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The study relates the syntactic phenomena of word order displacement and pleonastic pronouns with finite verbs to emphatic constructions in Biblical Hebrew. After a compilation of the word order patterns in a database of all (non-waw consecutive) main clauses in Gen 12-25, Dt 1-11, 29-31, there is a review of the older studies of Albrecht, Brockelmann, of modern studies in linguistics, and then newer studies in Biblical Hebrew.

Linguistic research suggests that word order displacement is a syntactic means many languages have to put information in special focus within a sentence and its context. The term for this special highlighting is 'marked focus.' Pleonastic pronouns with finite verbs also function in many of the same ways as word order displacement, suggesting that this pleonasm is a special focusing device. Based on the review the study suggests a working definition of emphasis in Biblical Hebrew as marked focus, the highlighting of a word or phrase by word order displacement or pleonasm, such that attention is drawn to that word or phrase and its function in the literary
context.

The study then proceeds to examine Dt. 4-11 to see if these patterns exhibit any specific discourse functions in their contexts. The resulting array of patterns strongly suggests that the purpose of marked focus is to create these discourse functions. The disjunctive clause, for example, involves such constructions as fronting, the grammatical chiasm, the casus pendens, and synchronic parallels, which function to produce contrast, shift in topic, synchronism, the synoptic yielded by the grammatical chiasm, and others. This is a list of the ways the disjunctive clause operates in opposition to the waw consecutive. The consistent presence of such patterns with these two types of marked focus corroborates findings in other language.

The method avoids subjectivity by requiring a study of the relationship of the marked function to the literary context, as opposed to logical or implicit contexts.
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The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between syntax and emphasis in Biblical Hebrew. Since syntax traditionally involves both inflectional agreement and the arrangement of words to show connections of meaning, it is clear that the study of word order is a syntactic study, and that there is a relationship between word order and distinctions of meaning. It is this last connection between word order variations and meaning that we will study for BH.

Historically, the term "emphasis" has been used to label variations of word order, but there has been no clear connection between such word order variations and meaning. For this reason we will attempt to determine the relation of variations in word order to connections of meaning. Our goal is to see if we can clarify the nature of word order

From this point we abbreviate Biblical Hebrew as BH.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between syntax and emphasis in Biblical Hebrew.\(^1\) Since syntax traditionally involves both inflectional agreement and the arrangement of words to show connections of meaning it is clear that the study of word order is a syntactic study, and that there is a relationship between word order and distinctions of meaning.\(^2\) It is this last connection between word order variations and meaning that we will study for BH.

Historically, the term emphasis has been used to label variations of word order, but there has been no clear connection between such word order variations and meaning. For this reason we will attempt to determine the relation of variations in word order to connections of meaning. Our goal is to see if we can clarify the nature of word order

\(^1\) From this point we abbreviate Biblical Hebrew as BH.

variations, how they function, and what relationship they have to meaning changes.

1.1 The Need for the Study

The need for the study arises from a combination of factors. One principal factor is the problem of emphasis. From the studies of Albrecht and Driver to the present work of Andersen, Hoftijzer and Muraoka the question of emphasis has received increasing attention. Even after Muraoka's study, however, there is a lack of clarity which calls for a fresh approach to the topic.3

There are two basic problems in the study of emphasis in BH. First, we have no access to intonation patterns in the language. There are no living informants who can help us uncover cases of emphasis brought about by intonation alone. There are clauses which are clearly questions, yet lack any definite marking. Such clauses depend on intonation.4 This eliminates the possibility of detecting emphasis produced by accent or intonation and leaves us with the written text, and only those emphatic constructions to which we have access in a written text. Even in this case we have no living informants who can answer detailed questions about the performance of word order change. If we are able to resolve and understand emphatic word order patterns

---

3 See chapter on emphasis for bibliography, and compare the comments of C. H. J. van der Merwe, "The vague term 'emphasis'" in Journal for Semitics, vol. 1/1, pp. 118-132.

4 See § 5.3.4 for a discussion of Gen 3:1.
in BH it will be from their function alone, i.e., from their use in the discourse context.

The second problem is the meaning of emphasis. For what purpose is a certain element stressed (syntactically) in a clause or sentence? Or, how does that stress function within the context to produce the various types of emphasis? Even if we can ascertain this for modern languages is it possible to do so for a dead language?

Another hindrance to such a study is one traditional interpretation of stylistics, namely that style or rhetoric relates to the manner or form of a discourse and not to the content or substance. An example of this view is found in Bandstra's discussion of emphasis as a discourse function. Based on the distinction between content structure and discourse structure, he makes the point that the process of arranging the elements of discourse in linear, sequential order is subsequent to and can be dealt with separately from the process of deciding what to say. What we broadly call "emphasis" is a matter of discourse structure and not content structure. Emphasis is a function of how the content of discourse is going to be stated.\(^5\) The result of such an approach is that structure has no relationship to meaning, or discourse semantics.

Bandstra's comments imply a basic dichotomy between the cognitive and the evocative or expressive aspects of a text, between style and meaning. If, however, it can be shown that emphatic

constructions involve cognitive aspects of communication this will
demonstrate the coherence of style and meaning.\(^6\)

1.2 The Corpus

The study requires a suitable corpus of prose material in order to
observe the function of the various constructions. There are two
overlapping corpora, the statistical database consisting of Gen 12-25,
and Dt 4-11, which establishes the normal and variant word order data,
and the textual corpus, consisting of Dt 4-11, in which we will analysis
the various constructions.

The texts contain significant concentrations of speech material.
Gen 12-25 is generally narrative which includes speech and Dt 4-11 is
composed of two speeches which involve considerable narrative. This
shows it is somewhat artificial to distinguish speech and narrative. Our
purpose is to include direct speech but to do so without eliminating its
framework. This is the best way, given the text we have, to recapture
the functional opposition of the different clause types in actual
discourse.

1.3 Method

\(^6\) M. Silva, Biblical Words & Their Meaning (Grand Rapids: Zondervan,
1983): 117, fn 49, ". . . surely stylistic elements (e.g., emotive) should be
regarded as part of meaning." Cf. the comments of P. Miller, Interpreting the
Psalms (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988): 30,31. Although he is speaking of
a different continuum, that of poetry and interpretation, the point is still the
same and can be applied to the style-meaning continuum in narrative,
speech, etc.
The study attempts to delineate the nature of emphasis by building on the modern discussion of the nominal clause, particularly in Andersen, Hoftijzer, Muraoka, and Waltke-O'Connor, and by relating the findings of modern linguistics to the problem, particularly the notion of information focus. The first section will attempt to develop a general notion of emphasis with reference to BH by examining word order statistics and the relationship of context to emphatic constructions.\footnote{C. H. J. van der Merwe, \textit{The Old Hebrew Particle gam} (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1990): 44, objects to the term 'emphasis' because of the past abuse of the term. There can be no objection in any discipline to a reformulation of a definition. The word is perfectly acceptable as a label to call attention to a certain highlighting of a word or phrase, etc., for some reason which only contextual considerations can clarify. The term is no less acceptable than 'focus'.} Succeeding chapters will discuss specific constructions in the corpus which are a product of word order variation from the waw consecutive clause. The discussion of the specific constructions will attempt to show the ways in which word order variation contributes to clear discourse functions and how the constructions interact with context to produce meaning distinctions.

1.3.1 The Word Order Database

It will be necessary to first establish the normal word order patterns for main clauses in a corpus of prose (speech) texts. The search of the statistical database will be for the word order patterns in two types of main clauses, either disjunctive clauses or asyndetic clauses, in order to determine the basic word order sequences. The
purpose of the search will be to then determine the functional
differences from the waw consecutive these word order variations may
involve. This implies that word order variations are a part of the
functional opposition of major clause types in the language system as a
whole.

1.3.2 The Contextual Analysis

The contextual analysis of discourse functions of the various
constructions will depend on two things: first ascertaining the emphatic
construction and its formal features, and secondly, determining the way
that construction interacts with its context.

The analysis must be contextual in order to control subjectivity in
understanding the way each construction functions in its own context.
It must be explicit in order to properly conceive the author's meaning.
A statement means what it means in a literary context, not what we may
infer about that statement in a vacuum. Secondly, valid inferences from
statements in a context may not be part of the point the author is
making. For example, if an author is describing a certain person by
making a series of descriptive statements, he may not wish for us to
draw just any logical conclusions from one of the statements. He may
want only to give us important general background in preparation for
the story. It is only in the story that we can see how those initial
depictions equip us to comprehend the author's purpose. There is a
difference between the literary purpose of a statement and what we may
otherwise logically infer from it.
1.3.3 The Constructions For Analysis

The constructions we will examine in this way are fronting, the cleft sentence, the chiasm, and the use of the pleonastic pronoun with the finite verb. All of these constructions are formally identifiable because of either syntactic redundancy (the pleonastic pronoun) or variations in word order from the waw consecutive.

Since we are dealing with a dead language, a degree of circularity in the demonstration is impossible to avoid, yet the consistent and contextually demonstrable presence of clear discourse functions in a large number of the constructions would corroborate the notion that this is the purpose or function of those constructions, that the syntax of those constructions is somehow involved in the production of a certain function in a context.

1.3.4 Information Focus

The notion of information focus in modern linguistics supports this investigative method. In modern languages focus often operates in conjunction with other elements in a context to produce various types of discourse functions, including, for example, contrast and a shift in topic. In many cases focus is a function of marked or unusual position in a clause. This indicates that such unusual order stresses or focuses on one clause element in order to bring it into relationship with another element in the context. Such studies suggest, by analogy, that the same positional syntax may function in BH. The next chapter will begin by
presenting the basic word order statistics and arguing the context in which we must understand them.

Chapter 2

Word Order in SN Prose

2.0 Introduction

This chapter furnishes the statistical basis for the study from a corpus including Gen 12-25 and Dt 1-11, 29-31, discusses the theoretical basis for such statistics, and also provides some analysis of the statistics. In addition, because of the importance of the syntactic clause to the theoretical discussion I will consider aspects of that construction.

2.0.1 Description of The Statistical Database

The database consists of a long first person speech in Deuteronomy and a group of chapters from Genesis which contains frequent direct discourse. In Genesis the database is narrative, but it is heavily weighted with direct speech, while in Deuteronomy it is a

---

This database is the statistical corpus, whereas Dt 4-11 is the textual corpus, that body of text in Dt 4-11 which we will analyse for various syntactic aspects of emphasis.
Chapter 2
Word Order in BH Prose

2.0 Introduction

This chapter furnishes the statistical basis for the study from a corpus including Gen 12-25 and Dt 1-11, 29-31, discusses the theoretical basis for such statistics, and also provides some analysis of the statistics. In addition, because of the importance of the asyndetic clause to the theoretical discussion I will consider aspects of that construction.

2.0.1 Description of The Statistical Database

The database consists of a long first person speech in Deuteronomy and a group of chapters from Genesis which contains frequent direct discourse. In Genesis the database is narrative, but it is heavily weighted with direct speech, while in Deuteronomy it is a

---

8 This database is the statistical corpus, whereas Dt 4-11 is the textual corpus, that body of text in Dt. 4-11 which we will analyze for various syntactic aspects of emphasis.
first person speech which contains both narrative and citations of direct discourse (a short speech between two persons) and direct speech (a short speech of one person). It is somewhat artificial to distinguish speech and narrative. The speech of Moses has long stretches of narrative, as does any speech which is of some length. It is less likely to find narration in short stretches of direct discourse cited in a text. The features, therefore, of a large selection of short sections of direct speech may be quite different, particularly in the use of asyndeton, than a longer speech or narrative. ⁹

The database for the statistics are all the main verbal clauses in the corpus. Although I looked at nominal clauses they are not included. The tables are a reflection of the database because they select all those main clauses which contain at least two of the major elements. The major elements are verb, subject and object. The clauses had to have, then, either verb and subject or verb and object. It is obvious that clauses with only verbs in them yield no information about word order.

The term 'relative word order' refers to the sequence of the major elements whether they are first in the clause or not. For example, if a clause is, in the order of elements, prepositional phrase-verb-subject, the relative order is verb-subject, even through a prepositional phrase is first in the clause.

The tables also present, in the far left column, the clause initial element for the clauses selected. These elements are grouped according to whether they are major elements (subject, verb or object) or margins

⁹ Cf. Dt 5:2-5 and Gen 47:5,6.
(adverbs, prepositional phrases, interjections, etc.). The other columns list these clauses according their relative sequence.

2.0.2 Frequency and Norm

The words 'normal' and 'unusual' when applied to word order in BH refer to frequency of occurrence. If emphasis is in some way related to unusual word order we will have to know what normal word order is. It is therefore necessary to obtain statistics on word order in BH.

For reasons to be explained I will look at the frequency of relative order for two distinct types of clause, the disjunctive and the asyndetic clauses. Once we have ascertained the frequency of occurrence it is still necessary to decide what level of frequency constitutes a norm. For our purposes we will assume that any relative sequence that is higher than sixty percent is a norm or pattern. For instance, if the relative order verb-subject occurs sixty percent of the time and the order subject-verb forty percent we will assume that the order verb-subject constitutes the norm and that the opposite sequence is unusual. If the frequencies were fifty-fifty we should have to conclude that there is no pattern for the order concerning the relative sequence of verb and subject. In this case the order is random and presents no pattern.

This is only a working assumption, and no more. In fact the notion of a norm or a pattern depends on the actual function of the clauses in question. If the 'norm' and its unusual or infrequent
counterpart do not point, in the context, to different functions then the
statistics have no functional interest; they are just numbers.

The working assumption, therefore, depends on the actual function
of the clauses that fit these statistical patterns. The assumption can be
validated only if the infrequent word order has some function that is
different from the normal word order.

2.1 Functional Opposition

The basis for these statistics also requires discussion. Word
order is not an independent phenomenon, unrelated to any other
function of language. This includes BH. If a given word order is a
feature of any type of clause, this regular order functions in opposition
to other types of clauses. The circumstantial clause, for example, has a
regular order of waw + subject + verb, while the waw consecutive
clause has waw + verb + subject + other elements.\(^\text{10}\) The difference
between these two types signals a change in discourse function. Word
order on this level is not an independent, random phenomenon, but
relates to the language system as a whole. It is just for this reason
that the use of word order statistics depends on other considerations.

In respect to BH the interpretation of such statistics is closely
related to two major categories and their subdivisions. The major
distinguishing mark is the use or non-use of the clausal waw.

\(^{10}\) This is not to overlook the morphological and accentual changes
found in various realizations of the waw consecutive.
2.1.1 Word Order and Clausal Waw

Lambdin and Waltke-O'Connor relate word order in clauses beginning with waw to their grammatical function.\footnote{Th. Lambdin, \textit{Introduction to Biblical Hebrew} (New York: Charles Scribners, 1971): 162. He recognizes that there are exceptions to these patterns but insists that most sequences can be reduced to these patterns, so there is value in regarding them as standard, p. 279. Also B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, \textit{An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax} (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 649, "Clausal waw is a simple conjunction, that is, it places propositions or clauses one after another, without indicating the hierarchical relation between them. Biblical Hebrew frequently joins logically subordinate clauses to a main clause either asyndetically or, more often, syndetically with this conjunction."} Lambdin notes the relative rarity of subordinating conjunctions which mark adverbial clauses as such. With a much higher frequency there is an almost constant sequence of clauses joined only by a form of the conjunctive waw. He concludes that an inspection of these sequences demonstrates that variation in the word order or of the verbal form used immediately after the waw marks differentiation in clause function. Both of these studies divide such clause functions into two major categories, the conjunctive-sequential and the disjunctive. The former is normally used to mark sequence with the preceding clause, and has the form waw + verb + other elements, whereas the latter breaks this sequence and marks some form of subordination and has the sequence waw + non-verb + other elements.

As far as the disjunctive clause is concerned the question of word order depends on what we consider normal. Statistics about word order are useful only if we know what the terms of comparison are. There are two basic possibilities. Either we count all disjunctive clauses and
consider the statistically most frequent order as 'normal' and others as 'marked,' (unusual) or we take the waw consecutive clause as normative and consider the disjunctive clause marked 'as such.' The first approach is faulty because it assumes that the contextual relationships are of no importance, that word order within a clause is independent of the presence of other types of clauses. The second approach assumes that various types of clauses function in opposition to each other.

Lambdin takes the latter approach when he notes that disjunctive clauses vary the word order from the conjunctive-sequential order. His approach depends on the actual function in context of this positional shift within the verbal clause.

For Lambdin and Waltke-O'Connor, then, the disjunctive clause depends for its function upon a variation of word order from the normal waw consecutive, i.e., waw + verb + other elements. Any word order in the disjunctive clause may be marked in relationship to the waw consecutive clause, because it shifts the order of the major elements in the clause. The function of a clause, then, can only be determined by contextual considerations. Various clauses beginning with waw operate in functional opposition to each other.

This study will consider any clause beginning with waw to have a marked word order if the next element after waw is a non-verb. Ascertaining the function of the word order will depend on contextual considerations.

---

13 For the present the term 'marked' refers to unusual word order which departs from the norm.
The following table gives the overall statistics for the disjunctive clause in the statistical corpus. The columns indicate the relative verb order and the rows give the actual number of clauses and the percentages in each case.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VO</th>
<th>OV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected the subject-verb order predominates over the verb-subject order. The next table will help clarify the reason for the occurrence of the verb-subject relative order.

Table 2 presents two aspects of disjunctive clauses, their clause initial element and the relative word order in those clauses.

---

14 Sigla for the tables: O = object; Adv = adverb; SV = subject-verb, SVO = subject-verb-object, etc.
One important factor is the frequency of the occurrence of a clause initial margin. In the statistical corpus a margin (any element which is not a subject, object, or a verb) occurs in the first position 20/100 times, or twenty percent of the time, whenever there are at least two nuclear elements in the clause. This indicates that clause initial adverbial clauses are not used as frequently as nuclear or major clause elements. The reason for this depends on the contextual function, i.e., only an analysis of the preceding clause can give us an indication of the reason for placing a margin first in the disjunctive clause. If the preceding clause is an asyndetic clause, as often happens, the asyndetic clause may also have such a margin. The reason, in this case, would have to do with the staging of the two clauses in conjunction.\textsuperscript{15}

Another significant fact is that in fifteen of twenty cases of clause initial margins the nuclear order is V-S or V-O. There are five

\textsuperscript{15} See the chapter on Fronting.
cases where the order is 0-V, all due to the occurrence of \( \equiv \) in the initial position. The latter fact calls for further study, but the V-S order appears to point to a syntactic constraint on the relative word order whenever clause initial adverbials occur. It is the occurrence of clause initial adverbials that cause the unusual (for disjunctive clauses) verb-subject relative order.

2.1.2 Word Order and the Asyndetic Clause

With reference to the relative order of subject and verb the statistics of the asyndetic clause are most significant. By definition the waw consecutive is always waw plus verb and the above tables have shown that the disjunctive clause has the order waw plus non-verb plus verb. It is also necessary to determine the word order features of the asyndetic clause to see if it differs from the clauses beginning with waw.

Since asyndetic clauses do not begin with a waw they must be considered separately from clauses which do begin with a waw. A major identifying mark of the asyndetic clause is not its word order but its lack of an initial waw. The question is, however, whether there is any functional opposition between the waw consecutive and the asyndetic clauses.
The overlap in numbers compared to the numbers in the next table is due to the fact that some categories are counted twice. Whenever the clause contains three nuclear elements (subject, object, verb), such as in a SVO, the number of occurrences is counted once for S-V and once for V-O.

The table indicates that the V-O sequence occurs eighty-three percent of the time in relation to the O-V order. If the clauses
beginning with a margin are excluded the percentage only decreases one
percent, down to eighty-two percent. The statistic shows that the
asyndetic clause maintains a relative order V-O, and that the change to
O-V may have functional reasons for such usage. The question remains
whether this has anything to do with the waw consecutive. Our
conclusion is that it does not. 16

Using the statistical corpus each asyndetic clause counts as one
example. To count the order of S-V versus V-S only those examples
were included which had at least S and V in the clause. Given this
approach there are sixty-seven clauses in the statistical corpus which
had both S and V present. Forty-two percent of the clauses were S-V
and fifty-eight percent were V-S order.

These percentages are almost reversed if one apparent constraint
on the word order in verbal clauses is kept in view. Just as in
disjunctive clauses the order in asyndetic clauses is always V-S
whenever an adverbial margin is first in the clause. 17 Further
investigation in a much larger corpus is necessary, but if the presence
of an initial margin is in fact a constraint on word order it would be a
methodological error to allow such examples to be counted as part of
this set. If such asyndetic clauses are excluded the percentage

16 Although this question is not a concern of this study, since our
primary interest is the functional reasons for word order shifts, it is a
significant problem. A careful study of the asyndetic clause is still
necessary.

Waltke-O'Connor are referring to the word order of BH verbal clauses in
general, without reference to the distinctions of syndetic or asyndetic
(use or non-use of the clausal waw). In the statistical corpus this
generalization holds for both disjunctive and asyndetic clauses.
reverses and the S-V clauses now constitute fifty-seven percent of the examples and the V-S forty-three percent.

However the sample is counted the percentages indicate that neither the S-V nor the V-S order is normative. For that reason, neither order is marked. The order of S and V in the asyndetic clause has no apparent functional significance. This statistic points to two significant facts. The first is that the asyndetic clause does not function in opposition to the waw consecutive clause, i.e., its random S and V order does not allow for a difference in function due to a basic word order shift in the construction. Secondly, it would be a mistake to count the asyndetic clause alongside the waw consecutive clause in order to determine the normal order of the verbal clause. To lump the two types of clauses together would only serve to mask the significant difference between the two and unnecessarily skew the statistics.

The asyndetic clause operates either as a subordinate clause or an independent paragraph level clause. As a subordinate clause it may modify a waw consecutive clause, or, more often, operate in tandem with a disjunctive clause to form conjunctive clauses. The conjunctive clause is often formed by the combination of an asyndetic clause and a following disjunctive clause. In this case the disjunctive clause is working, not in opposition to a preceding waw consecutive clause, but in conjunction with the preceding asyndetic clause. For example, in Ex 34:28:

---

18 F. I. Andersen, The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew, ch. 8. The major distinctive of the conjunctive clause, according to Andersen, is that each constituent clause has the same grammatical function as the conjunctive sentence as a whole. One proof of this is the fact that most conjunctive sentences begin with an asyndetic clause, indicating that the conjunctive sentence is adverbial as a whole to whatever precedes, unless the asyndetic clause begins a paragraph.
Bread he did not eat, and water he did not drink.

This conjunctive sentence provides another feature of the asyndetic clause which indicates its functional independence of the waw consecutive. This example exhibits fronting,\(^{19}\) which indicates that fronting occurs in the asyndetic clause in the same way it does in the disjunctive clause, another thing they have in common. But it is very important to note that the fronting often operates in a different way. Whenever the O-V order occurs in an asyndetic clause it rarely does so for reasons of contrast, except in special cases.\(^{20}\)

None of the functions of the asyndetic clause give us any reason to set up a functional opposition between it and the waw consecutive except in the sense that it is not a narrative sequential clause as the waw consecutive often is. The lack of a waw is one marker of this difference. The difference in word order, however, gives no reason to set the two clauses in opposition, since the word order in the asyndetic clause is random, i.e., the word order features of the asyndetic clause are not due to a functional opposition with the waw consecutive clause.

\(^{19}\) See the chapter on Fronting. Many of Andersen's examples in the chapter on the Conjunctive Clause are of this nature, an asyndetic clause followed by a disjunctive clause.

\(^{20}\) See the discussion of fronting. A case where the O-V order functions contrastively is Dt. 1:38, where the fronted object pronoun continues the topic of the preceding casus pendens. The object fronting by itself functions to maintain the preceding topic. The contrastive function has already been established by the casus pendens.
There is a second important function of the asyndetic clause, which it has in common with the disjunctive clause, that apparently has been overlooked, its paragraph-structuring function.

2.1.3 The Paragraph-Level Function of the Asyndetic Clause

Almost half of the paragraphs in the corpus begin with asyndetic clauses. Of those seventeen, nine are commands, one is an injunctive, six are temporal clauses, and one is an antithetical statement.21

There are three cases, 5:23,28, 9:26, where the paragraph begins with a waw consecutive plus imperfect. Each of these introduces direct speech paragraphs.22 In each case the speech paragraph begins with asyndetic clauses, 5:24 with hen plus perfect, 5:28b with a perfect, and 9:26 with vocative plus 'al plus jussive. If the introductory narrative past were excluded we should have three additional paragraphs beginning with asyndeton, i.e., twenty of thirty-eight.

The paragraph structuring function of asyndetic clauses is similar to the use of the waw consecutive to begin narrative past and futures. Gen 15:1 is an example of an asyndetic temporal clause which is paragraph initial:

21 The references are: imperative - 4:1, 5, 23, 32, 5:1, 6:4, 9:1, 7, 11:26; injunctive - 8:1; temporal clause - 4:10; 6:20, 7:1, 17, 10:1, 8; and antithetic - 7:7.

22 By 'speech paragraph' I mean the whole unit of speech introduced by the narrative tenses.
After this things the word of the Lord came to Abram in a vision.

The following three examples illustrate two different ways of beginning paragraphs, the first with an asyndetic clause, and the second and third with a waw consecutive:

\[ \text{כ יבשח ווהי אלוהים לאחריונא} \]
\[ \text{ורתי כשמשכנם וראתרל} \]
\[ \text{נוהי כי יבשח ווהי אלוהים אלארשא} \]

Each of these temporal clauses introduces a section by stating the basic situation. Circumstantial clauses function in a similar way when they are paragraph initial. Andersen notes that a circumstantial clause may initiate a new episode by introducing a new dramatis persona or a new development in a story. Two examples he gives of each are, respectively, Gen 3:1, 4:1.²⁴

1. הפשׂהשׂ קיה טריוו מבלתיית השׂקה פשׂר עשת יוהיה אלוהים

Now the serpent was the shrewdest of all the wild beasts which the Lord God had made.

²³ B. L. Bandstra, The Syntax of Particle KY in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic, 408, concludes that whenever the ki clause precedes its main clause then the semantic relationship between the ki clause and its main clause is one of condition, concession, or temporal circumstance. When the ki clause follows its main clause the relationship is one of complementation, consequence, adversion or causation.

²⁴ F. I. Andersen, Sentence: 79.
2. Now Adam knew his wife Eve.

In the same way asyndetic declarative clauses may also set up the basic situation and thus introduce the paragraph. This is the case in Dt 5:2, 6:4b, 7:7, 9:1aa (after the imperative), and 11:26. This is also true of the statement beginning the direct speech at 5:24:

"You said, "Look, the Lord our God showed us his glory and greatness. We also heard his voice from the midst of the fire."

This set of two clauses in chiasm is an asyndetic sentence which sets the situation and then becomes the basis for a conclusion the elders draw in the next asyndetic clause in 5:24:

We have seen that God speaks to man and he lives.

This brief survey indicates that asyndetic clauses which begin paragraphs in the corpus have the discourse function of setting the situation for the rest of the section. This is true whether they are temporal clauses, commands (imperatives or injunctives), or declarative clauses.
We may draw from this the conclusion that asyndetic clauses function to introduce a situation in much the same way as narrative past/future and circumstantial clauses do. Whether they are related asyndetically to the larger context, on the supposition they are in asyndeton with a preceding paragraph or section, is a difficult question which this study will not consider.

In addition to their paragraph initial function asyndetic clauses are found at the end of sections. Just as circumstantial clauses begin or end sections this is also true of asyndetic clauses. The summary asyndeton is an example of a paragraph-final position. The clause reintroduces, in brief fashion, the focus of preceding clauses, either by stating the topic or by making a brief comment concerning the preceding content. A good example is Dt. 5:22:

The Lord spoke all these words to your assembly, on the mountain from the midst of the fire, cloud and darkness with a loud voice. He added nothing more.

---

25 Cf. F. I. Andersen, The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew: 79,80, where he notes how circumstantial clauses may initiate paragraphs.


27 Cf. the useful but very brief comments of G. Braulik, Mittel der Deuteronomische Rhetorik: 143. Also F. I. Andersen, The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew: 80,81, for his demonstration that circumstantial clause may close out a paragraph.
This clause summarizes the giving of the Ten Words and is followed by several clauses which limit the revelation at Horeb to the Israelites present. The next clause begins a new section.28

All of the indications are that the asyndetic clause is another functional variant, a clause which has its own functions independent of the waw consecutive or the disjunctive clauses. As such it varies from the waw consecutive in two respects, its random verb subject order, and its lack of an initial waw.

2.2 Conclusion

The statistics indicate that there are three basic clause types, the waw consecutive, the disjunctive and the asyndetic clauses. The first important result from the survey of the statistics is that they present no reason to doubt the generally held view that the waw consecutive and the disjunctive clauses are in functional opposition. There is a basic word order shift after the waw.

The second important result is the fact that there is no normal order in the asyndetic clause as far as the subject and verb sequence is concerned. The sequence is apparently random. If this result holds up for carefully controlled searches of longer stretches of text it will show that we can not speak of shifts in this clause as far as the subject and verb are concerned. For example, we can not speak of

---

28 Cf. Gen 15:18, 17:26 as asyndetic summary comments concluding and focusing the previous section.
'subject fronting.' If there are any normal versus unusual sequences in this clause they have to involve the object or other elements.

Thirdly, the asyndetic clause functions in many ways that are similar to the disjunctive clause, and it often functions alongside the disjunctive clause (for example, to form conjunctive sentences). This clearly supports the view that asyndetic clauses must be aligned functionally not with the waw consecutive but with the disjunctive clause.

A fourth significant point is that the disjunctive clause may operate either in functional opposition to the waw consecutive or in conjunction with the asyndetic clause.

We conclude that the statistics and other considerations support the basic functional oppositions between the waw consecutive and the waw disjunctive, but that they do not support a functional opposition between the waw consecutive and the asyndetic clause. The opposition between the waw consecutive and the waw disjunctive, and, the independent function of the asyndetic clause determine the significance of word order and word order variation in parataxis. 29

The actual function of word order shifts in parataxis, and their relationship to emphasis, is the subject of the rest of the study.

29 We are not saying that there is no functional difference between the waw consecutive and the asyndetic clause, but that any functional differences are not due to word order shifts.
Chapter 3

The Problem of "Emphasis"

3.0 Introduction

Emphasis is a term which generally refers to any type of highlighting of a sentence element by one of several means. In many languages there are various methods of producing emphasis. The phonological methods of producing emphasis are intonation or stress. It is possible to tell where highlighting is placed within a clause simply by listening to the stress employed by a speaker. The lexical method is the repetition of words, and the grammatical method includes word order shifts, the passive voice, and pleonasm.

The constructions which are the subject of this study are syntactic -- either the products of word order shifts, or pleonasm. Some of these constructions, such as the chiastic sentence and the cleft sentence are not normally associated with emphasis, but fronting and pleonasm are.\(^\text{30}\)

\(^{30}\) See chapters on these topics.
Aside from the problems associated with phonological means of producing emphasis there are several reasons why the study of emphasis in BH presents special problems. To attempt a fresh approach to the problem we will first discuss the older views of emphasis, specifically with reference to word order, summarize more recent linguistic studies, and then review recent studies of emphasis and word order in BH. Finally we will conclude with a fuller definition of emphasis, specify its relationship to syntactic means of its production, and list some of its possible discourse functions in the corpus. The study, in individual chapters for each syntactic device, will then investigate the function, if any, of emphasis in each relevant example in the corpus.

3.0.1 Nature of the Problem

There are several reasons why the study of emphasis presents a major problem. These involve language in general, including BH, and confusion in older studies concerning the meaning and function of emphasis.

3.0.1.1 BH as a Language

BH as a language poses several problems for the investigation of emphasis. These problems concern the fact that BH is no longer a living language, which necessarily limits the scope of the investigation to extant texts.
3.0.1.1.1 BH is a dead language.

Because BH is a dead language, we do not have access to the suprasegmental (intonation and stress) signals which could confirm emphasis. Intonation and stress are one means of indicating emphasis in a language. Because of our lack of access to these features of BH we are limited to an investigation of other ways BH might have to produce and use emphasis.

In addition, since we have no way of questioning a living speaker of the language it will be necessary to approach BH and its possible use of emphasis more indirectly. Interdisciplinary studies can provide helpful clues to language in general, but it will be necessary to carefully query the text to discover the function, if any, of purported emphatic devices. In particular, it is of the utmost importance that any study indicate clear contextual evidence of emphasis and its function. It is not enough to show that a particular syntactic device looks similar to such devices in other languages, or that the word order phenomena are similar. There are good reasons, discussed below, for concluding that such features are not conclusive. We are left, then, with the necessity of providing cogent contextual proof that emphasis is present, how it functions, and what this means for the interpretation of that stretch of text. Unless this can be convincingly demonstrated it is not enough to suspect that emphasis is present based on powerful interdisciplinary analogies from psychology or linguistics (i.e., the way other languages function).
Because we are investigating a part of the remains of a language now dead we cannot know that any statistics we develop are representative of the language as a whole, or even of the use of that language within a certain type of speech or writing. For this reason we are all the more dependent on contextual demonstration that any putative word order change has a certain function. It is that contextual function which is the necessary criterion for emphasis, i.e., if emphasis indeed indicates a certain discourse function.

3.0.1.1.2 BH is a written text.

There is a second reason why we may consider only written means of producing emphasis. BH is a written text. The corpus chosen for study, Dt 4-11, represents a first person speech which has been written down for preservation. Even if the written version left the speech in its original speech format we do not have access to the speech context which accompanied its performance. We lack, therefore, the original intonation, body language, etc.

It may be assumed that there are differences in strategy for written and oral communication. Oral communication normally has access not only to intonation and stress but also body language of various kinds to bring emphasis into the act of communication. A writer in BH had no such tools. Whereas a modern writer has many graphic means of
indicating emphasis, such as underlining, italicizing, using bold letters, etc., the ancient scribe by and large did not use such possibilities.  

It is not true, of course, that a writer has no means of producing emphasis. As Cruttenden points out, most languages have grammatical means of producing emphasis. In English, for example, the passive, the cleft sentence, extraposition and fronting are all syntactic means of producing emphasis, specifically by the use of word order shifts. The question is how BH used these devices for emphasis.

