

# Parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew

BY

TAMAR ZEVI

BRILL

## Parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew

# Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics

*Editorial Board*

T. Muraoka and C.H.M. Versteegh

VOLUME 50

# Parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew

*By*

Tamar Zewi



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

ISSN 0081-8461  
ISBN 978 90 04 16243 3

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.  
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,  
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

## CONTENTS

Abbreviations for Bible Books .....	vii
Acknowledgments .....	ix
Chapter One Introduction .....	1
1.1 Parenthesis in General Linguistics .....	2
1.2 General Discourse Studies .....	8
1.3 Biblical Hebrew Syntax and Discourse Studies .....	10
1.4 Textual Philology: Interrupted Syntactic Structures as Possible Parentheses .....	21
1.5 Literary Approaches .....	25
1.6 Frame of Work .....	27
Chapter Two Parenthetical Clauses .....	31
2.1 External Expressions Referring to a Speaker, Appealing and Pleading, Affirming God's Existence, Identity, and Status or Indicating External Intervention, and Oath Patterns .....	31
2.1.1 Reference to a Speaker .....	32
2.1.2 Appeal and Plea .....	43
2.1.3 Affirmation of God's Existence, Identity, and Status .....	49
2.1.4 Oath Patterns .....	52
2.2 Narrative Formulas .....	54
2.2.1 A Formula Introduced by לָכֵן/עַל-כֵּן .....	55
2.2.2 A Formula Introduced by וַיִּתֵּן דְּבָרָיו .....	59
2.2.3 A Formula Indicating a Proper Name, a Month Name, or Related Information .....	59
2.3 External Information Mostly Expressed by Circumstantial Clauses .....	64
2.3.1 Examples Introducing Background Information .....	67
2.3.2 Examples of Foreshadowing .....	73
2.3.3 Examples Introducing Explanatory Information .....	77
2.3.4 Theological Remarks .....	86
2.3.5 Historical Remarks .....	91

2.3.6	Examples Introducing Other Marginal Information .....	98
Chapter Three	Parenthetical Words and Phrases .....	103
3.1	External Expressions Referring to a Speaker, Observer's Identity or an Individual Standpoint, Epistemic Modal Adverbials, Appeal and Plea, and Address .....	104
3.1.1	Reference to a Speaker .....	104
3.1.2	Observer's Identity .....	125
3.1.3	God's Standpoint .....	136
3.1.4	Epistemic Modal Adverbials .....	138
3.1.5	Appeal and Plea .....	150
3.1.6	Address .....	156
3.2	Narrative Time Co-Ordinates .....	158
3.2.1	The Phrases <i>עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה</i> and <i>עַד הַיּוֹם</i> .....	159
3.2.2	The Phrase <i>לְפָנַיִם</i> .....	164
3.2.3	The Phrases <i>בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא</i> and <i>בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא</i> .....	166
3.2.4	The Phrase <i>בְּעֵת הַהִיא</i> .....	168
3.2.5	The Phrase <i>מִיָּמַיִם יְמֵימָה</i> .....	169
Chapter Four	Conclusion .....	171
Bibliography	.....	175
Index of Citations	.....	185
Index of Subjects	.....	194
Index of Authors	.....	199

## ABBREVIATIONS FOR BIBLE BOOKS

Gen.	Genesis
Exod.	Exodus
Lev.	Leviticus
Num.	Numbers
Deut.	Deuteronomy
Josh.	Joshua
Judg.	Judges
1 Sam.	2 Samuel
2 Sam.	2 Samuel
1 Kgs.	2 Kings
2 Kgs.	2 Kings
Isa.	Isaiah
Jer.	Jeremiah
Ezek.	Ezekiel
Zeph.	Zephaniah
Ps.	Psalms
Job	
prov.	Proverbs
Ruth	
Esther	
1 Chron.	1 Chronicles
2 Chron.	2 Chronicles





## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This monograph evolved gradually alongside my ongoing work on other syntactic issues related to various Semitic languages. I have tried to integrate several fields of research which concern Biblical Hebrew and general Bible studies: linguistics, discourse studies, text linguistics, textual philology, literary approaches to the Bible, comparative Semitic, and Bible translation studies.

Now that my work is completed, I would like to express my gratitude first of all to Prof. Gideon Goldenberg and Prof. Anson F. Rainey, whose vast knowledge and good will have been an ongoing source of inspiration to my work. I would also like to thank Prof. Gideon Goldenberg for his sound advice on issues related to the current monograph. My sincere thanks go to Prof. S. E. Fassberg for reading my manuscript and commenting on it, for assisting me with bibliographical references, and for his constant good will and advice. I would also like to thank the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture for granting me a generous fellowship, which enabled me to accomplish my task to my satisfaction.

Finally, I would like to thank all my family, and especially my parents, Zfira and Moshe Dim, my husband Gill, and my children, Noga and Oded, who have appreciated and supported my work throughout the years.



## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

This book aims at a comprehensive presentation, discussion, and analysis of parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew. It begins with a theoretical discussion of parenthesis in general and continues with its recognition and realization in Biblical Hebrew. Complications are shown to arise in formulating a universal definition of the essence and structure of parenthesis, but also in the identification of parenthetical clauses, phrases, and words in specific languages, in particular Biblical Hebrew. Terms like parenthesis, parenthetical expression or remark, parenthetical unit or entity, and the like, are widely used in various related studies. In this book they primarily refer to any peripheral information external to a sentence, a piece of information which can be expressed by a single word, a phrase, or a clause.

Theoretical discussions of parenthesis can be traced in linguistic, discourse, and literary studies. Linguistic means to express peripheral parenthetical content are part of any language system. However, in many languages it might be difficult to determine the exact border between parenthetical units and other tangential constructions, the most prominent being certain types of sentence adverbials. As to adverbs and adverbial constructions, in Biblical Hebrew, for example, elements morphologically identifiable as adverbs are very rare.<sup>1</sup> Other adverbial units in Biblical Hebrew, including sentence adverbials, might be somewhat easier to trace and define. Parenthetical words and phrases in Biblical Hebrew are perhaps as exceptional as morphological adverbs. In fact, a comparison of Biblical Hebrew and Modern Hebrew reveals that most adverbs, sentence adverbials, and parenthetical words and phrases in use in Modern Hebrew were created in Medieval Hebrew, in the Hebrew of the enlightenment and revival, or in still later stages, and do not originate in Biblical Hebrew. Parenthetical words and phrases seem scarce in Biblical Hebrew. By contrast, certain Biblical Hebrew clauses and extended discourse units can more easily be pinpointed

---

<sup>1</sup> On elements morphologically identifiable as adverbs see, e.g., Kogut 2002:115–121.

and identified, and they can often be categorized as parenthetical not according to their shape but according to their content.<sup>2</sup>

In the light of these statements, in this book first parenthetical clauses are exhibited and discussed, and only in the next chapter are certain words and phrases described that might be relevant to the discussion. Most of them do not represent clear and perfect parenthetical units, and several might also be regarded as sentence adverbials.

