹרָא	
[PFS	אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יִשָּׂא פָנִים	who does not show partiality,
PFS]	וְלֹא יִקַּח שֹׁחַד	nor take a bribe.
ptc	עֹשֶׂה מִשְׁפָּט יְתוּסִים וְאַלְמָנָה	“He executes justice for the orphan and the widow, and
ptc	וְאַהֲבָ גֵר	shows His love for the alien
	לְתַת לוֹ לֶחֶם וְשִׂמְלָה	by giving him food and clothing.

10:19

PFS	וְאַהֲבַתֶּם אֶת-הַגֵּר	“So show your love for the alien,
AFS [imp	כִּי-גֵרִים הָיִיתֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם	for you were aliens in the land of Egypt.
ctr for		
emp?]		

10:20

CFSx4	אֶת-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ תִירָא	“You shall fear the Lord your God;
(PRL)	אֹתוֹ תַעֲבֹד	you shall serve Him
	וּבֹ תִדְבֹק	and cling to Him,
	וּבְשֵׁמוֹ תִשָּׁבַע	and you shall swear by His name.

10:2 1

CFSx2

(PRL)

[PFS

הוא תהלתך "He is your praise
 והוא אלהיך and He is your God,
 אשר עשה אותך who has done
 את הגדלות ואת הנוראות האלה these great and awesome things for you
 אשר ראו עיניך which your eyes have seen.

[PFS]]

10:2 2

CFSx2

(PRL-

CWP)

בשבעים נפש ירדו "Your fathers went down to Egypt
 אבותיך מצרימה seventy persons in all,
 ועתה שמך יהוה אלהיך and now the Lord your God has made you as numerous
 ככוכבי השמים לרב as the stars of heaven.

11:1

PFS

PFS

ואהבת את יהוה אלהיך ¶ "You shall therefore love the Lord your God,
 ושמרת משמרתו וחקותיו and always keep His charge, His statutes,
 ומשפטיו ומצותיו כל היתמים His ordinances, and His commandments.

11:2 - 6

PFS

[AFS ctr

to v. 7

S-[PFS]

S-[PFS]

וידעתם היום "And know this day
 כי לא את בניכם that I am not speaking with your sons
 אשר לא ידעו who have not known
 ואשר לא ראו את מוסר יהוה and who have not seen the discipline of the Lord
 אלהיכם את גדלו את ידו החזקה your God — His greatness, His mighty hand,
 וזרעו הנטויה and His outstretched arm,
 ואת אחותיו ואת מעשיו and His signs and His works
 אשר עשה בחוף מצרים which He did in the midst of Egypt
 לפרעה מלך מצרים to Pharaoh the king of Egypt
 ולכל ארצו and to all his land;
 ואשר עשה לחיל מצרים and what He did to Egypt's army,
 לסוסיו ולרכבו to its horses and its chariots,
 אשר הציק את מי ים סוף when He made the water of the Red Sea
 על פניהם to engulf them

O-[PFS]

O-[PFS]

A-[PFS]

PFS

O-[PFS]

O-[PFS]

A-[PFS]

בדרךכם אחריכם while they were pursuing you,
 ויאבדם יהוה עד היום הזה and the Lord completely destroyed them;
 ואשר עשה לכם במדבר and what He did to you in the wilderness
 עד באכם עד המקום הזה until you came to this place;
 ואשר עשה לדתן ולאבירם and what He did to Dathan and Abiram,
 בני אליאב בן ראובן the sons of Eliab, the son of Reuben,
 אשר פצתה הארץ את פיה when the earth opened its mouth
 ותבלעם ואת בתיהם and swallowed them, their households,
 ואת אהליהם ואת כל היתקום their tents, and every living thing
 אשר ברגליהם בקרב כל ישראל — that followed them, among all Israel —

11:7

AFS ctr ◁

v. 2

O-[PFS]

כי עיניכם but your own eyes
 הראת את כל מעשה יהוה have seen all the great work of the Lord
 הגדל אשר עשה which He did.