3.0.1.2 The Environment of Word Order Shifts

Since emphasis syntactically produced is a function of word order shifts it is important to realize that such shifts may not signal the same function in different environments. For example, the normal word

---


32 A. Cruttenden, Intonation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986): 76. W. Lehmann in "English: A Characteristic SVO Language" in Syntactic Typology (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979): 208 notes that the passive in English is not simply a voice used to represent the receiver or product of an action but rather, it can function as a grammatical construction used to highlight constituents which do not receive such an emphasis in the normal (non-passive) pattern. A. Cutler, "Stress and Accent" in Intonation, Accent and Rhythm, edited by D. Gibbon, H. Richter (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984): 36, also adds what he calls 'topicalization' as a grammatical means of expressing focus.

33 We may not for example, take it for granted that word-order shifts function the same way in nominal clauses and verbal clauses. If Andersen is correct then such shifts, in the nominal clause, are a signal of clause function, not of emphasis. Since he allows for emphasis only in one or two examples, and emphasis, on the whole, has no function in his categories, his approach implies that BH had no syntactic means of indicating emphasis in the nominal clause. Contrast B. Waltke, M.
order in main clauses may be different from the word order in subordinate clauses. To take an example from a modern language, the word order in German is different for dependent and independent clauses - subordinating conjunctions shift the verb to the end of the clause. For this reason, this study will generally confine its scope to main clauses in the corpus.

Finally, languages change over time, and such changes may include methods of producing emphasis, including word order shifts. Older word order changes may no longer function in the total language system to produce emphasis, i.e., word order shifts may not operate in functional opposition with the language context to produce various kinds of discourse functions. Such examples may be merely frozen remnants of a former order and have no function in the present language system. According to Strang this is demonstrably true of English; it may be true of BH. Therefore it is necessary to be sensitive to possible changes over time when selecting a corpus for the investigation. This is one major reason for the choice of Dt 4-11, a first person speech text that on most accounts fits within a reasonable date range. This requisite is

O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: § 8.4.2c-d.

34 A comparison of Kings and Chronicles indicates some of the changes. Note A. Kropat, Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1909). T. Givón, "The Drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The Pragmatics of Tense-Aspect" in C. Li (ed) Mechanisms of Syntactic Change (Austin: University of Texas, 1977): 181-254, concludes that there is also a clear shift in word order from early BH to late BH.

only a precaution, since we do not know what the major system changes are for BH over the total range of the canonical material.36

3.0.2 Past Studies of Emphasis in BH

The major cause of confusion about emphasis has been past treatment of the nominal and verbal clauses, as well as of the pleonastic pronoun. The focus of the discussion concerning the nominal and verbal clauses has been on the question of a "normal" word order.

The articles of Albrecht on the nominal clause continued older studies of word order in BH which maintained a typology which could be labeled as 'emphasis in the initial position.'37 Ewald, for example, although differing with Albrecht about the basic order of the Hebrew sentence, had said that the reason for the order was that the initial element in the clause contains the new and more important element which the speaker wishes to bring forward. When it is necessary to assign greater prominence to another sentence element, then that element, contrary to the normal order, may be first.38

---

36 Of course significant attempts to understand this development are represented in such studies as R. Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward An Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976) and D. A. Robertson, Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972). These studies pay little attention to word order features.

37 C. Albrecht, "Die Wortstellung im hebräischen Nominalsatze", Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft VII (1887): 218-224; VIII (1888), 249-263.

38 H. Ewald, Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des alten Bundes (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1870); § 306a.
Albrecht's articles had the effect of correcting a major flaw in those approaches, including Ewald's, which studied word order without distinguishing between the verbal and nominal clause. Albrecht separated them and maintained that the normative order for the nominal clause is subject, then predicate (SP).\textsuperscript{39} An example is:

\begin{center}
Gen. 2:12
\end{center}

And the gold of that land is good.

The usual explanation of the variant order PS is emphasis on P, for example:

\begin{center}
Psa. 119:137
\end{center}

Righteous art thou, Jehovah.

In common with older studies, he explains the meaning of the order in terms of the fundamental interest which attaches to the subject of the clause, a psychological notion. It is this center of interest that receives the fundamental emphasis. For this reason ('daher'), he says, the regular word order for the nominal clause in all Semitic languages is subject-predicate.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{39} Note the comment of C. Albrecht, "Die Worstellung im hebräischen Nominalsätze," 219, fn 1, that "...andere sogar noch Nominal- und Verbalsatz ungesondert betrachten...", emphasis mine.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 219.
Albrecht lists major exceptions to this order in terms of the types of predicates used in the clause. The basic reason for listing the exceptions by type of predicate used is the above statement that what comes first in the clause has the fundamental interest. Hence the predicate comes first in the clause if it is necessary to make quite clear ('um es für Ohr und Auge hervorzuheben') that it is the predicate which is specially emphatic. This is also true whenever the subject is a pronoun. In such cases it is quite natural to see the predicate first, Albrecht says, because the person assumed to be generally known (the grammatical subject, a pronoun) does not excite the interest as much as that which is said about him or her (the predicate).

It was Albrecht's view of the basic order (subject-predicate) for the nominal clause, that seems to have won out over other positions, such as Ewald's. The reason for the basic order, however, continues the older explanation that importance or interest determines what occurs in the first position.

41 F. I. Andersen, The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch (Nashville: Abington Press, 1970), 22, complains about this feature of Albrecht's presentation. He is certainly correct, but apparently does not appreciate the basis in Albrecht's theory for the approach.

42 Ibid., 220. It does not follow from this statement, that P is not emphatic. Cf. the allegation by both A. Kropat, Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik: § 8; C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1956), § 27f.

This view of interest or importance as an explanation of emphasis is continued in other works. The Gesenius grammar, for example, says that the principal stress falls on the subject since it is the object of the description. The reverse order is used when special emphasis is laid on the predicate.\textsuperscript{44} Brockelmann echoes this view when he says that the normal order may be reversed in the nominal clause when the predicate is the real, i.e., the psychological subject. He says that, "the predicate can also occur in initial position as the predominant idea."\textsuperscript{45} The 'also' implies that the subject is the predominant idea in the S-P order. Davidson follows this when he says, "In general the emphatic word is placed first..."\textsuperscript{46}

For this approach to the nominal clause the question of word order for the basic sequence as well as for any reversal of that sequence was a question of the function of the initial position in the clause. If the usual order is subject-predicate it was because the subject was the most important element in the clause. If the order was reversed it was for the same reason. The shift placed the predicate into the initial position in order to indicate clearly that it was the predicate that was of special interest in this case. So, whether it was the subject or the predicate which was in the initial position, in any given case, it was because it was emphatic, i.e., because it was of primary interest in the clause. Word-order shifts did not create

\textsuperscript{44} Cf. also Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: § 1411.

\textsuperscript{45} C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax: § 27c.

\textsuperscript{46} A. B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902): 145.
emphasis; they simply placed another element into the position of emphasis. The initial position in the sentence, in this view, was always emphatic.

In a verbal clause the order was normally verb-subject. Since the verb was in the first position the emphasis was on the verb, i.e., on the action. Whenever the normal order was inverted it was to place the subject, or some other element in the position of emphasis. The Gesenius Grammar, for example, asserts that the verb-subject order in a verbal clause is due to the principal emphasis which rests on the action (in the familiar and pervasive waw consecutive) of the subject.

Conversely, when the subject-verb order occurs it is often the case that the subject carries special emphasis. Their example is Gen. 3:13


לֹא אֲנִי לְמַעְרָכָה

(it is not I who am to blame, but)
The serpent deceived me.

47 Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: § 142a; C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax: § 48; R. Meyer, Hebräische Grammatik: § 91; P. Jouon, Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique: § 155k, dissents and says the order is subject-verb, without explaining. K. Schlesinger, "Zur Wortfolge im hebräischen Verbalsatz", Vetus Testamentum 3 (1953): 381-390, agrees with Jouon, and defends the position that the verb is always the second element in the verbal clause. He says that the large number of verb-noun sequences in poetry and the asyndetic examples in direct speech are examples of random sequences that occur in those two contexts. I am in agreement with the latter, but must note that the major weakness with such an approach is the failure to look at the functional opposition of the various types of waw and non-waw clauses in BH.

48 Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: 455. This explanation of the subject-verb order in the finite verb clause is qualified by the comment that in the vast majority of the cases the subject precedes the verb not to introduce a new fact but rather to describe a state. The qualification is no doubt due to the influence of the Arabic model, according to which any clause which begins with a substantive is a nominal clause, whether
3.1 Critique of the Standard Typology of Emphasis

In the standard typology emphasis was clearly not a function of word order, or even of a change in word order. The first position was always the position of emphasis, no matter what the word order was. The function of word order inversion was only to place into the normal position of emphasis an element not usually found there.

Secondly, as implied by the first point, emphasis is a function of the initial position in the clause. For these older studies of word order in BH, the initial position was the dominant or emphasized position. Whatever occurred in that position was emphatic, whether the order was the normal one or inverted. This assessment of BH is just the reverse of Quirk's view of modern English which holds that normal stress is end-stress, that is, it is on the predication at the end of the clause (which is often new information) and that the initial position is normally not stressed.

---

49 Although P. Joüon, Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique: § 155k, agrees with the common order on nominal clauses, he disagrees on the verbal clause and insists on a normal order of subject-verb. At the same time, however, he agrees with the common view that emphasis is on the initial position.

50 Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar: § 142f. "But as in the noun-clause (§ 1411) so also in the verbal-clause, a variation of the usual order of words frequently occurs when any member of the sentence is to be specially emphasized by priority of position."

51 Note the discussion in ch. 3.
An obvious problem for this typology is the presence of emphasis in every clause. If emphasis is always present is there any emphasis at all? An underlying assumption of the strategy of emphasis is that it must be used sparingly to be of significance when it is used. Otherwise we will have to say that there are at least two types of emphasis, that which marks one element in every clause as the 'important' one, and that which marks elements in a few clauses as being of special importance for other reasons.

One probable reason why these older studies were unable to perceive the function of emphasis is their limitation of emphasis to the clause in which it is said to occur. These studies speak of a certain dominance and isolation of the subject, or, in the case of predicate-subject order, special emphasis on the predicate. This emphasis is on one element in the clause and not on the other, but there is no discussion about the impact of this emphasis on the surrounding context, or of the surrounding context on this emphatic element.

This view of emphasis generally did not consider the relevance of the context outside the clause, except perhaps in a psychological way. Davidson, for example, says that in the verbal sentence the "idea expressed by the verb is the emphatic element, and in ordinary calm discourse the order is predic., subj." As Andersen notes, the older studies maintained that some of the exceptions to the usual order were

---

52 A. B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax § 105, emphasis mine. Cf. C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax: § 122 where he speaks of the word order for the verbal clause "in ruhiger Rede..." H. Ewald had earlier divided the types of word order in accordance with whether speech was calm and unimpassioned or restless and vivacious, Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des alten Bundes: § 306a-309.
cases where the preposed item was the "real", i.e., psychological subject of the clause. Such comments show no evidence or awareness that emphasis within a clause relates to the nearby context, whether that context was composed of the clause in question and its head clause, or whether the context was the paragraph in which the clause was located.

It is, however, too much to say that past studies paid no attention to the context. An example from Gesenius, cited above, mentions the contrastive use of emphasis, and Davidson, among others, speaks of those cases where a new subject or new topic is introduced. On balance, however, there is almost no indication in the grammars or special studies that emphasis had more than a vague psychological function.

3.2 Conclusion

As a result of such earlier studies it will be necessary to reconsider these issues after surveying selected modern studies. The major issues are the function of emphasis and its relationship to word order changes. To begin we will first turn to recent investigations in two areas of linguistics.

---

53 F. Andersen, The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch: 17. For such a comment see C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax: § 27a. S. R. Driver is a notable exception to the standard view.

54 A. B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax: § 105, Rem. 1.
Chapter 4

Emphasis in Linguistic Studies

4.0 Introduction

Since any discipline functions in interaction with other disciplines, and since modern linguistics has made many significant advances in the areas relevant to our study, we will survey a selection of the work which pertains to emphasis and word order. In addition, we will consider the relevance of emotive language to our topic.

4.1 Emphasis in Interdisciplinary Studies

Two developments in recent linguistics furnish tools which help clarify the relationship of word order and emphasis.

4.1.1 Syntactic Typology

In spoken English the preposition is often shifted to the end of a clause to produce contrastive emphasis, e.g., "Who are you working FOR?" implying a contrast with "Who are you working WITH?" This position is clearly not a normal one and is therefore highlighted.
The first area of study is syntactic typology, which investigates the basic word order of languages.55 These studies suggest a two-fold division of languages: those which have a verb object (VO) order, such as English, and those which have an object verb order (OV), such as Turkish or Japanese. Other orders, such as SVO and OVS, are variations of these two.

Once a language is classified for the word order of the basic declarative clause then the order of many of the other elements in the language can, to a large degree, also be predicted. For example, if a language is basically VO the adjective will usually follow its head, and if the order is OV the adjective will normally precede the head noun.

In a similar fashion, some languages have prepositions and some have postpositions, depending on the basic order.56 Any deviations from this depend on historical changes which may be due to either internal or external developments. Some languages have changed orders within their history, and still have remnants of earlier positions. French, as an example, has adjectives both before and after the head noun.


56 In spoken English the preposition is often shifted to the end of a clause to produce contrastive emphasis, e.g., "Who are you working FOR?" implying a contrast with "Who are you working WITH?" This position is clearly not a normal one and is therefore highlighted.
These studies indicate that each language can be classified according to basic word order. While this approach is still in its infancy it seems to corroborate the view that the phenomenon of word order in a language is not random, but predictable - it operates in accordance with general rules. The normal (high frequency) order is neutral and, as long as this order remains functional, any positional shifts are due to linguistic marking.\textsuperscript{57}

4.1.2 The Prague School: Topic and Word Order

The second development is a formulation of the Prague School of linguistics, which has helped clarify the relationship of word order to emphasis by developing the notion of a focus of information in clauses or sentences. According to Hajicova and Sgall the importance of the dichotomy of topic and focus for the system of language and for the process of communication has been known since Weil (1844). In fact, this discussion is also a further development of a traditional topic going back to medieval times, the notion of a logical subject/predicate, as opposed to the grammatical subject/predicate.\textsuperscript{58} The contribution of the

\textsuperscript{57} W. Lehmann,\textit{ Syntactic Typology}: 173, where he notes that constituents in verbal clauses "may be highlighted through various grammatical processes..." He notes, for example, that marking (a shift in focus) may be used for singling out various constituents, by change of word order or by intonation. The phenomenon of marking will be discussed fully below.

Prague School to the ongoing discussion was to formulate a linguistic account of the dichotomy of topic and focus.\textsuperscript{59}

4.1.2.1 Exposition of the Dichotomy: Topic and Focus

The dichotomy has as its starting point a distinction between theme and rheme, or topic and comment.\textsuperscript{60} The theme, or topic is the communicative point of departure and the rheme/comment is that part of the clause which contains new information. In the two clauses:

1) John hit the ball.

2) Then he ran to first base.

Clause 1) furnishes the context for clause 2). In clause 2) 'he' is the communicative point of departure (continues preceding subject 'John') and 'ran to first base' is the comment which is the new information.

Because of the importance of this approach for this study it is necessary to give a clear exposition of the various terms. To begin with, the topic of a clause is that item or element about which some


\textsuperscript{60} R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik, \textit{A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language} (New York: Longman, 1985): 1362, notes that "In contrast to 'given' and 'new', which are contextually established and to that extent 'extralinguistic', 'theme' and 'focus' are linguistically defined, in terms of position and prosody, respectively." This volume hereafter referred to as R. Quirk, etc.
comment or predication is made. It is often, but not always the subject of the clause. The term may refer as well to a larger unit of discourse because it is that element which unifies a string of text; it is the ongoing theme of the discourse.

Since the topic in any given string of discourse continues throughout the unit, it is old information, at least after its first mention. Obviously, the first time a new topic is introduced, it is new information. Afterwards it is old and assumed information which is generally carried on by the subject (often a pronoun) of each successive clause.

The rheme in each clause is normally new information, a new comment or predication concerning the ongoing theme. It is here, in this element, where new facts or descriptions of the theme occur.

In English it is the rheme, or comment, which receives stress, or accent, in the clause. Quirk calls this information unit the tone unit and stresses the coextensiveness of the tone unit and the [new] information unit. 61

The term 'focus' applies to this tone unit which contains new information. Gibbon defines focus as 'the position of an accent relative to a semantically interpreted syntactic constituent.' 62 The focus, then, locates new information by stressing it. Because this stress-information unit normally occurs at the end of the clause Quirk calls this feature of

61 R. Quirk, A Comprehensive English Grammar: 1356. He notes that this focus of information is most often a tone unit associated with new information.

English the principle of end-focus. To illustrate the principle Quirk supposes a context made up of the question:

1) When shall we know what Mary is going to do?

He suggests a reply:

2) She will decide next week.

In the reply 'She' is the theme, is uttered without emphasis, and takes up the expected subject from the question. It is the element 'next week' which receives the stress. This analysis recognizes a sequentially increasing prominence with the subject conveying the least information. The new information, normally at the end of the clause, is the focus of the message.

In summary, the normal stress in a clause is coextensive with the new information unit, which normally occurs at the end, or near the end, of the clause. It is important to realize that this stress is what normally or usually occurs, i.e., it is the normally expected stress.


64 All the examples besides the one from T. Givón are from Quirk.

65 J. Lyons, Semantics II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1977): 507, notes that this is in accordance with the findings of communication engineering that the more predictable a message is the less information it contains. His comment is, "As we saw earlier, signal-information is inversely correlated with semantic information;" Cf. his discussion in Semantics I: 32-50.
Normal stress focuses new information within the clause; it does not focus the old information, the continuing subject.

4.1.2.2 Marked Focus: Emphasis

In the sentence:

1) I am painting my bathroom blue.

the accent is on the word 'blue', a normal end-focus. In the following sentence, however, the intonation shifts from its normal end-position to an earlier position:

2) I am painting my living room blue.

If used after the preceding sentence this shift in intonation highlights or 'marks' the element 'living room,' effectively bringing it into contrast with 'bathroom.' Such a shift from a usual position to an unusual one is called linguistic 'marking.' In this case there is a shift in focus produced by a shift in accent. The information, in this case, is

66 In M. O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1980): 78-80, 306-7. O'Connor notes two uses of the term focus marker: the operation of a movement rule which fronts a focused subject in a clause, or, the positioning of an element before a clause in which it does not appear as an argument. In his work he argues only for the second, since he does not make any claims for Hebrew word order. In B. Waltke - M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: § 4.7b, 8.4.1b the word focus apparently includes both the movement rule and displacement/replacement. The reason for the inference is the claim in this latter work that Hebrew verbal clauses are normally VS.
accentuated in order to 'mark' it, i.e., to highlight it as unusual for some reason. The reason in this example is contrastive. In this context the accent shifts from the end to 'living room' in order to contrast 'living room' with the term 'bathroom' in the preceding sentence.

In this study the word 'normal' applied to word order or intonation refers to the most frequent word order or to the most frequently used position for accented stress. Any element which occurs in the usual position is termed 'unmarked,' and, likewise, an element which is stressed or occurs in an unusual position is 'marked.' In the preceding sentences the element 'blue' is unmarked and the element 'bathroom' is marked.

The previous examples indicate marking is a function of unusual stress, i.e., where the stress occurs in an unusual position. In the following sentence the marking is a function of a shift in word order, repositioning an element from the place it usually occurs to an unusual position. Whereas it was the stress that moved in the preceding example it is the words themselves which move in this example. In the following two clauses the first sentence supplies the context for the second:

---


68 For BH, of course, there can be no implication that 'most frequent' is typical of the language as a whole. Since we have only a small written remnant of the language, including the Hebrew Bible and various inscriptions, 'most frequent' for this study only refers to the textual corpus used for statistics, i.e., Gen. 12-25 and Dt. 1-11, 29-31. For this reason, the only proof that the statistics are meaningful for our corpus is the contextual demonstration that certain discourse functions occur whenever there is emphasis.
1) I am painting my kitchen blue.
2) But my living room I am painting white.

The element 'living room' is shifted from its normal end-position after the verb to the front of the clause. The 'fronting' of an element in such a way produces contrast with the element 'kitchen' in the first clause.69 This is another example of marked focus. In this case the marking is a function of a shift in word order. The word 'white' in the second clause is stressed because of its semantic contrast with 'blue', but the word 'living room' is in grammatical marked focus, i.e., the phrase is moved before the participle from its normal position after the participle. The reason for the displacement is contrast.

Such examples of marking for shifts in stress as well as shifts in word order show how English uses phonological (stress or accent) and syntactic (change of relative position) marking to highlight a sentence element. The examples given indicate a function of this increased prominence. In both cases the marking functions contrastively. This shows that marked focus has a clear discourse function which can be demonstrated from the context. The special prominence produced by the marking is the first clue to this discourse function. An examination of the context shows the reason for the highlighting.

This exposition of marking in English suggests an important methodological conclusion. The prominence caused by marking is not the same as normal prominence or stress. It is by definition unusual and functions differently. A change in focus functions differently than

69 See chapter on Fronting for discussion and definition.
normal focus. There are two kinds of focus, normal and marked. The normal focus usually, but not always, indicates new information, whereas marked focus, which is indicated by a shift in word order, has other functions, such as contrast. For this reason we should use the word 'emphasis' only for marked focus. Emphasis is not normal stress; it is unusual highlighting or prominence which puts a special focus on some sentential element to point to a function which normal focus does not perform. In this study we will use the word 'emphasis' only for marked focus.

4.2 Functions of Grammatical Marked Focus in English

In this section we will consider the different discourse functions of marked focus as products of grammar. In English there are several discourse functions of grammatical emphasis.

4.2.1 Change/Resumption of Topic

Once a topic is introduced in a context, or can be assumed by both speaker and hearer (writer/audience), further references to it can be carried by pronouns. When, however other topics or subjects intervene, it is necessary to reintroduce the topic. Givón gives a useful illustration in which he contrasts the suitability of using a simple
pronoun to reintroduce the topic with what he calls 'topic-shifting'. The examples are:

Context: Once there was a wizard.

Pronoun continuance: He lived in Africa.

Topic Shift: Now the wizard, he lived in Africa.

In this example the pronoun is the acceptable way to continue the topic and the topic shifting device is odd because unnecessary, since the topic has just been established in the preceding sentence. The next example, however, is different:

Context: Once there was a wizard. He was very wise, rich, and was married to a beautiful witch. They had two sons. The first was tall and brooding, and spent his days in the forest hunting snails. His mother was afraid of him. The second was short and vivacious, a bit crazy but always game.

Pronoun continuance: He lived in Africa.

Topic shifting: Now the wizard, he lived in Africa.

The second example shows that topic-shifting may be necessary to resume the topic after a context in which other persons are introduced. The use of a pronoun to continue the initial topic is confusing and

---

ambiguous. Givón's example fronts the adverb 'now' and reintroduces the title of the subject, and then repeats the pronoun 'he.'

The next example uses the device of fronting to introduce a new topic. Fronting is one type of grammatical marked focus produced by shifting a sentence element to the front of the sentence to highlight it. Putting this particular sentence element at the front of the sentence would be otherwise unusual, i.e., it is not frequently found there.

In this case the fronting arranges the clause order in such a way as to provide linkage with what has preceded (the theme) and also ensure that end-focus falls on the most important part of the message:

To this list may be added ten further items of importance.

These examples show one function of marked focus - fronting to resume or begin a topic. Such topic-shifting can be as simple as reintroducing the topic in order to make an assertion about the topic which was forgotten or overlooked in the first description. Another reason for topic resumption may be the reintroduction of a topic that was mentioned earlier but not discussed. This type of reintroduction causes introductory phrases as "Now as for X (whom we have already mentioned but not yet discussed), such and such is the case."

4.2.2 Parallelism
Quirk lists another function of fronting which is frequently employed to point to a parallelism between two parts of a clause or between two related but contrasting parts of neighboring clauses:71

His face not many admired, while his character still fewer praised.

Traitor he has become and traitor we shall call him.

In London I was born and in London I shall die.

All three examples front similar terms in order to make parallel or complementary statement about them. Two of the examples front direct objects and the third a prepositional phrase which is normally found at sentence end.

4.2.3 Contrast

From previous examples it is clear that the fronting of an element or the marked intonation of an element in an initial position in a clause can create contrast. In the three following examples, the first is an example of marked intonation in the initial position, and the second and

---

third are examples of the fronting of an element in the initial position which is not normally found there:

1. Ronald made the hamburgers but Sally made the salad.
2. Mr. Jones, "you are next." "Wilson is the name!"
3. I am painting my living room blue, but my kitchen I am painting white.

The contrast in each case is produced by marked focus. An element of the sentence is emphasized or highlighted in an unusual way. In addition to this unusual focus there is another element in the interclausal environment which sets up the context of the contrast. This context in some way poses the alternative or set of alternatives with which the element in marked focus is in contrast.\(^2\)

The alternative may occur in one of two ways, a) in a situation external to the text, speech or conversation, but known to both speaker/hearer (an external context), b) in the general context, i.e., in the immediately surrounding text, or, in the sentence itself.

If the alternative belongs to an external context the hearer/reader must know the referenced situation or he will not understand the contrast in view. If the reader, however, does not recognize the situation which is referenced by the contrast, he has no way of knowing how the marked focus functions. Then the marked focus has no item of contrast for the hearer and he is unsure of its function. This is

\(^{72}\) W. L. Chafe, "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects and Topics" in Subject and Topic: 33-35. Also, Quirk: Comprehensive English Grammar: 1365.
exactly the case when a reader sees what appears to be marked focus in a text and can not find an item of contrast in the context. In such cases an onlooker who has no access to the external context can not know what the discourse function of emphasis is.

If the contrasted item is in the internal context, either in the immediately surrounding text or in the sentence, the reader/hearer will be able to understand the contrast if the writer/speaker is clear in his reference. An internal contrast depends on actual textual material, either in the immediate or surrounding context. The contrast must be stated in terms of the text and not be a mere logical inference from individual statements in the text, i.e., the contrast must be textual, not logical. Consider this example:

I am painting my living room,
but my kitchen I am papering.

In this example the word 'kitchen' in the second clause is a direct object shifted to the front of the clause for highlighting. The reason for the highlighting is the previous clause. 'Kitchen' contrasts with 'living room' and 'I am painting' contrasts with 'I am papering.' This is an example of a textual contrast. The highlighted elements in the second clause contrast with the textual elements in the first clause.

A logical contrast would be an inference drawn from either of the two clauses in the example. For example:

I am painting my living room
would contrast with 'I am not papering my living room' or any other possible activity involves improving the looks of the living room and contrasts in some way with the act of painting. The same thing is true of statements about color. For example:

Joan was wearing a blue hat, and her dress was made of that sleek new shiny material which just came out in the stores this fall.

If the intent of this description is to describe the clothing of Joan it may very well be true to state that 'Joan was not wearing a red/green/white hat' but it is not a point the writer chose to place into contrast with the description. Any number of logical inferences may be made about a statement in any text which the author has, nevertheless not chosen to consider. Such possible logical inferences are not textual or literary and therefore are not part of the point of a text. For this reason, we will not consider possible logical contrast it is not also part of the textual material of a context.

4.3 The Problem of Emotive Language

In addition to phonological and grammatical methods of focusing it is possible to use lexical means. This approach functions by using words in such a way as to create marked focus. In English such highlighting can be produced by repetition of words, by emphatic adverbs or by emotive vocabulary.
Because the emotive use of words is part of the current problem with the term 'emphasis' it is necessary to clarify this type of lexical focus. In linguistics, the philosophy of language and literature the term emotive is often used to describe a kind of emphasis that is said not to convey cognitive information so much as some kind of emotion.

There are various purposes for using language. Some statements may convey information, and others may indicate the emotional state of the speaker. Another emotive possibility is the use of a statement to evoke feelings in a hearer. These functions are not mutually exclusive; rather, the cognitive and emotive aspects of language are interwoven. We cannot isolate the purely emotive and the purely cognitive. When we use these terms we are only emphasizing different ways in which utterances work.

Some utterances specialize in expressing or evoking feelings, whereas others specialize in conveying information. Both aspects, however, are generally present and effective together. For example, if a mother scolds her young child with the expression:

You're a bad boy!

---


74 R. Quirk, Comprehensive English Grammar: 1414-1416, uses the term 'purely' emotive.
her primary intention may be to evoke a sense of shame in her son. An analysis of the situation shows that the expression does this in two ways, by:

a) conveying information to the boy. The success of her intention to convey shame depends in part on the meaning of the clause and that he so understands it;

b) conveying her emotion to her son. He would see her facial expression, hear her tone of voice and use of stress, and see her point her finger at him.

When the situation is as described the boy probably senses shame, which was the mother's goal in uttering the expression. This shows that an expression which specializes in emotion, will, of course, refer to the emotion of the speaker, convey information to the hearer, and have some emotional impact on the hearer.

It is a matter of interpretation which of these aspects is primary in a given act. Understanding that intention depends on the situational context, i.e., the acts external to the speech act described above: the boy's knowledge of his mother's character and attitudes, his memory of similar past events, his perception of her facial expression and the tone of her voice. In speech the hearer can depend on such signals in the situational context to help him with an interpretation of an utterance, but in a written text a reader is dependent on written description.

A writer may give details about character, tone of voice, describe the mood of the characters, etc. This description allows the reader to accurately assess the meaning and intent of a statement.
There are other kinds of emotive language as well, particularly the use of words that themselves have strong emotive coloring. Black uses the example of approximate synonyms, roughly agreeing in reference, but differing substantially in their emotive powers. He gives the following example:

1. a. I am firm.
   b. You are stubborn.
   c. He is pig-headed.

2. a. Animals sweat.
   b. Men perspire.
   c. Women glow. 75

As a matter of communication such use of words may or may not be intended to cause such feelings in others; they may simply express the feelings of the utterer, or, they may be intended to insult, anger, etc. In the case of 1c and 2c above these words are generally marked as emotive by their meaning, not by their position or intonation.

Although such use of language is ordinarily lexical it is certainly possible that other means, such as intonation and word-order shifts may

---

75. M. Black, Labyrinth of Language: 105. His comment on the importance of emotive language is worth heeding: "Practical men are well aware of the capacities of what Bentham called 'passion-kindling epithets'...Yet the emotive powers of words, if potentially mischievous, also have their beneficent aspects. To reduce speech to neutrality, if that were a realistic goal, would result in the utter destruction of poetry and literature." We might add ..."not to mention useful communication in speech or writing of all kinds!"
accomplish the same ends. If that is true for BH, however, it must be said again that only contextual analysis can establish that fact.

4.4 Concluding Comments

We have considered three devices in English which signal emphasis. They are lexical (various emphasizing words, including meanings which specialize in evoking certain emotions), positional (word-order shifts), and suprasegmental (intonation/stress). Each of the devices indicates a shift from neutral (unmarked) to marked focus or theme. In general it is possible to demonstrate these aspects of emphasis whenever they are lexical or grammatical, but this is practically impossible when they are produced by intonation. For the lexical aspect or the grammatical aspect it is imperative that we perform a contextual analysis to see if we can exegetically demonstrate the type of emphasis in question.

In summary, it is important to note that we can establish emphasis in English either phonologically, by intonation, grammatically by fronting and cleft sentences, and lexically, by emphatic adverbs, repetition of vocabulary, and emotive words. In BH, however, we can establish such focus only by grammatical and lexical means, if such means exist; we have no access to the phonological means of producing marked focus. Since grammatical and lexical means of producing marked focus are related directly to written context, the demonstration of emphasis in a written text is possible only by arguments from that context.
For this reason any examination of the corpus will have to demonstrate both marked focus and the contextual elements which combine with that focus to produce the functions which these combinations create. Linguistic studies in English point to three clear possibilities for this approach: contrast, initiation or resumption of topic, and lexical emphasis. These are only suggestions, however, since we can not know how marked focus, or 'emphasis' functions until we carefully examine the corpus in BH.

Before we examine the corpus we will first review a selected list of current studies related to emphasis in BH, and then suggest a fuller definition of emphasis based on our discussion of these studies and the input of insights from modern linguistics.

Before we can attempt to apply the findings of modern linguistics in English to the study of emphasis in the corpus it is necessary to consider more recent studies of this subject in BH. Newer studies of BH have gone beyond the older standard typology, raising the discussion about emphasis to higher levels. It is in part because of their advances that we may be able to apply the above discussion of English and its use of marking devices to reconsider the question of emphasis in BH.

Since the approach of each of the scholars reviewed is different, we will examine each one in turn. The scholars in question are...
Chapter 5

Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew
A Review of Selected Studies

5.0 Introduction

Before we can attempt to apply the findings of modern linguistics in English to the study of emphasis in the corpus it is necessary to consider more recent studies of this subject in BH. Newer studies of BH have gone beyond the older standard typology, raising the discussion about emphasis to higher levels. It is in part because of their advances that we may be able to apply the above discussion of English and its use of marking devices to reconsider the question of emphasis in BH. 76

Since the approach of each of the scholars reviewed is different we will examine each one in turn. The scholars in question are

76 The term 'marking device' is a temporary expedient until we can discuss the term 'marked focus' below. We are referring to the devices in English and other languages which rhetorically highlight a sentence element in order to produce some discourse function.
Andersen, Hoftijzer, Muraoka, and Waltke-O'Connor. The list is not complete, but is typical.

5.1 Andersen on Emphasis

5.1.1 Description of Andersen's View of Emphasis

In his study of the nominal clause, Andersen parts company with Albrecht and other proponents of the standard view of emphasis and word order. He says that the basic differences in word order for the nominal clause represent external functions rather than emphasis.

There are three basic functions which the two word order patterns represent. The subject-predicate (S-P) order indicates a 'clause of identification' while the predicate-subject (P-S) order points to a 'clause of classification.' A third function, the circumstantial clause, also has the subject-predicate order and may contain, on a semantic level, clauses which identify or classify.

In the clause of classification (P-S), where the predicate is indefinite, there is a partial semantic overlap between S and P, i.e., the

---


78 F. I. Andersen, Hebrew Verbless Clause: 18.
predicate refers to the general class of which the subject is a member. An example is Lev. 13:36:

He is clean.

In the clause of identification (S-P), where the predicate is definite there is complete semantic overlap, i.e., the predicate supplies the identity of the subject. An example, from Ex 6:2, is:

I am Yahweh.