### 1.1 PARENTHESIS IN GENERAL LINGUISTICS

As stated above, the widespread terms parenthesis, parenthetical expression or remark, parenthetical unit or entity, and the like, generally refer to any peripheral information, expressed by a single word, phrase, or clause, which in terms of content is external to a sentence. As for their syntax, it is generally accepted that parenthetical units do not depend syntactically on, and are not complements of, any sentence part or the sentence as a whole; the sentence to which they are attached is grammatically complete without them. A short review follows of several contributions to the delimitation, recognition, and explanation of parenthetical units.

A starting point for this review could well be the famous book of the well known linguist, Leonard Bloomfield, *Language*.<sup>3</sup> In a discussion of parataxis in syntax Bloomfield defines parenthesis as “a variety of parataxis in which one form interrupts the other.”<sup>4</sup> Many more later studies, when discussing parataxis, namely coordination or juxtaposition, versus hypotaxis, namely subordination, frequently state that parenthetical units are independent, and, like Bloomfield, that parentheses interrupt the sentence in which they appear.<sup>5</sup>

Another scholar, Ziv, mentions two characteristics of parenthetical units: they do not hold a fixed position in a sentence and they are not dependent on other sentence elements.<sup>6</sup> Both characteristics are based

---

<sup>2</sup> But note that recognizing boundaries of discourse units and their possible identification with orthographic paragraphs may also meet difficulties. For discussions of this complexity by many discourse scholars see, e.g., Brown & Yule 1983:95–100, §3.6.1.

<sup>3</sup> Bloomfield 1933.

<sup>4</sup> Bloomfield 1933:186, §12.3.

<sup>5</sup> See the continuation of this approach, e.g., in Peterson 1999, who accepts these terms and also defines the connection between parenthetical clauses and their host clauses as non-syntagmatic relations.

<sup>6</sup> Ziv 1985:182–183. On the possibility to locate parenthetical units in more than one position, also see, e.g., Peterson 1999:237–238, §5.

on negating certain properties. Elsewhere Ziv indicates that a positive definition of parenthetical units is generally absent in linguistic literature, although a common denominator of many linguistic treatments is “the observation that the entities in question lack any grammatical role in the sentential unit and do not partake in syntactic processes affecting the sentence.”<sup>7</sup>

Nevertheless, the basic criteria for syntactically identifying parenthetical units are not always completely fulfilled by units interpreted as parenthetical. In a chapter on parenthetical clauses Jespersen<sup>8</sup> mentioned units he entitled ‘ordinary parenthetical remarks’, like “This, I think, (or, This, it seems,) is madness,”<sup>9</sup> and ‘speaker’s aside’, like “Talking of golf, have you met Nelson lately?”<sup>10</sup> but also certain types of non-restrictive relative clauses and cleft sentences.<sup>11</sup> Non-restrictive relative clauses and the ‘*it is (is it) together with the connective word*’ component of cleft sentences, mentioned by Jespersen, cannot be called entirely syntactically independent. Another prominent problem which arises in various languages is the complexity in determining the exact border between parenthetical units and certain types of sentence adverbials.<sup>12</sup> Once again, a clear-cut detection and a satisfying syntactic description of a parenthetical unit, as completely distinct from sentence adverbials, are unattainable.

These two difficulties, namely (1) differentiating parenthetical and non-parenthetical units that both display a certain syntactic attachment

---

<sup>7</sup> Ziv 2001:1, and see more references regarding linguistic treatments of parenthetical units *ibid.*:10, note 1.

<sup>8</sup> Jespersen 1937:72–79, §25.

<sup>9</sup> Jespersen 1937:72, §25.1.

<sup>10</sup> Jespersen 1937:79, §25.9.

<sup>11</sup> Jespersen 1937:72–79, §25.2–§25.8. Note *ibid.*:76, §25.6. On the relation of non-restrictive relative clauses to parenthetical units in English see also McCawley 1988:427.

<sup>12</sup> Sentence adverbials are adverbs which function as sentence modifiers. They do not refer to certain parts of the sentence but to the sentence as a whole (Crystal 2003:14, Blau 1977:2–4, §1.2–§1.3). The borderline between parenthetical units and sentence adverbials is not clear, nor is that between sentence adverbials and other adverbials (e.g., Blau 1977:2, §1.2). On the complexity in the classification of English adverbs see, e.g., Greenbaum 1969:15–34, Biber & Others 1999:136, §3.4. On a partially similar use of modal parenthetical verbs and sentence adverbials and their dissimilarities, see Urmson 1952:486–489. Rouchota isolates an English group of adverbials which he labels ‘adverbial discourse connectives’, like *moreover, nevertheless, after all, furthermore, then*, etc. and suggests that in contrast to other connectives, like *but, whereas, so*, etc., the former should be regarded as parenthetical because they enjoy relatively free position and “function as a comment or gloss on some aspect of the meaning of the host clause” (Rouchota 1998:100–102).

by coordinates or subordinates to their host clause, and (2) differentiating parenthetical units and certain sentence adverbials, are tackled in other studies. One such example is Haegeman's paper on parenthetical adverbials in which she argues, following others, that "peripheral adverbials can best be treated as being outside the syntactic representation of the sentences which they modify" and further, that "such adverbials are not syntactically integrated in their modifiee at any level of representation."<sup>13</sup> Haegeman's work is established in the frame of Relevance theory, which is not our concern here, and she covers English examples only. Still, she discerns the loose syntactic connection of parenthetical adverbials to their host clause, while formally initiated by coordinates and subordinates similar to other sentence adverbials, and she observes that these constructions should be interpreted not on the level of syntax but of utterance, namely taking into account contextual pragmatic discourse considerations; these matters are significant for the current work. Espinal in a paper published at the same time<sup>14</sup> recognizes that there might be nothing syntactically peculiar in parenthetical units, as well as other disjuncts, in comparison with their host clauses. This paper introduces pragmatic considerations into the analysis of these constructions, mostly in English.

Contextual pragmatic discourse considerations are introduced into the analysis of English parenthetical units in earlier works also. Corum, as early as 1975, talks about the illocutionary force implicit in constructions she refers to as 'parenthetic adjuncts' and to which she assigns shared functional properties of strengthening or weakening the force of an assertion.<sup>15</sup> The term parenthetic adjuncts includes, according to Corum, parenthetical adverbs, adverbial phrases, parentheticals, some non-restrictive relative clauses, and rhetorical tag questions.<sup>16</sup> More-

---

<sup>13</sup> Haegeman 1991.

<sup>14</sup> Espinal 1991:727–728. By 'disjuncts' Espinal refers to "a wide variety of constituents [which] bear no obvious syntactic relationship to the sentences they seem to be included in," that is, disjunct sentences, disjunct appositive relatives, disjunct adjectival phrases, disjunct adverbial clauses, disjunct adverbial phrases, disjunct noun phrases, disjunct prepositional phrases and combined disjuncts (ibid.:726–727). The lack of syntactic relation between parenthetical units and their host clause is further treated by Burton-Roberts, who draws the discussion into the realm of utterance instead of the clause (Burton-Roberts 1999).

<sup>15</sup> Corum 1975.