11:8

PFS
[PFS]
PFSx3
A-[S+ptc]

וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה
אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה הַיּוֹם
לְמוֹעַן תִּחְזְקוּ וּבִאתֶם
וַיְרִשְׁתֶּם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר אֲתֶם עֹבְרִים שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ

¶ “You shall therefore keep every commandment
which I am commanding you today,
so that you may be strong and go in
and possess the land
into which you are about to cross to possess it;

11:9

[PFS
[PFS]]

וּלְמוֹעַן תִּאָּרִיכוּ יָמִים עַל־הָאָרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לְאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם
לָתֶת לָהֶם וּלְזֶרְעָם
אֶרֶץ זָבַת חֶלֶב וּדְבַשׁ ׀

so that you may prolong your days on the land
which the Lord swore to your fathers
to give to them and to their descendants,
a land flowing with milk and honey.

11:10-2

CFS (A)-
[S+ptc]

כִּי הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה בָּא־שָׁמָּה
לְרִשְׁתָּהּ

“For the land, into which you are entering
to possess it,

CFSx2
(CC) PRL

לֹא כְאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
הוּא אֲשֶׁר יֵצְאתֶם מִשָּׁם
אֲשֶׁר תִּזְרַע אֶת־זֶרְעֶךָ
וְהִשְׁקִיתָ בְּרַגְלֶךָ כְּגֵן הַיָּרֵק

is not like the land of Egypt
from which you came,
where you used to sow your seed
and water it with your foot like a vegetable garden.

CFS (PRL-
CWP with
above)
2 apos

וְהָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם
עֹבְרִים שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ
אֶרֶץ הָרִים וּבְקָעֹת
לְמַטֵּר הַשָּׁמַיִם תִּשְׁטַח־מַיִם
אֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה דֹּרֵשׁ אֹתָהּ תָּמִיד
עֵינֵי יְהוָה אֵלֶיךָ בָּהּ
מִרְשִׁית הַשָּׁנָה וְעַד אַחֲרִית שָׁנָה ׀

“But the land into which you are about
to cross to possess it,
is a land of hills and valleys, drinks water
from the rain of heaven,
it is a land for which the Lord your God cares always;
on which the eyes of the Lord your God are
from the beginning even to the end of the year.

11:13

hyh
PFS
O-[S+ptc]

וְהָיָה אִם־שָׁמַעַתְּ תִשְׁמָעוּ אֶל־מִצְוֹתַי
אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה אֶתְכֶם הַיּוֹם
לְאַהֲבָה אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
וּלְעֹבְדוֹ בְּכָל־לִבְבְּכֶם
וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁכֶם

¶ “And it shall come about, if you listen obediently to
my commandments
which I am commanding you today,
to love the Lord your God
and to serve Him with all your heart
and all your soul,

11:14

PFS
PFS

וְנָתַתִּי מְטַר־אֶרְצְכֶם
בְּעֵתוֹ יוֹרֵה וּבְמִלְקוֹשׁ
וְאִסַּפְתָּ רִגְנְךָ וְתִירְשֶׁךָ וַיִּצְהַרְךָ

that He will give the rain for your land in its season, the
early and late rain,
that you may gather in your grain and your new wine and
your oil.

11:15

PFS
PFSx2

וְנָתַתִּי עֵשֶׂב בְּשָׂדֶךָ לְבִהֵמוֹתֶיךָ
וְאָכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבַעְתָּ

“And He will give grass in your fields for your cattle,
and you shall eat and be satisfied.

11:16

PFS
PFS
PFSx2
PFS

הִשְׁמְרוּ לָכֶם
כֵּן יִפְתָּה לְבַבְכֶם
וְסָרְתֶם וְעַבַּדְתֶּם אֱלֹהִים אַחֲרָיִם
וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם לָהֶם

“Beware,
lest your hearts be deceived
and you turn away and serve other gods
and worship them.

11:17

PFS	וְחָרָה אַף־יְהוָה בְּכֶם	“Or the anger of the Lord will be kindled against you, and
PFS	וְעָצַר אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם	He will shut up the heavens
PFS	וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה מָטָר	so that there will be no rain
CFS	וְהָאֲדָמָה לֹא תִתֵּן אֶת־יְבוּלָהּ	and the ground will not yield its fruit;
(result)	וְאֲבַדְתֶּם מְהֵרָה מֵעַל	and you will perish quickly from
PFS	הָאָרֶץ הַטֹּבָה	the good land
O-[PFS]	אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה נֹתֵן לָכֶם	which the Lord is giving you.