An apparent exception to the order P-S for a clause of classification is the S-P order where the P is indefinite. Andersen notes that such clauses are coordinated circumstantial clauses, the normal order for such a clause. An example he cites is Gen 2:12:

The gold of that land was good.

This circumstantial clause always has the subject-predicate order, and can contain, from a semantic perspective, either clauses of identification or clauses of classification. This means that whenever a circumstantial
clause is called for this requirement overrides any other order. It has a special function in discourse.

Andersen will not allow the use of the term emphasis to explain exceptions to any supposed normal order S-P for nominal clauses. For him any clause order in the nominal clause indicates some clause function. The use of the term emphasis has no empirical status. 79

Even he allows emphasis on very rare occasions. For example, when speaking of the inversion in Gen 17:15 from P-S to S-P, he says that it secures contrastive focus on the name itself:

..but her name is Sarah. 80

Another case is 2 Kgs 1:8, although he does not mention what kind of emphasis he has in mind.

It's Elijah the Tishbite.

The name 'Elijah' is the predicate in this sentence. Andersen notes that the new information in a clause is the predicate. 81 This means that the clause is P-S, and that the order is the reverse of the normally

79 Ibid., 18.
80 Ibid., 41.
81 Ibid., 21.
expected S-P. This fact poses the problem for Andersen. Because the order is the reverse of what is expected and since he can identify the predicate in the clause, it is clear that this is an unusual clause of identification. It is not a circumstantial clause. This could only leave the notion of emphasis. Andersen, however, does not say what this indicates.

In this context the answer to the king's request for a description of the man certifies what he already suspects, therefore he is able to identify the man. Before this he did not know; now he is sure. The king certainly had a limited number of candidates in mind, and when the messenger described him, the king was sure. The verse in question, then, gives us Ahab's identification out of a limited number of possible candidates. If this reconstruction of the context -- which is less than certain -- is accurate the word order indicates contrastive focus; the king identifies Elijah out of a set of possible prophetic candidates. Whereas a normal identification does not presuppose a set of alternatives this one does and is, by definition, contrastive.

This survey of Andersen's view of the nominal clause indicates that for him the two basic word orders can not be divided into normal/emphatic. Each order specifies what he calls 'an external function.' By and large emphasis has no empirical status.

Although he does not allow for word order inversion in the nominal clause to indicate emphasis, Andersen has quite a bit to say about contrast in his study of the Hebrew sentence.\(^{82}\) The notion of

\(^{82}\) F. I. Andersen, The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew: esp. in the chapter on Contrastive Sentences and Adjunctive Clauses.
contrast occurs in two types of sentences, the contrastive and the antithetical. In each case there is a lead clause followed by either a contrastive or an antithetical clause.

In the chapter on Contrastive Sentences he describes the pairing of disjunctive clauses to secure a mild contrast:

The participants in two parallel but in some ways different activities are brought into prominence by realizing them as grammatically similar items in preverbal positions. A common way of doing this is to refer to the two participants by means of explicit pronoun subjects.

Andersen gives an example from Gen 3:15.

He will wound your head, and you will wound his heel.

According to Andersen the identical verbs point to similarity, while 'head' versus 'heel' point to a contrast. Neither of these pairs, he says, is brought into prominence. The contrast is between the focal pronouns 'he' and 'you.'

In this chapter he details some 39 examples of contrastive pairs and notes that it is not the pattern in the individual clause alone that determines the function of the whole. Rather, it is the "total pattern of the two clauses together that determines the total effect in the resultant sentence as a single construction." He analyzes the contrast in

83 Ibid., 150.
these clauses as a result of grammatical focus, i.e., "the sentence is marked for contrast in that both clauses have features which are unusual from the grammatical point of view, whereas the clauses in the neutral (unmarked) conjunctive sentence are more ordinary." 84

For Andersen, then, contrast in the verbal clause is a function of interclausal relationships and special grammatical marking. Otherwise, there is no difference between these pairs of clauses and other pairings which are not so marked. 85

These contrastive sentences express only mild contrast because they do not involve explicit negation of one proposition with another. Rather, the contrast amounts to differences between two otherwise similar persons, facts, or situations.

It is important to note that, for Andersen, the mild contrast here is not based on semantic contrast, i.e., the contrast set up by the contrasting meaning of a pair of words (lexical contrast). It is grammatical focus that produces the contrast in these pairs of clauses.

Another type of sentence which expresses contrast is the antithetical sentence. Although this sentence is made up of a pair of clauses with the same formal structure as the above sentences in Andersen's categories of contrast, it is, again, the total sentence structure, the semantic content and sequence patterns, which realize the distinctive syntax of the antithetical sentence. 86

84 Ibid., 150.
85 Cf. the chapter "Conjunctive Sentences" in F. I. Andersen, Hebrew Sentence: 97-118.
86 Ibid., 179,180.
Specifically, the antithesis is created when one of the two clauses expressly contradicts the other. An example is Ex 24:2:

And Moses alone will draw near to Yahweh, but they will not draw near, and the people will not go up with him.

Andersen notes, "The item to which the antithesis applies is placed in the focal position before לָל, even if this requires an explicit and redundant subject pronoun."87 This indicates that the contrast is not simply between the two propositions, i.e., "Moses will go" and "they will not go" but between Moses and 'they.'

This antithetical contrast is a consequence of grammatical focus. The item of contrast is placed in the initial focal position even if this requires a redundant (pleonastic) pronoun. In addition to the two-clause construction it is possible to realize an antithetical relationship between the clause and its general context. An example is Gen 17:21:

As for Ishmael, I have heard you... But I will establish my covenant with Isaac.

His translation 'But' indicates that the Lord will not

---

87 Ibid., 181.
establish his covenant with Ishmael. This rendering is based on Andersen's inference, or reading from the context, that the assertion of Gen 17:21 poses a contrast with the immediately preceding context. The Lord is going to do several things for Ishmael because he is the seed of Abraham. One thing he is not going to do, however, is establish his covenant with him. Andersen notes that such a 'marginal' antithesis usually leaves the negation implicit.

For Andersen, then, there are two types of contrast, a mild contrast and an antithetical contrast. The method of producing this contrast involves grammatical focus. Andersen notes, for example, that "the contrastive sentence is marked for contrast in that both clauses have features which are unusual from the grammatical point of view." 88

There is a further point about Andersen's perspective that is necessary to understand. In both chapters here reviewed he comments that in clauses with the suffixed verb (yaqtul) and the command forms (imperative, jussive, cohortative) the verbs are usually clause initial, whereas in clauses with the prefixed verb (qatal) and the participle the verb is rarely clause initial. For this reason, he concludes, a preverbal position in a clause with a prefixed verb (yaqtul) or a participle is less likely to be contrastive. In addition, whether such a clause is antithetic or not is determined more by semantic considerations alone.

5.1.2 Critique of Andersen

---
88 Ibid., 150.
There is no clear evidence in the corpus that Andersen is wrong about the function of word order in the nominal clause. What is clear is that, in principle, he allows no place for marked grammatical focus in simple nominal clauses, i.e., excepting the class he calls discontinuous. If there was ever any marked focus in the simple nominal clause in BH it was phonological and we have no access to such information.

Andersen faults Albrecht for using the same structure for two different reasons, once explaining a P-S sequence as emphatic and a second time because S is a pronoun. Though the criticism may be legitimate in this case it is not always so. For Andersen the P-S sequence indicates a clause of classification, but, when, for discourse reasons, a circumstantial clause (order S-P) is required, this fact overrides the usual order of the clause of classification and makes it S-P. Then it is possible to ascertain the kind of class by a semantic analysis, i.e., if the predicate in the circumstantial clause "refers to the general class of which the subject is a member." The genuine advance in Andersen's critique is his clear introduction of wider discourse, i.e., the notion of context and its influence on the individual clause.

In the chapter on the cleft sentence we will suggest that the cleft construction supplies just such marked grammatical focus for the nominal clause. If Andersen had seen that his 'adjunctive clause'

---

89 Ibid., 24.

90 Ibid., 32.
(verbal casus pendens) can function to mark contrastive focus he might have noted this feature.\(^1\)

As for the verbal clause, it is necessary to point out that Andersen does not use the word 'emphasis' to denote contrast or contrastive focus, etc. He does, however, speak of marking and marked focus by noting unusual prominence, or those elements that, from a grammatical standpoint, are in unusual positions. This procedure he identifies as 'marked for contrast.'\(^2\) This observation is important because we are using the term 'emphasis' in this study as equivalent to marked focus.

Perhaps the most significant feature of Andersen's approach to marked focus for highlighting contrast and antithesis is his insistence on the relationship of the focused item and the interclausal context. In a contrastive sentence (two clauses) it is not the pattern in just the contrastive clause alone that determines the grammatical function of that clause, but the total pattern of the two clauses together. Both clauses have features which are unusual from the grammatical point of view, whereas clauses in the neutral (unmarked) conjunctive clause are more ordinary.

In the above example from Gen 3:15 he says that the identical verbs point to similarity, while 'head' and 'heel' point to a contrast.

---

\(^1\) Ibid., 92-94.

\(^2\) Ibid., 150. Also compare the comment about the optimum realization of the antithetical clause by placing the antithetical element in the focal position before ｳｪｩ: 181.
But, he says, neither of these pairs is brought into prominence; rather, the contrast is between 'he' and 'you' in preverbal position.

This verse gives an example of the interclausal relationship of the words in focal position, both of which, according to Andersen, are grammatically unusual. As valuable as this point is, it is just here that the problem with Andersen's perspective lies. It was noted above that Andersen thinks the preverbal position in a clause with a prefixed verb is less likely to be contrastive. For Andersen this means that the preverbal position in a clause with a suffixed verb may be contrastive but the same position in clauses with a prefixed verb is probably not marked.

Such an assertion raises a question concerning Andersen's view of word order. Since Andersen does not stipulate what kind of clauses he has in mind it is necessary to analyze his position.

There are only three possibilities, the waw consecutive clause, the disjunctive clause (waw + non-verb), and the asyndetic clause. It is obvious that Andersen can not be speaking about the first, since, by definition both the past and future narrative tenses have the verb in initial position. Nor can he be speaking about disjunctive clauses, which by definition are waw + non-verb + other elements. He must therefore intend the asyndetic clauses. We will look, then, at the relative frequencies of various elements in asyndetic clauses.

As for the pattern of frequencies when an asyndetic clause has either a qatal and yaqtul verbs the verb is clause initial 39 percent of the time in clauses with the yaqtul verb, and 28 percent of the time in
those clauses which contain a qatal verb. For the statistical corpus this is just the reverse of Andersen's view.93

Whenever objects are found in the clause other elements are clause initial 82 percent of the time, which probably indicates that initial objects are marked. Adverbials, including prepositional phrases, are clause initial in asyndetic clauses about 34% of those times they are present in the clause. This percentage for adverbials advises more caution, since non-adverbials are clause initial about 66 percent of the time and adverbials 34 percent. Again, only a careful contextual examination can resolve such matters. There is no basis, however, from the statistics for Andersen to deny the possibility of contrast whenever adverbials or other margins are clause initial in yaqtul clauses. The data allow for marking of clause initial preverbal elements in both qatal and yaqtul asyndetic clauses.

In addition, whether the verb is clause initial is not as important or significant for such frequencies as the percentage of times a certain element is clause initial compared to the total number of times it is found in such clauses, i.e., if a clause contains an object the significant fact is the relative percentage of times it is clause initial. If there are one hundred clauses containing an object and it is clause initial ten percent of the time it is this relationship that it important, not just whether the verb is clause initial a high percentage of the time in such clauses. There is no evidence that non-verbs replace verbs when they are in clause initial position.

93 See the chapter on Word Order for these statistics.
Another problem for Andersen is found in his discussion of the contrastive sentence. Most of his examples are pairs of clauses whose lead clause is asyndetic (30/39 occurrences). The second clause in the pair is disjunctive. The problem is that for the asyndetic clause the relative order subject-verb (S-V) versus verb-subject is not marked. In declarative main clauses in the corpus, for example, the percentages of S-V and V-S are 42% and 58% respectively. As noted in the chapter on word order this hardly indicates a normative order in relation to the position of the verb and subject.

Because of the statistics of order in the asyndetic clause we cannot conclude that preverbal focus automatically marks clause initial elements, either in qatal or yaqtul clauses. The statistics indicate that the relative order of subject and verb is not marked, and that the clause initial object is probably marked. Whether we consider the clause initial adverbial as marked or not depends on further analysis of the contexts in which such clauses occur. We can conclude that statistically the presence of marked focus depends on what element is prefixed, not simply on the presence of a prefixed element.

For Andersen’s illustration from Gen 3:15 this means that the preverbal location of the two independent pronouns is not unusual. What is unusual about this is the fact that the pronouns are pleonastic and therefore unnecessary from a syntactic standpoint. It is the syntactic redundance and not the position that indicates marked focus.

This still leaves the question whether the pronouns are in contrast. We will show in the chapter on fronting that there are numerous examples of pairs of clauses in which such items in parallel
are not at all contrastive. They are in parallel and are pointedly brought alongside each other for some type of comparison or inclusion of a set of items, persons or notions which are in some way complementary. Note the following examples:

1) יָכֵא הַבַּרְכָּה לֵּאמֶר כָּל לִשְׂנָה שָׁם לֹא יֵאלֶה יַעֲשֶׂה

You will speak everything I command you, and Aaron your brother will speak to Pharaoh. Ex 7:2

2) יִהְיוּ עַל הָעָם

The Lord will fight for you, and you shall keep still. Ex 14:14

3) מִכָּה וְשֵׁם עִלָּה כֹּה

Me he restored to my position, and him he hanged. Gen 41:13

These examples show how BH can stage complementary elements in sets of clauses. In 1 there is nothing unusual about the second clause, but the pleonastic pronoun in the first clause creates marked focus on the subject. The reason for this focus is the creation of the parallel between that subject and the regular subject of the second clause. Together with the subject of the following clause this creates a set of complementary activities by the two actors Moses and Aaron.

94 See the chapter on the Pleonastic Pronoun.
Nr. 2 is the reverse of nr. 1 in that the pronoun is found in the second clause. In nr. 3, however, there are pleonastic pronouns in both clauses and both of them are direct objects. Statistically, the fronted objects mark them and force a special parallel between the two actors. If there is any contrast due to the different fate of these two actors it is created not by the pronouns, but by the semantics of the two verbs. In each case the clause sets compare two actors. In two the actions are complementary, and in the third they receive opposing fates. What that have in common may be found in the expression, "On the one hand x, and, on the other hand x or y." The marking, if it is present, forces a comparison and the semantics involved may create contrast or maintain the comparison.

Many of Andersen's examples in the chapter on Conjunctive Clauses are just like Gen 3:15 (which is in the chapter on Contrastive Clauses) but he labels them as correlative. The words correlative, complementary, comparative, etc., all help describe the parallels staged by this type of construction.

When this type of clause is compared with the antithetical sentences the procedure is quite different. In the above example from Ex 24:2, for example, the contrast is set up by the word order opposition between the waw consecutive clause and the disjunctive clause. For a disjunctive clause the subject initial element is not unusual; for a waw consecutive clause it is. What happens is a shift in order which causes the prefixed pronoun to receive marked focus in terms of the context.
This critique of Andersen presents one factor which is extremely significant for a consideration of marked focus. Given the fact that marked focus is only significant in its relationship to the immediately preceding context, we must also stipulate the rule that such marking relates to norms presented by that preceding context. The example of an antithetic clause from Ex 24:2 is an example of marked focus not because the pronoun in preverbal position is unusual in the antithetic clause, but because it represents a departure from the order of the immediately preceding waw consecutive clause. It is this interclausal contextual relationship which marks the pronoun as unusual and also creates the antithesis with the subject of the lead clause.

The two pleonastic pronouns in Gen 3:15 create marked focus because of the syntactic redundancy, but not to make a contrast. The marking produces a correlative statement: "He will do this, and you will do that." If there is any contrast at all it has nothing to do with these pronouns, but with a semantic opposition between two nouns 'head' and 'heel'.

Even if Andersen's approach for contrastive sentences needs some adjustment his view of contrast is significant. It is important to mention the nature of the argument used to support what Andersen labels contrast. For him contrast is a function of marked grammatical focus and the relationship of this focus with the preceding context. The syntactic shift highlights the focused element and the relation of this focused element with the preceding clause creates contrast. There is no difference between his view of marked focus and our use of the term 'emphasis.' Contrast is one type of emphasis.
5.2 Hoftijzer on Emphasis

5.2.1 Description of Hoftijzer on Emphasis

J. Hoftijzer published a long review of Andersen's work on the nominal clause. The interest here is not his critique of Andersen so much as his view of emphasis which surfaces as a result of that critique. Therefore, it will be necessary only to summarize Hoftijzer's approach to the nominal clause and show how that relates to his definition of emphasis.

As far as his own approach to the nominal clause is concerned the notion of contrast plays a role of central importance for Hoftijzer. He comments on the one place in Andersen where contrastive focus plays a role and says,

> What in his book is a phenomenon of secondary importance, is in this article one of central importance. I have avoided the use of the term emphasis because emphasis is the way (or better: one of the ways) by which in our languages the idea of contrast is expressed.

Hence he avoids the term emphasis and uses instead the term contrast. If the notion of contrast is of central importance, then, it is necessary to indicate a method for ascertaining its presence. Hoftijzer outlines such a procedure in terms of an exegetical query of the context and an

---


96 Ibid., 492, fn 1.
analysis of the relationship of that context to the two central constituents of the particular nominal clause.

In order to pursue this approach it is necessary for Hoftijzer to discuss the nature of the nominal clause and its constituents. He prefers to start with what he calls a formal approach. For dead languages such as BH, languages in which we can not gain any

real degree of competence, as we can have in modern languages, the safest way is to start with formal criteria and formal oppositions. For in such a case it is easier to get a reasonable grip on these phenomena than on functional, semantic and other ones.\(^7\)

In addition to this practical reason he is also concerned with the traditional problems with subject and predicate, i.e., the confusion with the grammatical subject and the so-called subject of discourse.\(^8\) To avoid these problems he divides the nominal clause into two basic elements he calls 'core constituents.' These core constituents are chosen by what he calls formal rather than functional or semantic ones. By 'formal' types he refers to word-level grammatical labels such as the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
Nd & \text{ - definite noun} \\
Ni & \text{ - indefinite noun} \\
Pr & \text{ - pronoun} \\
Np & \text{ - proper noun} \\
Pti & \text{ - indefinite participle} \\
Ptd & \text{ - definite participle} \\
Pp & \text{ - prepositional phrase}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^7\) J. Hoftijzer, "Review": 446-510, here page 477.

\(^8\) Ibid., 487.
Each nominal clause has two core constituents in addition to any other elements in the clause. An example would be:

\[
\text{We are honest men.}
\]

Core order: \(\text{Ni-Pr: indefinite noun - pronoun}\)

This indicates that he is taking a radically different approach than Andersen, who relates formal and functional categories, i.e., the part of speech with its function in the sentence:

\[
\text{In this study I want (contrary to Andersen's tagmeme theory) to make a clear difference between formal phenomena and functional indications given by these formal phenomena.}^{99}
\]

On the question of sequence Hoftijzer is closer to Andersen and in opposition to the standard view represented by Albrecht. He, like Andersen, avoids the notion of a normative sequence, along with its corollary that anything which deviates from that sequence is emphatic.\(^{100}\) He prefers to say that there are two possible sequences for each formal pair and that the function of these core sequences is completely dependent on whether and how often clauses with this sequence are used in a certain context. For example, in Amos 7:14,

\[99\text{Ibid., 488.}\]

\[100\text{Ibid., 488.}\]
I am not a prophet.

ןכפ' is the Ni, an indefinite noun, and יכפ is the Nd, the definite noun (pronoun), and the sequence is Ni Nd.

To determine the function of any core sequence he asks the question, which we will apply to the example from Amos 7:14:

Is it of special importance as ascertained from the immediate context that this core constituent, the Ni (‘a prophet’) be used with this Nd (‘I’)?

In this example Hoftijzer says it is of special importance that Amos is not a prophet. His answer is yes. Amos is making the important point that he does not belong to the מנהיג category. This means that this core constituent is contrastive.

He asks this question concerning the second constituent only in those cases where not all of the nominal clauses in a formal class are contrastive. If he is able to demonstrate that the preceding core constituent is contrastive in all examples of a class (say, for example, the core sequence נני-נד) he then concludes that the sequence in particular is contrastive, and secondly, that it is the preceding constituent in this sequence which is the contrastive one. For those sequences that are necessarily contrastive he never asks whether the second member may also be contrastive.

If not all of the examples are contrastive as above defined Hoftijzer then proceeds to see if each of the two core constituents are

---

101 Ibid., 491.
sometimes contrastive. In that case he will indicate that the sequence as such does not indicate contrast. By this he does not mean that contrast is never found in this formal type, only that it is not always found, and, therefore, that the sequence as such does not indicate contrast. Rather, he will give some indication of examples of each core constituent, both contrastive and non-contrastive. Ostensibly, the presence of contrast is not due to the sequence in such cases, since it is not as such contrastive.

Whenever the sequence does not show contrast he nevertheless still asks the basic exegetical question concerning each core constituent, i.e., 'Is it of special importance as ascertained from the immediate context of this passage that this core constituent be used with the other core constituent and no other? In the Amos 7:14 example he would ask, 'Is it important that Amos and no one else is not a prophet? He does not indicate that he alone stands outside the category, so the answer is no. The conclusion is that כָּלַה is contrastive but יִרְמָל is not.'

If it is possible to answer this question concerning either (but not both) of the two core constituents then the constituent in question is contrastive. A core constituent is contrastive, then, if it is of special importance in this context that it is used together with the second core constituent and not with any other.

102 Ibid., 493.
103 Ibid., 492, he says a contrastive core constituent is one of which it can be said that it is of special importance that this core constituent is used together with the other one, and not any other core constituent.
104 Ibid., 492, f.n. 1.
For Hoftijzer, then, when a core sequence necessarily indicates contrast it does so for the initial core constituent, not for the second one of the two. When a core sequence does not necessarily indicate contrast then either of the two constituents may indicate (but not always) contrast. From the viewpoint of the sequence then, there is some connection between the sequence and the necessity of contrast. When the sequence indicates necessary contrast it is always the initial element which is contrastive. When it does not either core constituent may be contrastive. For Hoftijzer, then, contrast is a function of core sequence.

It is plain that Hoftijzer has two reasons for these conclusions. To find out whether contrast is present in any given example it is necessary to answer his exegetical questions affirmatively. The affirmative answer, however, does not tell us whether the contrast is necessary, it only tells us whether it is present.

His second line of reasoning, which he does not make explicit, is that if a given sequence always indicates contrast then it does so necessarily, and, secondly, that it is the initial core constituent that is always contrastive. This latter amounts to a logical assumption. If affirmative answers to the exegetical questions demonstrate contrast it is only the fact that this always happens for a given sequence that demonstrates that it is necessarily so.

It is reasonable to assume from Hoftijzer's explicit comments that the core sequence has everything to do with the cases that are necessarily contrastive, and that it has nothing to do with those cases that are contrastive only some of the time.
This interpretation of Hoftijzer indicates that for him contrast is a function of relative word order (his 'core sequence'). Even if he avoids the terms subject and predicate in his listing of the BH data, he nevertheless relates contrast and word order. The initial placement of certain core elements in the various possible sets of sequences in the nominal clauses necessarily indicates contrast.

We noted above that he avoids the notion of a normative sequence, and the requirement that the unusual sequence be emphatic. While this is true he substitutes for this notion of a normal sequence of functional categories (subject and verb) a normative sequence of formal categories which are emphatic (contrastive) versus a non-normative sequence which may be.

5.2.2 Critique of Hoftijzer

There are two major problems with Hoftijzer's view of contrast in BH. First of all his exegetical questions are ambiguous, and, secondly, his definition of contrast is much too broad. Since he nowhere gives a definition of contrast the two issues are considered together.

First, his questions are ambiguous. The two exegetical questions referred to above do quiz the context, but the notion of 'special importance' is too vague to elicit the necessary information. I will give a few selected examples of Hoftijzer's reasoning from specific contexts to indicate the nature of the problem.

---

He remarks concerning the sequence Nd-Pr in Lev. 13:23, מִדָּוִּין מֵאָדָם מַלְּאָבָה, '..it is the scar of a boil,' that in the context it is highly important that one has in this case to do with a scar of a boil and not with the dreaded leprosy. For him this reasoning shows that the nominal clause 'it is the scar of a boil' is contrastive.

The problem with Hoftijzer's view of contrast here is that it is based not on any literary or textual contrast made in the text itself, but on his logical inference. His use of the charged word 'dreaded' has no referent in the text. Nor does the text say or indicate that "it is only a scab; it is not leprous!" The priestly instructions are matter-of-fact and straightforward. Naturally, the patient would have rejoiced at such a pronouncement from the priest, and, we think, the priest would also have been sympathetic, but none of this is asserted in the text. There is no textual evidence of contrast.

In Lev. 18:7, he notes that the verbal clause "it is forbidden to uncover the nakedness of one's mother" is followed with the argumentation מִדָּוִּין מַלְּאָבָה, "The fact that the woman in question is not a mere woman but one's mother is decisive here." This represents Hoftijzer's reason for thinking that the suffixed noun here is contrastive. It is for him of special importance that the woman is this, i.e., his mother, and not some other woman.

Again Hoftijzer is making a logical inference without pointing to either a fair abstract of the text or to an assertion in the text. The point of contrast would be "she is not just any woman." In the context

---

106 Ibid., 488.

107 Ibid., 488.
there are a series of injunctions which prohibit sexual intercourse when certain blood or marital relationships exist, 18:6-18. In this case it is clear that the reason for the prohibition is the special relation this woman has to the party who hears the command. The injunction itself (a verbal clause) already says that the woman is his mother, so the fact is not being introduced anew in the nominal clause. The repetition of the fact certainly underscores the relationship this woman has to the party who is the subject of the command.

The whole reason for this injunction is the relationship mothers have to their sons. The fact that this logically implies that she is not just any woman is true, but there is no such contrast made in the context. And this is just the problem with Hoftijzer's questions. He asks the question and then considers what may be logically implied by such a statement. He does not ask, in many cases at least, whether there are contrasting statements in the context; nor does he present a statement which is an abstract of the actual context which is contrastive with the constituent in question.

A final example is his discussion of Ex 2:2, מְנָאָס. Moses' mother uttered this statement when she saw him at birth. Hoftijzer remarks, "that this could be said about the newborn child was, in the situation, of great importance: now it was worthwhile to hide him." The nature of the reasoning here is interesting. The text simply states a reason-consequence sequence. Moses mother saw he was a fine child and she hid him. It is difficult to follow Hoftijzer's reasoning here.

---

108 Ibid., 497.
What are the two contrasting members? In this case perhaps he intends to say that the contrast is:

a) If he had not been a fine child she would not have hidden him.

b) He was a fine child and she hid him.

This is probably what Hoftijzer intends by italicizing the word now in the above citation. Yet there is certainly no evidence of such a contrast in the context. If, in the first two examples there may have been some reason for making an inference of such contrasts there is hardly any textual motivation for doing so here. There is an all-important difference between textual or literary motivation and logical inference.

The problem is more with Hoftijzer's use of the questions than just his statement of them. When he asks the questions he refers to the demands of the context, but his actual reasoning depends, in many cases, on logical inference from the actual statement of the nominal clause rather than on textual contrasts. In the cases where he draws logical inferences from the nominal clause itself this indicates the context is not relevant to the conclusion that there is a contrast.

This practice of Hoftijzer's is in contrast to those cases where he points to a clear contextual contrast. For example, in Gen 12:19, מִיָּדָּךְ, when he asks his exegetical question he includes the importance of the context, pointing to the contrastive member in 12:12, מִיָּדָּךְ.\(^{109}\)

\(^{109}\) Ibid., 488.
The conclusion from a brief review of Hoftijzer's practice in asking his question shows that there is a problem with his definition of contrast. He includes not simply textual contrast but also logical inferences from the assertions in the nominal clause. This latter inclusion significantly broadens his definition of contrast to include not simply those elements that the writer explicitly (i.e., textually) contrasts with the element in question but also any assertion which may be logically contrasted with the element in question.

This kind of broadening of the definition is difficult for two reasons. First of all, all statements may imply some logical contrast if the alternatives are unlimited. Chafe reports that Bolinger once suggested that the set of alternatives for every predication may be unlimited. The point is that any predication, such as 'x is y' implies that x is not anything else, i.e., 'x is not a', 'x is not b', 'x is not c', etc. Chafe responds that we are more prone to consider a sentence as contrastive when the alternatives are limited.\(^\text{110}\)

Secondly, a contrast must be literary rather than just logical. Even if Hoftijzer limited the set of logical alternatives in accord with Chafe's recommendation -- as he usually does -- to a small range of alternatives, his inferences are often logical rather than textual and are therefore subjective. In this restricted context of discussion the word 'subjective' means that Hoftijzer is attributing to the text that which is not supported in the text.

The conclusion is that as long as Hoftijzer includes logical inference in his querying of the text he has, in fact, no textual control for his exegesis of actual examples. Once he does this objective control over the context is lost and he can no longer claim that he has demonstrated contrast. The question is not what may logically follow from what a writer says, but what the writer is actually saying.

Hoftijzer's view is, in fact, contrary to literary psychology, or, to put it differently, rhetorical procedure. In any given conversation or text it may be possible for the hearer or reader to draw numerous logical inferences from what is said. If the text says:

```
Jane was wearing a red hat.
```

the reader may or may not draw various inferences from this fact, such as 'she was not wearing a green hat', etc. The statement as a simple description of someone's attire will probably give the reader little concern for making such inferences, unless, perhaps the text is in a murder mystery and the attire is significant, i.e., a bit of textual information may be considered more carefully than others because of the nature of the genre. If, however, the writer makes a special point of any assertion or bit of conversation and highlights some fact, this means he is giving the reader special guidance concerning the significance of the point. What that guidance is depends on the surrounding context, not on a logical inference from the statement in the marked clause. For example, the following illustration gives a
context and a marked clause. Without the context we should be hard-pressed to know exactly what contrast the author has in mind:

[We thought a non-family member stole John's book,]
It was his sister who did it!

This marked sentence 'It was his sister who did it' might lead us to infer that the contrasting member is a member of the family, but the context makes it clear that the contrast is between a member of the family and 'a non-family member.' This is one of many possible examples we could use to show the problem of making logical inferences about statements, without having an actual contextual contrast.

The example just given, however, is easier to discuss than one in BH. In English we know a great deal about the function of contrast and marked focus; in BH that is the question before us, and the only evidence we have is the context to guide us to what a marked clause is doing or not doing.

Although it is not my stated purpose to discuss Hoftijzer's view of the nominal clause as such, but only to consider his understanding of the term 'contrast,' nevertheless, there is one important matter which relates to this study. It is his reason for pursuing a 'formal' approach.

Hoftijzer avoids the terms 'subject' and 'predicate' for two reasons. First of all he wishes to avoid confusion between the subject as a grammatical notion and the so-called subject of discourse (=topic). His second reason is that these terms are functional categories, not formal. As already indicated, because BH is a dead language in which
we have no native competence he thinks it safer to approach it from a formal perspective.

As for the possible confusion of grammatical subject and topic, in the ordinary nominal clause, where there are just two core constituents and other marginal elements, it is irrelevant to speak of a problem of distinguishing between the topic of discourse and the grammatical subject. The problem can not arise when there are only two core constituents. The problem is not distinguishing between topic and subject, but distinguishing between the subject and the predicate when both are definite. For this reason the problem as Hoftijzer states it is a non-issue.

In fact, Hoftijzer's own practice shows that he is willing to designate the grammatical subject in his examples. He argues in such a way exegetically that he tells us what he thinks subject and predicate are in many examples. His conclusions in fact depend on his understanding of what is subject and what is predicate. For example, in a comment on Gen 48:18 concerning Joseph's comment to Jacob about his two sons, יִשָּׁבָן נַעֲרֵי, "...it is clearly implied that this one of the two is the first born and not the other one."

He does not say, "the first born is this one..." Even if Hoftijzer does not translate his examples the fact is that either translation or exegesis depends on an interpretation of the subject and predicate functions in the nominal clause.

At any rate, if one wishes to choose the formal method of proceeding, there is nothing wrong with this if the purpose is to

111 Ibid., 491.
ascertain the function of clearly distinct formal categories, and provide a check on more functional approaches. The problem with Hoftijzer's formal approach is that he is committed to the unstated but obvious view that for a core sequence to have a given function it must always have that function. A core sequence can be necessarily contrastive only if it is always contrastive. Any significant number of examples to the contrary would show that the sequence has no such function even if it does so in a majority of the cases. This consequence, of course, follows from his desire to avoid the notion of normal versus unusual sequences.

This is the reason that, once he decides a core sequence is necessarily contrastive, (and contrastive only in the initial core constituent) that he does not bother to ask the question about the second core constituent. And whenever there are any examples for the first constituent that are non-contrastive, only then does he proceed to see in what cases the second core constituent may be contrastive. He never finds a core sequence necessarily contrastive where the second core constituent is contrastive. In the end, however, this discussion of Hoftijzer's formal method and the problem of core sequence is all academic if his definition of contrast is wrong.

These points are sufficient to show the weakness of Hoftijzer's approach to the question of emphasis. He did not go far enough in his pursuit, either in obtaining a definition of contrast or in working out the nature of the exegetical questions which must be asked. The merit of his review of Andersen is that he reveals quite a few difficulties in detail with Andersen's rules, secondly, that he pays attention to the
necessity of demonstrating contrast exegetically, and finally, that he forces us to see the importance of contrast.\footnote{112}

5.3 Muraoka on Emphasis

5.3.0 Introduction to Muraoka on Emphasis

In a major work on emphasis T. Muraoka has begun the immense task of refining and reconsidering the notion of emphasis in BH.\footnote{113}

There are many very helpful comments about the nature of emphasis, particularly about the analysis of contrastive emphasis, and, as well, concerning the different functions of emphasis in the verbal clause.\footnote{114}

In order to manage this task of description Muraoka divides the clause into the verbal clause and the nominal clause and then

\footnote{112} This in spite of the fact that he avoids the term emphasis because "it is only one of the ways by which in our languages the idea of contrast is expressed." Ibid.: 492, f.n. Cf. p.475 where he says that "the problem with the term emphasis is that it most properly refers to suprasegmental features of BH, which features may not be readily discerned from such an old text." The study of marked focus shows that it is a mistake to limit emphasis to intonational features, particularly since emphasis is a function of any kind of change of focus, including suprasegmental, lexical, and positional changes. Secondly, just because there are other ways of making contrast is no sufficient reason to avoid the term emphasis. The question is whether these other ways of realizing contrast are properly termed emphasis. For instance, the words l'...ky often signal antithetic sentences in BH, but this is not called emphasis.