<sup>16</sup> A 'tag question' is "a question structure usually consisting of an auxiliary verb plus pronoun, attached to the end of a statement in order to convey a negative or positive orientation" (Crystal 2003:456). The term 'parentheticals' may be differentiated as a special type of a parenthetical unit and it may accordingly be used in reference

over, the inclusion of such a variety of patterns under the single title parenthetical adjuncts reflects the difficulty of defining within the frame of syntax alone the exact distinction between parenthetical units and other interfacing syntactic patterns.<sup>17</sup> This problem is also manifested in later studies, such as Espinal's paper mentioned above.<sup>18</sup>

Yet again, pragmatic discourse considerations are called on for a description of a unique type of parenthesis in a paper published in 1979 by Mittwoch. This paper treats a special type of English parenthetical units, namely a final parenthetical question following another question, like "Is he going do you know", and other partly similar types, and Mittwoch compares them with equivalent sentences with opposite word order.<sup>19</sup> Mittwoch concludes that the two questions in such constructions are syntactically separate while pragmatically they form one unit. Another pragmatic approach analyzes German parenthetical units alongside a few English ones as syntactically separate units embedded in their host clauses for pragmatic reasons which do not contribute to the primary pragmatic function of the host clause. This view is expressed by Hoffmann.<sup>20</sup> Trumer's work on the status of parentheses from a pragmatic viewpoint is a similar attempt to introduce pragmatic

---

to "expressions which can be appended parenthetically to an anchor clause but which also have a non-parenthetical use in which they take a declarative content clause as complement—expressions like *I think, don't you think?*, and so on" (Huddleston & Pullum 2002:801).

<sup>17</sup> Pragmatic considerations are deliberated by Hand (1993) as well as his discussion of the common omission of 'that' before English indirect speech and its syntactic implications. Hand tries to minimize the need to syntactically distinguish between indirect speech propositions which contain 'that,' introducing embedded constructions, and those which avoid it, whose speech expression is parenthetical. An attitude expressing such indifference to the distinction between these two constructions is fairly common, e.g., Urmson 1952:481. Nonetheless, Hand's treatment of the topic does convey the pragmatic dissimilarity of the two constructions. Reinhart (1983), on the other hand, claims that the two constructions, with and without 'that,' when containing verbs expressing point of view alongside speech verbs, are evidently distinct. Reinhart claims that they can be distinguished by the number of points of view involved in each: a clause connected by 'that' expresses more than one point of view, but when parenthetical it expresses only one (Reinhart 1983:172–175). On p. 176 Reinhart too introduces into the discussion the need to look at the context to differentiate between the two types. A distinction between such embedded constructions with 'that' and others in which verbs like, think, know, etc., are parenthetically used, is also stated in Emonds 1973, though he is mainly interested in their representation in transformational grammar.

<sup>18</sup> Espinal 1991.

<sup>19</sup> Mittwoch 1979.

<sup>20</sup> Hoffmann 1998.



considerations into the analysis of parenthetical units in reference to Modern Hebrew.<sup>21</sup>

Kaltenböck, in his recent paper “Charting the Boundaries of Syntax: a Taxonomy of Spoken Parenthetical Clauses,” presents a collection of definitions of parenthetical units which are not necessarily entirely independent from a syntactic point of view. His list of “syntactic categories commonly included under parenthetical” includes the following potentially dependent syntactic constructions: coordinated main clauses, reporting clauses, non-restrictive relative clauses, content appositive clauses, adverbial clauses, question tag, adverbial phrases, interjections and discourse markers.<sup>22</sup> Kaltenböck goes on to discuss in detail a certain type of parenthetical clauses that he names ‘syndetic parenthetical clauses’; these show a certain type of connection to their host sentence, by markers like *namely*, *that is*, *that is to say*, *especially*, and other coordinate and subordinate elements.<sup>23</sup> The range of constructions covered by this paper, and by other linguistic literature, as potentially parenthetical makes the task of identifying parenthetical units in any language a complex task. Consequently, one has to rely not only on linguistic syntactic definitions but on functional-pragmatic ones as well.

A good conclusion to a discussion of the general linguistic status of parenthetical units is Kaltenböck’s words, as follows:

Parenthetical clauses (PCs for short) are interesting especially because of their borderline status, crossing, as it were, the boundaries of syntax. On the one hand, PCs are part of syntax in terms of linear precedence: they intersect with other structures (their host structures) on the linear plane, sharing with them a terminal string. On the other hand, they fall outside the scope of syntax since this linear order is not controlled by independently motivated principles governing the linearisation of underlying structures (e.g., c-command). PCs, in other words, have no syntagmatic (i.e. paratactic, hypotactic) link to their host clauses. They are related to their host by linear adjacency but are not part of any larger syntactic unit, i.e. they do not form constituents. This ‘peripheral’ position of PCs, where the principle of linearity overrules that of hierarchical relations is, of course, difficult to account for in a grammar and has been a particular concern for generativists. On the one hand, it has led to proposals to extend the grammar to include such fringe phenomena by

---

<sup>21</sup> Trumer 1987.

<sup>22</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:25–27. See also a potentially wider definition of parenthetical units in Biber & Others 1999:138, §3.4.2.

<sup>23</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:34–36.

adding an extra level of representation...or stipulating elaborate transformations... On the other hand, it has led to analyses which exclude PCs from the domain of grammar altogether, treating them simply as utterance phenomena...<sup>24</sup>

Although Kaltenböck refers only to parenthetical clauses and his work is established in terms of generative grammar, which is outside the scope of this book, his statements support the general agreement regarding a fundamental criterion, that parenthetical units do not depend syntactically on and are not complements of any sentence part or of the sentence as a whole, and the sentence is grammatically complete without them.<sup>25</sup> This syntactic independence of parenthetical units becomes evident by their being dispensable and unattached to any other sentence parts, and it is further confirmed, according to Kaltenböck and others, by certain tests, like the inability to become the focus of a cleft sentence and of being questioned, quantified, and affected by negation in the host clause.<sup>26</sup> Taking this observation a step forward, another scholar, Taglicht, in his work on focus and scope in English, shows that, being external, parenthetical units might acquire another function, that is, they can function as what he labels ‘partitions,’ namely parenthetical units can set off marked themes from the rest of the sentence.<sup>27</sup>

The second important criterion mentioned above, that parenthetical units do not hold a fixed position in a sentence, is also indicated by Kaltenböck, who entitles it ‘positional flexibility.’<sup>28</sup> Kaltenböck correctly highlights the inherent problem in defining parenthetical units: they “cannot be defined by themselves... They derive their existence, as it were, from their interaction with a host clause.”<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:21–22. For more references regarding the definition of parenthesis and parentheticals in linguistic literature see, e.g., Kaltenböck 2005:23–27.

<sup>25</sup> In fact, grammatical theories like generative grammar, relevance theory, etc., in particular have stimulated extensive debate on the syntactic status of parenthesis, since they are most curious about its representation in formal syntactic descriptions. Although formal syntactic descriptions are not an interest of this book, the theoretical approaches expressed in those studies contribute to understanding the proper framework for the classification of Biblical Hebrew parentheses.

<sup>26</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:31, and more references there. See also Espinal 1991:729–735, §1.2.