11:18

PFS	וְשִׂמְתֶם אֶת־דְּבָרֵי אֵלֶּה	¶ “You shall therefore impress these words of mine
	עַל־לִבְבְּכֶם וְעַל־נַפְשְׁכֶם	on your heart and on your soul;
PFS	וְקָשַׁרְתֶּם אֹתָם לְאוֹת עַל־יָדְכֶם	and you shall bind them as a sign on your hand,
PFS	וְהָיוּ לְטוֹשֵׁפֹת בֵּין עֵינֵיכֶם	and they shall be as frontals on your forehead.

11:19

PFS	וְלַמְדֹתֶם אֹתָם אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם	“And you shall teach them to your sons,
	לְדַבֵּר בָּם בְּשֹׁבְתֶךָ בְּבֵיתְךָ	talking of them when you sit in your house
	וּבְלִכְתְּךָ בַדֶּרֶךְ	and when you walk along the road
	וּבְשֹׁכְבְךָ וּבְקוּמְךָ	and when you lie down and when you rise up.

11:20

PFS	וְכָתַבְתֶּם עַל־מְזוּזוֹת	“And you shall write them on the doorposts
	בֵּיתְךָ וּבְשַׁעְרֶיךָ	of your house and on your gates,

11:21

[PFS]	לְמַעַן יִרְבוּ יְמֵיכֶם וְיְמֵי בְנֵיכֶם	so that your days and the days of your sons may be
	עַל הָאֲדָמָה	multiplied on the land
O-[PFS]]	אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לְאֲבֹתֵיכֶם	which the Lord swore to your fathers
	לָתֵת לָהֶם	to give them,
	כִּי־יִמֵּי הַשָּׁמַיִם עַל־הָאָרֶץ ס	as long as the heavens remain above the earth.

11:22

[PFS]	כִּי אִם־שָׁמַר תִּשְׁמְרוּן	“For if you are careful to keep
	אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת	all this commandment
O-[S+ptc]	אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מְצַוֶּה אֹתְכֶם לַעֲשׂוֹתָהּ	which I am commanding you, to do it,
le phrx4	לְאַהֲבָה אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	to love the Lord your God,
	לְלַכֵּת בְּכָל־דְּרָכָיו וּלְדַבְּקָה־בּוֹ	to walk in all His ways and hold fast to Him;

11:23

PFS	וְהוֹרִישׁ יְהוָה אֶת־כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם	then the Lord will drive out all these nations
	הָאֵלֶּה מִלְּפָנֵיכֶם	from before you,
	וְיִרְשְׁתֶּם גּוֹיִם גְּדֹלִים וְעֲצֻמִּים מִכֶּם	and you will dispossess nations greater and mightier than
		you.

11:24

CFS	כָּל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר	Every place on which the sole of your foot shall tread
	תִּדְרֹךְ כַּף־רַגְלְכֶם בּוֹ לָכֶם יִהְיֶה	shall be yours;
CFS	מִן־הַמִּדְבָּר וְהַלְבָּנוֹן	from the wilderness to Lebanon,
(PRL)	מִן־הַנָּהָר נְהַר־פָּרָת	and from the river, the river Euphrates, as far as the
	וְעַד הַיָּם הָאֲחֵרֹן יִהְיֶה גְבֻלְכֶם	western sea shall be your border [Shimasaki]

11:25

PFS
CFS (CC
prp)
A-[PFS]
[PFS]

לֹא־יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ בְּפָנֶיכֶם
פַּחַדְכֶם וּמִוֹרְאֲכֶם יִתֵּן
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר תִּדְרֹכוּ־בָהּ
כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר לָכֶם ס

“There shall no man be able to stand before you;
the Lord your God shall lay the dread of you and the fear
of you on all the land
on which you set foot,
as He has spoken to you.

11:26

PFS
CFS BI

רְאֵה
אֲנֹכִי נֹחֵן לְפָנֶיכֶם הַיּוֹם
בְּרֹכָה וּקְלָלָה

“See,
I am setting before you today
a blessing and a curse:

11:27-8

Q
[PFS
O-[PFS]]
Q?
PFS

אֶת־הַבְּרֹכָה
אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶל־מִצְוֹת
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה אֶתְכֶם הַיּוֹם
וְהַקְּלָלָה
אִם־לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּ אֶל־מִצְוֹת
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
וְסָרְתֶם מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ
אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה אֶתְכֶם הַיּוֹם
לָלֶכֶת אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים
אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדַעְתֶּם ס

the blessing,
if you listen to the commandments
of the Lord your God,
which I am commanding you today;
and the curse,
if you do not listen to the commandments
of the Lord your God,
but turn aside from the way
which I am commanding you today,
by following other gods
which you have not known.