\footnote{113} B. Waltke and M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 293. Cf. the comment by Muraoka, Emphatic Words: 165, "..emphasis is a rather opaque and nebulous (conveniently so) notion whose varied aspects need to be identified and defined with greater precision." It is particularly in his last chapter, "Some Concluding Remarks", 165-167, that he sums up the types of emphasis.

\footnote{114} Muraoka, Emphatic Words: 54-56.
establishes the statistically normal pattern for each type. He then attempts to account for the deviations from the norm, in particular to see whether these deviations can be explained in terms of emphasis. In addition, he also discusses the casus pendens as a special case. The rest of his volume regards lexical emphasis and the pleonastic pronoun.

Because Muraoka's discussion of the nominal clause, the verbal clause and his definition of emphasis and contrast raise such different and important issues we will discuss each one of these and critique it before proceeding to the next section.

5.3.1 Muraoka on the Nominal Clause

With reference to the nominal clause his general conclusion is that the normal order is S-P and that P-S is often emphatic. And in this latter sequence, even if P is emphatic it is impossible to guarantee that sequence is the cause of the emphasis. This position represents a nuanced version of Albrecht.

5.3.1.1 Description of Muraoka on the Nominal Clause

To look at Muraoka's position in more detail I will divide his discussion of the nominal clause into emphatic and non-emphatic patterns. For the emphatic patterns he has, as expected, P-S where S = personal pronoun, or where P = prepositional phrase or adjective.

In not a few cases of P-S where the S is a personal pronoun the P is not emphatic. He remarks that it is possible that there may be
some prosodic (intonation) differentiation between the emphatic and non-emphatic pronouns in this sequence, i.e., intonation may mark the emphatic examples.

Another pattern which is emphatic is S-P where the S = personal pronoun. He notes that many of these examples are emphatic yet appear in the 'normal' (statistically most frequent) order. He says that often a contrastive emphasis may be due either to a fronted S or to a definite P.

5.3.1.2 Critique of Muraoka on the Nominal Clause

There are major difficulties with Muraoka's view of emphasis in the nominal clause. First of all, the exceptions he allows are of major consequence for any defence of the view that emphasis is a function of word order shifts from normal to unusual. It is difficult to defend the view that S-P is a normal, therefore non-emphatic word order and yet say that many examples of S-P are emphatic when the P = personal pronoun. If this is in fact so, then the emphasis can not be a function of the word order.

There are also significant inconsistencies in Muraoka's description of the details. For example, he says that emphasis for this example of S-P may be due either to the 'fronting' of the pronoun or to a definite P. If emphasis is due to a definite P, then it has, of course, nothing to do with word order, but if the emphasis is due to the pronoun it is difficult to understand what Muraoka means by 'fronting' since this term usually refers to a marked initial position, i.e., it indicates that the
element in the initial position is not normally there. Yet, for the S-P sequence the S (pronoun) is by definition normally in initial position. If the pronoun is normally in initial position how can Muraoka call it 'fronted'? The same type of problem occurs when he discusses the P-S sequence. Many examples of P-S where \( S = \) pronoun are non-emphatic. This indicates that there are major exceptions for both the normal and the abnormal sequences. It is difficult to understand how Muraoka can continue to defend even a nuanced version of Albrecht with these constraints.

As was true in the discussion of the S-P sequence, there are significant problems in detail with his understanding of the P-S sequence. He notes in particular that "one must allow for the possibility of some prosodic differentiation between the emphatic P-S pronoun and the non-emphatic P-S pronoun."\(^{115}\) This means that any emphasis is created by intonation (phonological) and that phonologically unmarked (non-accented) examples are not emphatic. Surely, this is just the reverse of what Muraoka wants. Since intonation marks otherwise unmarked and non-emphatic sequences, this is a grave problem for Muraoka. It is impossible to say that it is the P-S sequence which is marked for emphasis by virtue of its sequence, and then to say that it is intonation which marks the difference between emphatic and non-emphatic examples of P-S when \( S = \) personal pronoun. It would be more consistent to say that the sequence here is irrelevant.

\(^{115}\) Ibid., 16.
to emphasis and that only intonation (or lexical marking) can create emphasis in an otherwise marked sequence.

In effect, Muraoka's abnormal (marked) word order does not always secure emphasis, and his normal (unmarked) sequence may very well indicate emphasis.

A second major problem is his attempt to invoke intonation as a basis for distinguishing between emphatic and non-emphatic cases. This admission, of course, indicates that word order is not decisive, but more difficult is the fact that we have no access to the accents in the text. In cases where phonological stress marks emphasis what evidence can anyone appeal to that the cases in question are emphatic? Muraoka himself admits this, yet invokes it in this difficult example.\(^{116}\)

5.3.2 Muraoka on the Verbal Clause

Muraoka's approach to the verbal clause is a constituent part of his understanding of emphasis in BH. For that reason I will consider his description of the verbal clause prior to discussing his definition of emphasis as such.

5.3.2.1 Description of Muraoka on the Verbal Clause

Because the waw consecutive represents an obvious constraint on word order in BH Muraoka excludes this clause type from his statistical

\(^{116}\) Ibid., xiii, "Except for the Massoretic accents, little information about the prosodic or suprasegmental features of Biblical Hebrew has been transmitted to us."
survey of the verbal clause in BH. Instead he looks at the statistics of verbal clauses outside the waw consecutive. Even here he discovers that the V-S is the (statistically) normal word order. In this sequence neither element receives emphasis, unless the S = a pleonastic pronoun, in which case we can have emphasis or contrast. In this case the pronoun is not emphatic because of its position but because it is redundant, giving a two-fold expression to one and the same content.

In the S-V sequence he often finds emphasis, although there are several other reasons for a deviation from the normal sequence. He notes, as an aside, that emphasis may even lead to the reverse order. Here he cites Gesenius, who notes that the V-S order emphasizes the V, a strictly psychological notion which assigns relative importance to the element in the first position. Some functions of this sequence are emphasis (or contrast), the circumstantial clause, the pluperfect, the avoidance of the waw consecutive, those cases where S = Deity, et al.

His next consideration is the placement of the object. If it is medial, whether V-O-S or S-O-V he finds no evidence of emphasis for these medial sequences, but if the O is initial, whether O-V-S or O-S-V he finds the same general categories as above.

When the adverb is initial it is most often emphatic with the exception of certain common adverbs. The far greater number of such fronted adverbs represent:

- emphasis
- response
- chiasm
- contrast
- interrogatives
5.3.2.2 Critique of Muraoka on the Verbal Clause

Muraoka's study of the verbal clause is significant, in particular because he shows that there are a variety of functions for the statistically unusual sequences. If he can show that each of the functions is related to the unusual word order we can conclude that word order shifts in the verbal clause mark these functions, or, to put it conversely, each of these types of discourse usage is a function of grammatical marking, namely, word order shift. Since he notes some of these same functions for the *casus pendens*, it appears as if the same factors may be at work in that construction, namely, grammatical marking by word order shifts.

Finally, he sees the same functions appearing in the case of the pleonastic pronoun, another type of syntactic marking. This suggests that all these functions, may have a common denominator.

There are, however, several problems with Muraoka's presentation. The basic problem is his approach to word order statistics. After excluding the *waw* consecutive clause, without explanation he lumps together both asyndetic and disjunctive (syndetic) clauses. This move results in masking the statistical difference between these two types of clauses. Our statistics show for the asyndetic clause that the relative number of S-V sequence versus the V-S sequence is not significant. They are close enough to 50/50 that we can say neither sequence is marked. This indicates that it would be a mistake to speak of 'subject fronting' for this type of clause.\(^{117}\)

\(^{117}\) See chapter on word order for these statistics.
The statistics are different, however, when we come to the disjunctive clause. The relative S-V order occurs close to 85% of the time, while a fronted object occurs around 56% of the time, i.e., waw + O + V.¹¹₈

A test case for Muraoka's approach, then, would be the asyndetic clause where the order is zero + S + V. If his view is correct, as opposed to my statistics, he should be able to show emphasis for those examples of asyndetic clauses. He provides a list of 16 examples where S nom-V is emphatic or contrastive. Of these 8 are asyndetic clauses. The examples are: Gen 31:38, 41:16, 42:19, 50:20, Jud 7:2, 8:23, 9:54, 1 Sm 14:45. Of these he indicates that Gen 31:38, Jud 7:2, and 9:54 are psychological emphasis, and that Gen 50:20 and Jud 8:23 are contrast. He does not say which of these functions the other three examples (Gen 41:16, 42:19, and 1 Sm 14:45) indicate.

For reasons given in the next section I find the category 'psychological emphasis' unacceptable and will consider only those examples where possible contrast is involved. Of the group of three where he does not specify which is psychological and which is contrastive emphasis Gen 41:16 and 1 Sm 14:45 have no evidence of contrast. In his third example, Gen 42:19 the b clause is contrastive, but 19a, the example he gives, is not. This is a good example for further consideration:

¹¹₈ It must be remembered that a relative order does not tell us what element is clause initial.
If you are honest men let one of your brothers stay in prison, but you go and buy grain for your starving households.

Muraoka cites 42:19a as a case of either emphasis or contrast. Only 42:19b, which he does not refer to, is a case of marked focus. The focus, however, is a function not of a shift in word order but of syntactic redundance, i.e., it is due to the pleonastic pronoun before the first imperative. This means that the question of word order in 42:19b is not relevant. This is also true, of course, in 42:19a. For these reasons this example is not pertinent for Muraoka.

This leaves Gen 50:20 and Jud 8:23, which Muraoka specifically says are contrastive. As for the first:

Although you meant to harm me, God intended it for good...

There is no doubt that there is a contrast between the brothers and God, but the contrast is lexical, not grammatical, i.e., it is based on the contrast between 'good' and 'evil'. The focused pronoun in the first clause brings the brothers into comparison with God, as does the identical verb. Again, the pleonastic pronoun in 20a is marked whereas the word order in the S-V asyndetic clause in 20b is not. In this example, then, there is no contrast based on marked word order. The
same environment exists in the other example, Jud 8:23, hence we can say that not one of Muraoka's examples indicates emphasis for asyndetic clauses where the emphasis is a function of the sequence S-V.

Another problem is the category 'avoidance of the waw consecutive.' Since all disjunctive clauses and asyndetic clauses by definition 'avoid' the waw consecutive, the question is why it is necessary to avoid that construction? Any of these clauses can fit in other categories.

One last category which is problematic is where S nom - V and S = God. Muraoka notes,

"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 places determines the arrangement of words giving S the initial position."

There are twelve examples in favor of Muraoka's thesis and seven counterexamples. It is at least of some interest to note that when the asyndetic clauses are separated from this grouping (including the counter-examples) there are seven of the S-V order and seven of the V-S order, a 50/50 split, again supporting the statistical inference from the corpus that S-V/V-S order for asyndetic clauses is random.

One of his examples, Gen 44:16 has nothing to do with either of the categories he suggested, a theophany or a blessing pronouncement.

---

It is merely an inference the brothers draw to explain the reason why they have been 'discovered' for their past misdeeds. There is no evidence of contrast.

Muraoka himself notes that the counterexamples may cause someone to raise an objection to this category. His comment is, "Although we are not able to attain absolute certainty, no alternative explanation with more plausibility seems to suggest itself at present." In fact our analysis of the asyndetic examples corroborates the view that the S-V and V-S sequences in the asyndetic clause are not contrastive, i.e., they are random and unrelated to the question of emphasis and unusual word order. The other examples are simply normal disjunctive clauses; they are marked because they are used in conjunction with a preceding waw consecutive clause.

5.3.3 Muraoka's Definition of Emphasis and Contrast

It is crucial for an understanding of Muraoka to discuss his view of emphasis and contrast together because they seem to form a certain unity.

5.3.3.1 Muraoka on Emphasis

We will consider Muraoka's definition of emphasis separately, and then discuss his view of emphasis and contrast together, particularly since Muraoka consistently combines emphasis and contrast and thinks that contrast is a type of emphasis.
5.3.3.1.1 Muraoka's Definition of Emphasis

Muraoka claims that "emphasis is the expression of a dominantly psychological aspect involved in speech acts."\(^{120}\) Another citation shows exactly how far he is willing to go with this psychological factor:

However one defines emphasis, an enquiry into certain psychological aspects of speech acts is unavoidable. Although I myself am fully aware of dangers and difficulties involved in such an approach, I am equally convinced that any attempt that does not positively evaluate and take into account inner psychological aspects of emphasis is inevitably doomed to failure, since in my view they belong to the very nature of emphasis: emphasis as a linguistic expression belongs more to the psychological than to the logical, purely communicative sphere. Thus the added hu' in an utterance like yhwh saddiq hu' (as against saddiq yhwh) does not affect the basic logical relation that obtains between the subject and its predicate; it only seems to indicate the force and stress laid upon the fact that Jahweh is righteous, for which purpose, it might be noted, a certain stress or accentual pattern may serve just as well.\(^{121}\)

The basic point is that emphasis belongs to the psychological and not to the logical, purely communicative sphere. It is not clear whether he wishes to place an absolute dichotomy between the psychological and the logical. On the one hand he says that emphasis belongs more to the psychological than to the logical sphere, but then notes that the added מֵ֣עַ in the clause מֵ֣עַ לִּבְנַ֣ת מִשְׁרַ֣ט does not affect the basic logical relation between מֵ֣עַ and לִבְנַ֣ת מִשְׁרַ֣ט; it only affects the force or stress on the fact that מֵ֣עַ is לִבְנַ֣ת מִשְׁרַ֣ט. By making such a statement Muraoka is apparently

\(^{120}\) Ibid., 2.

\(^{121}\) Ibid., xiii,xiv, emphasis mine.
thinking in terms of a style/content dichotomy, i.e., style (which includes emphasis) is ornamental and unrelated to the actual (cognitive) content of the text. Therefore, the emphatic pronoun אָמַּת does not affect the cognitive content of the statement. It only gives it psychological force.

For a clear understanding of Muraoka it is important to note the above comment that the inner psychological aspects belong to the very nature of emphasis. This viewpoint surfaces continually in his study. In his discussion of the pleonastic pronoun with the finite verb he mentions the use of יָשָׁנֶה preceded by the verb in Cant 5:5,6:

I rose to open to my beloved...
I opened to my beloved.

Here Muraoka regards the pronoun as a means to indicate the agitated, excited self of the maiden, now ready to welcome her lover? In Jud 5:3:

Hear O kings; listen O princes.
I to Yahweh, I, I will sing.

\textit{Ibid.}, 49. Note however, the next clause. This example may be contrastive.
he says that the pronoun is an expression of the tension between the
two parties, 11:7.\textsuperscript{123} He comments to the same effect about 1 Sam. 23:22
where the pronoun is said to indicate the psychological tension of the
king who is fearful and madly jealous of David. In general, anytime a
situation is described in which strong emotional heightening is involved,
we often find the personal pronoun used.\textsuperscript{124} Many emphatic forms are
frequently associated with an unusual degree of emotional tension and
are found in contexts expressive of indignation, anger, astonishment,
despair and the like.\textsuperscript{125} Indeed, the presence of a cluster of various
emphatic forms in lively conversational passages rather more frequently
than in narrative may be accounted for by the speaker’s emotional
involvement.\textsuperscript{126} A slightly different emotive nuance is found in those
passages where the use of the pronoun is an indication of focused
attention or deep self-consciousness:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 50.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 51.
\item \textsuperscript{125} Ibid., 165.
\item \textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 166.
\end{itemize}
Then the king said to Doeg, "You turn and fall upon the priest!"
So Doeg the Edomite turned and he fell upon the priests.
I Sam 22:18

According to Muraoka the pronoun in the king's command is contrastive, whereas in the fulfillment clause, where Doeg obeys the word of the king, he says that the author is probably inviting our special attention to the abominable murder of the priests by using immediately after he mentioned the murderer by his personal name. This is a good example of Muraoka's psychological emphasis. The pronoun ostensibly mirrors the disgust of the author of our text as he retells the story of Doeg.

5.3.3.1.2 Critique of Muraoka on Emphasis

The major problem with M.'s understanding of emphasis is his overestimation of its psychological aspect. At times he even seems to identify emphasis with the emotive. This is the case when he confuses 

---

127 He takes Qoheleth's use of the pleonastic pronoun as an example of emphasis due to the 'meditative self' of the writer. Two examples he cites are Qoh. 1:16, 2:1. Of about 27 examples I found of this first person pronoun in Qoheleth at least 13 fit the category of topical resumption, i.e., when the writer finishes a particular description of what he saw and begins a new section with his self-identification, he often uses the pleonastic pronoun with the finite verb to do so. The pronoun in these cases may be only the indication of a new section, not what Muraoka calls the 'meditative self.' This is not Qoheleth's only technique for beginning a new section. He also uses asyndetic clauses, with or without fronted objects. We conclude that Muraoka's analysis should not be taken for granted. Cf. comments of Driver in Tenses: 202n.
a semantic indication of the presence of emotion with emotive emphasis itself. He also tends to set up a tension between communication and emphasis.

It is not necessary to create a dichotomy between the emotive and the cognitive aspects of communication. Emotive emphasis conveys information, ostensibly about attitudes, and it is only because these statements mean something that, as Black puts it, "...the way is open to exposition, exegesis, and criticism." Emotive emphasis may specialize in the special kind of cognitive information it brings to the attention of the hearer; the referent is the attitude of the speaker in this situation and not simply to the speaker's intent concerning a given topic. It is this peculiar kind of information that may result in some emotion in the hearer, e.g., anger, agreement, pity, etc.

It is a mistake, then, to set up a tension between the emotive and cognitive aspects of communication. Part of Muraoka's reason for this tension may be his view that style refers to the manner in which something is put and not to its logical or cognitive content.

The reason why his psychological understanding is so problematic is that it is inherently subjective. The only appeal to context that M. makes is lexical, i.e., whenever he sees unusual word order or a pleonastic pronoun Muraoka often says it marks psychological emphasis if he sees any lexical evidence of emotion in the context. Presumably, he will not draw such a conclusion if there is also evidence of contrast

128 M. Black, Labyrinth of Language: 108.
129 Ibid., 110.
in the context. He never clarifies what will happen if there is evidence of emotion and contrast in the same context.

We may ask, however, why it is that the presence of emotion in the context is enough to signal emotive emphasis in conjunction with marked word order or pleonasm? It is one thing for an author to simply note in a factual manner that some emotion is present; it is quite another for him to highlight that fact. What Muraoka needs to do is provide a contextual test which demonstrates that the context is doing more than just referring to the fact that some emotion is present, and is in fact highlighting it in some way. Just because an author notes that someone is angry does not mean that he is making a literary point of the matter. It is just this latter that Muraoka needs to demonstrate.

In his concluding remarks he says that one feature shared by many forms he has concluded to be emphatic,

is that they are frequently associated with an unusual degree of emotional tension. Many emphatic forms are found in emotionally charged contexts expressive of indignation, anger, accusation, reprimand, warning, astonishment, exultation, despair, and the like.

The point is that these emphatic forms are identified in terms of the lexical inventory of the context. If a context notes that someone is angry, it is likely that Muraoka will conclude that a pleonastic pronoun or a unusual word order in such a context is indicating emotive emphasis.

---

130 Ibid., 165.
Muraoka's insistence on defining emphasis as psychological, or emotive by definition presents us with an interesting puzzle. If he also insists that emphasis is a broader word than contrast and includes it, how can he unify emphasis and contrast, i.e., if contrast is clearly cognitive and informational whereas emphasis is psychological and emotive, in what way can contrast be included notionally in emphasis? It seems as if there is no way for him to accomplish such a task, in spite of the fact that he claims that emphasis is a broader word than contrast and therefore includes it.\(^{131}\)

This query introduces another similar question. In his discussion of the order of the verbal clause Muraoka notes concerning the sequence S-V that things are "not so simple as to allow us to assume that every case of the deviation [from the normal order] is due to some intended emphasis on the subject."\(^ {132}\) He admits that such is often the case, that there are many other cases where one can hardly perceive any emphasis laid on the preceding S. His conclusion is that we must look for other factors at work. He then lists other categories beside emphasis and contrast which lead to the reversal of word order.

This caveat indicates that other factors besides emphasis explain word order phenomena. These other factors are not emphasis; they are something else. They include, among others, the circumstantial clause and chiasm. It is worth asking at this point why Muraoka separates these other factors from emphasis if he does not do this for contrast,

\(^{131}\text{Ibid., 25, f.n. 61, where he criticizes Hoffijzer for thinking that contrast is a broader term than emphasis.}\)

\(^{132}\text{Ibid., 32. Comment in brackets my own insertion.}\)
which, for him, is a category subsumed under emphasis? This may be a clue that his definition of emphasis is either too narrow or on the wrong track.

5.3.3.2 Muraoka on Contrast

Muraoka's discussion of contrast is worth considering for at least two reasons. The first is that he attempts to define contrast, and the second that he frequently combines emphasis and contrast both in his discussion and in his lists. He often, for example, will list the functions of a specific word order by listing first those examples that are emphatic or contrast, and then, in order, other uses. He is, in some way, combining contrast and emphasis. 133

5.3.3.2.1 Description of Muraoka on Contrast

Muraoka is one of the few biblical scholars to attempt a clear definition of contrast. In his chapter on the use of the pleonastic pronoun he points out that despite the vague way in which different scholars use the word 'emphasis' everyone recognizes the contrastive aspect of emphasis.

133 Ibid., 31, 33, (on 38,39 and 58,59 he separates them), and also 25, f.n. 61 where he criticizes Hoftijzer for thinking contrast is a broader term than emphasis. In his remarks on the pleonastic pronoun, p. 54, he points out that despite the vague way in which different scholars use the word 'emphasis' everyone recognizes the contrastive aspect of emphasis.
aspect of emphasis. He approaches his description of contrastive emphasis from two points of view, the formal and the semantic.

From the formal point of view contrast can be either explicit or implicit. The difference between these two is not clear from Muraoka's description. He says that explicit contrast may be found in a single sentence, but it may also be spread over more than one sentence. As far as implicit contrast one must seek the missing contrasted member in the context. Since he gives no examples which he marks as 'explicit contrast' this distinction between explicit and implicit is unclear. From his discussion, however, he seems to intend the idea that explicit contrast is a direct statement in the immediate context, but that an implicit contrast depends on an abstraction from the context. Both types of contrast are present in the text, but one is more direct than the other.

On a semantic level the contrast can involve either antithesis (the positive and negative side of an idea common to both of them) or simple juxtaposition. Although the antithetical category is simple enough it is more difficult to understand what Muraoka means by juxtaposition. Judging from his examples, juxtaposition may involve either a set of immediately adjacent clauses which are quite similar on a formal (grammatical) level (Gen 3:15), to a more remote (over a span of several verses) set of clauses which are not grammatically similar but

---

134 Ibid., 54.

135 Ibid., 56. Note the statement Abram attributes to the king of Sodom in Gn 14:23, where any contrast would depend on some abstraction from the context instead of a specific statement.
nevertheless pose two alternatives. An example of formally similar clauses is Gen 3:15:

He will bruise your head
and you will bruise his heel.

Each clause begins with a pronoun, followed by the same verbal root to which is added a pronominal object, and in each clause there is a second object which "more closely determines the nearer object."136

Other examples, however, are not at all grammatically similar. For example Gen 33:2,3 is a conjunction of a waw consecutive clause (which relates Jacob's division of his family prior to his meeting with Esau) with a circumstantial clause which notes that he went on ahead of them. Gen 15:13-15 is another similar example.

These examples indicate that for Muraoka juxtaposition is not only a formal, grammatical arrangement; it can also be two statements which are not grammatically similar, or even immediately adjacent, but which nevertheless indicate alternative actions by two different persons or groups.

5.3.3.2.2 Critique of Muraoka on Contrast

---

136 E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: § 117 II.
Muraoka has begun the task of defining contrast on a semantic level and of seeing it as a function of word order and lexical marking. There are two elements of his definition, however, which need more discussion.

He understands contrast as anything on a line from outright antithesis (the positive and negative side of an idea common to the two terms being contrasted) to a simple juxtaposition. Although no one will question the appropriateness of including antithesis as one way of expressing contrast, the use of juxtaposition is another question. The term itself does not indicate contrast, although it may suggest comparison. This is not a problem, since contrast often involves a comparison of similar things in respect to their differences. So if Muraoka intends by this a juxtaposition of similar entities in order to point out a difference, the approach is legitimate. It will be necessary, however, to spell out this category in such a way as to specify what it is that produces the contrast.

Look at the above example from Gen 3:15. Is this really contrast? What distinguishes contrast from a simple role alternation, i.e., he will do this and you will do that. Why is this role difference in Gen 3:15 a contrast? It is not because of the two fronted pleonastic pronouns. Are both pronouns marked? If so, this is a different way to use marking and Muraoka does not alert us to the difference. The examples we have seen of contrast indicate that one element in one clause is grammatically marked, and that item is in contrast with an element of

the immediately surrounding context. For contrast, then, we would expect only one marked element, not two in parallel. If there is any contrast in this set of clauses it is due to the contrast set up between 'head' and 'heel,' not because of the two pronouns in parallel. This means that the contrast depends on whether 'head' and 'heel' in such a context are seen as opposites.

In any case, this example is formally different from Muraoka's other examples. Gen 33:3, for example, has a waw consecutive clause followed by a disjunctive clause. The disjunctive clause is waw + S + V. This indicates that it is the S, another pleonastic pronoun, which is marked (by virtue of the preceding waw consecutive order). There is only one marked pronoun in this case. The same is true for Gen 15:15, which is clearly contrastive. With such a mixture of types, it is difficult to assess the merit of this category. Our conclusion is that one end of Muraoka's 'spectrum of contrast' needs more work.

Secondly, although there may be no difficulty with Muraoka's distinction between explicit and implicit contrast, it is necessary to exercise great care in this area. There is a very important difference, especially for BH, between a contrast implied by the text itself and a

---

138 See further discussion in chapters on Fronting and the Pleonastic Pronoun.

139 This particular example is probably not pertinent to use in Muraoka's cause, since the disjunctive clause is more likely a simple circumstantial clause. There is no contrast between parts of the family being in one place and Jacob being in another.

140 In our chapter on Fronting we will make further suggestions about a category which fronts unusual elements in two successive clauses.
contrast we might reasonably expect but which is not in any way involved in the text.\^141 As long as it is possible to see the contrastive member clearly implied by the context it is legitimate to speak about 'implicit' contrast. It is often the case that discussion about a topic of discourse does not explicitly or directly state the topic. If a speaker/writer or participants in a conversation were asked in such a case what they were talking about the response would be something like "We are talking about x." If we could see this 'x' reflected in the preceding discourse we would conclude that the subject matter was in the text, even if it was not expressed directly. Otherwise, if there is no such textual implication of the contrastive member, attributing contrast to a marked form is subjective and impossible to demonstrate.

5.4 Waltke-O'Connor on Emphasis

This new study of Biblical Hebrew Syntax is significant because it contributes to the study of emphasis in BH in three important ways. First of all it takes account of emphasis in the context of the basic opposition of the conjunctive-sequential and disjunctive clauses. It also contributes to the study of the nominal clause by suggesting the valuable notion of focus marker for the nominative absolute (casus pendens) construction. Finally, it indicates the purpose of emphasis by noting that it points to distinctions in meaning.

\^141 We mean here that it is necessary to show evidence from the text, and not simply appeal to what is logically implied. There is an important difference between the authors literary or discourse strategy and what may be logically implied by any of his statements.
5.4.1 Description of Waltke-O'Connor on Emphasis

The first area of significance is the linguistic opposition posed by the two basic types of waw clauses. They note the basically different discourse functions of the conjunctive-sequential and the disjunctive clauses in BH. The first is the well known waw-consecutive clause which structures narrative sequentially in past or future tense, and the disjunctive (waw + subject + verb, etc.), which has several different functions, all of which are non-sequential.142

Waltke-O'Connor basically follow Lambdin in making this distinction between the conjunctive-sequential waw clause and the waw disjunctive clause.143 They also further nuance the functions of the disjunctive. Whereas Lambdin had simply listed these functions, they divide them into two distinct areas, those pertaining to discourse continuity and those involving a shift in scene. The functions are, respectively:

1. Functions which maintain Discourse Continuity: when these functions are used within a scene, they do not begin, end, or otherwise shift the scene to something new; the clause does not shift a scene or a participant in that scene. Some of these are:
   a. Contrast

   There are two ways of producing contrast. One the one hand, in Gen 40:21,22, 41:54 the contrast is brought out by a shift in word order from the waw consecutive (waw + verb + subject) to a

---

142 Ibid., § 39.2.3.
disjunctive clause (waw + subject + verb). In Gen 3:15, 13:12 two clauses are joined by a waw-adversative (a species of waw-disjunctive), and the subjects are in initial position in both clauses.

b. specification of contemporary circumstances: the typical circumstantial clause: Gen 11:4, 24:15

c. causes: Gen 24:56, Ex 23:9

d. comparison: Prv. 25:25, 26:4

2. Functions which involve Discourse Discontinuity. These uses produce a scene shift or introduce new participants. Such clauses introduce new topics and begin new 'paragraphs’, or they end a scene just prior to a new beginning.

a. scene initial/terminal

b. parenthetical

Inasmuch as it is the disjunction between these two basic clause types which determines clause function it is necessary to keep this opposition in mind when looking at their view of word order. The above suggested discourse functions for the disjunctive clause are all a result of the word order shift from the basic conjunctive-sequential sequence.

Alongside this set of contrasts, Waltke-O'Connor apparently posit another important functional opposition, an opposition between the two basic word order sequences in the verbal clause, verb-subject and subject-verb. There are two basic sequences for the verbal clause, the verb-subject order and the subject-verb. For Waltke-O'Connor the

144 Ibid., § 39.2.3b.
standard order for the verbal clause is V-S.\textsuperscript{145} This order usually obtains when:

1. The clause has no introductory material, Ps. 63:9

\begin{Hebrew}
ךְִכֵ֣בָּה נֶפֶשׁ שִׁבְתַּ֣תִי
\end{Hebrew}

2. The waw consecutive clause, Gen 1:3

\begin{Hebrew}
לֹֽא־אָכֶ֥ה יִצְרֵ֖א בָּאָמָֽרֽה
\end{Hebrew}

3. When a clause begins with adverbial materials,

Gen 15:1

\begin{Hebrew}
מִשְׁתָּחֵ֥ת נָחַֽלְתֶּ֣ה רַבָּה וְדָוִֽדַ֖ה שִׁלְׁשַֽׁמְבֶּֽהָה
\end{Hebrew}

It seems apparent from the examples given that they are combining waw consecutive and asyndetic verbal clauses as the data base for the assertion that the normal order of a verbal clause is verb-subject. The clauses numbered 1 and 3 are asyndetic and the number 2 clause is waw consecutive. This would mean that the statistical majority of waw consecutive and asyndetic clauses as a group are verb-subject.

The disjunctive clause, on the other hand, has the order waw plus noun (or its equivalent) plus verb. For examples they note Gen 1:1, 2, 4:1. They also call attention to those cases where two clauses in contrast have clause initial subjects in both clauses.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., § 8.3.

\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., § 8.3.

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., § 39.2.3.
The two basic word order groups, then, involve the conjunctive-sequential and asyndetic clauses on the one hand (the verb-subject order), and the waw disjunctive clauses, one the other (the subject-verb order).

As far as the nominal clause is concerned, Waltke-O'Connor basically follow Andersen, with the significant exception that they allow for a word order shift of either of the two basic types of clauses to signal contrast with preceding material.\footnote{Ibid., § 8.4.2 c-e.} If, for example a classification clause stands in contrast to or in disjunction with what precedes then the order is S-P: Gen 18:27, disjunction: Ex 17:11,12. In addition the S-P pattern may be used for both of two contrasting precative clauses (the precative ordinarily P-S). This exceptional sequence probably reflects the need to give point to the contrast, Gen 27:29.

The nominal clause may have three rather than two parts; the relationship of the subject and predicate may be affected through a pleonastic pronoun.\footnote{Note, as well, the discussion of S. Geller, "Cleft Sentences with the Pleonastic Pronoun: A Syntactic Construction of Biblical Hebrew and Some of Its Literary Uses", Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society, forthcoming, and our discussion in the chapter on Cleft Sentences.} For example in Gen 36:8:

'Esau, he is Edom.'
One understanding of this construction is subject-pleonastic pronoun-predicate: 'Esau, he is Edom.'\textsuperscript{150} Waltke-O'Connor take 'he is Edom' as S-P and 'Esau' as a nominative absolute (sentential topic or focus marker). They define the nominative absolute as "a grammatical element isolated outside a clause, usually at the start of the clause; also known as focus marker, casus pendens, topic."\textsuperscript{151}

They note that the order P-pleonastic pr-S is almost nonexistent (only examples of identifying P-pleonastic pr-S are Isa 9:13,14) in identifying clauses in BH, which suggests that the Focus Marker-S-P analysis is correct for that form (Identifying clauses) of the language.

The same analysis holds for the classifying clauses, where the analysis is Focus Marker-P-S (Num. 1:4, Lv 11:4).\textsuperscript{152}

As for the function of this construction, it can

a. preserve syntactic clarity: Isa. 11:10, 2 Kgs 1:4

b. be contrastive, in some of these cases indicating the uniqueness of the subject/focus: Dt. 4:35, 1 Kgs 18:39, Gen 2:14, 31:8.

c. change the center of attention: Gen 42:5,6, Gen 9:18.

Other than in the nominative absolute construction the independent pronoun may be used redundantly with finite verbs.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., § 8.4.1b.

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., 692. The nominative absolute construction "serves to highlight or focus one element of the main clause" p. 76, f.n. 13.

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., § 8.4.2b.