<sup>27</sup> Taglicht 1984:22. The term ‘theme’ is used by Taglicht for what is elsewhere referred to as ‘logical subject’, ‘topic’, etc.

<sup>28</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:22.

<sup>29</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:27.

Due to the vague definitions of parenthesis and parenthetical units, confusion obviously arises about which constructions are entitled to be included under this heading. A prosodic test for spotting parenthetical units by recognizing them as separate tone units might also be called for, but it cannot become a standard overall criterion given that many parenthetical units are not indicated by prosodic marking,<sup>30</sup> and more important for this book, prosody cannot be examined in ancient languages preserved only in written forms, such as Biblical Hebrew. The prosodic approach to speech utterances is paralleled regarding written texts in the search for similar evidence in typographic signs, like punctuation marks, brackets, dashes, etc. Such signs frequently mark parenthetical units in English, Modern Hebrew, and other languages.<sup>31</sup> But again, modern typographic signs do not assist much with ancient texts. As to Biblical Hebrew, although the Masoretic system of accents, which was added to the Hebrew Bible around the 7th–9th centuries C.E., might be regarded to a certain extent as the equivalent of prosodic and typographic features, alongside its other roles, it should not be treated as the one and only reading instruction but as a reading suggestion based on the Masoretic tradition and reflecting a certain exegesis. Therefore, it cannot make up for the gap in prosodic or typographic data.

The complexity in establishing formal criteria for parenthetical units leaves only two formal criteria as fundamental for identifying parenthesis in this book: (1) parenthetical units are relatively independent syntactically, and (2) they frequently enjoy flexible positioning in a sentence. (3) A third criterion, functional-pragmatic, relies on contextual considerations. These criteria, and the degree of their fulfillment in each of the constructions discussed in the following chapters, are the basis of this study.

## 1.2 GENERAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

Several linguistic works which prefer pragmatic discourse terms to syntactic ones in treating parenthetical units have been cited in the previous section on general linguistics. This approach is further developed

<sup>30</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:28.

<sup>31</sup> See, e.g., Quirk and Others 1972:1071–1072, App.III.23, Quirk and Others 1985:1625–1626, §III.16, 1629–1630, §III.20, Biber & Others 1999:137, §3.4.2, Huddleston & Pullum 2002:1748–1751.

in general discourse studies regarding external information deviating from the main discourse. Brown and Yule, for example, consider a certain pattern described by them as ‘a further context,’ which may be constructed with its own index and co-ordinates.<sup>32</sup> Later in the text they also label this context an ‘extracted fragment.’<sup>33</sup> The co-ordinates of the index mentioned by Brown and Yule, following Lewis,<sup>34</sup> are possible world co-ordinates, that is, “to account for states of affairs which *might be*, or *could be supposed to be* or *are*”; time co-ordinates, that is, “to account for tensed sentences and adverbials like *today* or *next week*”; place co-ordinates “to account for sentences like *here it is*”; speaker co-ordinates, that is, “to account for sentences which include first person reference (*I, me, we, our*, etc.)”; audience co-ordinates, that is, “to account for sentences including *you, yours, yourself*, etc.”; indicated object co-ordinates, that is, “to account for sentences containing demonstrative phrases like *this, those*, etc.”; previous discourse co-ordinates, that is, “to account for sentences including phrases like *the latter, the aforementioned*, etc.”; and assignment coordinates, that is, “an infinite series of things (sets of things, sequences of things...)” [Italics in the original] Such co-ordinates can assist in identifying parenthetical units in any language, including Biblical Hebrew, which is our focus here. Especially important for the current research are time and place particles traced in biblical texts which refer to time and place different from those of the main story line. Such time and place particles should probably be accredited to editorial work done by a certain scribe or narrator.

The term ‘discourse’ itself is found in the titles ‘discourse grammar’ and ‘discourse studies,’ which are partially equivalent to ‘text linguistics’ and are aimed at a study of text and conversation units which integrate pragmatic and functional considerations. Still, the term ‘discourse’ by itself, and more strictly ‘direct discourse,’ might also be used simply for a set of utterances joined in a conversation.<sup>35</sup> In any event, discourse studies and text linguistics deal with coherent units of texts, and seek

<sup>32</sup> Brown & Yule 1983:48, §2.2.2.

<sup>33</sup> Brown & Yule 1983:49, §2.2.2.

<sup>34</sup> Lewis 1972:175–176, Brown & Yule 1983:40–41, §2.2.1. Other scholars with similar lists of co-ordinates are mentioned in Brown & Yule 1983:41, §2.2.1.

<sup>35</sup> Crystal 2003:141–142, 461–462. On this term see also Dawson 1994:13–14, 21–22. On the terms narrative syntax, text grammar, text linguistics, and discourse grammar, and their equivalents, see van der Merwe 1997b:134–135. For an introduction to this field in Biblical Hebrew see Bodine 1995b:1–18. Niccacci indicates that the first scholar to apply the term ‘text linguistics’ to Biblical Hebrew was W. Schneider. (Niccacci 1995:111, note 2).

to describe their common characteristics; a fundamental distinction in this field of research is between narrative and conversation.<sup>36</sup> Discourse and text linguistic studies look for distinct characteristics of the two text types, narrative and discourse, and they display extreme sensitivity to syntactic marking of the shift from one type to the other. More important for the present work, such studies constantly discuss the possibility of a break in the narrative flow by a shift from narrative to direct discourse and vice versa, or by the introduction of parenthetical, new, and contrastive background, and off-the-line information by several syntactic means.<sup>37</sup>

### 1.3 BIBLICAL HEBREW SYNTAX AND DISCOURSE STUDIES

Thus far syntactic and discourse approaches to parenthesis have been presented and discussed only from a theoretical point of view. The present subsection reviews progress in these fields regarding Biblical Hebrew to date.

First, let us tackle a tangential topic, namely parenthetical words and sentence adverbials in Biblical Hebrew. Numerous scholars, some of whom are mentioned here, generally conclude that most adverbials and parenthetical words and phrases in use in Modern Hebrew do not originate in Biblical Hebrew. This statement is true and valid. Blau's work "An Adverbial Construction in Hebrew and Arabic, Sentence Adverbials in Frontal Position Separated from the Rest of the Sentence" is a good example.<sup>38</sup> Blau presents sentence adverbials at four Hebrew stages: Biblical Hebrew, Middle (Mishnaic) Hebrew, Medieval Hebrew, and Modern Hebrew.<sup>39</sup> The section dealing with sentence adverbials in Modern Hebrew in Blau's work is the largest and contains the widest variety.<sup>40</sup> Blau's discussion of sentence adverbials in Biblical Hebrew

---

<sup>36</sup> Other terms in use are 'speech', 'dialogue', and 'discourse', the last in the narrow sense (Crystal 2003:141). For the German terms parallel to narrative and conversation, *Erzählung* and *Rede*, see, e.g., Polotsky 1985:157, Schneider 1978:161–163, §44.2. In this book 'narrative' is regarded as a text which conveys temporal events. On such a definition, alongside other definitions of narrative, see, e.g., Reinhart 1984:781.