11:29

hāyāh
CTX
A-[PFS]
PFS

וְהָיָה כִּי יָבִיֵאֵךְ
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶל־הָאָרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר־אַתָּה בָּא־שָׁמָּה לְרִשְׁתָּהּ
וְנָתַתָּה אֶת־הַבְּרֹכָה עַל־הַר גֵּרִזִים
וְאֶת־הַקְּלָלָה עַל־הַר עֵיבָל

“And it shall come about,
when the Lord your God brings you into the land
where you are entering to possess it,
that you shall place the blessing on Mount Gerizim
and the curse on Mount Ebal.

11:30

CFS?

הֲלֹא־הֵמָּה בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן
אַחֲרֵי דְרֹךְ מְבוֹא הַשָּׁמֶשׁ
בְּאֶרֶץ הַכְּנַעֲנִי הַיֹּשֵׁב בְּעֶרְבָה
מִוֶּל הַגִּלְגָּל אֶצְלֵי אֵלֹנֵי מֹרֵה

“Are they not across the Jordan,
west of the way toward the sunset,
in the land of the Canaanites who live in the Arabah,
opposite Gilgal, beside the oaks of Moreh?

11:31

CFS (CC)
[PFS]
PFSx2

כִּי אַתֶּם עֹבְרִים
אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן לָבֹא לְרִשְׁתָּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ
אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם נֹחֵן לָכֶם
וְיָרִשְׁתֶּם אֹתָהּ וַיִּשְׁבַּתֶּם־בָּהּ

“For you are about to cross
the Jordan to go in to possess the land
which the Lord your God is giving you,
and you shall possess it and live in it,

11:32

PFS
O-[PFS]

וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם לַעֲשׂוֹת אֵת כָּל־הַחֻקִּים
וְאֵת־הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים
אֲשֶׁר אֲנֹכִי נֹחֵן לְפָנֶיכֶם הַיּוֹם

and you shall be careful to do all the statutes
and the judgments
which I am setting before you today.

An example of Outline: 4:44-11:32

Moses' Second Address (4:44-28:68)

- A. Introduction (4:44-5:5)
- B. The Ten Commandments (5:6-22)
 - Introduction (5:1-5)
 - Shema Israel** 5:1
 - Ten Commandments (5:6-21)
 - Closure (5:22)
- C. Response of the People (5:23-33)
 - hāyāh* contextualisation (23)
 - Closure (33)
- D. Elaboration of the Ten Commandments (6:1-26:15)
 - 1. The First Commandment: No Other Gods (6:1-11:32)
 - a. Love the Lord your God (6:1-25)
 - Introductory formula (1)
 - Shema Israel** (4)
 - hāyāh ky* (10)
 - ky impf* (20)
 - Closure (25)
 - b. Destroy the Nations and their gods(7:1-26)
 - ky imp* (1)
 - c. Do not forget the Lord (8:1-20)
 - Initiation (1)
 - d. Do Not Boast in Your Own Righteousness (9:1-10:11)
 - 1-6 Do not boast
 - Shema Israel** (1)
 - Initiation and background (1)
 - 7-21 Israel's sin at Horeb
 - Contextualisation (8)
 - Contextualisation (9)
 - hyh* (11)
 - topic shift (20)
 - topic shift (21)
 - 22-24 at other places
 - Contextualisation (22)
 - Contextualisation (23)
 - 25-29 Moses intercession
 - Closure (29)
 - 10:1-5 New tablets
 - Contextualisation (10:1)
 - 10:6-9 Special Note
 - Topic-shift (10:6)
 - contextualisation (10:8)
 - 10:10-11 Forty days and nights again
 - Topic-shift (10:10)
 - e. Fear the Lord and Keep His Commands (10:12-11:32)
 - 10:12-22 Serve only the Lord
 - 11:1-7 I am speaking to you, for you saw it
 - 11:8-17 Blessing and curse in the new land
 - Casus Pendens (11:10)
 - Closure (11:17)
 - 11:18-21 Teach my words
 - 11:22-25 Blessing
 - 26-32 Blessing and curse
 - hāyāh ky* (11:29)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, William James, Jr. "Determining the Functions of Biblical Hebrew Verb Forms by a Statistical Sampling of Verbs." *Hebrew Computational Linguistics* 9: E-1-21, 1975.
- _____. "The Functions of Biblical Hebrew Verb Forms as Determined by Statistical Sampling of Verbs." *Hebrew Abstracts* 13: 69-72, 1972.
- Adams, William James, Jr. and L. La Mar Adams. "Language Drift and the Dating of Biblical Passages." *Hebrew Studies* 18: 160-64, 1977.
- Albrecht, Von C. "Die Wortstellung im hebräischen Nominalsatze." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* vii: 218-224, 1887.
- Andersen, Francis I. *The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, no. 14. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.
- _____. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. Paris, New York: Mouton Publishers, 1974.
- Bailey, Nicholas A. "'What's Wrong with My Word Order?': Topic, Focus, Information Flow, and Other Pragmatic Aspects of Some Biblical Genealogies." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 10: 1-29, 1998.
- Bandstra, Barry L. "Word Order and Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Syntactic Observations on Genesis 22 from a Discourse Perspective [1986]." In *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. W. R. Bodine, 109-123. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Bergey, Ronald L. "Post-Exilic Hebrew Linguistic Developments in Esther: A Diachronic Approach." *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 31:2: 161-168, 1988.
- Blau, Joshua. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976.
- Bodine, Walter R. "How Linguists Study Syntax [1987]." In *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Walter R. Bodine. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Buth, Randal. "Word Order Differences Between Narrative and Non-narrative Material in Biblical Hebrew." In *Proceedings of Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division D*, ed. D Assaf, 9-16. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990.
- _____. "Functional Grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic: An Integrated, Textlinguistic Approach to Syntax." In *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature*, ed. Walter R. Bodine, 77-102, The Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies, by Edward L. Greenstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- _____. "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 79-108. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