\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., § 16.3.2.
Since the finite verb already has the pronominal element the inclusion of an independent pronoun is unnecessary. Its presence, therefore, requires some explanation. The two reasons given for its use both relate to emphasis:

1. Contrast: Ex 20:19, 2 Sm 17:15, Gen 3:15, Gen 14:23, Jud 14:3, 1 Kgs 1:17

2. Psychological Focus:154
   a. For this category we reproduce the directly from Waltke-O'Connor: "...most of these involve first and second person pronouns. In connection with this group Takamitsu Muraoka alludes to 'strong emotional heightening' and 'focused attention or deep self-consciousness.' Most instances involve the first person, in a state of rapturous elevation (Jud 5:3) or profound meditation (Qoh 1:16, cf 2:1), or in flashes of self-assertion (Gen 16:5, Jud 11:9, Ps 2:6, 2 Chr 6:2)."
   b. Self-assertion may be combined with antithesis (1 Kgs 21:7 "Are you in charge anymore?...I will give you the vineyard of Naboth."
   d. In 2nd person cases the pronoun indicates strongly focused attention; the speaker may be giving a command or leading up to a demand (Gen 31:6, Jud 10:13, 1 Sm 22:18).155

---

154 This analysis follows Muraoka's view.
155 Ibid., § 16.3.2e.
5.4.2 The Meaning of Emphasis

Waltke-O'Connor define emphasis in a very general way as meaning distinctions produced by stress. The

"meaning of 'Did Mary bring this for me?' depends in part on whether one of the words is emphasized. If the emphasis is on Mary ('Did Mary bring this for me?'), the attention is on the fact that Mary was the one who brought the gift;...In oral/aural communication we express such distinctions by stress and tone of voice, but in written expression other means are used....the syntactic and morphological means...." 156

This citation indicates that for Waltke-O'Connor syntactic and morphological means are available to writers to bring about the same distinctions in meaning that stress produces in spoken communication. The conclusion is that there are three ways of highlighting sentence elements such that the highlighting produces distinctions in meaning.

Their treatment of the nominative absolute (casus pendens) contains a very significant approach to such highlighting in BH. One of the synonyms for nominative absolute is focus marker, by which they mean "that grammatical element isolated outside the main clause, usually at the start of the clause..." 157 The construction "serves to highlight or focus one element of the main clause." 158 As far as the discourse functions of this construction is concerned, they list a series of uses.

---

156 Ibid., § 16.3.1b.
157 Ibid., 692.
158 Ibid., § 4.7b.
including contrast, change of topic, maintenance of syntactic clarity, etc. As in the above discussion they clearly separate their discussion of the method of highlighting a sentence element and the function it has in the discourse.

In both of these contexts emphasis seems to be identified as one of several types of highlighting, whether phonological, syntactic or morphological, which in some way produce distinctions in meaning. It is not clear, therefore, when they note that logical contrast and psychological focus may only be 'loosely' termed emphasis. They may be pointing to the very different character of contrast (which is cognitive) and psychological emphasis (which is emotive).

5.4.3 Critique of Waltke-O'Connor

A stronger case can be made for the contrast between conjunctive-sequential and disjunctive clauses if Waltke-O'Connor would leave out asyndetic clauses in their discussion of verbal word order and place them alongside disjunctive clauses. One important reason for this suggestion, of course, is the statistics of the asyndetic clause. Whereas the waw consecutive clause is always verb plus subject neither of the two possible sequences (V-S nor S-V) is important for the asyndetic clause. This realignment would yield two sets of contrasts, the conjunctive-sequential versus the disjunctive clause, i.e., the two basic

---

159 Ibid., § 8.4.2b, 16.3.3c.

160 Ibid., § 16.3.2b.
types of waw clauses, and, secondly, the contrast between waw clauses and non-waw clauses. With such a realignment the asyndetic clause, whose sequence is independent of the question of subject and verb word order, would not clutter the statistics of the waw type verbal clauses. In the latter case the dichotomy is the presence or absence of the waw, not the subject-verb sequence.

The inclusion of the asyndetic clauses alongside the conjunctive-sequential clause is problematic for a second reason. The presence of the asyndetic clause indicates the same two basic types of discourse function as the disjunctive clause, as a paragraph level marker (scene shifting), and as a marker of subordination within the same scene (discourse continuity). As such it should be included alongside its functional partner, the disjunctive clause, rather than with the waw consecutive. Once it is recognized that the subject-verb placement in the asyndetic clause is not significant there is nothing to prevent this suggested realignment.

The approach Waltke-O'Connor take to the definition of emphasis is clearly fruitful, particularly in their suggestion that emphasis is a feature of prosody (phonological, morphological and syntactic highlighting) that results in distinctions of meaning. This approach, however, has not been completely carried through. To take further advantage of this insight it would be useful to demonstrate what emphasis is, how it relates to grammatical highlighting and to the various functions involved.

161 See the chapter on Word Order for a brief description of this paragraph structuring feature of the asyndetic clause.
The exposition of psychological focus is similar to the view of Muraoka. To prevent this category from being altogether subjective it would be necessary to show what basis there is for ascertaining its presence in the text. When pleonastic pronouns are used, what basis is there for deciding on psychological focus as the function in view? Unless the problem is dealt with in terms of the context, and in such a way as to demonstrate that the focus is literary (textually explicit) as opposed to merely logical, such a category has the same problems with it as the term emphasis has had in the past. It will remain inherently vague. If no such justification is forthcoming we will have to continue to cope with subjective and ambiguous assertions about (psychological) emphasis in BH. One thing is clear. A clear demonstration in this area, one way or another, is still a requirement.

As attractive as the Waltke-O'Connor suggestion is that the standard order in a clause of classification may be reversed for contrastive emphasis, their two examples, Gen 18:27 and Ex 17:11-12, in my opinion, could just as easily be labeled circumstantial clauses.\textsuperscript{162} Even if these examples are allowed, we still need a large enough number of clear examples to indicate that there are genuine exceptions; otherwise, Andersen's view still stands. The question here is, what is the boundary (whether fuzzy or neat) between circumstantial clauses and contrastive clauses? The same question holds for their suggestion that the verbal clause in Gen 24:56 should be labeled as causal rather

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., § 8.4.2c-d.
than circumstantial. It will be necessary to indicate the difference between these two. Of course, when it comes to circumstantial clauses we may be speaking only of the various semantic nuances of this class of disjunctive clauses.

5.5 Conclusion

This review indicates several important conclusions. The first one is that the older view of emphasis is no longer of significance for these scholars. Emphasis is now related in some way to unusual word order. In all the scholars discussed here there is an attempt to determine the normal sequence of the verbal clause and all but Andersen are willing to relate word order shifts to emphasis for the nominal clause. Andersen, of course, basically says there are two sequences in the nominal clause, each of which identifies a basic function.

Secondly, emphasis is now defined in terms of unusual word order. Whereas the older view thought emphasis was always present in each clause, because they identified it with the initial position and therefore with what was important in the clause, the newer studies consider elements of a clause to be emphatic only when an unusual sequence marks emphasis as present.

Not only is emphasis a function of unusual word order, it is also identified by its relationship to the context. Although there are

---

163 Ibid., § 39.2.3b. Jouon treats the verse as circumstantial, Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique: § 159e, and cf. E. Kautzsch: Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: § 142d.
differences between the scholars reviewed all agree that it is necessary to query the context in some fashion in order to demonstrate either the presence or function of emphasis. The context is now vital to the identification of emphasis. This is clearly necessary, contrary to the older position, which saw no such need and could not have, since every clause by definition had emphasis present. For this reason it is simple to understand why the newer approach sees the necessity of looking at the context for the demonstration of emphasis. The approach Waltke-O'Connor take from Lambdin, and apply to the word order problem is especially fruitful. They see word order sequences as related to discourse function because unusual sequences are in opposition to other types of clauses. For example, it is the opposition of the disjunctive clause to the waw consecutive clause that produces the change in function and demonstrates, for these two types at least, that the context of an unusual sequence is an opposing type of clause. The occurrence of such opposing clauses produces a change in discourse function.

In addition, most of the scholars see that unusual word order has a variety of discrete discourse functions. As we noted above, Waltke-O'Connor call them 'meaning distinctions,' and give a nuanced list of functions which influence discourse on two levels, on the paragraph or below the paragraph level. Muraoka, as we have seen, admits that not all inverted clauses produce emphasis. He says there are other reasons for unusual word order, and lists some of them, including the chiasm and the circumstantial clause.

The survey shows a fundamental change from the older view but there are still problems. For one thing, it is still not clear what
emphasis means. Muraoka continually calls emphasis psychological, yet he associates it continually with contrast, and even subsumes contrast under emphasis. The other scholars have similar problems with the term.

The study of these scholars has also indicated the need for a clear analysis of word order, particularly because of the confusion caused by the inclusion of the asyndetic clause in various approaches to the sequence of the verbal clause.

With the advances made in modern linguistics, and benefiting from the progress made by modern studies of emphasis in BH we will suggest a new approach to the topic of emphasis in the next chapter, and put forward a working definition for the purposes of examining the corpus.

I should like to suggest that the term emphasis indicates marked focus, whether phonological (stress or intonation), syntactic (word order shifts or pleonasms), or lexical (word repetition), and its purpose is to stress one clause element in a particular context in order to produce distinctions in meaning.

Marked focus, or emphasis does not apply to normal stress or focus in a clause or sentence. The failure to distinguish between normal stress and marked stress, or what the modern linguist calls focus and marked focus, led the proponents of the standard view astray. And it was the movement away from this view to the notion that emphasis was the highlighting caused by unusual stress or unusual word order that has led to such progress in a definition of emphasis. The older view that the initial position in the clause was emphatic led to
Chapter 6

Working Definition of Emphasis in BH

6.0 Working Definition of Emphasis

I should like to suggest that the term emphasis indicates marked focus, whether phonological (stress or intonation), syntactic (word order shifts or pleonasm), or lexical (word repetition), and its purpose is to stress one clause element in a particular context in order to produce distinctions in meaning.

Marked focus, or emphasis does not apply to normal stress or focus in a clause or sentence. The failure to distinguish between normal stress and marked stress, or what the modern linguist calls focus and marked focus, led the proponents of the standard view astray. And it was the movement away from this view to the notion that emphasis was the highlighting caused by unusual stress or unusual word order that has led to such progress in a definition of emphasis. The older view that the initial position in the clause was emphatic led to
the absurd notion that every clause is emphatic, or, that every clause has an emphatic element. We should not, then, evoke the word 'emphasis' for normal word order with normal stress. The words 'prominence', 'highlighting' and the like are useful synonyms for marked focus but not for normal stress.

6.1 Explanation of Definition

This highlighting is produced grammatically by a contrast or opposition between various clause types, such as the waw consecutive in opposition to the waw disjunctive, or the waw consecutive in opposition to the asyndetic clause, etc. It is also produced by syntactic redundancy, i.e., by repetition, as in the case of the pleonastic pronoun. It is produced phonologically by stress. It is this last feature to which we do not have access in BH. We have recourse only to highlighting which is observable in the text before us.

If the purpose of marked focus is to produce distinctions in meaning, the result is those various discourse functions which such highlighting produces. Waltke notes, for example, that the disjunctive clause has discourse structuring features, i.e., it can begin and end paragraphs, or it can occur parenthetically. It can also operate within the paragraph to produce contrast, chiasm, the circumstantial clause, or what Williams calls synchronism, or simultaneous action.

---


All of these discourse functions are semantic variations of the same word order shift.

Detecting these discourse functions depends on finding the emphasis, and secondly, determining its contextual function. It is this latter requirement that needs discussion. The requirement that the function be ascertainable in the text means that the contextual function must be literary and not merely logical, i.e., that the referent of highlighting be in the text and not merely a logical implication of the text. We will mention several of the functions to indicate how the context functions in our identification of those features.

Detecting the chiasm requires only that we know what it is, normally a waw consecutive clause followed immediately by a disjunctive clause in which at least two of the sentence elements (S, V, O, Pp, etc) are reversed, producing the cross-over pattern. In addition there are semantic features which we have described in our chapter on Chiasm.

For contrast the normal requirement is discovery of the contrasting member in the immediately preceding context. The contrasting member must be an actual piece of text. It may not be only a logical inference from the marked clause.

If the marked focus points to a change in topic we must be able to demonstrate that the topic is new to the preceding section, or is a resumption of an earlier topic.

These are some of the requirements for textual demonstration of the discourse functions produced by marked focus. To show a new

---

166 See discussion in ch. 3, § 3.1.3.3.
discourse function it will be necessary to show how it is required by the context, i.e., based on the text itself.

6.2 Benefits of This Approach to Emphasis

This method of approaching emphasis has at least three major benefits in the study of BH.

6.2.1 It is Rhetorical Highlighting

This definition of emphasis is in the best traditions of rhetoric because it demonstrates the tools the writer/speaker had at his disposal to guide the reader/hearer to the meaning of the text and therefore to attain success in his purpose of persuading his audience. By separating the definition of emphasis from its set of discourse functions, or 'distinctions in meaning' we can separate such rhetorical highlighting from the uses an author had at his disposal. Its functions constitute a partial inventory of the important tools a writer or speaker possesses to so construct his text that he guides the audience in its interpretation of that text, and ensure that they are understanding the text. Only on such a basis can the author have some reason to think that his communication will be successful, whether that purpose is persuasion, sharing of information, entertainment, etc.

6.2.2 It Eliminates Past Confusion
Secondly, this approach eliminates any tendency to attribute all sorts of vague or mysterious notions to the term, all the source of much confusion in the past. It also avoids the pitfall of psychological definitions of emphasis. Rather than attempting to define emphasis in terms of one of its functions and then force the rest of them under its umbrella, or even to say that such highlighting points to emphasis and a host of other functions, this definition limits the term to the actual formal function that it performs, that of highlighting a clause element in order to create meaning distinctions. It is difficult, if not impossible to point to any common denominator for such a diverse list outside the two facts that each is a discourse function, and that each is produced by rhetorical highlighting (= emphasis).

6.2.3 Emphasis is Context Oriented

Thirdly, it shows us that emphasis points outside itself to a referent in its context. It is just this characteristic of emphasis that unifies its relationship to each of its discourse functions. The relationship created by this reference to the context produces the list of discourse functions, or, meanings, of emphasis. One merit of past studies is that they have shown there are quite a few different functions for emphasis, including contrast, chiasm, the circumstantial clause, shift in topic (whether on a paragraph level, or parenthetic), etc.167

167 I am not here granting that psychological focus is one of those functions, only that it has been suggested. Nor am I denying it here. I am only insisting that this function needs to be carefully demonstrated
This appeal to context also allows for any given case of rhetorical highlighting to have more than one function at once. The circumstantial clause, for example, is one function of rhetorical highlighting, and it can also function to indicate a shift in topic. Andersen has noted that the chiasm may also indicate antithesis.

6.2.4 It Excludes Non-Textual Highlighting or Reference

This approach eliminates non-textual elements from its definition of emphasis. There are two elements of a text in its original performance which may not be in the present written version of the text as we have it. Those elements are phonological stress and extra-textual reference.

In the first case a speaker may have given a certain word special stress in a sentence, highlighting the word in a way that the emphasis would have functioned in that context to create a particular discourse function, such as contrast. Note the following three examples:

Context: A friend walks into a room where you are reading a book. He sees the book and asks,

Example 1: Who's that novel by?
Example 2: Who's that novel by?
Example 3: Who's that novel by?

In the first example the marked stress creates a contrast with some other item, say, a report lying next to the person reading. In the second example the stress marks the adjective, so that the contrast from the text. To date it has not been.
would be with the novel in your hand and, perhaps, another novel lying on the reading table. In a written representation of this conversation the contrasts could be shown only if the words were underlined, typed in bold, or if word order adjustments were made. If they were not it would be impossible to know which of the two (or more) interpretations is correct. In fact the question, as in example 3, might be just a request for the author's name, with no contrast intended. This set of examples shows that a text which originally had stress in a spoken performance could be ambiguous in a written representation. In the written texts of BH we do not have access to the stress and therefore can not claim that we know that there is a marked focus due to phonological accenting. This may very well be the source of puzzles about certain cruxes, such as the comment by the serpent in Gen. 3:1:

Has God said...?

This example, whose translation is traditional, has called forth a wide spectrum of comment, from Speiser's remark that an interrogative sense would be "without parallel" to Westermann's comment that it is not necessary to add the interrogative particle. In the middle of this is Skinner, who says that the text "requires but a slight interrogative inflexion of the voice to yield the shade of meaning." The remark

---

by Skinner shows that we can only guess that the written version of the text had a voice inflexion which pointed to a question. The context may favor such an interpretation, but there is no marked focus in the text. The very proof we need is not present in the text.

If this approach to the definition of emphasis excludes non-textual highlighting it also, for the same reason, excludes non-textual reference. A speaker may use marked focus which has its referent in the non-textual environment. People who are close friends or mates often have ongoing conversations which extend over long periods of time. For that reason one of the parties can make a statement with marked focus whose referent is obvious to the other friend, but not at all to any bystander.

Or, a writer may be unsuccessful in his attempt to convey his point, hence the reference may be unclear. Whatever the reason is, the context does not reveal the reference to which the highlighting points. We do not know, therefore, what the discourse function of the highlighting is.

6.2.5 This Approach is Open-Ended

This definition of emphasis is closed in the sense that it limits emphasis to rhetorical highlighting, but open in the sense that it leaves open the kinds of discourse functions such highlighting may have. Past studies usually identified emphasis with one or two discourse functions

Augsburg Publishing House, 1984): 185, "It is not necessary to add the interrogative particle to "N."

and then said other cases of marked focus were something else. This approach allows for the discovery of any new functions of such focus.

One problem area which needs further study, as I see it, is what Muraoka calls emphasis, or what Waltke, O'Connor call psychological focus. Where such examples can not appeal to clear contextual criteria we may be involved in the same type of uncertainty as those cases in BH where we may reasonably suspect but cannot demonstrate phonological stress, such as those examples given above.

6.3 Conclusion

After this review of the problem of emphasis, including the older standard view of emphasis, the contributions of modern linguistic studies, of modern discussions of BH, and a new definition of emphasis, we can now turn to investigate the individual discourse functions of either word order shifts or the pleonastic pronoun in the corpus, Dt. 4-11.
7.0 Introduction

The term fronting refers to the displacement of a major sentence element to the front of the clause, changing its position from the normal (most frequent) to an initial position. Whenever such a displacement occurs the question then arises whether this shift indicates some discourse function.

The only clause types which can have fronting are the asyndetic and disjunctive clauses. Within these clauses not all the elements are candidates for fronting. In general, what determines marking is the difference between the sequence of the waw consecutive and the other clause. Within each of the two types, namely, the asyndetic clause and

---

169 D. Crystal, Dictionary of Linguistics: 129. Quirk, Comprehensive English Grammar: 1377, defines fronting "as the term we apply to the achievement of marked theme by moving into initial position an item which is otherwise unusual there."
the disjunctive clause, the sequences are of importance. For instance, in the asyndetic clause the percent of the relative sequence verb-object versus object-verb is 83/17. This indicates that the writers do not choose the marked object-verb (marked in relation to the waw consecutive) sequence very often. To put this differently, they highlight objects in the asyndetic clause only seventeen percent of the time. The reverse is the case for the disjunctive clause, which highlights the object seventy percent of the time.

7.0.1 The Asyndetic Clause and Fronting

We have already seen from the statistics of the asyndetic clause that the relative sequence of the verb and subject is of no significance. The statistics indicate that there is no question of subject and verb order in this clause which is in opposition to the waw consecutive order. For this reason, we can not speak of the 'fronting' of a subject in an asyndetic clause in BH. To do so assumes that the sequence subject-verb is marked. As far as the verb and subject are concerned the opposition between the asyndetic clause and the waw consecutive is in terms of the absence of a waw. We can not therefore expect emphatic sequences in the asyndetic clause due to subject fronting in BH.\textsuperscript{170}

This means that verb and subject order within the asyndetic clause is independent of the waw consecutive.

\textsuperscript{170} The apparent exception to this, of course, is pleonastic pronoun as subject in a finite verbal clause which is asyndetic. The presence of the pleonastic pronoun alone constitutes marking. It is not subject-verb sequence that marks the subject.
7.0.2 Disjunctive Clauses and Fronting

For disjunctive clauses it is the departure from the waw + verb sequence that determines functional opposition. Beside the subject-verb sequence only margins and objects qualify as possible elements for fronting in either the asyndetic or the disjunctive clause. The fact that 70% of the disjunctive clauses have the order O-V, as opposed to 30% for V-O, shows not that the V-O order is unusual and marked, but that the disjunctive clause has a high percentage of O-V sequences either in contrast to the waw consecutive, with its constant V-O order, or in conjunction with the asyndetic clause which is O-V about 20% of the time.

7.1 The Corpus

We will examine valid cases of fronting in the corpus for their discourse function. In each case we will attempt to describe the textual environment and possible function of fronting in the corpus.

7.1.1 Fronting for Contrast

There is no intension to understate the facts. When we speak of the waw consecutive we are not speaking simply of waw followed by a certain sequence of elements. There are also necessary morphological or accent changes.
There are 8 of 18 examples of fronting which secure contrast. In order of their occurrence are:

Dt. 4:20

...the whole host of heaven...
which the Lord your God apportioned to all the nations under heaven.
But you the Lord took...

V. 20 begins with the fronting of בְּיָדָיו in order to call attention to the contrast between Yahweh's treatment of the nations and Israel. To the nations he allotted the host of heaven, but Israel he rescued and made a special people for himself.

Andersen calls this inversion a case of antithesis by implicit negation. By 'implicit' he means that the contrast arises out of the preceding general context and not out of the preceding clause, i.e., the referent of the highlighted item in 20a is an abstraction from the text in 15-19. He does not intend to say that the contrast itself is only implicit.172 We agree, then, with Andersen's definition of 'implicit' as long as it refers to textual material and not to logical inferences made from the text.

172. F. I. Andersen: Sentence: 180. He explains 'implicit' by noting that "whereas a well-formed antithetical sentence is a two-clause construction, an antithetical relationship may be realized between a single clause and its general context, as when an antithetical clause is placed alongside an entire paragraph to bring out some kind of contrast."
The antithesis, then, is not between v. 20a and the preceding clause, but between v. 20a and the preceding context. In this case it is necessary to weigh more than just one clause. It will be essential to analyze the sense of the preceding context.

In vv. 15-19 Israel is warned to guard their hearts. They had seen no form on the day of assembly when God spoke to them. One reason for this was to keep them from becoming corrupt by making an idol for themselves, v. 16. They were to be careful not to worship the heavenly bodies which the Lord had allotted to all the nations.

The ongoing subject in these verses is Israel (you guard yourselves, for you did not see...the Lord your God...lest you corrupt and you make for yourselves...lest you look...and you...you...). The topic, however, of these clauses is the danger that faces Israel, i.e., worshipping false gods. The object of the last verb in the series of waw consecutive clauses in vv. 15-19 is them, i.e., all the heavenly bodies.

The relative clause at the end of v. 19 then explains the divine purpose of the heavenly bodies. Yahweh allotted them to all the nations.

This analysis shows that the ongoing subject (Israel) is in danger of making idols or of worshiping the heavenly bodies as gods (the ongoing topic). The relative clause clarifies the purpose of the heavenly bodies. Yahweh allotted them to the nations. This implies that the heavenly bodies, ostensibly as objects of worship, belong to the nations, not to Israel. It is necessary to analyze the whole paragraph, not just the relative clause, to see this point. Once this is said, it is
clear that fronted introduction of the pronoun ...introduces a clear contrast between Israel and the nations. The contrast is:

The Lord gave the nations false gods; But you he saved. 173

Dt. 5:3

It was not with our fathers the Lord cut this covenant, But with us, those here today, all of us alive.

The fronting of the prepositional phrase is part of an explicit contrast. The contrast is supported lexically by the combination of the negative and the , and syntactically by the fronted prepositional phrase in the next clause. The presence of the marked word order within a normally structured antithesis indicates the possible combinations the speaker could use to pose contrast.

In addition, the double apposition in v. 3 adds to the overall antithesis. The repetition invokes two powerful facts to make the contrast explicit and unusually forceful:

...but with us, those here today, all of us alive.

The independent pronoun מְנַהֲג acts as a tag pronoun, reinforcing the adversative construction. The two clauses in apposition, 'those of us here today' and 'all of us alive' emphasize the living generation of Israelites in contrast to the patriarchs, who were not participating in the Sinaitic covenant. The phrase 'those of us here today' contrasts with 'not with our fathers' by virtue of those here and those not here, whereas the phrase 'all of alive' contrasts by differentiating between the fathers, who are dead and the present Israelites who are alive.

Dt. 6:13

It is the Lord your God alone you shall fear, it is He whom you shall serve, and it is in His name you shall take your oaths.

Beginning with the asyndetic clause 'the Lord you shall fear' there are three coordinated injunctions. Each of the three clauses has a fronted element. Two background elements point to contrast. First of

174 B. L. Bandstra, The Syntax of the Particle 'KY' in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic: 86f, defines tagging as follows: "Noun phrases or suffixes can be echoed by an independent pronoun. This 'tag along' pronoun marks as topic the element it follows."
all the imperative in v. 13, 'do not forget the Lord' sets the tone for this contrast and secondly, v. 14 'do not follow after other gods' makes it explicit. The Israelites are not to forget the Lord. It is the Lord they are to worship, not other gods; it is the Lord they shall serve, not the gods of the surrounding nations; and, it is in Yahweh's name they shall swear, not by the names of the nations' gods. Beginning with 'do not forget' in v. 12 there is a negative, then three positive injunctions, then, in v. 14 another negative.

Dt. 7:6b

...and you are to burn their idols with fire, for you are a people holy to the Lord your God. You alone the Lord chose to be a people prized more highly than all the nations on the earth.

Here the contrast is supplied by the immediate context and the clause itself. To say the Lord chose them OUT OF all the nations on the face of the earth indicates the contrast is with 'all the nations on the face of the earth.' The piling up of attributives ('all the' and 'on the face of the earth') brings even more prominence to the contrast. In this case the background element which supplies the contrasting member is within the same clause. Although there is no need to look in a nearby clause or context for any contrast, the preceding verse does supply its rationale. Israel is to burn the idols of the people because they are special; they are holy to Yahweh. 7:6b then supplies the
explicit contrast. We could say the contrast is between the whole (all the nations) and a small part (Israel).

Dt. 8:3b

"לֹא מִעֲלַיֶּהֶם לְחֵי, יְחַיְיֵּהוּ " כִּי לֹא עָלְיוֹ הָעָלָהֲהוּ וּיהִי עָלָהֲהוּ "

...so He could make you know that: it is not by bread alone that man lives But by every utterance of God...

These clauses indicate the goal of God's testing and provision. Yahweh wanted to show Israel two things in their wilderness testing. He removed the usual supplies of nature which man depends on. This removal of provision worked in two ways. First, in vs 2, it "undermined the shallow bases of confidence of those who were not truly rooted and grounded in God." Secondly, in v. 3, it forced them to flee to Yahweh alone as the one who could supply them with their needs for survival.

The contrast is set up first by the two fronted prepositional phrases and then by the "not by bread alone 'and every utterance of God' are in semantic contrast. The three signals of this contrast are positional, lexical ("עָלָהֲהוּ), and then semantic.

We may conclude that contrast, or antithesis, can be secured in one of several ways, or in combination, here both by the word order and by lexical means (the use of conjunctions and the negative adverb).

Dt. 9:5

לי נפשך ת므로 לפקד נפשך נפשך נפשך נפשך
נפשך נפשך נפשך נפשך נפשך נפשך נפשך

It is not because of your righteousness or because of your natural equity that you are going to inherit the land. Rather, it is because of the wickedness of these nations that the Lord your God is expelling them before you.

In this verse the nouns 'righteousness' and 'wickedness' are fronted in two successive clauses. Deviation from the normal word order signals the prominence of the words. The meaning of the two words in prominent position indicates the reason for the fronting. Semantics shows that we have a contrast. This alone indicates the contrast. In addition, the use of the words "כ...מ" preceding each clause creates a stronger contrast. The point is "It is not because of your righteousness that the Lord is bringing you to inherit the land; rather, it is because of the wickedness of the nations that he is driving them out before you." This example is striking because it indicates that

176. V. 4 has a difficult textual problem, unless Lohfink's suggestion of rereading the consonants is correct, N. Lohfink, Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11 (Rome: Pontifical Bible Institute, 1963): 63. If so, we should have a set of complementary nouns fronted in conjunctive clauses, in contrast to v. 5, which contrasts these same fronted nouns. An attractive suggestion rhetorically, but it is probably incorrect.
the semantic contrast set up by righteousness and wickedness is brought to the fore by the fronting of the prepositional phrases.

Dt. 10:15

Behold, the heavens, and the highest heavens, the earth and everything in them belong to the Lord. Yet it was on the fathers the Lord set his affection by loving them.

There are two elements in the context of 10:14,15 that indicate that the fronted prepositional phrase in 10:15 signals contrast. First of all, v. 14 shows that Yahweh is the Lord of all creation. There is nothing that is not His. In 15b the creation is narrowed to the fathers, and then to their descendants, out of all the nations. From the totality of all things to all the nations, to the fathers, and finally, to their descendants, the people of Israel, Yahweh has directed his love, has made his choice. This makes the contrast explicit. The contrast is between the Lord's ownership of the totality of the creation and his special love for the fathers. This is another example of totality versus a small part.

Furthermore, it is this contrast which is the point of the section. Vv. 14,15 act as a motivator for the commands given indirectly in 12,13. It is because of this contrast that Israel should exercise gratitude to Yahweh. By his grace they are a special people and have experienced
his special care. Therefore they should love him with all their heart and soul. Here again the word order phenomenon is strategic.

Dt. 4:12

You heard words; Yet, you saw no form.

In this verse the pair 'voice of words' and 'form' are fronted in two successive participial clauses. The negative existential denies the proposition 'you saw a form'. This raises the question whether 'not seeing a form' is in contrast with 'you heard words.' The exceptive phrase 'only a voice' at the end may indicate a contrastive understanding of the two revelatory experiences: 'You heard words, but you saw no form - you only heard a voice.' The reason for the exception is clearly important to the theology of Deuteronomy. The people's experience of Yahweh at Horeb gave them no warrant to construct an image.

This is the only example of contrast for what we call below 'conjunctive pairing.' The use of such stark contrast seems unusual, but is no real surprise. If more such examples can be found in further examination of longer stretches of text we could conclude that this pairing can be used for contrast. The reason is not far to find, at least by analogy with English. The way we often contrast things is by first showing their similarities. The difference from the examples
discussed in the next section is that there is real two contrast between two clauses in this example.

7.1.2 Non-Contrastive Examples

There are a number of examples of fronting where no contrastive emphasis exists. The large size of the sample, over 50% (10 of the 18 examples) of the whole, requires some examination of the environment to see if other patterns exist, i.e., if fronting indicates other clause functions in addition to contrastive emphasis.

7.1.2.1 Conjunctive Pairing

One example where no contrast exists is Dt. 9:9, a verse repeated at 9:18, which refers to Moses fasting on the mount:

תלメン לא אט אט לא ואל לא שמעתי
I stayed on the mount forty days and nights. Bread I did not eat and water I did not drink.

The direct objects of these two clauses are fronted. There is obviously no contrast, but is there a reason to assign focal prominence to these two objects? The objects are complementary, not contrastive.
This may indicate that preverbal fronting can be used to mention normally collocated items (also see 2:6,28 and esp. 29:5).\textsuperscript{177}

This analysis does not deny that the asyndetic sentence as a whole may be functioning as an adverb to the preceding waw consecutive clause. This would suggest a rendering such as the following:

\begin{quote}
I stayed on the mount forty days and nights,
Neither eating bread nor drinking water.
\end{quote}

The problem with this suggestion is the fact that adverbial clauses have not been studied carefully. The amount of research, past and present, on the syntactic function of the adverbial clause is very scanty.

Waltke-O'Connor have noted that the relationship of such clauses to their context, lacking syntactic markers (such as a subordinating conjunction), depend on the semantic relationship of the clauses to each other.\textsuperscript{178} To investigate the relationship of clauses semantically would demand a great deal of care and caution. This is particularly so

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{177} Collocation refers to the tendency for pairs of words to occur together, in this case a conjunction of words which are the same part of speech. D. Crystal, A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics: 55, says the term is used "to refer to the habitual co-occurrence of individual lexical items...linguistically predictable to a greater or lesser extent." Cf. H. Matthews: Syntax, 5,6,10. One set of examples relates to types of words used for description. For example "The milk looks sour" and "The meat looks bad". The two sentences would not switch the predicate nominatives, and not because of syntax or even semantics. One simply does not normally use those predicates in such a way. We expect them to co-occur as given in the above citations. Likewise, some pairs of words tend to occur together, such as 'food and drink', 'heaven and earth', 'light and darkness'.

\textsuperscript{178} B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: § 38.1h.
\end{footnotesize}
because there are often several possible explanations which would seem semantically satisfying.

Even when a suitable answer to this problem is given, it is still the case that asyndetic sentences often exhibit the feature of a conjunctive pairing of clauses, and that the two clauses have a relationship to each other that might be summed up in the terms collocation, complementarity, or the like.

Dt. 4:36 is an important example of this collocation:

```
From heaven he proclaimed to you his voice..., and on the earth he showed you his great fire.
```

The pairing of heaven and earth here amounts to a merism. 4:32-40 accentuate the uniqueness of Yahweh by showing that there is no one like him. One basis for this conclusion in 4:35,39 is the unique experience of Israel. No nation had ever experienced such things: from Adam's creation until now, no people had ever heard the voice of God speaking from the fire, from one end of heaven to the other. The Lord is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath, v. 39. The fronting of the meristic set in 4:36 contributes to the overall highlighting of this theme.179

179. S. Ullmann: Semantics: 153, suggests several uses in English and French for collocated terms, including a) providing an outlet for strong emotions, b) making one's meaning clearer and more emphatic, or
Your daughter you shall not give to his son,
Nor his daughter shall you take for your son.

The fronting pairs 'his daughter' and 'your daughter' and the end position pairs 'his son' and 'your daughter.' Not only does the fronting create marked focus by moving the direct object into a preverbal position but the front/end pairing creates a nice balance. To put it differently, while the fronted pair creates a merism, the end pair rounds off the pair and closes the marital circle. All in all the double pairs creates an impressive device. This is not all, however. Seitz has observed a chiasm of suffixes: ..ן..י..י..ן..ן.