<sup>37</sup> On the term background, namely a break in the narrative temporal flow to insert side information, and its contrast, foreground, namely the narrative temporal flow, in linguistics, see, e.g., Reinhart 1984:782–785.

<sup>38</sup> Blau 1977.

<sup>39</sup> Blau 1977:18–52, §2.

<sup>40</sup> Blau 1977:34–52, §2.4.

concentrates on particles and conjunctions which separate sentence adverbials from the rest of the sentence: the presentatives הַנֶּה and הַנֵּה, and the conjunctions, conjunctive and consecutive *wāw*, כִּי, אֲשֶׁר, and rarely וְ. Sentence adverbials separated from the rest of the sentence by these particles and conjunctions include time particles, e.g., לָעֵת, וְעַתָּה + time reference, בְּטָרֵם + time reference, בְּיוֹם + time reference, and many other time references, as well as other particles which express nuances of addition, cause, affirmation, contrast, and the like, e.g., אֲדָ, אֲמַנָּם, אֲכֹן, לָכֵן, גַּם. Occasionally, prepositional phrases also function as sentence adverbials, e.g., בְּחֻלּוֹמֵי (Gen. 40:9).<sup>41</sup> Such sentence adverbials are also treated in Blau's discussion of later periods of Hebrew. Several of these sentence adverbials might also be regarded by certain scholars as parenthetical to some measure.

The treatment of Modern Hebrew by other scholars also includes many epistemic modal adverbials, like, כְּאֵמֶת שׁ... בִּידוּעַ, נִגִּיחַ שׁ... כְּמוֹבֵן שׁ... בּוֹדְאֵי שׁ... לֵלֵא סִפְקַ שׁ... כְּנִרְאָה שׁ... בִּטַח שׁ, and the like, which might at least partially be defined as parenthetical words and phrases as well, as suggested, for instance, by Livnat.<sup>42</sup> The probable late origin of many parenthetical words and phrases in Hebrew is also apparent in Dubnov's work on parenthesis with emotional meaning in Modern Hebrew. She convincingly shows that such constructions are products of much later stages of Hebrew, some originating in Medieval Hebrew under the influence of Arabic, but many more having developed under the influence of German, Yiddish and Russian, either in independent Hebrew writings or in Hebrew translations from German and Russian literature.<sup>43</sup>

A similar conclusion regarding a more specific type of post-Biblical Hebrew parenthetical units is also expressed by Sarfatti, in his short discussion on the expressions that he names 'parenthetical laudatory formulas' such as זָכַר, וְזָכְרוֹנוּ לְבִרְכָה, עֲלֵיו הַשְּׁלוֹם, זָכוֹתוֹ יִגַּן עֲלֵינוּ

<sup>41</sup> Blau 1977:18–30, §2.1.

<sup>42</sup> See Livnat's Ph.D. hybrid title "Parenthetic Sentential Adverbials in Contemporary Hebrew" (Livnat 1994b). Also see Livnat 1999 in which she states that epistemic modality can be realized in Modern Hebrew by various syntactic measures, e.g., principle propositions, formal predicates, sentence adverbials (also entitled by her 'parenthetic sentential adverbials'), parenthetical clauses, heads of relative clauses, and one-member clauses. In another paper Livnat isolates a sub-group of Modern Hebrew sentential adverbs which specifically indicate the domain in which a clause is true (Livnat 2000).

<sup>43</sup> Dubnov 2005.

צַדִּיק לְבִרְכָה etc. and their acronyms.<sup>44</sup> Sarfatti indicates that these formulas might have remote roots in certain non-laudatory expressions in Biblical Hebrew and in Rabbinic Hebrew, and suggests that they mainly evolved in the Medieval Hebrew dialect that developed under the influence of Arabic. Sarfatti presents his thesis as a proposal for further research on this topic more than as a conclusive account; ultimately he concludes that the essence of these parenthetical units should not be sought in Biblical Hebrew or Rabbinic Hebrew. Nonetheless, as Sarfatti intimates, and Sharvit in a paper on invocations of the dead details and demonstrates, certain parenthetical laudatory formulas, especially those following the name of a deceased person, such as זְכוּרָנוּ לְבִרְכָה, etc., in fact have roots in certain Biblical Hebrew verses, in their equivalents in the analogous language of the book of Ben Sira, and in Rabbinic Hebrew literature and epigraphy. Examples are Prov. 10:7—זָכַר צַדִּיק—יִרְקַב וְשֵׁם רָשָׁעִים יִשָּׂא לְבִרְכָה וְשֵׁם רָשָׁעִים יִרְקַב—“The memory of the righteous is a blessing, but the name of the wicked will rot,” and מִשֶּׁה זָכְרוּ לְטוֹבָה (Ben Sira 45:1).<sup>45</sup> The important distinction between the earlier rare occurrences and the later widespread medieval formulas lies in the mostly dissimilar syntactic status of either: the latter are always parenthetical while the former are rarely so. The development, distribution, and parenthetical role of these laudatory formulas as parenthetical units, therefore, is to be traced, as Sarfatti suggests, not earlier than Medieval Hebrew, and very probably to the influence of Arabic. Consequently, these parenthetical words and phrases exceed the scope of the current work.

The foregoing statement leads the discussion of Biblical Hebrew parenthesis in other directions. A productive course is not to seek out Biblical Hebrew parenthetical words and phrases but how Biblical Hebrew deals with larger units of information outside the flow of Biblical narrative. Since the typical verbs in Biblical Hebrew narrative clauses are prefix conjugation forms prefixed by the conversive *wāw*, namely *wayyiqtol* forms, the narrative flow can be broken by means of a different type of verbal clauses in order to introduce parenthetical, new, and contrastive settings and off-the-line information, namely clauses with suffix conjugation forms (*qatal* forms) following their subjects. This pos-

<sup>44</sup> Sarfatti 2003.

<sup>45</sup> Sharvit 2001, Beentjes 1997:79. Sharvit 2001 and Sarfatti 2003 both suggest that the laudatory formula *עליו השלום* in Rabbinic literature is probably a later addition in printed editions, since it does not appear in manuscripts. Both also suggest an Arabic origin for this expression (Sharvit 2001:85, Sarfatti:81).

sibility is described in numerous studies. Other scholarly works enlarge the number of means used for this purpose, and indicate, in addition to clauses containing *qatal* verbal forms, all clauses not introduced by *wayyiqtol*, namely verbless, participial, and elliptic clauses. Several such contributions are discussed below.<sup>46</sup>