- Chafe, Wallace L. "Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, ed. Russel Tomlin, 21-51. Vol. 11, Typological Studies in Language, by T. Givón. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987.
- _____. *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: the Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- _____. "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View." In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles Li, 25-26. New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. Word Biblical Commentary, ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1991.
- Coxon, Peter W. "Syntax of the Aramaic of Daniel: a dialectal study." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 48: 107-122, 1977.
- Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976.
- Creider, Chet A. "On the Explanation of Transformations." In *Discourse and Syntax*, ed. Talmy Givón, 3-21. Vol. 12, Syntax and Semantics. New York and London: Academic Press, 1979.
- Dawson, David Allan. *Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. JSOTSup, ed. David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, no. 177. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- de Beaugrande, Robert-Alain and Wolfgang U. Dressler. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longmans, 1981.
- de Regt, Lénart J. "Macrosyntactic Functions of Nominal Clauses Referring to Participants." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 273-296. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand. *A Course in General Linguistics*. Translated by Wade Baskin, ed. C. Bally, A. Sechehaye, and A. Riedlinger. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- den Exter Blokland, A. F. *In Search of Text Syntax*. Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij, 1995.
- Dik, Simon. *Functional Grammar*. Publications in Language Sciences 7. Dordrecht: Foris, 1981.
- _____. *The Theory of Functional Grammar (Part 1: The Structure of the Clause)*. Functional Grammar Series. vol. 9. Dordrecht: Foris, 1989.
- Dinneen, Francis P. *An Introduction to General Linguistics*. London, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. 3d ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901.
- Endo, Yoshinobu. *The Verbal System of Classical Hebrew in the Joseph Story: An Approach from Discourse Analysis*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica, no. 32. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Ferguson, Margaret, ed. *The Norton Anthology of Poetry*. 4th ed. New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1970.