These pronominal suffixes are part of the double pairing, and the pronominal chiasm 'your..his..his..your' is a third element in the structural parallelism of the two clauses.

7.1.2.2 Discussion of Conjunctive Pairing

This example is important for our attempt to understand the reason for such fronting where there is neither contrast nor a change even c) a contrastive effect.

of topic. Fronting may occur to signal a pairing of items that normally occur in a set. Certain types of interrelationships seem tailor made for such pairing. For example, the links between giving and taking in marriage are often expressed by using this complementary pairing. Note for example Gen. 34:9:

Your daughters give to us and our daughters take for yourselves.

Also compare Gen. 34:21:

Their daughters we will take as wives, and our daughters he will take for them.

The four non-contrastive examples exhibit some similarities which suggest a common pattern for this structure. All four frontings pair elements together, whether identical, as in the case of Dt. 7:3 (daughters with daughters, etc), or similar as in the case of Dt. 4:36, 9:9, 18 (bread and water, heaven and earth).

There are some interdisciplinary studies which have suggestive value, and some studies in BH which refer to such structures. In English, for example, fronting often secures a structural parallelism between clauses when the items fronted in the two clauses are semantically and grammatically similar. The unusual order of the first clause may make us expect a second clause with such an order:
My paintings the visitors admired.
My sculptures they disliked. 181

Quirk points out that the impression of a link between the two initial noun phrases is reinforced by both the internal structure of the two phrases and the lexical set to which both painting and sculpture belong. In this particular case the fronting indicates contrast, but this is not necessarily so, as for example:

In London I was born, and in London I shall die.

For BH Andersen discusses just such an environment for pairings of clauses he labels conjunctive clauses. 182 According to Andersen the fundamental identifying characteristic of the conjunctive clause is the fact that each constituent clause has, or could have, the same grammatical function as the conjunctive sentence as a whole. Most frequently the second clause has the same kind of predication, and if that predication is a finite verb, it has the same tense-aspect and mood. Also the clauses often have the same subject. Andersen concludes that the result is often a kind of grammatical rhyme.

Although quite a few conjunctive sentences fall short of this ideal, what unites them, Andersen says, is not so much similarity of internal content or structure, but similarity of external function. By and large these sentences indicate a kind of structural parallelism in that the

subjects and verbs, and the margins as well are often either the same, or, they are in some way correlative. For example, in Dt. 2:28 (cf. 2:6):

Sell me food for cash so I may eat and give me water for money so I may drink.

The items 'food' and 'water' and 'eat' and 'drink' belong together as the items and the activity of eating. The margin 'for money' is identical in both clauses. The verbs are similar in that both can be used for purchasing. The word collocational is a predicate which can describe the semantic environment of the above example. Food and word, eating and drinking, and giving and buying all tend to occur together as pairs.

An example whose internal structure has less unity is found in Ex. 15:25,

There he gave him a statute and an ordinance, and there he tested him.

Grammatically each clause is adverb-verb-object, but there is no real semantic unity between the two clauses: the verbs are not similar and the objects are different. What unifies the two clauses is the repetition of the fronted adverb. This conjunctive sentence has a location as its
unifying factor. This results in a general statement, "There is where this and that happened." The reference, of course, is to Marah. Both of the above examples exhibit fronting, the first one direct objects and the second adverbs. In neither of the cited cases is there contrast; in both cases the fronting is repeated in two successive clauses which are part of a conjunctive sentence. In the first sentence the fronted elements are correlative or collocational while in the second they are identical. Only in the first sentence can we speak of collocation, or pairing of items that often occur together. What the sentences have in common is the formally identical fronted items, direct objects in the first case and adverbs in the second. It is these items which 'co-relate' the two clauses.

Williams uses the overall term 'synchronism' for these examples, by which he means simultaneous action. While many of the non-contrastive examples fit William's suggested term, Andersen is probably closer to the facts when he states that the conjunctive sentence, while not specially marked for simultaneity or similarity, it is compatible with these relationships and generally implies them. It does not, however, highlight similarity or simultaneity.

The facts suggest that Andersen's term conjunctive sentence is the best overall label we can use for the various examples discussed.

---


185 F.I. Andersen, The Hebrew Sentence: 97.
Any other labels may be useful for specifying subcategories. For our four examples, the term collocation is useful for Dt. 9:9,18, and merism for Dt. 4:36. Neither of these labels fits Dt. 7:3. Perhaps the term complementary is more specific for this verse. Different labels within the broad category may only show the range of possibilities for such conjunctive sentences.

Although Andersen does not mention it, almost all of the conjunctive sentences he lists are asyndetic clauses followed by disjunctive clauses, i.e., the conjunctive sentence is most often made up of an asyndetic clause balanced with a following syndetic disjunctive clause. In addition, almost all of the examples are fronted objects or adverbs. A few exceptions are zero + S + V followed by waw + S + V. These exceptions, however, have pleonastic pronouns as subjects. The marking then, is not fronting, since a preceding subject is not unusual; it is lexical.

7.1.2.3 Fronting to Highlight Change of Topic

We have already noted this discourse function in the chapter on Emphasis, particularly in the view of Waltke- O'Connor. The examples given below clearly fit this category.

Dt. 5:4

186 B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 39.2.3c.
Face to face the Lord spoke to you on the mount from the midst of the fire.

The fronted asyndetic adverbial accusative phrase does not present an explicit contrast with any element in the context; it marks a change in topic. After setting the general situation of revelation at Sinai, the asyndetic clause in v. 3 shifts the topic from covenant making in general to the persons with whom the covenant is made. V. 4 then again shifts the topic to the modality of revelation. V. 5, which is subordinate to v. 4, further qualifies (but does not shift the topic) this face-to-face revelation, by noting that Moses (paradoxically) stood in between Israel and the Lord to declare the word of the Lord to them.

This shift is singularly appropriate to the introduction of the Ten Words, which Yahweh spoke 'directly' to the sons of Israel. It is the clause in 5:4 to which לְאִשֵׁרָה belongs, and not to the following circumstantial clause. This also indicates that 5:4 introduces the Ten Commandments.

Dt. 7:5:

Rather, this is what you shall do to them:
Their altars you must tear down
& their pillars you break up
& their Asherah you must cut down.
& their idols you must burn with fire.
This list of 4 items fronted in Dt. 7:5 begins asyndetically and establishes a content for the injunctive clause התמקם נופל. We can say that the list is further evidence of collocation, the grouping of similar items. Collocation, however, is probably not the reason for the fronting of these four items. In addition to the collocation there is the introduction of a new topic. Such 'listing' occurs often in the legal material (cf. Lev. 18). The preceding verses in 7:2-4 represent the opposite of the contrast 'don't do this, rather, do that.' This verse introduces the positive side of Israel's response to gaining their inheritance from the Lord. We can say, therefore, that there are two coinciding reasons for the fronted list of items in this verse, collocation and the introduction of a new topic. Finally, this fronting of items to introduce a new topic may influence the highlighting in 7:25.

Dt. 7:25

כְּסִיֵּלָא וְלֹא-רָדְמָה וְשֵׁקָם כְּבָשׁ לְאַרְשָׁר הָבְרְמֹת וְלֹא-רָדְמָה

The idols of their gods you shall burn with fire;
Do not covet the silver or gold on them.

The rhetorical problem here is the fronting of כְּסִיֵּלָא in the first clause. There is nothing in the context to contrast with 'idols of your gods.' The fronting of the cultic item is reminiscent of 7:5, but it is more important to recognize that there is a change in topic. The
preceding verses, 7:17-24, constitute a unit whose topic is the injunction to Israel not to fear their enemy. The motivating factor is God's action on their behalf.

7:25 begins a small instructional section with a new topic, the injunction to destroy the images of the nations' gods. The motivation in this case is the negative covenant sanction, the בְּרֵסִית. The conclusion is that the fronting focuses on the images of the gods because that is the topic of the ensuing section.

Dt. 8:1

כָּלָּמָּשְׁפִּים אֶת עַנְּכֶּם אִשֵּׁים הָיוֹתִים תַּשְׁפָּרָה

Every command I command you today
Be careful to keep.

In the above examples fronted asyndetic clauses either introduce either new sections or a shift in topic. In this case כָּלָּמָּשְׁפִּים is fronted to introduce a new section with a new topic. There is no contrast involved.

An analysis of the context indicates the clear beginning of a new section. 8:1 is an injunction to keep all the commands of God. 8:2-5 represents a motivation from the past to be obedient to all the commands of the Lord. 8:6 picks up the topic again with a renewed injunction to keeps the commands of the Lord. The renewed injunction is motivated by future blessing in the land in 8:7-10. A third section, 8:11-18, warns against forgetting the Lord and his commands. The basis
for the warning is the blessing the land represents. When Israel is sated from such blessing she may be tempted to forget God. Finally, 8:19,20 gives the ultimate warning of destruction from the land if Israel does not heed the voice of God.

This analysis gives good reason to believe that 8:1 is not simply a new topic for the section 8:1-5, but also for the entire chapter.

7.1.2.4 Resumption of Topic

Dt. 5:22 does not begin a new topic; it resumes the topic after the long citation of the Ten Words:

These words the Lord spoke to your whole assembly.

It is tempting to see a second function for the fronting here - indicating a contrast between these Ten Words and the commands. It can be argued that two factors combine to indicate the contrast: a) the demonstrative 'these' and b) the words "He added no more" at the end of the verse, i.e., "it was these words and no others." The same two reasons apply, however, as an indication of topical resumption. The 'these' simply point to the Ten Words just cited, and 'these words and no others' argue that the words just cited and no more are the words Yahweh spoke to Israel face to face.

The verse also has a redactional function because it closes out this section after the citation of the Ten Words. The remark takes up
the prior narrative and closes it before the beginning of the next section.

Dt. 10:20

фессיה להלך ויהי לך ידך ביה תחל ויהי לך שמחת שמחת

Fear the Lord your God alone and serve him alone. Cling to him alone and swear in his name alone.

The four inunctives comprise a conjunctive sentence which begins asyndetically and begin the last section in this chapter, 10:20-22. There is no contrast here, but a change of topic from the preceding injunction.

Not only is there a change of topic, but there is also a return to the theme begun in v. 12. This fronting, then, indicates a resumptive topic which ends and refocuses the initial subject matter.

7.2 Conclusion

Fronting is a focus-marking mechanism. There are clear examples which divide into three clear categories, contrast, conjunctive pairing, and shift/resumption of topic. The presence of three different categories demonstrates the importance of contextual analysis and a textual basis for ascertaining the function of marked word order.

On a formal level all three of the discourse functions are fronted objects, adverbial accusatives, or prepositional phrases. These patterns
call for the investigation of a wider range of text. If a fuller study shows the same patterns we may conclude that the fronting of an object, an adverbial accusative or of a prepositional phrase amounts to a special focusing device to mark contrast, conjunctive sentences, and change in topic in BH.\(^{187}\)

\(^{187}\) Josh. 1:14 a,b is an example where an asyndetic clause with the order subject noun - finite verb is contrastive, but this is due to the clause in 14b which has a pleonastic pronoun.
Chapter 8

The Cleft Sentence

8.0 Introduction

The term cleft sentence, borrowed from English,\(^{188}\) is applied here to the construction in BH classically called the casus pendens.\(^ {189}\) After a general consideration of the cleft sentence in English we will discuss the nature of the casus pendens in BH and then consider the


appropriateness of applying the term to the BH construction. Finally, we will consider the functions of the construction in the corpus.

8.1 The English Cleft Sentence

The cleft sentence is one of the principal grammatical means of focusing in English. As its name indicates it involves the division of a sentence into two elements. For an example, the sentence:

I admire his boldness.

may be divided into two clauses to highlight the element of boldness in some way:

It is his boldness I admire.

In English each of the resultant clauses has its own verb; the first clause uses the dummy pronoun 'it' as a subject (an empty theme) and the second clause is a relative clause.

In general the cleft sentence enables the user to select which element of the sentence will be highlighted. From the sentence:

Julie buys her vegetables in the market.

at least three alternative cleft sentences may be constructed:

190 A. Cruttenden, Intonation: 30.
1. It is Julie who buys her vegetables in the market.
2. It is her vegetables that Julie buys in the market.
3. It is in the market that Julie buys her vegetables.

In these constructions the element after the verb to be receives focus. In this way, as Quirk puts it, the cleft sentence "provides unerringly guidance to the reader in silently assigning appropriate prosody."\(^{191}\) This says that the cleft sentence is a syntactic guide to emphasis. The means, however, by which the prosody is assigned depends on the relationship of the context with the items of focus in the two parts of the cleft sentence.

The sentence, in fact, provides divided focus, i.e., there are two focal points within the construction, one in each clause. The particular use of these focal points and the resulting prominence or emphasis depends on the context.\(^{192}\) For example, the following two situations will shift the focus in such a way that one item is more dominant:

A. You should criticize his BOLDness.
   No, it is his BOLDness that I adMIRE.

B. You should ignore his BOLDness.
   No, it is his ARrogance that I shall ignore.

In A, because boldness is already given and admire is new, the dominant item will be admire and boldness will have a secondary focus.

\(^{191}\) Quirk, Comprehensive English Grammar: 1384. The preceding examples are taken from Quirk. Emphasis (capitalization) his.

\(^{192}\) Ibid., 1384.
In A, although *boldness* is highlighted as the topic of conversation, the prominent contrast is between *criticize* and *admire*, although the cleft sentence in A also sets off *boldness* in contrast to other implied characteristics of the person in question.

In B the contrast is between *boldness* and *arrogance*. The word *ignore* is given and *arrogance* is new, creating a primary prominence on *arrogance*. This prominence, in turn, finds a contrast with the word *boldness* in the preceding clause.

These examples indicate that one function of the cleft sentence in English is to indicate contrastive emphasis. Another function is to make explicit the division between given and new parts of the communication. For instance, if the cleft sentence,

It is John who is going to the races

is a response to the question,

Who is going to the races?

the prominence assigned to the predicate in the first clause of the cleft sentence functions to adjust the focus according to what is presupposed in a given utterance.\(^{193}\) The use of the cleft sentence to mark John shows that the information is new. It would be necessary to stress the word *John* in initial position in the unclefted version of this:

\(^{193}\) Ibid., 1365, 6.
John is going to the races.\textsuperscript{194}

These two uses of the cleft sentence in English are due to the combination of focus marking and contextual implication. As a prosodic device the cleft sentence is a more complicated application of focus than fronting or intonation, but it also allows more nuanced use of contrastive emphasis in a context, as well as an explicit way of highlighting what is informationally important.\textsuperscript{195}

8.2 Casus Pendens in BH\textsuperscript{196}

In BH the term casus pendens is applied to constructions which prepose one or more elements prior to a full clause. These preposed elements do not constitute a clause and are in some way related to the

\textsuperscript{194} J. Lyons, \textit{Semantics II}: 509 notes, "Roughly speaking, expressions that convey new information are stressed, and expressions conveying information that the speaker presents as given, or recoverable from context, are unstressed." Harries-Delisle, "Cleft Sentences": 422, notes that cleft sentences are equational sentences which establish an identity between a known or presupposed entity and a focused entity which represents the new information. The meaning of the term 'new' has contextual constraints. As J. Halliday notes, the information may not be strictly new but only be a matter of contrast with what has been said before or what might be expected. "Grammar, Society, and the noun." Inaugural lecture 1966, University College, London, 205,206, cited by Harries-Delisle, "Cleft Sentences":437.

\textsuperscript{195} Ibid., 89.

\textsuperscript{196} For a careful consideration of the history of this discussion see W. Gross, \textit{Pendenskonstruktion}: 132-145.
following clause, often including a syntactic relationship signalled by the resumptive in the following independent clause.

The term is easily applied to the verbal clause which is so constructed. The following are some examples of verbal types of the casus pendens (with a literal gloss):

a. Object focus

אַלּ לָכֵּה לֹאֵו אָמַּר אֱלֹהִים בְּרִית ונַעֲךָּ יִהְיֶהּ שָׁבָּה

Everything I am commanding you, it you shall be careful to do. Dt. 13:1

b. Subject focus

וְהָיָה בְּרֵאשֵׁי הַגּוֹרָם נִמְצָאָה נָבַּה וְשָׁבָּה

Joshua, the son of Nun, who is standing before you he will go there. Dt. 1:38

c. Other element focus

לְכַל יַעֲשֶׂה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְךָ לְשָׁבָּה לֵאמָר

As for all the sacred gifts of the Israelites, I give them to you as your share... Num. 18:8

In the example in Dt. 13:1 an object clause is preposed to the complete clause 'it shall you do.' The independent personal pronoun 'it' in the complete clause resumes the preposed 'everything I command you.' This resumption provides cohesion with the preposed element and the complete clause. Further, it is a syntactic connection inasmuch as the resumptive usually agrees with the major element in the preposed clause in number, gender and person.
8.2.1 Problems with the Traditional Classification

There are problems, however, both with the traditional label, casus pendens, as well as with explanations of the construction. Since there are no case morphemes in BH, the use of the term casus can be misleading. Secondly, there are problems in the way the construction is classified, especially by those grammarians who follow the model of Arabic.

The Arabic model categorizes sentences as verbal or nominal according to whether the subject is after the verb (or predicate) or before it. If a subject precedes a finite verb the sentence is nominal, not verbal. In addition, the Arabic model takes the preposed element as the subject of the nominal sentence and the rest of the clause as the predicate.

In this view any added resumptive pronoun in the independent clause (see above example, 1 Kgs 18:39) establishes a connection between the subject and predicate, strengthens the subject by an emphatic resumption, and thus creates a compound sentence. The sentence is

197 There are only remnants of earlier case endings. Case in BH is a matter of syntactic function, not of case endings.


199 W. Gross, Pendenskonstruktion: 134, referring to Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: § 141g.
called compound for two reasons, first, because the pendens is the main subject, and secondly, "since the predicate to the main subject consists of an independent clause." 200

Because this view represents the pendens as the subject and the independent clause as the predicate it can not account for those cases where the pendens is an object or some other clause element, as in the above examples a & c. 201 In both examples the pendens can not be the subject, nor even the complete predicate; it relates syntactically to only a part of the predicate.

8.2.2 The Term Nominative Absolute

Another label which some use to describe this construction is nominative absolute, a term which comes from the grammar of the classical languages. 202 The absolute part of the term implies that the pendens is unrelated syntactically to the rest of the construction, i.e.,

---

200 E Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: § 141g.

201 In the Journal of Biblical Literature, 64, 1945, "Syntax Of The Sentence In Hebrew", Th. Meek does not use the term casus pendens for the construction with the direct object. He calls the objects 'virtual subjects' and construes them as accusatives of specification. However, he admits that these constructions 'look like' and 'function like' the casus pendens. This is another reason a broader term is needed to apply to constructions that look and function alike. If the analogy does not fit well, we should look for a more appropriate one.

202 B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 76, fn 13, "Casus pendens is a term from Latin grammar...The term nominative absolute corresponds to the genitive absolute of Greek and the ablative absolute of Latin; all three constructions are distinct."
to the following independent clause, whereas the nominative part of the term indicates that the pendens functions like a nominative case. The label is more accurate than *casus pendens*; it shows that the pendens does not function as the subject of the whole clause, but is more loosely attached syntactically. The presence of the resumptive pronoun in the independent clause is a problem for this interpretation, however, because the pronoun relates the full clause syntactically to the pendens. In addition, the fact that the pendens is often accusative or has an element that can not be construed as a nominative, also tells against this view. For these reasons I prefer the approach of Gross in his assessment that the construction is unique; it is neither compound nor simple. The presence of the pendens indicates that the construction is not a simple clause, and the fact that the pendens is not the subject of the following full clause shows that the construction is not a compound sentence.

8.2.3 A Nominal Casus Pendens?

---


There are in fact at least two competing interpretations of the nominal clause which has three rather than two major elements. Some examples are:

a. Clause of identification

Yahweh, he is God. 1 Kgs. 18:39

b. Clause of classification

As for the place where you are standing it is holy ground. Ex. 3:5

If we identify this construction as a casus pendens type, as does, for example, Driver, we explain the initial element as a preposed pendens. In the first example in 1 Kgs. 18:39 Yahweh would be the pendens and the independent personal pronoun 'he', followed by 'God' would be the subject and predicate of a complete sentence. Furthermore, the 'he' would be a resumptive pronoun, resuming the preposed subject 'Yahweh.'

There are many, however, who have disagreed with this approach to the nominal construction. Gross cites the positions of

---


206 See especially the discussion of W. Gross, Pendenskonstruktion: 5.4.
Brockelmann, to some degree Gesenius' Grammar, Meyer, and Jouön.207 To refer only to the argument of Brockelmann, he gives several reasons why the independent personal pronoun in such constructions is a copula:208

a. the pronoun occurs also in nominal clauses with an indeterminate adjectival predicate, Gen 34:21:

These men are at peace with us.

b. the pronoun occurs with a preceding predicate, Lam 1:18:

The Lord is righteous.

c. the third person pronoun occurs where the subject is first or second person, Psa 44:5:

You are my king.

d. there are also clauses with the sequence noun - pronoun - noun which are begun with the verb 'to be.' This is supposed to demonstrate that the pronoun must be a copula, 1 Kgs 18:24.

207 Ibid., 133-35.
208 C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax: § 30.
And the God who answers with fire, he is the true God.

Gross’s response to this set of arguments has several elements. On the grammatical level he considers the necessity of the independent pronoun in such constructions, the analogy with its verbal counterpart, the function it has in discourse, and the problem of congruence between the pronoun and the subject. In the last case he points out that problems of congruence in the nominal clause are linguistically unavoidable and do not support the copula interpretation.

With reference to any syntactic model he notes that the theory which is able to explain the data in a unified way is to be preferred. The copula theory is a distinctive explanation whereas the pendens theory understands the construction as a specific case of a wider-ranging syntactic arrangement.

He also remarks that the independent personal pronoun in such nominal clauses is optional, because these types are in the minority compared to the usual two-membered nominal clause. Either, therefore, the pronoun is an optional copula, comparable to the verb 'to be' in the nominal clause, or we have an optional variant construction which has a preceding pendens. Against the view that we have a copula is the fact that the independent pronoun, in contrast to the verb 'to be' indicates no content, whereas the verb 'to be' indicates tense or the fact that we have a wish clause. Secondly, the pronoun indicates varied

---

209 W. Gross, Pendenskonstruktion: § 5.4.
highlighting, depending on position. Both of these features can be observed in the usual pendens construction.

Not only do semantic and syntactic functions suggest that we have a pendens construction, but also, by analogy with the verbal and participial pendens constructions, there are striking similarities between the three-membered nominal clause and these constructions. In these as well the pronoun is a resumptive of the previous subject. Why should the nominal version of the clause be explained differently? If the Hebrew author had wished to construct a nominal casus pendens this is how he would have done it. Why should there be no casus pendens for the nominal clause?²¹⁰

Those who depend on the copula interpretation argue that the pronoun makes it easier to identify and separate the subject and predicate, and that often there is no recognizable emphasis. This explanation is not illuminating for the nominal clause with the sequence determinate noun - indeterminate noun - pronoun. The subject and predicate are simple to identify because of the difference in determination, and if the pronoun is to accomplish this function it comes too late, at the end of the clause. Often, in fact, the resumptive is chosen because of the length of the pendens (due to several relative clauses, a finite continuation of an attributive participial, insertion of direct speech); in such a case the relation of subject, or initial element, to the rest of the clause would otherwise be unclear.

²¹⁰ We might add, that if Andersen is correct that there is no emphasis in the normal nominal clause, this construction supplies that emphasis.
The most difficult problem is those cases where a personal pronoun is a first or second person and is resumed by a third person pronoun. Gross says that even these cases do not demonstrate the copula theory. In order to evaluate this argument Gross observes that it is first necessary to assess the congruence between the element to be resumed and the resumptive element under all four categories of determination, number, genus and person.

In cases of determination where the preposed element is indeterminate and the resumptive pronoun is definite the difference in definiteness is unavoidable, since the pronoun is always definite. Further the discrepancy is not between the subject and the predicate but between the preposed element and the resumptive element. He notes that these cases are different and do not contribute to the present discussion.

For problems of gender, he asks the question how a pronoun might react if both the substantives related to each other as subject and predicate differ? If the difference is only in gender the resumptive pronoun as a rule agrees with the subject to be resumed, not with the predicate which follows or precedes the pronoun.\(^{211}\)

When the difference is only in number the pronoun agrees with the resumed subject.\(^{212}\) When both number and gender disagree the pronoun agrees with the predicate.\(^{213}\) The examples for this subgroup,\(^{211}\) Examples are Dt 4:24, 10:9, Ex. 3:5, Neh 8:10. Dan 8:21 is a 'Gegenbeispiel.'

\(^{212}\) Ezek 11:17, Ex 32:16.

\(^{213}\) Lev 25:33, Jer 10:3.
however, are so few they are not sufficient to say we can make syntactic inferences.

Gross gives examples of differences in person in ordinary nominal clauses and shows that there is nothing unusual about such differences.\textsuperscript{214} In the set of examples for the unusual nominal clauses he finds ambiguities, but notes there are several syntactic constellations. In general it is clear in the normal examples that the pronoun can not be a copula; it is the predicate of a normal nominal clause. The difference in number is clearly the difference between the subject and the predicate. In the unusual examples the pronoun usually agrees with the predicate, but not in every case, which shows that the pronoun varies according to the changing gender of subject and predicate. From this it follows that we are not speaking of a pronoun which has completely frozen into an indicator of the relationship of subject and predicate, i.e., it has not become a copula.

Waltke-O’Connor have stated the case for the pendens interpretation along somewhat different lines by showing that when we call the preposed element a focusing element the rest of the clause follows the Andersen typology of S-P for the clause of identification and P-S for the clause of classification. They further note that there are almost no cases of nominal identifying clauses with the sequence predicate - pronoun - subject, suggesting that the construction focus marker - subject - predicate is correct.\textsuperscript{215}

\textsuperscript{214} Isa 43:10, Psa 102:28: מַחְלֵף מִצְּה, מַחְלֵף מִצְּה, resp.

\textsuperscript{215} B. Waltke, M. O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: § 8.4.1b, fn 16.
We may consider the literary function of the construction as an indirect way of understanding its character. One the one hand, there is no reason to expect any unusual syntactic functions for a nominal clause with a copula. If the independent personal pronoun did shift, as Brockelmann suggests, toward the function of a copula in nominal clauses, there is no reason to think that such clauses would be marked for any special discourse functions.\textsuperscript{216} The pendens construction, on the other hand, has recognizable functions. Geller has shown that a majority of such clauses are explicitly contrastive, and others have pointed to similar functions.\textsuperscript{217} This functional argument gives presumptive support to the pendens (or nominative absolute) interpretation. If a construction has important features which are similar to another construction and behaves in the same way as that other construction, we have good evidence for thinking the constructions may be of the same type.

Based on these considerations, we will assume that the three-membered nominal clause is a pendens construction of the traditional casus pendens type.

8.2.4 The Discourse Functions of Casus Pendens

\textsuperscript{216} C. Brockelmann, \textit{Hebräische Syntax}: § 30a.

\textsuperscript{217} S. Geller, "Cleft Sentences": 6, 7.
In order to explain the construction it will be useful to list its discourse functions in BH. The basic functions suggested by various grammarians involve at least the following:\footnote{These functions are not mutually exclusive; the purpose of clear guidance in the interpretation of prosody may be to point to a focus constituent which is contrastive, i.e., one construction may function to preserve syntactic clarity and point to contrastive emphasis at the same time.}


Waltke, O'Connor note that the construction

"serves to highlight or focus one element of the main clause; it may serve in context to contrast this element to a comparable item in another clause."\footnote{Ibid., § 4.7b.}

In this type the focused element is in semantic contrast with a contextual element. An example would be:

\begin{verbatim}
[some Hebrew text]
\end{verbatim}

[Do not fear other gods...]
Rather, it is the Lord who brought you up from the land of Egypt...whom you shall fear. 2 Kgs. 17:36.

In this example the NP הָיוֹת velit is preposed before the clause רָצוֹנַי וְנָתַן. The pronoun רָצוֹנַי resumes הָיוֹת. There is clearly a contrast between רָצוֹנַי רָצוֹנַי of v. 35 and רָצוֹנַי...רָצוֹנַי of v. 36. For this the English cleft
The sentence "It is Yahweh, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, whom you shall fear" is an appropriate rendering of the Hebrew construction. The grammatical clefting in EH functions in the same way on a discourse level (semantically) as its analogue in English.

2. Syntactic clarity

Particularly when the preposed focusing element is expanded by relative or attributive clauses and becomes quite long the resumptive in the accompanying clause maintains clarity for the hearer. Note, for example:

"Yahweh, the God of heaven who brought me from the house of my father and the land of my kinsmen, who spoke to me and who swore to me: "To your posterity will I give this land." He is the one who will send his messenger before you..."

Gen. 24:7

In this passage the preposed element is quite long. It is composed of the PN plus three relative clauses and a citation. The distance between

---

221 W. Gross, Pendenskonstruktion: 18, 42, 113, 128, 192; B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 77; S. Geller, "Cleft Sentences": 8,9. T. Muraoka, Emphatic Words: 94. This is probably what A. B. Davidson is stating in Hebrew Syntax: § 106 when he says "The consn. is common in sentences where the subj. is encumbered with complementary elements, so that it needs to be disentangled and restated." Quirk, Comprehensive English Grammar: 1365, calls this function correction. He notes that shifts in focus prevent the reader from reading a normal end-focus, thus misunderstanding the focus.
the pendens and the verb קִשָּׁה is a problem for the reader who may forget what the subject was. The resumptive clarifies this and thus helps the reader to refresh his memory.

3. Topical Resumption

When the ongoing context resumes a previous topic this construction can refocus on that topic, and bring it back into the discussion. One pertinent text is Gen. 40:12

The (aforementioned) three branches are three days.

4. Initiate a new section

Closely related to the last item, the construction can initiate a new topic. Two classic examples are found in Gen. 17: 4, 15:

V. 4: בֹּאֶת הַנֶּחֶשׁ בָּנֵי יֶשֶׂע
As for me, behold my covenant is with you.

V. 15: יְנַהֲקֵם לָנוּ שֵׁם שְׁמוֹ הַמֶּנֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל
As for Saray your wife, you shall no longer call her Saray.

Geller also mentions questions, demonstratives, lists and causal clauses. The last is important. W. Gross, Pendenskonstruktion: 124, notes that the type X-Pr-Y (Foc-S-P: clause of identification) occurs 50 times in Prose, of which 18 are in ki clauses; on 128 he likewise mentions that for the type X-Y-Pr (Foc-P-S: clause of classification), 15 of the 58 occurrences of this type in prose are in a ki clause.
In this chapter Yahweh's speeches to Abraham consist of comments on a series of topics, each section introducing a new *dramatis persona*, and discussing something with reference to that new person. Secondly, the focus creates differentiation from the other paragraph topics, each paragraph concerning a different participant. The 'I' in v. 4 stands over against the 'you' in v. 9 and the 'Saray, your wife' in v. 15. The affixed resumptive pronoun in 'my covenant' further clarifies the topic; the topic is not simply 'I', but 'my covenant.' From these examples in Gen 17 we can see that because the pendens sentence introduces a new topic it can be paragraph initial.\(^{223}\)

From this brief review of the functions of the pendens sentence we can see that it has some of the same uses as other types of emphatic constructions. For example, fronting also produces contrast and initiates or resumes topics and new sections. This similarity raises the question whether the construction works in similar ways for the same reasons, i.e., because of emphasis.

8.2.5 Linguistic Analysis of the Pendens Construction

The way to answer the question whether this construction is emphatic is to look at the elements of the *casus pendens*, a two-element construction, consisting of a preposed phrase-level element, a following

\(^{223}\) Another example is Dt. 13:1.
complete clause, and, normally, a resumptive pronoun in the full clause which resumes the preposed element. 224

The pendens segment amounts to the pre-position of the element represented by the resumptive pronoun, so that the resumptive pronoun is a copy of the preposed element. 225 This copying of the pendens element suggests a splitting off into two elements of an original simple sentence. We will take a nominal and a verbal example from 1 Kgs. 18:39 and Dt. 13:1:

1 Kgs 18:39

יִהוּדָּה הוָגוֹדֶה לַםַל־לָּיָה

It is the Lord who is God.

Proposed simple sentence

1 Kgs 18:39

The Lord is God.

Dt. 13:1

כָּל־לָּיָה תֹּא הַבָּלֶא מַשֶּׁה הָאֲבִי נַחַל מַשֶּׁה הָאֲבִי

Now each thing I am commanding you are to keep.

Proposed simple sentence

Dt. 13:1

You shall be careful to keep every thing I am commanding you.

In both examples the construction is the result of copying: the original simple clause displaces a clause element to the pendens position. The

224 B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 76. The resumptive pronoun is often not found in pendens constructions which have direct object pendens.

225 Cf. B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 76, fn 14, "Linguists use the term copying to refer to the displacement of a nominal constituent from its basic position in the clause, accompanied by the replacement of it by a pronominal constituent."
original substantive in the complete clause now becomes a resumptive pronoun. The positional shift is similar to fronting, the all important difference being that it creates a new construction. We can now look at the significant effect these syntactic shifts can have on the context.

8.2.6 Marked Focus in the Pendens Construction

There are several features of the pendens construction which show that it exhibits an example of marked focus. First of all, the construction exhibits syntactic redundancy. The pendens and its resumptive pronoun constitute syntactic pleonasm, naming the same referent twice. As W. Gross puts it, the pendens and its resumptive pronoun are 'referenzidentisch. They both have the identical referent. Functionally, there is no difference between this and the redundancy created by the occurrence of an independent personal pronoun with a finite verb.

Secondly, there are positional shifts which produce marked focus. The displacement of the subject of the proposed simple sentence is a word order shift from the original position. This shift in combination with the resumption of the pendens in the full clause creates a double focus on that element. This assertion is confirmed by the fact that pendens with direct object markers are resumed by pronouns affixed to the direct object marker, syntactic indicators of their function.