Ewald and Gesenius, the well known nineteenth-century Biblical Hebrew grammarians, acknowledged even then the sequential nature of what they called the *imperfect* with *wāw consecutive*, which is their label for the *wayyiqtol* forms, and they defined this verbal use as a narrative tense.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, within a discussion of verbal usage in relation to the consecutive *wāw*, Ewald specifically mentions the term ‘parenthetical proposition’: “when any *parenthetical proposition* begins, whether it be a relative one with וְשֵׁשׁ, who, כִּי, for, etc. or a circumstantial clause . . . , the simple tense-form always reappears” (italics in the original).<sup>48</sup> By ‘simple tense-form’ Ewald means *qatal* forms. Also, Ewald includes under the definition of a parenthetical proposition alongside certain types of circumstantial clauses other subordinate clause types too. This implies that he recognized as potentially parenthetical not only syntactically disconnected clauses but certain subordinate clauses in certain contexts as well. The term ‘parenthesis’ reappears in Joüon’s grammar in connection with a certain circumstantial clause, to which he assigns parenthetical properties.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> For references other than those discussed next see, e.g., Schlesinger 1953:386–390, who mentions several syntactic conditions for using suffix conjugation verbs, Gibson 1995, Gross 1981, Sailhamer 1990:321–323, §1.1.1–§1.1.3, Talstra 1995b. Myhill & Xing question the use of the term contrast in Myhill & Xing 1993:37, and discuss other uses of clauses in which the verb is in a second place including foreground and background information (ibid.:40ff). de Regt 2006 discusses several motivations for Hebrew syntactic inversions and their reflection in English. See many more references in van der Merwe 1994, 1997a, 1999; a brief reference to these measures in van Wolde 1997b:39; Zevit 1998, mostly for the role of *qatal* in expressing anterior constructions in Biblical Hebrew, but also other constructions like subject-predicate word order (Zevit 1998:71), and see Zevit 1998:1–13, for other references; Joüon & Muraoka 2006:362–363, §118da. A similar interpretation of *yaqtulu* for expressing foreground information and *qatala* for expressing deviations from the narrative flow is offered by Greenstein regarding Ugaritic narrative verse (Greenstein 2006:91–101).

<sup>47</sup> Ewald 1881:244–245, §342, *GKC* 1910:326, §111a. Also see Joüon & Muraoka 2006:350–352, §115, 360–362, §118a,c,d. On West-Semitic origins and parallels to these forms see, e.g., Smith 1991:14, 17–19. On their role also see Givón 1977:198, 200.

<sup>48</sup> Ewald 1881:254, §346c.

<sup>49</sup> Joüon & Muraoka 2006:566, §159: “On the other hand, a nominal or verbal clause with *Waw* forms a sort of parenthesis and precedes the main clause as in . . .”



Other works on Biblical Hebrew syntax which show sensitivity to the function of certain clause types and verbal forms in various texts are those of Andersen, Khan, and the extensive *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* of Waltke and O'Connor.<sup>50</sup> Though these authors choose to work in the frame of the sentence and avoid analyzing larger units, they indicate that certain clause types might be selected by the scribes or narrators for functional-pragmatic reasons.<sup>51</sup> Andersen observes many clause types which deviate from the main story line. Of these, especially noteworthy for us is Andersen's treatment of circumstantial clauses,<sup>52</sup> more specifically the type he describes as "circumstantial clause beside the episode." At the beginning of his treatment of such clauses Andersen also discusses "circumstance as parenthesis," and his observations there are fundamental for this study. He states:

The best-known circumstantial clauses are those which come alongside the main thread of discourse. They generally report some coetaneous event or state, hence the name 'circumstantial'. For the same reason they are sometimes described as subordinate or 'adverbial', and not always distinguished from parenthetical information placed in apposition. We pay more attention to surface features, and distinguish circumstantial clauses carefully from conjunctionless apposition.

It is a token of this standing alongside the main time stream that predicators in such circumstantial clauses are predominantly tenseless, neither past nor future, even when the rest of the discourse is either past or future. Verbless clauses, and clauses with participles or quasiverbals as predicators, when used circumstantially, take their tense from the lead clause or from a paragraph as a whole.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Andersen 1970 discusses nominal clauses; idem 1974 discusses apposition sentences, coordination, circumstantial, adjunctive, and surprise clauses, conjunctive, chiasmic, disjunctive, contrastive, inclusive, exclusive, and antithetical sentences. Khan 1988 is a treatment of sentences involving extraposition in Biblical Hebrew alongside Arabic, Aramaic (Biblical Aramaic and Syriac), Akkadian, and Amharic. The examination of the linguistic evidence is accompanied by a discussion of the discourse roles played by extraposition in each language. Waltke & O'Connor 1990:53–55, §3.3.4 indicate their reservations about using discourse methods, but they are amenable to functional-pragmatic considerations, as can be seen in Waltke & O'Connor 1991:490, §30.5.2b, where the use of the past perfect is discussed, and 651–652, §39.2.3c, where it is said that "a disjunctive-*waw* clause may also shift the scene or refer to new participants." Clauses are described as interruptive, explanatory, or parenthetical, following Lambdin 1971:164.

<sup>51</sup> Andersen 1994 goes beyond the borders of a clause and treats connections between clauses.

<sup>52</sup> Andersen 1974:77–91, §5.

<sup>53</sup> Andersen 1974:82, §5.1.3, §5.1.3.0.

This book follows Andersen's observations above on the essence of these circumstantial clauses, the clause patterns of which they are made, that is, mainly verbless, participial, and quasi-verbal, and their tenseless character. It also adopts Andersen's observation of a similar role of circumstantial clauses with suffix conjugation verbs and with prefix conjugation verbs in non-initial position.<sup>54</sup>

A short but important paper by Polotsky discusses the distinction between narration and discourse and the existence of sequential and non-sequential verbal forms in Ramesside Egyptian and in Biblical Hebrew.<sup>55</sup> Polotsky shows that the sequential forms appear in narrative, and alternate with another tense, 'a retrospective' or 'a perfect', in his terms. According to Polotsky and according to his examples, the sequential tense in Biblical Hebrew is *wayyiqtol* and the non-sequential as well as speech tense is *qatal*. Rainey too, in a paper on *yaqtul* preterite in Northwest Semitic,<sup>56</sup> discusses *yaqtul* as a narrative tense capable of being replaced by *qatal*, when fronting or contrast is involved.<sup>57</sup> Rainey is also aware of the use of *yaqtul* in first position versus *qatal* in second position, following another sentence component.<sup>58</sup> The Northwest Semitic form, *yaqtul*, is obviously reflected, according to him and others, in the form *wayyiqtol* in Biblical Hebrew. Zevit, in his monograph on the anterior construction in Classical Hebrew, states the following regarding certain uses of *qatal* as anterior past:

Syntactically, anterior clauses are connected to the narrative flow through the conjunction which creates formally a minimal cohesion; semantically, they are disconnected because they introduce a new topic; but logically, they work against text cohesiveness by arresting and reversing temporarily the chronological flow of the narrative. Their main function is to provide information for the main narrative line by advancing heretofore unknown

<sup>54</sup> Andersen 1974:85–86, §5.1.3.4, §5.1.3.5. The non-initial position of the prefix verb is revealed in Andersen's example *וְהָאֲבָנִים תִּהְיוּ עַל-שְׁמֹת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל*—“...their names according to the names of the sons of Israel,” from Exod. 28:21. For a classic study of the function of Biblical Hebrew circumstantial clauses, see Driver 1892:195–211; see Gibson 1995:275–276, and references to Andersen, Driver and others in Kotze 1989:114–119, §3.

<sup>55</sup> Polotsky 1985.

<sup>56</sup> Rainey 2003a.