- Fillmore, Charles J. "Pragmatics and the Description of Discourse." In *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole, 143-166. New York and London: Academic Press, 1981.
- Firth, J. R. *Papers in Linguistics: 1934-51*. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Gai, Amikam. "The Place of the Attribute in Geez." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26: 257-265, 1981.
- Galambos, Silvia J. "A Clarification of the Notion of Topic: Evidence from Popular Spoken French." In *Papers from the parasession on pronouns and anaphora*, ed. J. Kreiman and A. E. Ojeda, 125-38. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1980.
- García, Erica C. "Discourse without Syntax." In *Discourse and Syntax*, ed. Talmy Givón, 23-49, *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 12. New York and London: Academic Press, 1979.
- Geller, Stephen A. "Cleft Sentences with Pleonastic Pronoun: A Syntactic Construction of Biblical Hebrew and Some of its Literary Uses." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 20: 15-34, 1991.
- Gianto, Agustinus. *Word Order Variation in the Akkadian of Byblos*. Studia Pohl, no. 15. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990.
- Gibson, Arthur. *Biblical Semantic Logic: A Preliminary Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.
- Gibson, John C. L. *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Syntax*. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- _____. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: Volume I Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Givón, T. "Beyond Foreground and Background." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, ed. Russel Tomlin, 175-188. Vol. 11, *Typological Studies in Language*, by T. Givón. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987.
- _____. "The Drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The Pragmatics of Tense-Aspect." In *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, ed. Charles N. Li, 181-254. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.
- _____. "From Discourse to Syntax: Grammar as a Processing Strategy." In *Discourse and Syntax*, ed. Talmy Givón, 81-112, *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 12. New York and London: Academic Press, 1979a.
- _____. "Topic, Pronoun, and Grammatical Agreement." In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles Li, 149-188. New York: Academic Press, 1976.
- Gleason, H. A. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. rev. ed. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Golomb, David M. "Nominal Syntax in the language of Codex Vatican Neofiti 1: Sentences Containing a Predicate Adjective." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 42 (3): 181-194, 1983.
- Green, Georgia M. and Jerry L. Morgan. "Pragmatics, Grammar, and Discourse." In *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole, 167-181. New York and London: Academic Press, 1981.

- Greenberg, Joseph H. "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements." In *Universals of Language*, ed. Joseph H. Greenberg, 73-113. Cambridge and London: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.
- Grimes, J. E. *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 1975.
- Gross, Walter. *Die Pendenskonstruktion im biblischen Hebräisch*. Arbeiten Zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament. vol. 27. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1987.
- _____. *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa: Untersucht an den Büchern Dtn, Ri und 2Kön*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament, no. 17. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1996.
- _____. "Is There Really a Compound Nominal Clause in Biblical Hebrew?" In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 19-49. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Gundel, J. K. "Left Dislocation and the Role of Topic-Comment Structure in Linguistic Theory." In *Working Papers in Linguistics 18*. Ohio: Ohio State University, 1975.
- Hale, Mark. "Old Persian Word Order." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31: 27-40, 1988.
- Haik-Vantoura, Suzanne. *The Music of the Bible Revealed: the Deciphering of a Millenary Notation*. 2nd Revised ed. Translated by Dennis Weber. N. Richland Hills, TX: Bibal Press - D. & F. Scott Publishing, 1991.
- Hoftijzer, J. "The Nominal Clause Reconsidered." *Vetus Testamentum* 23: 446-510, 1973.
- Huehnergard, John. *The Akkadian of Ugarit*. Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 34. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989.
- _____. *A Grammar of Akkadian*. Harvard Semitic Museum Studies, no. 45. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1997.
- _____. "Introduction to the Comparative Study of the Semitic Languages," 1995, Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Hurvitz, Avi. "Linguistic Criteria for Dating Problematic Biblical Texts." *Hebrew Abstracts* 14: 74-79, 1973.
- Hurwitz, Hyman. *The Elements of The Hebrew Language*. 2nd ed. London: John Taylor, 1832.
- Izre'el, Shlomo. *Amurru Akkadian: A Linguistic Study*. Harvard Semitic Studies. vol. 1, no. 40. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Jackson, Kent P. "The Language of the Mesha Inscription." In *Studies in the Mesha Inscriptions and Moab*, ed. Andrew Dearman. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Implications of Language Universals for Linguistics." In *Universals of Language*, ed. Joseph H. Greenberg, 263-278. Cambridge and London: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.
- Jongeling, K. "On the VSO Character of Hebrew." In *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. K. Jongeling, 103-111. Leiden, New York: E.J. Brill, 1991.
- Joüon, Paul, S. J. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Reprint of First Edition, with Corrections ed. Translated by Takamitsu Muraoka. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993.

- Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*, ed. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch. vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Khan, Geoffrey. *Studies in Semitic Syntax*. London Oriental Series. vol. 38. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Kumpf, Lorraine E. "The Use of Pitch Phenomena in the Structuring of Stories." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, ed. Russel Tomlin, 189-216. Vol. 11, *Typological Studies in Language*, by T. Givón. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987.
- Kuno, S. "Generative Discourse Analysis in America." In *Current Trends in Textlinguistics*, ed. W. Dressler, 275-294. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1978.
- Lambdin, Thomas O. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1971.
- Lambrecht, Knud. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. vol. 71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- _____. *Topic, Antitopic and Verb Agreement in Non-standard French*. Pragmatics and beyond II:6. Amsterdam, 1981.
- Layton, Scott C. *Archaic Features of Canaanite Personal Names in the Hebrew Bible*. Harvard Semitic Monographs, ed. Frank Moore Cross, no. 47. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Lieberman, Stephen J. "Word Order in the Afro-Asiatic Languages." In *Proceedings of 9th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division D*, ed. D Assaf, 1-8. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986.
- Lode, Lars. "A Discourse Perspective on the Significance of the Massoretic Accents." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. Robert D. Bergen, 155-172. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Longacre, R. E. "The Analysis of Preverbal Nouns in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Some Overriding Concerns." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5: 208-24, 1992.
- _____. *Joseph, A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39-48*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1989.
- Lowery, Kirk E. "Relative Definiteness and the Verbless Clause." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 251-272. Vol. 1, *Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic*, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Lyons, John. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- MacDonald, Peter J. "Discourse Analysis and Biblical Interpretation." In *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. W. R. Bodine. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Martin, James D. *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar*. 27th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Mauchline, John. *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar*. 26th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1966.
- McGrath, Alister E. *A Passion for Truth*. Leicester: Apollos, 1996.

- Mendenhall, George E. "Languages (Byblos Syllabic)." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *Deuteronomy*. The New American Commentary, ed. E. Ray Clendenen. vol. 4. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1994.
- Miller, Cynthia L. "Pivotal Issues in Analyzing the Verbless Clause." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 3-17. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- _____. *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis*. Harvard Semitic Museum Monographs, no. 55. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Miller, Cynthia L., ed. *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, ed. M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. vol. 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Mithun, Marianne. "Is Basic Word Order Universal?" In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, ed. Russel Tomlin, 281-328. Vol. 11, Typological Studies in Language, by T. Givón. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987.
- Moran, William L. "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets." Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1950.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "The Biblical Hebrew Nominal Clause with a Prepositional Phrase." In *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. K. Jongeling, 143-151. Leiden, New York: E.J. Brill, 1991.
- _____. *Classical Syriac for Hebraists*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987.
- _____. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.
- _____. "On the Nominal Clause in the Old Syriac Gospels." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20: 28-37, 1975.
- _____. "The Tripartite Nominal Clause Revisited." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 187-213. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Naude, J. A. "A Syntactic Analysis of Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 16: 115-130, 1990.
- _____. "The Verbless Clause with Pleonastic Pronoun in Biblical Aramaic." *Journal for Semitics* 6: 74-93, 1994.
- Niccacci, Alviero. "Simple Nominal Clause or Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew Prose." *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 6: 216-227, 1993.
- _____. *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. JSOTSup, ed. Davis J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, no. 86. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- _____. "Types and Functions of the Nominal Sentence." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 215-248. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

- O'Connor, M. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980.
- Parunak, H. Van Dyke. "The Discourse Implication of Resumption in Hebrew רשׁוּעַ Clauses: A Preliminary Assessment from Genesis." In *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. L.J. de Regt, J. de Waar, and J.P. Fokkelman, 101-116. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet and Julia Hirschberg. "The Meaning of Intonational Contours in the Interpretation of Discourse." In *Intentions in Communication*, ed. Philip R. Cohen, Jerry Morgan, and Martha E. Pollack, 271-311, System Development Foundation Benchmark Series. Cambridge, MI and London, UK: The M.I.T. Press, 1990.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet B. "The Phonology and Phonetics of English Intonation." Ph.D. diss., M.I.T., 1980.
- Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Monograph Series, ed. Frank Moore Cross, Jr. vol. 12. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 6: 177-205, 1993.
- Prince, E. "A Comparison of Topicalization and Left-dislocation in Discourse," paper 1982, presented at the Linguistic Society of America annual meeting.
- _____. "Toward a Taxonomy of Given-new Information." In *Radical Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole. New York: Academic Press, 1981.
- Quirk, Randolph. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman, 1985.
- Revell, E. J. "The Conditioning of Word Order in Verbless Clauses in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34: 1-24, 1989.
- _____. *The Designation of the Individual: Expressive Usage in Biblical Narrative*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, ed. Tj. Baarda, no. 14. Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996.
- _____. *Nesiga (retraction of word stress) in Tiberian Hebrew*. Textos y Estudios Cardenal Cisneros, no. 39. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 1987.
- _____. "Thematic Continuity and the Conditioning of Word Order in Verbless Clauses." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 297-319. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Riemschneider. *An Akkadian Grammar: A Translation of Riemschneider's Lehrbuch des Akkadischen*. Translated by Thomas A. Caldwell. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1974.
- Robertson, David A. *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*. SBL Dissertation Series, no. 3. Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- Robins, R. H. *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*. Longmans' Linguistic Library. London: Longmans, 1964.