---

As we have already indicated, it is of some interest that this interpretation of the pendens as a focus marker corroborates the view of Andersen that for nominal cases of casus pendens the sequences follow his types of clauses of identification and classification. The sequence for a normal identifying clause is S-P and the one with the pleonastic pronoun is Ssus, Sres-P. The second component is the pleonastic pronoun and Andersen interprets it as a resumptive. Andersen maintains that the nucleus of the casus pendens is the combination of the second and third elements of the construction, so that S...S-P has the S-P as a nucleus (his identifying clause sequence) and S...P-S has P-S as a nucleus. In both cases this interpretation separates the nucleus as a unit from the initial pendens (suspended) element. He says in his work on the Sentence that "a marked break in the flow of discourse is achieved by fresh topicalization."  

In line with this Waltke-O'Connor interpret the first element as a focus marker, and the resumptive and predicate as subject and predicate following the focus marker. Using the example from above, 1 Kgs 18:39 we would have the following:

It is the Lord who is God.
Sequence: Focus - S - P

228 F. I. Andersen: *Hebrew Sentence*: 92.
The pendens, or focus marker, is the first element, the second is the subject of the identifying clause, which resumes the focus marker, and the third element is the predicate. This observation of Waltke-O'Connor both maintains Andersen's view of the nominal clause with a pleonastic pronoun and interprets the pendens as a focus marker. 229

We conclude that the casus pendens construction exhibits syntactic marked focus, that it displays the same discourse functions as other marked constructions, and that, as a construction, it is a production of the division of a simple sentence into two elements.

It is the combination of marked focus and the division of a clause into two elements that suggests the appropriateness of using the term cleft sentence as a legitimate label for the BH casus pendens construction. The cleft sentence in English has similar constructional features and similar discourse functions.

There are, of course, significant differences between the English and Hebrew constructions. The primary difference is the pendens element itself, which, in BH, is not a clause; it amounts, at best, to a phrase, and nothing more. 230 A second difference is the accompanying clause in BH after the pendens element. Whereas in English the second constituent is a relative clause, the accompanying clause in BH is normally syntactically complete, i.e., except for the resumptive it could stand as an independent clause.


230 Though the BH construction is different from the English one in this respect, it is a fact that the 'it' in the initial English clause is a 'dummy slot.'
These differences, however, are not sufficient to call in question the usefulness of applying the term cleft sentence, to the construction traditionally called casus pendens, or nominative absolute. The differences between the English and BH constructions are not differences in construction, but are merely a different approach to clefting for these two languages.

As was the case with other emphatic constructions it is also true here that the discourse function is a combination of marked focus with elements in a particular context. In this case the divided focus, or emphasis, has the same effect and, in conjunction with a contextual element, produces a particular discourse function. Geller notes that the general function of the cleft sentence is to

foreground the relationship of a clause, or part of a clause, to some other feature in the immediate context. The specific nuance, or combination of nuances, is determined by that context. The most common such nuance is contrastive emphasis.

---

231 B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 248,249, compare the English cleft sentence with the construction in BH which uses an article with the finite verb. Note 2 Chr. 29:36. On 76, fn 13, they use the term nominative absolute to refer to what we call the cleft construction, admitting that the BH construction is distinct from the Latin and Greek absolute constructions. The problem with the term absolute is the presence of the resumptive pronoun in the pendens clause. In absolute constructions the relationship between the absolute and the rest of the context is semantic. The presence of the resumptive creates syntactic coherence with the pendens.

232 S. Geller, "Cleft Sentences": abstract. His definition of emphasis is "stress arising from contrast between two terms or topics in context." p. 11.
Given the similarity between English and BH, and the attribution of such similar discourse functions to the casus pendens by biblical scholars it is proper to examine the corpus for such functions.¹²³

8.3 Cleft Sentences in the Corpus

8.3.0 The Contrastive Uses

Dt. 4:3

3. כִּי נִשְׁמַחְתָּם בַּעֲלְבוֹן הָעַזְוָי נַפְשֵׁי בָּשָׂרָם נַפְשֵׁי נָפָשׁוֹת

4. הוּא נִשְׁמַחְתָּם בַּעֲלְבוֹן אֲנָחָה בְּנִשְׁמַחְתָּם נַפְשֵׁי

For it is every one who followed Baal Peor whom the Lord your God destroyed from your midst; But all of you who clung to the Lord are alive today.

The cleft sentence in v. 3 balances the similar clause in v. 4; together they are coordinated clauses dependent on the causal particle גָּפָר. The conjunction of the two clauses forms a stark contrast between the two pendens themselves, between 'every one who followed Baal Peor' and 'all of you who clung to the Lord.' This syntactic strategy closes out the first paragraph by illustrating the issue posed by the demand for total obedience in v. 2, and reinforces the main point made by the inclusio of 'life.' in vv. 1 & 4.

¹²³ In his investigation Geller: Ibid.: 7, shows that contrastive emphasis accompanies this construction about 50% of the time, and is one of the major functions of the cleft sentence in BH.
You were shown that you might know that it is the Lord who is God; there is no one else beside him.

In this verse YHWH is the pendens, and is resumed in the following clause by אד. The contextual consideration that supports the rendering is the next clause, "None but He alone." The second clause is asyndetic and furnishes the element of contrast with the pendens and its resumptive pronoun. The two clauses are equivalent to this paraphrase:

It is the Lord who is God.
The other claimants are not.

You are to acknowledge today and keep in mind that it is Yahweh who is God.
There is no one else.

In a very climactic way the object clause ending v. 39 uses the cleft construction to highlight the general theme of the paragraph, i.e.,

234 S. Geller, "Cleft Sentences": 7.
the use of the phrase 'heaven and earth' together with the uniqueness of the Lord of Israel. As in v. 35, the spatial language is important, and contributes to the contrast between other claimants, whether in heaven above or on the earth beneath. This merism indicates that there is no one like Yahweh, anywhere at all. The cleft sentences in vv. 35,39 identify Yahweh as the only God, in contrast with all others for whom such is claimed.

Dt. 9:3

You must understand that it is the Lord God Himself who is going before you as a consuming fire;
It is He who will destroy them,
it is He who will subdue them before you.

This is a difficult example. In the immediate context there is no explicit contrast. There is no statement saying that "x is not going before you." 235

Secondly, there is no implicit contrast with divinity in 9:3, since the cleft sentence is not identifying Yahweh as God, but who it is going before Israel. 236

---

235 In Dt. 31:3 there is explicit contrast between Moses and Yahweh using language identical to 9:3.

236 S. Geller, "Cleft Sentences: 7, fn 22,32. Both Driver and Dillmann argue that the contrast is Yahweh and no other: S. R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy: 111; A. Dillmann: Die
The larger textual context furnishes a possible contrast. That background is the contrast in Ex. 33:12ff between Yahweh and a messenger who is less than Yahweh, a messenger who is not equivalent to Yahweh. In Moses' intercession for Israel he had requested that the Lord not only be with him, but also with the people. Moses stresses the importance of the personal accompaniment of Yahweh in Ex. 33:15:

If your presence does not take the lead, do not let us go up from this place.

The fact that Moses can say in Dt. 9:3 that it is the Lord Himself who is going with them is demonstration that Israel has been forgiven, that Yahweh has granted the intercession of Moses. The reason for this contrast, then, would be to announce that Yahweh had forgiven Israel, had heard Moses' intercession, and was therefore going to accompany Israel and defeat their enemies.

Further argument to support this understanding of the text comes from chapter 9 itself. Israel should not think the Lord is going with them because they are righteous. In vv. 4-6 Moses warns the people to realize that the reason they are going to inherit the land is not their

---

Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua: 278.

237 B. Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974):586. The above conclusion is not an attempt to clarify the difference between the angel in 23:23 and the one mentioned here, and exactly what it is that this implies. However one attempts to treat the problem Moses' intercession depends on the notion that there is a vast difference between the angel leading them and the Presence of Yahweh Himself going before them.
righteousness but the wickedness of the peoples. In 7-24 Moses gives various examples from their wilderness period to demonstrate their guilt, from their idolatry at Horeb to their refusal to take the land at Kadesh. Within this section Moses continually reiterates his intercession on their behalf as the reason the Lord had not destroyed Israel. Finally, in 25-29 Moses cites the text of his intercession on Israel's behalf. The reasons are the same as those given in Ex. 32:11-14.

The conclusion is clear. The Lord is going before Israel to conquer their enemies, but it is not because of their righteousness. There are two reasons given for the Lord's holy war against their enemies: the first is the wickedness of the enemies, 9:5, and the other is that the Lord has heard Moses' intercession on their behalf. He has restored them and will, as Moses' requested, forgive them and go before them. The contrast highlights this important point and the rest of the chapter supports it.

It may be, however, that no such contrast is intended. We may have simply a change in topic, which is not unusual with a ו clause, particularly since the construction ו itself announces a new topic.\(^{238}\)

Dt. 10:9

\(^{238}\) The causal clause may also introduce new topics.
For this reason Levi has neither portion nor inheritance with his brothers. It is the Lord who is his inheritance.

The Levite has neither portion nor inheritance in the land; his inheritance is not these things, but the Lord Himself. The contrast between 'the land' and 'the Lord' is clear.

Dt. 10:17

'For it is the Lord your God who is the supreme God and the sovereign Lord.

This statement carries contrast within itself in virtue of the two superlatives 'God of gods and Lord of lords.' It is their Yahweh who is above all others called 'god.' This is the reason Israel is to have a circumcised heart. The Lord with whom they are in covenant is like no other.

8.3.1 Shift/Resumption of Topic

Dt. 4:24

For the (aforementioned) Lord your God is a consuming fire, a jealous God.
This cleft sentence does not produce contrast with any elements in the present context. The statement is not a claim to divinity, but identifies the Lord as a consuming fire. The pendens element is a topical resumption of the same syntagma at the end of v. 23. The apposition underscores and intensifies the identification of Yahweh as a consuming fire. The purpose, then, of the pendens would be to recall from the end of v. 23 and make a statement concerning it. The same is true, for example, of Gen. 17:20:

דַּיְתָה יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁמֵנָה עַל הָעָם אַחַת

As for (the aforementioned) Ishmael, I have heard you. Behold I will bless him.

As in the preceding changes of topic from לַאֹ in v. 4, to Abraham in v. 9, to Saray in v. 15, and now, concerning Ishmael, a topic is introduced. In this case, a preceding textual element is explicitly recalled in order to then make a statement about it.

Dt. 7:9

יְהֹוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל חָלַת יְהוֹעַדְיָהו

You shall recognize that it is the Lord your God who is God...

Whereas vv. 7,8 concern the reason for the Lord's choice of Israel, the injunction beginning v. 9 begins a new topic, the character of Yahweh who chose them. The identification is not simply of Yahweh as God, but Yahweh as the covenant Lord who is faithful to the
covenantal sanctions. It may be that the identification of Yahweh as God implicitly contrasts him with other gods, particularly due to the clear contrasts already made in 4:35, 39, i.e., in the preceding text.

9:21:

As for your (aforementioned) sin which you made, I took the golden calf and burned it with fire.

The direct object is fronted and then resumed in the sentence following. In this example, as Driver notes, the pendens is resumed by a "fresh substantive." 239

This cleft sentence does not produce contrast. Rather, it resumes a previous topic and thus initiates a new section. The focus on the pendens serve to recall that earlier context in v. 16ab. This new topic introduces the last in the series of activities at Horeb.

Dt. 11:10

239 S. R. Driver, Tenses: 151. Some examples are Dt. 17:12, which repeats the substantive שׁם in the pendens instead of resuming with a pronoun. Lev. 7:20 repeats ובו and 7:25 substitutes לְָּכְ for לְָּכְ. See also Dt. 18:20, which repeats עָשָׂה. Jer. 23:34 substitutes כְָּכְ in the clause for the conjunctive pendens elements כְָּכְ נָכְלָכְ.
For, as for the land...
it is not like the land of Egypt.

The cleft sentence in vs 11 functions as a shift in topic from the requirement of keeping every command in v. 8, to the 'land', which is mentioned in vv. 8,9, but not as the theme of the paragraph. Once the new topic is introduced, the following clauses set out, without the use of marked grammatical focus, a contrast between the land of Egypt and the land of promise. This contrast will result in an antithetical translation:

...a land of milk and honey.
For, as for land which you are going to inherit,
it is not like the land of Egypt...; rather, it is a land of hills and valleys.

8.4 Conclusion

Of ten examples of cleft sentences in the corpus seven are nominal. Five of these are X Pr Y (identifying clefts) and 2 are X Y Pr (classifying clefts). One of the verbal sentences continues a X Pr Y and two are O-V-O (object pendens followed by a verbal sentence).

Six of the sentences are contrastive while four produce a shift in topic. Two of the latter, 4:24 and 9:21, resume a topic, and the other two, 7:9 and 11:10 introduce a new topic.240

240 There is no necessary distinction between the resumption of a topic and the introduction of a new topic. A new topic may well be picking up something previously mentioned in order to make it the theme of a new section, or the resumption may be marginal to the paragraph, i.e., it may only be parenthetic.
The above examples support previous studies which point to the discourse functions of the so-called casus pendens in BH, and add further corroboration to the thesis that these functions are emphatic, the result of marked focus. The corpus evinces only two of the functions suggested by current discussion, i.e., contrastive emphasis and topical resumption, but further studies may add to the list.241

Finally, the corpus further illustrates why the term cleft sentence is an appropriate label for the traditional casus pendens. The use of the term shows how a more usual construction can produce an emphatic one, and further explain the use of marked focus which is so clear in these constructions. The actual use of this construction in discourse is the most important clue to the construction type.

241 S. Geller, "Cleft Sentences" suggests 7 contextual environments in which the cleft sentence is used.
Chapter 9
The Chiastic Sentence

9.0 Introduction

This chapter will consider the chiastic sentence as a two-clause grammatical structure in prose. Consider the following example:

Joseph named his first-born Manasseh, and his second son he name Ephraim. Gn 41:51,52

Syntactically, this chiastic arrangement is a creation of word-order displacement in the second clause. The sequence of elements created in this way is as follows:

Clause 1: V S O Oc
Clause 2: O V Oc

242 Oc = Object complement, i.e., the names Manasseh and Ephraim.
The network of elements is created first of all by this shift of order in the second clause, producing a V-O/O-V crossover of major clause elements. Secondly there is a repetition of the verb 'name' and the noun 'name' in each clause. The name 'Joseph', the subject in the first clause, is taken up by the suffixed antecedent pronoun in the verb in the second clause. Semantically each clause states the naming activity of Joseph for each of his two sons. The clauses vary semantically only in the change of the name of the son.

The change of word order in the second clause also avoids the narrative sequencing of the two events. This shift stages the two events in a different way than the usual sequencing would have done. In this case the same activity performed by one person on two other persons is stated in two parallel clauses without putting them in sequence.

The question is whether a review of such grammatical chiastic sentences would indicate that the change in word order has a clear and discrete discourse function that is more than simply aesthetic. If so, the chiastic sentence would be another example of a 'meaning distinction' for marked word order.

In order to limit the chiastic sentences to sets of clauses that are syntactically related I will stipulate the requirement that the two clauses be syntactically contiguous. It will not be enough that a clauses appear to be in an order the reverse of its apparent partner. The two clauses must be in the same immediate context. This eliminates the inclusio, which may stretch over many verses, especially where the first and last
clauses are not syntactically related to each other, but to some other contiguous clause.

Finally, for practical reasons I will consider asyndetic chiastic sentences along with syndetic, even if other considerations require for them to be separately treated.243

9.1 Past Study

Past studies have generally included a range of devices in addition to the grammatical construction, such as thematic and key-word envelopes.244 As far as their function is concerned comments have been impressionistic, without considering the way in which each type

---

243 By asyndetic I intend the lack of a waw between the two clauses. Whether the chiastic sentence begins with a waw or not is determined by discourse considerations and does not affect the relationship of the two chiastic clauses.

244 See the study in Italian by A. DiMarco, Il Chiasmo nella Bibbia, unpublished MS (Messina: 1975) translated into German in Linguistica Biblica, 36,37,39,44.
contributes to the discourse context.\textsuperscript{245} A clear exception to this is Andersen's chapter on chiasm in his study of the sentence in BH.\textsuperscript{246}

We will proceed by first interactiing with Andersen, then examining the chiastic sentences in the corpus, and finally, we will draw some conclusions.

9.1.0 Andersen on the Grammatical Chiasm

Andersen generally limits his consideration to grammatical chiasm between coordinated clauses. The following citation gives a general view of his approach:

Hitherto chiasmus has been chiefly noticed on the level of literary appreciation and hermeneutics. The present chapter examines the strictly grammatical functions of inter-clause chiasmus.\textsuperscript{247}

The criteria he specifies for a chiastic sentence are:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [245] J. W. Welch (ed.) Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), a volume which discusses the chiasm in Akkadian, Ugaritic, Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek and Latin, not to mention the Book of Mormon! The article by W. G. E. Watson, "Chiastic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry": 118-168, is one of the few which considers the grammatical chiasm, although his classification of the functions of the chiasm in poetry is not useful, since he attempts to categorize the types in accordance with the motifs in the chiasm, which means the list of functions is as long as the motifs used. He does not consider the semantic relationship between the two clauses to be a relevant feature. Cf. also N. W. Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament (Chapel Hill: 1942), and W. L. Holladay, "Chiasmus, the Key to Hosea XII: 3-6", Vetus Testamentum 16 (1966):21-31.
  \item [246] F. I. Andersen, \textit{Sentence}: 119-140.
  \item [247] F. I. Andersen, \textit{Sentence}: 119.
\end{itemize}
a) The clauses must have at least two clause-level tagmemes in common.  

b) At least two of the matching elements have a sequence in the second clause which is the inverse of their order in the lead clause.

Andersen gives an example of such a sentence from Gen. 11:3:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cj} & \quad \text{V} & \quad \text{B} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{SC} \\
wa-t't\text{hi} & \quad \text{lahem} & \quad \text{halfa} & \quad \text{ben} & \quad \text{I'b} \\
\text{Cj} & \quad \text{S} & \quad \text{V} & \quad \text{B} & \quad \text{SC} \\
\text{w'hahemar} & \quad \text{haya} & \quad \text{lahem} & \quad \text{lahomer} & \\
& \text{and-was} & \text{for-them} & \text{the-brick} & \text{for-stone} \\
& \text{and-bitumen} & \text{was} & \text{for-them} & \text{for-mortar} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The chiastic sequence:  
Clause 1: V B S/  
Clause 2: S V B.

In these two clauses the V, S, and B items cross over and create an effect similar to the one produced by the circumstantial clause. The first, or lead clause has normal word order and the second, chiastic clause shifts the basic order. Just as is the case with the circumstantial clause the effect is a staging of the two actions as

---

248 J. A. Linton, *Four Views*: 43, gives a common definition of tagmeme: "Tagmeme is a correlation of grammatical function (a slot) with the class of mutually substitutable items which manifest that function." A sentence can be constructed of a subject filled by a noun (S:N), and a predicate filled by a verb (P:V) and an object filled by a noun phrase (O:Np). Cf. B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*: 52, fn 19.

249 F. I. Andersen, *Sentence*: 120. Actually, Andersen allows for two or more clauses in chiasm, esp. 109, 126, 128. Because the lead clause can take a set of inverted clauses as its partner, limited recursiveness is possible.

250 Ibid., 120. S,V = subject,verb, Cj=conjunction, SC=subject complement, B=benefactive (something for the benefit of). The analysis is Andersen's.
contemporaneous, simultaneous, or, at least complementary. The important difference between the two constructions is that clauses in chiasmus are unified by a network of relationships among the two clauses. Consider another example from Andersen:

\[
\text{Neg} \quad V \quad A \quad O \\
\text{lo'} \quad \text{ta}^\text{a} \quad \text{sun} \quad 'itti \quad 'lohe \quad \text{kesep}
\]

\[
\text{Cj} \quad O \quad \text{Neg} \quad V \quad B \\
\text{we-'}lohe \quad \text{zahab} \quad \text{lo'} \quad \text{ta}^\text{a} \quad \text{su} \quad \text{lakem}
\]

Do not make with me gods of silver and gods of gold do not make for yourself. Ex. 20:20.

Here the objects and verbs cross over. Andersen notes that the accomative ('itti) and the benefactive (lakem) do double duty. Since the verbs are the same

the construction has the effect of a single prohibition and each clause makes an equal contribution to the total picture. The construction is balanced and symmetrical. Neither clause can be said to be in any way dependent on the other. It is clear, then, that for Andersen the discourse function of the chiastic sentence is to present a synoptic of two similar or

\[251 \text{ Ibid., 120.} \]

\[252 \text{ Ibid., 121.} \]
simultaneously occurring aspects of the same situation or events.\textsuperscript{253}

Note the following examples:

And covered the cloud the tent of meeting while the glory of Yahweh filled the tabernacle
Ex. 40:34.

and Moses took half the blood and put it in the basins and half the blood he threw over the altar.
Ex. 24:6

In the first example the subjects, 'the cloud' and 'the glory of Yahweh' are complementary, and the objects, 'the tent of meeting' and 'the tabernacle' have the same referent. The cloud remained visible over the tent while the glory filled it. In the second example the same action is performed on two different objects.

It is often the case, however, that the chiastic sentences involve either temporal sequence, or contrast between the predicates. In such cases Andersen says the effect of the chiasm is to tone down the sequence or contrast and highlight similarity or complementarity.

Consider a chiastic sentence which has temporal sequence, Ex. 9:23:

\textsuperscript{253} Ibid., 121.
Moses stretched his staff up to the sky, and the Lord sent thunder and hail.

Andersen says that the chiasm presents the actions of Moses and Yahweh as concomitant; their actions are represented as simultaneous, even though a time sequence of cause and effect might be supposed. Chiasm highlights the immediate response and abolishes the time interval. This comment that the chiasm "abolishes the time interval" may be an overstatement, since he elsewhere notes that two actions may be linked in a single picture, "playing down the time succession."

In the next example Andersen asserts that the chiasm may also involve an antithesis, but it tones down the contrast. Consider Gen. 15:10. He divided them in the middle and the birds he did not divide.

---

254 Ibid., 128.

255 Ibid., 129,130. The citation is in reference to Gen 18:6,7.

256 Ibid., 130. Cf. W. G. E. Watson, "Chiastic Patterns": 166, fn 11, who asserts that the chiasm does not tone down antithesis in poetry. He cites the wisdom Psalms and Proverbs, e.g. Prov. 13:25, where the antithesis fills out the ethical world from the poles which comprise the extremes: the righteous and the wicked.
In some cases however, Andersen perceives the sequence to be so pronounced that he calls the examples atypical. Note Dt. 4:10bB:

...שֶׁנֶּאֶר בָּלָה תְּמוּנָה לְרַאוֹת אֶתִּי

that they may learn to fear me... and teach their children.

Of this example he says that

the construction is strained when the two events must occur in sequence. Thus the instruction of the next generation in Dt 4:10bB is chiastic, not sequential. This must be considered atypical.

The assumption for Andersen here is that the ongoing instruction of the children in coming generations is clearly in sequence with the prior 'learning to fear' the Lord.

Even with such atypical cases the normal function of the two-clause grammatical chiasm, for Andersen, is to highlight some unifying aspect of two events or statements about a situation. If there is sequence or contrast the chiasm tends to play them down and highlight similarity or simultaneity.

9.1.1 Discussion of Andersen

257 RM=relative marker.

258 Ibid., 139.
In order to critique Andersen's view of the chiastic sentence we will first have to narrow the range of the sentences to contiguous chiastic sentences. Then we will discuss Andersen's interpretation of the chiasm.

9.1.1.0 The Range of the Chiasm

We have already excluded, in the introductory comments, some of the constructions that Andersen discusses, in particular apparent chiastic sentences whose clauses are not immediately contiguous. There are two reasons for this narrow focus. First of all, we are studying syntactic relationships whose meaning can be ascertained by contextual exegesis. Secondly, other types of chiastic structures operate, apparently, on a different level and are often compositional devices. For example, note the clauses in Dt. 9:7, 8, 22:

7. how you angered the Lord in the desert...
8. at Horeb you angered the Lord
22. and at Taberah .... you angered the Lord

In 9:7 the object clause introduces the general statement that Israel angered the Lord in the desert. This is followed by the first member of an inclusio, v. 7b, whose second member, v. 24, is in inverted order from v. 7b. After this the specific examples in 8 and 22 are introduced by clauses with inverted order. Andersen labels these
as chiastic.\textsuperscript{259} The problem with this identification, from our perspective, is syntactic: the first member in 9:7 is in a subordinated object clause, while the second and third members in vv. 8, 22 are in main clauses, i.e., not all the clauses are on the same level, a criticism similar to the one Andersen made about Brockelmann's approach.\textsuperscript{260}

While there is no doubt that this set of clauses places several events under a main heading it is not clear that we must regard them as chiastic. Even if we do there are sound reasons for regarding them on a different compositional level, under different restrictions. Sound inferences concerning the discourse function of such examples will depend on a larger number of examples of such broad-ranging chiasms.

An example of an inclusio that has a chiastic arrangement is Dt. 9:7,24:

\begin{verbatim}
7. לָמָּה תְּקֵשׁוּ הָאָדָם מִשְׁמַרְתּוֹ שָׁרֵפְּבַדְתָּנָה...
24. מַמְרֵרָה חֵיָה מַעֲרָדְתָּה...
7. From the day you left the land of Egypt until you came to this place you have been obstinate against the Lord...
24. ...You have been obstinate against the Lord since the day I met you.
\end{verbatim}

This inclusio is not a two-clause chiastic sentence. Grammatically, each of the two clauses is in asyndetic relationship with a preceding clause.

\textsuperscript{259} F. I. Andersen, \textit{Sentence}: 126.

\textsuperscript{260} \textit{Ibid.}, 120.
9:7b amplifies the preceding clause and 24 is a summary of the preceding example. Each clause, therefore, is syntactically related to a lead clause within its own context. The inclusio does form a bracket around the context, but the two clauses are not syntactically related.

9.1.1.1 Critique of Andersen's Interpretation

Andersen's interpretation of the chiastic sentence is illuminating because it correctly points to the unifying tendency of the construction. Even when sequence or contrast is present the chiasm holds these elements together and unifies them. For example, in the above illustration from Gen. 15:10 the antithesis is unified both by the repetition of the identical verb יָנָשָׁה in both clauses and the fronting of the direct object יָנָשָׁה in the second clause. In the chiasm from Ex. 9:23 the two sets of actors and actions are unified by the crossover of the main clause elements. The chiasm plays down the sequence by avoiding a second waw consecutive.

There are some difficulties, however, with Andersen's description. First of all, there is a problem with the language Andersen uses to describe the effect of the chiasm. There seems to be some tension between the different metaphors. On the one hand, he speaks of the effect of the chiasm as "abolishing" sequence, but then says that the chiasm "plays down" the time sequence.261 There is a difference in the two metaphors, even if only speaking of "effects", between "abolishing"

261 Respectively, Ibid., 128, 130.
and "playing down." The first has the effect of eliminating the time element and the second subdues it. In either case the chiasm would take away any normal focus on the sequence and highlight the unity of the of the two clauses.

It is useful to clarify the character of Andersen's argument. He is in fact inferring sequence not from the use of sequence in the text (the waw consecutive) but from a logical analysis of the statements in the text: learning precedes teaching. The staging, on the other hand, is a waw consecutive followed by a disjunctive clause. There is no narrative sequence.

We can restate Andersen's argument by saying that, for him, it is atypical in BH to see events that are logically in sequence (and clearly so) placed in chiasm rather than in narrative sequence. When the argument is stated this way, we can see that a simple search of the textual examples can ascertain its correctness.

Dt. 4:10 is not as unusual as Andersen thinks. A quick survey of his chapter on chiasm indicates five clear examples of sequence, including Gen. 18:6, 7 (Abraham running to the tent and to the herd - he can not have done both at the same time), 49:51, 52 (Joseph naming his two sons - there is no indication they are twins!), Ex. 9:23, 10:13, and 24:6. In Ex. 10:13, which is quite similar to 9:23, the Lord's response to Moses' stretching forth his staff is causing the east wind to blow all that day and night. This is clearly sequential to Moses' action and not concomitant. In the example in Ex. 24:6 which we gave above, Moses' taking half the blood and putting it into bowls and sprinkling the other half on the altar also implies sequence.
The question concerning the meaning of the grammatical chiasm is whether the unifying tendency of the chiasm allows for sequence and contrast. The answer may lie along two fronts, a) the nature of the difference between a sequence represented by two waw consecutive clauses and a waw consecutive followed by a chiastic clause, and b) the semantic boundary between a chiasm and contrast. The presence of a disjunctive clause following a waw consecutive clause indicates the presence of several possible discourse functions. What points to chiasm in such cases is that networking of elements that Andersen describes. Where in b) contrast is involved there is a significant boundary question.

Since contrast is often marked by a construction that looks just like a chiasm the question is how, if possible, to distinguish them. Using Andersen's approach, the answer must be that the clauses of a chiasm are more interlaced than the contrast, i.e., there is a complex of interrelated elements in the two clauses which the simple contrastive construction does not evince. In the example given above from Ex. 20:23 the objects and the verb are identical. In such intensely interwoven chiastic sentences there is no problem with identification. A problem occurs whenever the chiasm is less well-formed. Then the question is, at what point are we willing to say a construction is not chiastic at all? In those cases that are not clear we should say they are boundary problems that fit neither paradigm.

Such boundary cases are not the same, however, as those cases, for example, that are chiastic and indicate some contrast. In these
cases there is sufficient networking among the elements to point to chiasm as well as contrast.

9.2 Chiasm in the Corpus

Dt. 4:13,14

He declared to you his covenant...
and Yahweh commanded me ...to teach you statutes.

The Chiastic Sequence: V ..DO...
DO...V..

Although it is tempting to consider v. 14 in chiasm with the preceding relative clause in v. 13, it is not clear how "me he commanded" could modify "the covenant" in v. 13 in the same way that "which he commanded you to keep" does.

Syntactically, it is more accurate to see here a crossover using different verbs to note the two different revelatory acts of Yahweh toward different objects. The crossover is grammatical and not semantic, although the verbs are both used in the same legal domain.

The fronting of the DO in the second clause can not point to contrast because there is no contrasting element, e.g., you in the first clause. The chiasm is strictly grammatical. The subject is identical and the objects are not in contrast. This yields a two-sided presentation of Yahweh's words to the people and to Moses:
He declared the covenant, the Ten Words
He commanded Moses to teach the Commands

By putting 'me he commanded' in a chiastic clause the writer subdues the clear sequence and instead focuses on Yahweh's twin revelatory role in declaring the Ten Words directly to the people and giving commands to Moses for transmittal to the people. Both revelatory acts are elements of a unified presentation of the work of Yahweh in dispensing his commandments. The literary point is the unity of the revelation given directly to the people and to them through Moses. In this context, then, it is Yahweh who speaks to the people directly and who also creates the mediatorial role of Moses with reference to the commands and statutes. Both dominical activities unite into one picture of the Ten Words and the commands and the statutes, all from the Lord of the covenant.

Dt. 4:36

From heaven He made you hear his voice to discipline you,
And on the earth He showed you his great fire
And you heard his words out of the fire.

Chiastic Sequence: Pp V-IO DO
& Pp V-IO DO
& DO V Pp
Note the word-chiasm in these three verses.

A B C
heaven hear (hiphil) voice

D E F
earth show (hiphil) fire

C' B' F
words hear fire

In this passage there is a chiasm of direct object and prepositional phrase between the third clause and the first two clauses. The first two clauses constitute a double merism - from both heaven and earth and by sound and sight the Lord has revealed himself in voice and fire. The merism is created by a marked rheme, fronting the prepositional phrases in the verbal clauses. The marking focuses the parallels in the first two clauses, clearly pointing to the merism. In addition, Yahweh is the one agent in the merism, whereas Israel is the recipient of the Lord's activity.

In the third clause Israel becomes the subject, while the verb changes to Qal. The third clause networks with both the first and second clauses. In the first clause 'hear his voice' is in parallel with 'you heard his words' in the third clause. The words 'his great fire' in the second clause parallel 'out of the fire' in the third clause. This networking of the chiastic clause with both the clauses in merism is an example of how involved the chiastic interweaving can become. The result is a picture full of perceptual imagery, a synoptic print which
shows Yahweh speaking from heaven and showing his fire from earth, while Israel hears His words from the fire.

The three activities in the one event all occur simultaneously. There is no sequence. The revelatory event is a unified composite of these three elements. In 36ba the text says that the Lord had "shown you his great fire." V. 36bb shows another side of this fiery revelation by noting that Israel had heard His words out of the fire. The fiery theophany included both sight and sound.

Another feature of the chiasm is the relationship between the Revelator and the recipient of the revelation. Yahweh is active and Israel is the passive recipient - in spite of the active verb.

The chiasm plays a significant part of the striking context of vv. 32-40. The rhetorical questions in vv. 32-34 face Israel with the uniqueness in both time (from creation onward) and space (from one end of heaven to the other) of the redeeming acts of Yahweh. These acts include his revelatory speech out of fire and his redeeming them from Egypt. V. 35 concludes the first point by indicating that the purpose of these saving acts of Yahweh is that Israel might know that it is Yahweh who is unique.

V. 36 takes up this same point by using the spatial language again - but this time with a merism that shows that the revelatory acts included both heaven and earth. This latter point is not clear until v. 39, which calls on Israel to acknowledge that it is the Lord who is God, both in heaven above and on the earth beneath - there is no one like Him. He transcends the idols of both heaven and earth. As a series of conjunctive clauses v. 36 is in asyndetic relationship to v. 35 and
explains the uniqueness of Yahweh by the uniqueness of his revelatory acts from heaven and earth. The conclusion in v. 39 shows the value of each point which has been mentioned. Yahweh is God both in heaven and upon the earth. The chiasm plays a significant part of this important point by carefully adjusting and balancing the merism of the two preceding clauses. As in 4:12, what they saw in the fire was not a form; rather, they heard a voice. The chiasm is theologically significant and communicatively important. It is no mere ornament. The nuances created by such chiastic interlacing of events, situations or other elements are cognitive and not simply impressionistic.

Dt. 5:24

The Lord showed us his glory and his greatness
And his voice we heard from the midst of the fire.