<sup>57</sup> See Rainey 2003a:407 regarding Ancient Hebrew, and Rainey 2003b:12–21. Rainey 2003b:34–39 extends these conclusions to other West-Semitic languages. These papers follow and extend Rainey's earlier views presented in prior publications, primarily Rainey 1996 II, which deals with the Canaanite verbal system in the Amarna tablets; see especially Rainey 1996 II:221–233, 347–366.

<sup>58</sup> Rainey 2003a:407.

background information into the foreground. In some cases, the information can be trivial, as in death notices (Judg 4:1; 16:31); in others, it can be significant, marking the incipit of motifs that then come to dominate the narrative (Gen 6:7–8m 37:2–3); in yet others, it may be of a parenthetical nature (Gen 8:4–5; 31:25).<sup>59</sup>

A major contribution to the understanding of the verbal usage in Biblical Hebrew is made by Niccacci, who again, like the above author, reveals sensitivity to various text types. Niccacci mainly follows Weinrich's division into distinct use of tense in discourse and narrative, both of these having three aspects which Niccacci calls linguistic attitude, foregrounding, and linguistic perspective.<sup>60</sup> Accordingly, he draws three basic tables, in each of which he sets the main verbal forms in two columns, one for the narrative type of text and one for the discourse type.<sup>61</sup> The first of the three aforementioned aspects, namely linguistic attitude, concerns narrative and commentary; the second, foregrounding, concerns highlighting and background;<sup>62</sup> the third, linguistic perspective, concerns retrieved information, degree zero, which is the level of the story itself, and anticipated information.<sup>63</sup> As for basic verbal forms in the Biblical Hebrew texts, Niccacci treats not merely two, that is, *wayyiqtol* and *qatal*, but four: *wayyiqtol*, *yiqtol*, *qatal*, and *wəqatal*. He mentions *wayyiqtol* as the main narrative form and *yiqtol* as dominant in discourse, and he indicates that both are the basic forms of Hebrew prose.<sup>64</sup> Niccacci further states that “narrative develops by means of a chain of WAYYIQTOLs.”<sup>65</sup> By contrast, he considers *qatal* retrospective, namely a form which expresses recovered information (like an antecedent event or flashback) or a comment on the main events (background). It is used in narrative and discourse but not

<sup>59</sup> Zevit 1998:25–26. Zevit uses ‘parenthetical’ in reference of some of the examples.

<sup>60</sup> Niccacci 1990:19–20, §2–§3, Weinrich 1971. Weinrich is mentioned among others who refer to the distinction between narration and discourse by Polotsky (Polotsky 1985:157), and see van der Merwe 1997a:9–10, §4.4.1 and Longacre 1995:99.

<sup>61</sup> “Narrative concerns persons or events which are not present or current in the relationship involving writer-reader and so the third person is used. In discourse, on the other hand, the speaker addresses the listener directly (dialogue, sermon, prayer)” (Niccacci 1990:29, §7).

<sup>62</sup> On the meaning of these terms see, e.g., Cook 2004:254–257, §2.2, and a short definition on pp. 261–262, note 27. Also see van Wolde 1997b:34–39 for these terms, and Aristar Dry 1992 for various approaches to the definition of foregrounding.

<sup>63</sup> Niccacci 1990:20–21, §3.

<sup>64</sup> Niccacci 1990:29, §7.

<sup>65</sup> Niccacci 1990:30, §9. See also Niccacci 1990:175–176, §140.

as a narrative form.<sup>66</sup> The form *wəqatal* might function in discourse, in a chain of verbs, somehow similar to *wayyiqtol* in narrative.<sup>67</sup> Niccacci's description of the verbal and clausal uses in Biblical Hebrew conforms to the idea of breaking a narrative flow by using clause patterns which deviate from the normal narrative pattern.<sup>68</sup>

In another paper Niccacci indicates that he makes "a sharp distinction . . . between verb forms of connection and verb forms of interruption" and that the former are verbal and the latter are nominal sentences.<sup>69</sup> He also states there that "in narrative a verbal sentence is a linguistic sign of connection, while a nominal sentence (simple or compound) is a sign of interruption in the mainline of communication."<sup>70</sup> Niccacci's distinction between verbal and nominal clauses is sometimes considered controversial,<sup>71</sup> but his distinction between connecting and interrupting patterns is significant for the current work; several of Niccacci's interrupting patterns can be defined as parenthetical.

Many scholars consider Longacre's discourse approach and its application to Biblical Hebrew pioneering and fundamental work.<sup>72</sup> Though the complete scope of his discourse theory is beyond the concern of this study, Longacre's recognition that different verbal forms and clause types in Biblical Hebrew are used in distinct narrative and non-narrative text types and to introduce off-line information is relevant and significant.<sup>73</sup> Longacre's approach has been maintained, developed, and modified by several scholars. Dawson, for example, also takes into account various types of texts, narrative and non-narrative,<sup>74</sup> and the parameters of main-line versus off-line, and foreground versus background.<sup>75</sup> He follows and develops Longacre's methods, finding Longacre's contributions

---

<sup>66</sup> Niccacci 1990:35, §14, 180, §147.

<sup>67</sup> Niccacci 1990:82–86, §57–§59, and also recently Niccacci 2006:250. For *wəqatal* forms in this use see also Longacre 1994.

<sup>68</sup> See also Niccacci 1994a, and *ibid.*:117–118 his criticism of the discourse linguistic approach.

<sup>69</sup> Niccacci 1994b:175.

<sup>70</sup> Niccacci 1994b:177, §3. See also Niccacci 1999, which discusses types and functions of the nominal sentence, and Niccacci 1997, which applies his theory to Exodus 19–24.

<sup>71</sup> See, e.g., Gross 1999:35–37.

<sup>72</sup> Longacre 1979, 1983, 1989, 1992a, 1992b, 1995. See also van der Merwe 1997b:142–145.

<sup>73</sup> Longacre 1989:60, 64–82.

<sup>74</sup> Dawson 1994:94–100, §2.2.1, 114–116, §3.2.3, 123ff.

<sup>75</sup> Dawson 1994:101–103, §2.2.2.1.

in this field “particularly productive”.<sup>76</sup> Heller’s “Narrative Structures and Discourse Constellations, an Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose” likewise develops Longacre’s approach and methods and applies them to a specific Biblical Hebrew corpus.<sup>77</sup> Heller, like others, emphasizes the role of *wayyiqtol* as a sequential verb.<sup>78</sup>

Longacre’s approach and analysis have not been accepted by all. Another scholar, Heimerdinger, in “Topic, Focus and Foreground in Ancient Hebrew Narrative,” rejects Longacre and his followers’ methods and conclusions.<sup>79</sup> He links his own approach to literary studies rather than text linguistics, and explains Biblical Hebrew word order and verbal choice by functional criteria only, concentrating mostly on topic and focus as stimulating the choices of word order and verbal usage.<sup>80</sup> Though Heimerdinger himself sees his approach as sharply opposed to Longacre’s, it might be better to consider the two approaches as complementary, since both discourse and functional grounds play a part in word order and verbal choice in Biblical Hebrew, as in many other languages.<sup>81</sup> Another critic of the discourse approach is Cook, who in a recent paper maintains that *wayyiqtol* and *wəqatal* are not merely empty verbal forms functioning according to discourse factors but they necessarily carry a basic semantic meaning. This meaning might support the discourse’s functional usage but it is not identical to it.<sup>82</sup> Again, and according to Cook himself, his approach can be regarded as complementary to the discourse approach, not contradictory. A similar view of the need to combine the two approaches was nicely expressed still earlier by Joosten: “. . . the recent text-linguistic and discourse-oriented approaches to the problem of the Biblical Hebrew

---

<sup>76</sup> Dawson 1994:114, §3.2.2.