- _____. *A Short History of Linguistics*. Longmans' Linguistic Library. London: Longmans, 1967.
- Rooker, Mark F. *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: the Language of the Book of Ezekiel*. JSOTSup, no. 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- _____. "Ezekiel and the Typology of Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Annual Review* 12: 133-155, 1990.
- _____. "Ezekiel and the Typology of Biblical Hebrew." *The Westminster Theological Journal* 58: 303-12, 1996.
- Roth, Ray Lee. "Gebal." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Shimasaki, Katsuomi. "Statistical Approach for Dating Biblical Passages," TD. June 1995, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA.
- Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and their Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983.
- Sinclair, Cameron. "Are Nominal Clauses a Distinct Clause Type?" In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 51-75. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Sivan, Daniel and Shamir Yona. "Style and Syntax, Pivotal Use of Extrapositional Syntagms in Biblical Hebrew." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 26: 443-454, 1994.
- Soldt, Wilfred Hugo van. *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit Dating and Grammar*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament. vol. 40. Kevelaer: Butzon und Bercker, 1991.
- Stuart, Douglas K. *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter*. Harvard Semitic Monograph Series, ed. Frank M. Cross, no. 13. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Takeuchi, Shigeo. "The so-called "Aramaism" in Psalm 2." *Exegetica* 4: 1-16, 1993.
- Talstra, Eep. "Tense, Mood, Aspect and Clause Connections in Biblical Hebrew: A Textual Approach." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 23: 81-103, 1997.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy*. The JPS Torah Commentary, ed. Nahum M. Sarna. Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tomlin, Russell. "Linguistic Reflections of Cognitive Events." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, ed. Russel Tomlin, 455-479. Vol. 11, Typological Studies in Language, by T. Givón. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987.
- Tsumura, David T. "Coordination Interrupted, or Literary Insertion AX&B Pattern, in the Book of Samuel." In *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. L.J. de Regt, J. de Waar, and J.P. Fokkelman, 117-32. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- _____. "Hymns and Songs with Titles and Subscriptions in the Ancient Near East." *Exegetica* 3: 1-7, 1992.
- _____. "Literary Insertion (AXB Pattern) in Biblical Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (4): 468-482, 1983.
- Ungnad, Arthur. *Akkadian Grammar*. rev. ed. Translated by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. Society of Biblical Literature, ed. Marvin A. Sweeney, no. 30. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992.

- van der Merwe, Christo H.J., Jackie A. Naude, and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Biblical Languages: Hebrew, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Richard S. Hess, no. 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- van der Westhuizen, J. P. "Verbless Sentences in the Amqi Amarna Letters." *Journal for Semitics* 4: 117-129, 1992.
- van Wolde, Ellen. "The Verbless Clause and Its Textual Function." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, 321-336. Vol. 1, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, by M. O'Connor and Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Walker, Larry L. "Notes on Higher Criticism and the Dating of Biblical Hebrew." In *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, 35-52. Chicago: Moody Press, 1986.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry*. JSOTSup, ed. Davis J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, no. 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984.
- _____. *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*. JSOTSup, ed. Davis J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies, no. 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. The Anchor Bible, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. vol. 5. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1991.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary, ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1987.
- Wilson, Gerald H. "Ugaritic Word Order and Sentence Structure in Krt." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 27: 17-32, 1982.
- Winther-Nielsen, Nicolai. *A Functional Discourse Grammar of Joshua: A Computer-Assisted Rhetorical Structure Analysis*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995.
- Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. vol. 1. London: SPCK, 1992.
- Young, Ian. *Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament, ed. Bernd Janowski and Hermann Spieckermann, no. 5. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1993.
- Zevit, Ziony, Seymour Gitin, and Michael Sololoff, eds. *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Zewi, Tamar. "Subject-Predicate Word Order of Nominal Clauses in El-Amarna Letters." In *Ugarit-Forschungen*, ed. M. Dietrich and others, 657-693. Vol. 27, 1995.