Chiastic Sequence: V S DO & DO
DO V Pp

The difference between this chiasm and the earlier one in 4:36 is the lack of involved networking and the perspective. The chiasm in 4:36 is Moses' words to the people, the one here is the people's words to Moses. Just as in 4:36, the scene at Sinai is unified by this chiasm and put onto one canvas: "The Lord showed us his glory and greatness; at the same time we heard his voice from the midst of the fire." It should be noted in passing that the staging is not of one agent but
two, i.e., the Lord reveals and Israel hears. Again, there is no sequence here; the chiasm focuses on the simultaneity of the two sides of the one event. The unifying factor is defined by the objects, which all refer to Yahweh's work of revelation. The figure is impressive and this is no surprise. The Israelites were deeply impressed. The next sentence gives their own conclusion: "Today we have seen that God speaks with man and he lives." In the biblical revelation this is startling, so startling to these Israelites that they proceed to show their cynicism about this very point. Just because they do not believe this situation can persist they ask Moses to become their mediator, apparently assuming that he was immune to this danger.

In the context this chiasm presents the first step in the appeal of the Israelites for a mediator. It was this event which incited them to come to Moses with such a request. For them the event is portrayed, as in chapter 4, as a combination of seeing and hearing (typical prophetic language). The Lord had shown them his greatness and glory; He had spoken to them out of the fire. From this two-sided portrayal of the revelatory face-to-face event they argued that a continuing experience of such a relationship would lead to their deaths. Therefore they requested that Moses be their mediator. This citation is part of Moses' argument that he is the legitimate teacher of the commands and statutes, 5:1.

Dt. 5:27
Approach you and hear everything which...
And you speak to us...

Chiastic Sequence: Imv S & Imv DO
& S Imv

It is the varied position of the pronoun in this verse that creates the chiasm. This chiasm causes rhetorical underscoring by eliminating the sequence of the two segments of the mediatorial activity of Moses, i.e., both activities of the mediator -- going to the Lord to hear, and returning to the people to tell that word -- are placed into one stage setting. When the use of the contrastive pronouns is also brought into view the rhetorical figure becomes doubly impressive:

Approach you (not we) and hear what the Lord says
You (not the Lord) tell us what the Lord says

There is not only the rhetorical figure here, but also the double use of the pleonastic pronoun which indicates contrast. These items in conjunction show the speaker's art in a significant way and indicate the power of syntactic ordering in communication. The chiasm is impressive enough by itself, because it joins the twin functions of the mediator into one portrait. When the function of the contrastive pronouns is added to this the communication value of the whole is quite significant.

The synoptic staging of the twin roles of the one mediator is carefully nuanced by the double set of contrasts: you (not we) and you (not the
These contrasts do not change the picture at all; they only show that the twin role of the mediator is to be distinguished from what the people do and what the Lord will do.

The two events in the synopsis are not simultaneous, but the staging unifies them and further indicates the literary power of the chiasm. It can take sequential events and stage them as parts of a whole. These two acts of Moses, approaching the Lord to hear his word, and returning and telling the people what he said, are clearly part of a sequence, but here they are two parts of Moses' mediatorial function. The chiasm can take sequential acts and stage them as part of a whole; two acts in sequence are nevertheless constituent parts of a unity. The point here is that there is no tension between sequence and synopsis. The fact that both sequence and contrast are important elements of the synoptic demonstrates the need to adjust Andersen's insistence on simultaneity and similarity. That which unifies the network of elements is the mediatorial work of Moses, not the fact that the acts are staged as simultaneous. The contrast is part of the sequence, i.e., the first pronoun contrasts Moses and the people, since he is the one to approach the Lord, and the second pronoun contrasts Moses' and the Lord, since it is Moses and not the Lord who is to return with the revelation for them.

Dt. 5:32b,33
Do not turn aside to the right or to the left, 
Walk in all the way that the Lord your God has commanded you.

Chiastic Sequence: neg V AdvAcc & AdvAcc 
Pp... V

This asyndetic chiastic sentence gives an exposition of the preceding command, and in typical Deuteronomic fashion, paints in the negative and positive poles of the preceding injunction to be obedient. Although semantically the commands are on positive/negative poles, they are two sides of the same coin and are united by the chiasm, which highlights the unity of these poles. The injunctives are not two acts that take place at the same time, but two ways of expressing the same command, i.e., they are a perspective on the same act. The exegetical significance of the figure is clear. As has been said, the asyndeton is expository. The two chiastic clauses basically say the same thing from two different poles, and thus give an explanation of what means. The contextual discussion shows that the opposite poles (i.e., the negative and positive assertions) are different ways of pointing to the same whole. This chiasm is significant as well because it occurs at the center of a word-chiasm in 5:27-6:3.262

Dt. 6:22,23

Before our eyes the Lord sent miraculous signs and wonders upon Egypt and Pharaoh and his whole household, while us he brought out of there...

Chiastic Sequence: V S O Pp....
O V Pp...

This chiasm is a verb object/object verb crossover which correlates the signs and wonders in Egypt against Pharaoh and his house, with deliverance from Egypt. The synoptic connects judgment and deliverance in one snapshot: we can see the Lord displaying great might and ominous signs before Pharaoh and the people of Egypt as He brings the people out of the land. So here the chiasm displays two sets of actions from the hand of one agent, but as a unified event: Yahweh's signs and wonders against Egypt in conjunction with his delivering Israel. The Exodus act is separated into two basic constituents but it is portrayed in one scene. The two events are negative and positive poles of God's work of redeeming Israel. It is probably correct to say there is no sequence here, since the miraculous acts and signs include that last act by which Yahweh delivered his people.

Furthermore the chiasm occurs as part of the answer of the father to the son beginning in v. 21. In that verse the father first puts both parts of this duplex scene in one statement:

The Lord brought us forth with a strong hand.
Then in 22.23 the chiasm divides the verbal action and the instrumentality into two clauses in chiasm:

The Lord performed great and mighty signs and portents against Egypt, Pharaoh, and his court.
Us he brought forth from there to bring us to the land.

Compared to the unified statement in v. 21 there is an important addition to the second clause in the chiasm; whereas v. 21 had only mentioned bringing the people out of the land this addition shows the goal of this redemptive act - bringing the people into the land promised to the fathers, an important sub-theme of this chapter.

Dt. 7:10

ןִּיחַ֣שְׁדָּלָהֹ֥ו אֶל-אָדָ֣ם לְתוֹךְ הַלָּהֹ֥ו
וּלֺאִ֥י נֹעַ֥ד
לָשׁוֹן֙ אִלְּאָבֲעָרִ֔ית יִשְׁלָ֖ם לִלְבֵּֽךְ
And recompensing the one who hates him openly...
He does not delay....
The one who openly hates him he recompenses.

Chiastic Sequence: Vbl Pp to his face... Pp to his face V

These three clauses are part of a larger construction, a set of four attributive clauses whose head is 'the faithful God' in vs 9. The chiasm begins with the second clause in the set, which itself is in conjunction with the first clause. The clauses in chiasm are repetitive asyndeton, whereas the third clause, לָשׁוֹן אִלְּאָבֲעָרִית is apparently an added adverbial explanation in view of the purpose clause חַיְבֵּךְ, i.e.,
the threat of destruction is immediate and requires explanation. In any case, it shows that the retribution will be swift.\textsuperscript{263}

It is worth suggesting that the contrast here is 'a thousand generations' versus 'without delay', whereas in the second commandment the contrast is 'a thousand generations' versus 'third to fourth generations.' In addition, the order in the sanction is the reverse of the commandment, just as in Ex. 34:7, first blessing and then curse.

It would be stretching the analysis, however, to say that this chiasm is presenting two sides of a picture; the clauses are in almost identical parallelism, and restate the same fact. There is no simultaneity; there is no sequence. There are, however, three things which highlight the repetition, namely, the chiastic structure, the change in verb from participle to finite verb, and thirdly, the intervening clause which the chiastic clauses surround.

The intervening clause strengthens the general point by showing that not only will the Lord surely punish the impudent; he will also do it quickly. The presence of the intervening clause also indicates that a chiasm can combine with another clause to produce an added effect. There is no artificial or mechanical use of rhetorical devices here.

The command to acknowledge this God, in contrast to the gods of Canaan, is an injunction to keep the second commandment because the Lord of this covenant is faithful and will abide by the sanctions of that commandment. The attributive language here picks up on the sanctions

\textsuperscript{263} The second and third clauses are antithetical clauses in 'apposition'. Andersen notes that Dt likes to follow up the antithesis with a positive statement. In addition, the fact that the chiasm is separated by a clause is another indication that such devices are more complex than a simple conjunction of two similar clauses.
of the that command, although in reverse order. The injunctives in 9 and 11 indicate that the reasons Yahweh chose Israel were given to encourage obedience in the face of false pride. If Israel considered these reasons and acknowledged Yahweh's covenant fidelity to his obedient people she would be motivated to faithfulness.

Dt. 10:16

Circumcise the foreskin of your hearts Stiffen your necks no longer.

Chiastic Sequence: V DO & DO V

This chiasm puts two synonymous statements in unison. Moses commands Israel to bring about inward changes with a positive and a negative injunction. There is no sequence implied. The two clauses are two perspectives of one and the same act, two ways of stating the requirement for an internal change.

In view of such particular love Moses commands Israel to quit being stubborn. Dillmann suggests that the command in 16 may be

[Citation #264]

264 Cf. M. Kline, The Treaty of the Great King (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), p. 69. Dillmann, Deuteronomy: 273, notes that vv. 9f are "a free interpretation of the words of the Decalogue and fitted to the present purpose..." Dillmann also notes that these verses guard against the possibility of drawing false conclusions from the Decalogue by showing that the Lord will punish not just the children but also the sinner himself, in agreement with 24:16.
motivated by the reference in v. 15 to the patriarchs. Here the act of symbolizing the covenant relationship becomes spiritualized in order to show that what Yahweh requires of them is not a mere outward sign but an inward attitude which is the opposite of stubbornness toward the Lord. Dt. 30:6 shows that the purpose of this inward change is to create love to Yahweh, which would be the opposite of their stubbornness.

This chiasm is another example in Dt. of positive/negative alternation; first something is said positively, then negatively. Semantics and word order cooperate to lend weight to this two-sided injunctive. The two metaphors are theological synonyms, each conveying, in different ways, the need for Israel to become willing servants of Yahweh. The chiasm syntactically unites the two into one idea. Theologically they are two sides of the same coin. In view of the significance of both in Deuteronomy this correlation is quite important. This amounts to an injunction that Israel undergo a spiritual and ethical transformation.

9.3 Conclusion

The chiastic sentence is another example of interclausal relationships signaled by word order displacement. The displacement

---


266 Cf. Ex. 6:12, Jer. 4:4.

267 For the latter metaphor note ch. 9, which expands on the notion of Israel's stubbornness in manifold ways, and note the use of the vocabulary of qsh, qsy. For the former note Dt. 30:6.
does not itself unfold the relationship; it is only a pointer, a focus marker which highlights a network of relationships between the lead clause and the inverted clause. It is this network of relationships that is responsible for the discourse function of the chiastic sentence.

As far as the discourse function of the chiastic sentence is concerned, Andersen's model is basically correct, namely, the idea of two sides of a coin, the presentation of two aspects of a synoptic, etc. His examples and his discussion yield two spectra of types, the first group including all those unified sets from the simultaneous to the sequential and the second group from the similar to the antithetical. He is uncomfortable, however, with the presence of what he logically infers to be clear sequence between the two clauses. In the critique of his work we were able to see at least five examples where sequence was necessary and clear, enough to show that there is a need to rethink the question of sequence in chiastic sentences.

The examples show that the chiastic sentence can use either contrast or sequence and stage them as a part of a larger unity. That unity Andersen approaches from these two spectra. In the corpus three of the four end-points of Andersen's two sets are present, simultaneity (4:36, 5:24), sequential (4:13, 14, 5:27, 6:22, 23), similar (including repetitive, 7:10, 5:32b,33, 7:15, 10:16).

Our reaction to the presence of these varied functions should not be to mold some of them into one of them, i.e., attempt to squeeze all into one mold, or to call one of them atypical, but to appreciate the variety included in the unifying power of the chiasm.
We can conclude that the purpose of the chiasm is not merely aesthetic, but also cognitive. The avoidance of sequence has a clear function which we may label as synoptic. It is this synopsis which the author is pointing to by the word order inversion in the chiastic clause, which in turn points to the network of elements between the two clauses of the whole sentence.
Chapter 10
Pleonastic Pronouns with Finite Verbs

10.0 Introduction

The term pleonasm in general grammar refers to some redundancy. Waltke-O'Connor define the term as a:

a grammatical element that is semantically empty and is used chiefly to fill a needed syntactic slot, e.g., it in 'It's raining' is a dummy pronoun, with no true antecedent.\(^{269}\)

In this chapter we will look at the independent personal pronoun in conjunction with the finite verb in main clauses.\(^{269}\) An investigation of the pleonastic pronoun in nominal clauses will be reserved for the chapter on the cleft sentence. The pronoun is superfluous in this case

\(^{268}\) B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 690.

\(^{269}\) Cf. B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: 293.
because it is already indicated in the verb form.\textsuperscript{270} Obviously, other substantive types are not superfluous, since they introduce a specific subject.

In English such recurrence often indicates marking, i.e., the repetition highlights the item repeated for some reason, although this refers to lexical, not syntactic marking.\textsuperscript{271} In BH the question is whether such recurrence has any function in the text. Driver noted the occurrence of such pronouns and said they were emphatic. Compare the following with and without the pronoun:

\begin{quote}
'\textit{whom you knew.}' Dt. 9:2\textsuperscript{272}
\textit{whom you did not know.}' Dt. 11:28
\end{quote}

He calls the first example emphatic but does not say in what sense or even suggest a translation which indicates such emphasis. It is difficult to know what to make of such suggestions if they give no guidance to the reader for interpretation.

Various scholars do point to the functions such repetition may have. These are:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{270} T. Muraoka, \textit{Emphatic Words}: 31, notes that the pronoun is formally redundant and gives a two-fold expression to one and the same linguistic content, i.e., person.
\item \textsuperscript{271} Quirk, \textit{Comprehensive English Grammar}: § 7.89, 18.58, 19.23
\end{itemize}
1. Contrast:273

Ahithophel has advised...to do such and such, but I advised them to do so and so. 2 Sam 17:15

In this example the pronoun 'I' is superfluous and is in contrast with 'Ahithophel.'

2. Psychological Focus:274

I will really be your chief. Jud. 11:9

Those who defend this view assume that the pronoun is in some way emotive, i.e., that it principally refers to the emotional state of the speaker. In this view the pleonastic pronoun in some way marks that emotive state.275

In light of the functions suggested by others for its use in various environments we will examine the corpus for the function of pleonastic pronouns in main clauses. If this pronoun is used for syntactic marking it should have some contextually observable function. The emotive examples are difficult to observe in the context, but the use

---


274 B. Waltke, M. O'Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax: § 16.3.2e. The example and its gloss is from this work. Also see T. Muraoka, Emphatic Words: 49-54.

275 See our ch. 4, for a critique of this category.
the pleonastic pronoun to mark contrast seems clear. We will therefore examine the corpus for any such functions.

This section does not include these pronouns when they are found in nominal sentences. Here we will only look at examples in main verbal clauses where the independent pronoun is clearly superfluous, i.e., where the person is already indicated in the verb. As in the discussion of fronting it will be necessary to separate the examples into those which exhibit contrastive emphasis and those which do not.

10.1 The Corpus

Dt. 4:33

Has a people heard the voice of God speaking from the midst of the fire
As you have heard, and lived?

The pronoun following the verb is pleonastic; it is not necessary grammatically. But is it emphatic? What does it highlight? The question "has a nation has heard the voice of a god speaking from the midst of the fire?" supplies the answer. The pronoun you is in marked focus against the background question, "Has a people heard...?" What no nation had ever heard Israel had indeed heard. No (other) people has ever heard, but Israel has. Not only did they hear; they lived through it! The pleonasm, then, sets up contrastive emphasis between בָּנֵי and בָּנָיהָ.

276 There will be no attempt to discuss the complex issue of word order in nominal clauses. There is not enough evidence in the corpus to suggest anything one way or another.
Dt. 4:35

Or, has a god ever tried to go and take for himself a nation from the midst of a nation, by tests, by signs and by wonders and by war... according to all that God has done for you, before your very eyes in Egypt?
Yet you were shown so you might know that...

The pleonastic pronoun beginning v. 35 highlights the unique experience of Israel by taking up the contrast already explicitly made in vs. 34. In 34, however, the contrast is between what no god has ever done for a nation and what the God of Israel had done in His role as the deliverer of His people. The term of comparison in vv. 33,34 is comprised of the comparative clause in v. 33 in conjunction with the relative clause in v. 34. The two subordinate clauses portray Israel as those who had heard God's revelatory speech and had personally seen God's mighty acts of deliverance in Egypt. The pleonastic pronoun in v. 35 picks up the references to Israel in the two preceding subordinate clauses and resumes the topic in v. 32, beginning a new paragraph.277

---

277 V. 36 is adverbial to v. 35 and describes the character of the revelation from Sinai. V. 37 is a disjunctive clause which continues the asyndetic clause in v. 36, completing the two-fold characterization of Yahweh's revelatory action, and using the same order as in 33,34, i.e., Sinai-Exodus. Only with v. 39 does the topic continue. Vv. 37aB and b have narrative imperfects which continue the action not in the main verb in v. 35, but the verb in the disjunctive clause in v. 37.
The shift in topic, however, does more than create a new paragraph. It functions against the preceding context to produce contrast.\(^{278}\) V. 33 asks the question whether a people had ever heard the voice of God? This question is the explicit background which forms the contrasting member with the pronoun beginning v. 35. What no other nation has seen or experienced Yahweh has revealed to his people.

Dt. 5:3

לֹא מָצָאתָם כִּלָּה אַתֶּנָּה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הָאֲדָמָה
כִּי אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּנָּה אֱלֹהֵינוּ פְּלֵם חַיָּה

The Lord did not make this covenant with our fathers. Rather, it was with us (sc. 'he made the covenant.'), with those of us here today...

This second antithetical clause in this sentence is elliptical, i.e., the subject, verb and object of the preceding negative clause are assumed but not explicitly stated. The repetition of the personal pronoun in the elliptical clause creates added focus on the suffixed preposition phrase. Since the 'ל...אֶל already sets the two fronted clauses ('not with our fathers...but with us...') in antithesis, the pleonastic pronoun underlines the contrast and indicates what the member of significance is in the contrast.\(^{279}\)

Dt. 5:27


\(^{279}\) Cf. 1 Sam. 25:24 and 1 Kgs 1:26.
You approach and hear what the Lord our God says.
You tell us what the Lord says.

Within a speech a new command often begins asyndetically. Although this passage has already been discussed in the section on chiasm, the use of the pronoun is under consideration here. Since the person is already indicated in the imperative the two pronouns are obviously unnecessary. Do they have any discourse function? In the context the answer is clear; the Israelites want Moses, not themselves, to go and receive the words of God for them. This is a case of contrastive emphasis. "You, not we, must approach the Lord." In the second case the sentence would be "You, not the Lord, speak to us." Although this contrast is implicit from the immediate context the parallel passage in Ex. 20:19 makes this second contrast explicit:

You Speak with us that we may hear
But do not let the Lord speak with us.

In the passage in Exodus the two conjunctive clauses are also in chiasm:

V S(Pr) Pp

280 Cf. 5:30.
281 Not to mention the fact that they are quite infrequent with imperatives.
The two elements in chiasm are the subjects and prepositional phrases. In addition the verbs are identical, increasing the effect of the chiasm. The second clause shows clearly that the pronoun is contrastive.

In the passage in Exodus the second clause indicates an explicit contrast between you/not the Lord, whereas in Deuteronomy the preceding context makes this contrast clear. In Dt. 5: 25,26 the comments of Israel show the basis of their request to Moses. They ask the rhetorical question, "Why should we die, for this great fire will consume us?" A second comment is an asyndetic conditional sentence gives the reason for their conclusion, "If we continue hearing the voice of the Lord our God any longer then we will die." These two comments show why they ask Moses to be their mediator. It is because they do not wish to hear Yahweh speak to them again. They are afraid of the consequences. Exodus has the same contrast but produces it in a different way. This particular example shows how fine a nuance is possible in a particular situational context using these rhetorical features.

Dt. 5:31

Go tell them, "Return to your tents." But you stay here with me.
The contrastive emphasis is explicitly established by vs 30. The Lord instructs Moses to tell the people to return to their tents whereas he (not they) is to remain with the Lord. Of course this contrast, added to the two in verse 27, is at the heart of the subject matter. The people had asked for a mediator and now the Lord is granting that request. The contrast is the point of the whole section. Their request and the Lord’s assent to that request establishes the legitimacy of Moses as mediator. This therefore establishes the call of Moses to Israel in v. 1 to hear what he was teaching them.

Dt. 9:3 (See discussion in chapter on the Cleft Sentences)

It is He Himself who will destroy them, and it is He Himself who will subdue them before you.

The presence of the pleonastic pronouns in both the clauses of this conjunctive sentence raises the question of their function. Since the preceding cleft sentence has already set up a contrast, and since these two pronouns resume the previous subject, it is clear that the function of the pleonastic pronouns is to continue the stress already begun in the cleft sentence. Since that stress creates contrastive focus these two pronouns resume and continue that contrastive stress. The translation suggests the meaning:

You are to acknowledge today that
It is the Lord Himself who is crossing before you as a consuming fire;
It is He Himself who will destroy them and
it is He Himself who will subdue them before you. 282

10.2 Conclusion

All the examples of pleonastic pronouns in main clauses in the corpus function contrastively, indicating at least that contrast is one of the significant discourse functions of pleonasm. The recurrence of the pronoun outside its bound use with the verb marks contrast. It is possible that it also marks other functions, such as change of topic, etc. We may conclude, for these examples at least, that pleonasm is a misnomer. The pronoun is not superfluous syntactically; it points to one or more discourse functions. While the occurrence of the pronouns may be syntactically repetitive they are not unnecessary. On the contrary they have a clear literary function.

It might seem simple to conclude that this is the only use of the pleonastic pronoun in BH, at least in main clauses. That would be too easy, however, since, as we saw in the chapter on emphasis, there are disputed categories, especially concerning the notion of psychological emphasis. This category in particular needs more clarification.
11.0 Introduction

There are several clear gains from the study of the various constructions in Deuteronomy 4-11. In a general way all of these results concern the relationship of the constructions with the immediate context, either on an interclausal level, or with the context of nearby clauses. The discourse function of these constructions becomes clear only as a result of joint syntactic and semantic considerations, i.e., form and meaning function together.

11.1 The Function of Emphasis

The first significant result of the study is the usefulness of the new working definition of emphasis. By identifying emphasis with marked focus it is possible to maintain a clearer notion of the meaning and function of emphasis in BH. In that way it is possible to study each of the constructions as functions, i.e., as the results of the interaction of word order highlighting with the context. Studies in modern linguistics suggest such an approach and a consideration of the
various constructions in their contexts have corroborated the definition. Because BH is a dead language we cannot have complete certainty on such matters but the requirement that emphasis be highlighting working in conjunction with the context protects the definition from circularity. It is always open to the test of the (textual) context.

11.2 Syntactic Displacement and Discourse Function

Syntactic displacement provides a major example of the function of a construction in its context. Such positional or word-order displacement functions as a focus marker on a clause level. This clause level marker, however, operates in conjunction with some other element in the context to create a meaning relationship. In the case of the chiasm, for example, the word-order displacement creates a complex interlacing of interclausal components which, in turn, produce a nuanced synopsis of the elements of both clauses. Emphatic word-order displacements such as the cleft sentence and fronting produce special focus which operates with some element outside the clause to produce discourse functions such as contrast and topic shifting. The disjunctive clause often functions independently of the waw consecutive clause when it begins or ends sections, but it may function in parallel with asyndetic clauses to form special relations of complementarity. This demonstrates that all of the devices, to one degree or another, function within discourse and as an integral part of that discourse. Such a finding should encourage further study of the discourse function of these and other constructions.
11.3 Syntax and Style

The syntactic contribution to style clearly demonstrates that rhetoric is more than form or manner. The stylistic aspect of discourse creates effective communication just because it is a skillful interweaving of the various types of rhetorical devices for a specific occasion. The expressive creates an effect and grabs the attention, serving the point the writer/speaker wishes to make. When the device is not only expressive but also cognitive, as in cases of contrastive emphasis, emphasis has the further use of pointing to logical contrast. The syntactic constructions studied here indicate the various ways in which word-order displacement contribute to effective discourse.

The study also indicates that variation in word order produces stylistic constructions. For example, the inversion of order which produces the chiastic sentence is a variation from a preceding waw consecutive. With the exception of Andersen's study most scholars have appreciated only the stylistic elegance and overall general impact of the grammatical chiasm. Andersen has shown that the construction also brings a clear semantic contribution to the context. The avoidance of the waw consecutive has a purposeful semantic and syntactic function to play in the context. The variation in the word order is a syntactic variation from the normative (high frequency order) word order. This corroborates on the syntactic level the view that style is related to variation.

Although some of the constructions in this study are considered to be stylistic devices we can conclude that emphasis is more than
expressive when the context indicates contrast. In this case the emphasis is also cognitive. Emphasis as a highlighting device can point to either expressive or cognitive functions within the text. Effective discourse involves a wide range of rhetorical devices, and the effects these devices produce include both the expressive and the cognitive.

The use of marked focus to point to the creation of a new topic, the maintenance of an ongoing topic, or the resumption of a previous topic, points more to discourse strategy than to the (overlapping) opposition between effective and cognitive. In Dt 1:38, for example, the object pronoun continues the topic set by the previous cleft sentence. The marked focus created by the shift in word order maintains the continuing topic.

11.4 Word Order and Discourse Function

Alongside the finding that emphasis may be cognitive is the important advancement in our understanding of the function of word order in BH. Linguists have noted that various languages have alternate means of indicating marked focus, and that word order inversion is one of those. Word order displacement functions in different ways in the various constructions depending on their special relationship to the context. The shifts in focus can signal contrast, point to a collocation of substantives, changes in discourse topic, or chiasm.

Although the study of the corpus indicates no challenge to the views of Andersen concerning word order in the nominal clause, it will
be necessary to investigate a larger body of text to substantiate this finding. If he is correct the nominal cleft sentence may be just that construction which provides emphasis for the nominal clause. If so this finding confirms his position.

11.5 The Asyndetic Clause

In many ways our understanding of the asyndetic clause, which functions alongside the waw consecutive and the disjunctive clause in a variety of ways, is the linch pin of this study. The suggestion here is that the word order of the asyndetic clause is crucial to an understanding of word order in various types of BH verbal clauses. It is only when the order of the asyndetic clause is separated from the waw consecutive and the disjunctive clause that we can make genuine progress in our understanding of parataxis and of word order studies.

We have made a few suggestions about some of the functions of the asyndetic clause, in particular, its paragraph initiating and ending features (which have clear implications for compositional techniques), and its function in conjunction with the disjunctive clause. Because the asyndetic clause begins with nothing (no waw) there are no syntactic clues, other than juxtaposition, to indicate its function.283 The only way to determine its use is the semantic relationships it enters into in

---

283 P. H. Matthews, Syntax: 224, calls juxtaposition "the most primitive constructional relation . . ." On p. 222, he notes that parataxis posits "no syntactic relationship." Obviously, this is not true for BH once we see the way in which these clauses operate in opposition to each other to indicate discourse function.
The classification of semantic relations between asyndetic clauses and their lead clauses will allow a more accurate understanding of these clauses in their contexts and prevent atomistic interpretation of the asyndetic clause without a due consideration of its relationship to the lead clause. There is sufficient reason for an extended study of asyndetic clauses.

Appendix: List of Database Examples

1. The Disjunctive Clause (cf. Table 1 in § 1.1.1)

   a. The Subject-Verb Relative Order

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Gen 14:10</td>
<td>27. Gen 24:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gen 15:15</td>
<td>30. Dt 1:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gen 16:1</td>
<td>32. Dt 2:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gen 17:6</td>
<td>33. Dt 2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gen 17:9</td>
<td>34. Dt 2:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gen 17:12</td>
<td>35. Dt 3:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gen 19:6</td>
<td>40. Dt 8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gen 19:23</td>
<td>42. Dt 8:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Gen 19:24</td>
<td>43. Dt 8:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gen 20:4</td>
<td>44. Dt 9:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Gen 22:1</td>
<td>47. Dt 11:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Gen 24:1</td>
<td>50. Dt 31:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. The Verb-Subject Relative Order

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gen 14:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gen 18:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gen 23:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gen 25:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dt 4:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dt 4:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dt 7:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dt 9:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dt 10:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. The Verb-Object Relative Order

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gen 14:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gen 17:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Gen 21:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gen 22:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gen 23:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Gen 24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gen 24:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gen 24:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Gen 24:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Gen 24:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dt 1:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Dt 1:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dt 1:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Dt 2:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Dt 2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Dt 2:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Dt 3:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Dt 3:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Dt 3:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Dt 3:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Dt 4:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Dt 5:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Dt 9:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Dt 9:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Dt 11:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Dt 30:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Dt 31:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. The Object-Verb Relative Order

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gen 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gen 12:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Gen 14:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gen 14:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gen 15:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Gen 17:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gen 17:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gen 19:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Gen 19:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Gen 24:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Gen 24:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Gen 24:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Dt 1:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dt 2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Dt 2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Dt 2:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Dt 3:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Dt 3:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Dt 3:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Dt 3:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Dt 4:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Dt 4:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Dt 4:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Dt 5:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Dt 6:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Dt 6:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Dt 7:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Dt 7:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Dt 7:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Dt 7:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Dt 7:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Dt 8:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Dt 9:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Dt 9:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Dt 10:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Dt 29:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Asyndetic Clause (cf. Table 3 in § 1.1.2)

a. The Subject-Verb Relative Order

1. Gen 13:12  
2. Gen 14:3  
3. Gen 14:23  
4. Gen 16:5  
5. Gen 19:9  
7. Gen 21:24  
8. Gen 22:8  
9. Gen 24:39  
10. Dt 1:6  
11. Dt 1:10  
12. Dt 1:28  
13. Dt 1:30  
14. Dt 1:36  
15. Dt 1:41  
16. Dt 2:11  
17. Dt 2:20  
18. Dt 2:20  
19. Dt 3:9  
20. Dt 3:14  
21. Dt 3:18  
22. Dt 3:24  
23. Dt 4:35  
24. Dt 5:2  
25. Dt 8:4  
26. Dt 8:17  
27. Dt 29:1  
28. Dt 31:3

b. The Verb-Subject Relative Order

1. Gen 15:4  
2. Gen 15:18  
3. Gen 16:5  
4. Gen 17:13  
5. Gen 17:26  
6. Gen 18:4  
7. Gen 18:13  
8. Gen 21:7  
9. Gen 21:16  
10. Gen 24:5  
11. Gen 24:39  
12. Gen 24:50  
13. Dt 1:5  
14. Dt 1:21  
15. Dt 1:37  
16. Dt 2:36  
17. Dt 3:21  
18. Dt 4:26  
19. Dt 5:3  
20. Dt 5:4  
21. Dt 5:22  
22. Dt 5:27  
23. Dt 5:28  
24. Dt 7:6  
25. Dt 7:16  
26. Dt 7:19  
27. Dt 7:24  
28. Dt 9:4  
29. Dt 10:1  
30. Dt 10:6  
31. Dt 10:8  
32. Dt 10:10  
33. Dt 10:15  
34. Dt 10:22  
35. Dt 11:25  
36. Dt 11:25  
37. Dt 29:4  
38. Dt 29:19  
39. Dt 30:18
c. The Verb-Object Relative Order

1. Gen 13:14  
2. Gen 14:21  
3. Gen 14:22  
4. Gen 14:23  
5. Gen 15:4  
6. Gen 15:9  
7. Gen 15:18  
8. Gen 16:5  
9. Gen 16:6  
10. Gen 16:10  
11. Gen 17:10  
12. Gen 19:5  
13. Gen 19:8  
14. Gen 19:15  
15. Gen 19:22  
16. Gen 19:34  
17. Gen 20:5  
18. Gen 21:7  
19. Gen 21:10  
20. Gen 21:11  
21. Gen 21:18  
22. Gen 22:2  
23. Gen 22:8  
24. Gen 22:12  
25. Gen 23:4  
27. Gen 23:6  
28. Gen 23:11  
29. Gen 23:13  
30. Gen 24:2  
31. Gen 24:14  
32. Gen 24:17  
33. Gen 24:37  
34. Gen 24:39  
35. Gen 24:56  
36. Dt 1:6  
37. Dt 1:8  
38. Dt 1:10  
39. Dt 1:13  
40. Dt 1:17  
41. Dt 1:21  
42. Dt 1:22  
43. Dt 1:28  
44. Dt 1:36

45. Dt 2:7  
46. Dt 2:9  
47. Dt 2:19  
48. Dt 2:24  
49. Dt 2:34  
50. Dt 3:2  
51. Dt 3:9  
52. Dt 3:14  
53. Dt 3:18  
54. Dt 3:22  
55. Dt 3:27  
56. Dt 4:5  
57. Dt 4:5  
58. Dt 4:10  
59. Dt 4:31  
60. Dt 4:36  
61. Dt 5:1  
62. Dt 5:2  
63. Dt 5:28  
64. Dt 6:16  
65. Dt 6:17  
66. Dt 7:2  
67. Dt 7:2  
68. Dt 7:18  
69. Dt 7:25  
70. Dt 8:17  
71. Dt 9:4  
72. Dt 9:7  
73. Dt 9:12  
74. Dt 9:13  
75. Dt 9:16  
76. Dt 9:23  
77. Dt 9:26  
78. Dt 29:1  
79. Dt 30:15  
80. Dt 31:2  
81. Dt 31:3  
82. Dt 31:6  
83. Dt 31:8  
84. Dt 31:12  
85. Dt 31:14  
86. Dt 31:26  
87. Dt 31:28
d. Object-Verb Relative Order

1. Gen 17:14  
2. Gen 23:11  
3. Gen 24:8  
4. Dt 1:28  
5. Dt 1:38  
6. Dt 2:6  
7. Dt 2:28  
8. Dt 2:36  
9. Dt 6:13  
10. Dt 7:3  
11. Dt 7:5  
12. Dt 7:25  
13. Dt 8:1  
14. Dt 9:9  
15. Dt 9:18  
16. Dt 10:20  
17. Dt 10:20  
18. Dt 11:25  
19. Dt 29:5  
20. Dt 30:19
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