<sup>77</sup> Heller 2004. See also Zewi 2004.

<sup>78</sup> Heller 2004:430–432, 456, and *ibid.* for more references. See also Revell 1985 on the narrative techniques in Judg. 20:29–48. Revell indicates several times that the main narrative sequence is carried by *wayyiqtol* verbs (Revell 1985:418, 422, 425). More references are, e.g., Bergen 1994b:325, Longacre and Hwang 1994:337, 345, §5.1, Goldfajn 1998:70.

<sup>79</sup> Heimerdinger 1999:10, 52–100.

<sup>80</sup> Heimerdinger 1999:101–220. For functional-pragmatic considerations in analyzing Biblical Hebrew verbal clauses also see Gross 1996:53–72, §1.5.3, 2001:10–14. For other such approaches see, e.g., Bandstra 1992 and Zewi 1992.

<sup>81</sup> Works which nicely combine the two approaches are Buth’s thesis of 1987 on “Word Order in Aramaic from the Perspectives of Functional Grammar and Discourse Analysis,” and Buth 1995.

<sup>82</sup> Cook 2004.

verb do not replace earlier analyses in terms of tense and aspect, but are complementary to them.”<sup>83</sup>

One more important work on Biblical Hebrew verbal usage in the frame of discourse studies is Eskhult’s “Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose.”<sup>84</sup> At the outset Eskhult indicates that the scope of his first application is “to show how the static (*wə*)*subj-qt* clause is used as an episode marginal circumstantial,” and that the scope of his second application is

to exhibit a broader amplification of the theoretical outline: how static clauses are used in the economy of a narrative or an episode, and further to investigate the interplay between foregrounded and backgrounded clauses, especially as to the delimitation of scenes, and, finally, to investigate the function of the different aspectual values in their narrow context, and the bearing of the difference between narrative discourse and direct speech in this respect.<sup>85</sup>

Eskhult’s conclusions emphasize the distinction in verbal usage between narrative and speech and the central role played by circumstantial clauses in establishing marginal information.<sup>86</sup> His observations, including his use of terms like ‘marginal’ and ‘circumstantial,’ and ‘foreground’ versus ‘background’ clauses, are crucial for this study.<sup>87</sup>

In his book *Participants in Old Testament Texts and the Translator*, de Regt discusses various ways of introducing participants into a Biblical text and their reflections in Bible translations.<sup>88</sup> de Regt concentrates on implicit and explicit ways of referring to characters in Biblical Hebrew, most of which are irrelevant for this book, and he examines various text

---

<sup>83</sup> Joosten 1997a:51, and see the application of his approach in Joosen 1997b.

<sup>84</sup> Eskhult 1990.

<sup>85</sup> Eskhult 1990:9–10.

<sup>86</sup> See especially his treatment of dialogue versus narration in Eskhult 1990:37–41, §2.5, of circumstantial clauses in Eskhult 1990:31–33, §2.3.3, and of episode marginal circumstantial clauses in Eskhult 1990:45–57, §3, and its summary there on p. 57, §3.5.

<sup>87</sup> References to the issue of time, and sometimes also word order and discourse in Biblical Hebrew, also exist in many studies on the complexity of the tenses and aspects in Biblical Hebrew. See Driver 1892 for the treatment of Hebrew verbs as expressing aspects, Mcfall 1982 for his historical survey, Hatav 1997:3–5, Van der Merwe 1997c, and Goldfajn 1998 for introducing the concept of ‘relative time’, that is, according to Goldfajn, “the time that is being talked about or the temporal standpoint from which the event is considered” (Goldfajn 1998:46) to the study of Biblical Hebrew, and Goldfajn 1998:69–72, 78–85, 90–104, for the prefix *wāw* and telicity, for discourse studies and Biblical Hebrew, and for word order in Biblical Hebrew narrative. On Goldfajn’s work also see Zewi 2001.

<sup>88</sup> de Regt 1999.

genres—narrative, dialogue, poetry and prophetic texts, of which the last two are also irrelevant here. Yet de Regt makes some important observations for a discussion of parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew. In one, he concurs with others that “...it is often preverbal subjects that are associated with the reintroduction of participants and the beginning of a new paragraph.”<sup>89</sup> In another he points out that “sometimes a participant is introduced in a verbless clause that gives him a name,” with examples such as Gen. 4:21,22 and Num. 26:59. de Regt adds that occasionally an additional preceding clause introduces a new character into the story, as in Gen. 38:1 and 1 Sam. 17:13.<sup>90</sup> These measures should also be considered as breaking the narrative flow by inserting information which is external to the story line.

Finally, parenthesis is hardly ever mentioned or discussed in syntactic studies of other Semitic languages. An occasional reference to parenthetical units appears in Reckendorf’s *Arabische Syntax* in which he mentions the break of an Arabic sentence by a parenthetical clause initiated by one of the two Arabic conjunctions ف (*fā*) and و (*wā*) under a general discussions of these particles.<sup>91</sup> Another short section dedicated to parenthesis in Syriac appears in Nöldeke’s *Compendious Syriac Grammar*, in which he treats parenthetical units involving verbs of thought and speech which interrupt the clausal sequence.<sup>92</sup> A slightly longer treatment of parentheses in several Semitic languages appears in Brockelmann’s *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*.<sup>93</sup> Brockelmann discusses and demonstrates several parenthetical constructions in Arabic, neo-Ethiopian languages, Biblical Hebrew, and Syriac.

The elusive linguistic nature of parenthesis in general and certain parenthetical patterns in particular, and the difficulty in recognizing, defining, and analyzing them, have certainly aggravated the relative ignorance of scholarly studies on Semitic languages about these constructions.

---

<sup>89</sup> de Regt 1999:17, §2.1.

<sup>90</sup> de Regt 1999:32–33, §2.2.2.

<sup>91</sup> Reckendorf 1921:319, §164.6, 321–322, §165.5.

<sup>92</sup> Nöldeke 1904:315, §380.

<sup>93</sup> Brockelmann 1913:668–671, §462–§463.





The first question arises sporadically in discussions on parenthetical units, and Kaltenböck, for instance, in his paper on the classification of spoken parenthetical clauses in English, wisely rejects the possibility of including anacoluthon under the title of parenthetical clauses: “The difference between PCs [parenthetical clauses] and anacolutha is this that the former follow a clear and relatively predictable pattern, whereas the latter fall into the category of performance error, caused by working memory limitations.”<sup>99</sup>

As to the second question, in an earlier paper I tried to show that interrupted relative clauses in the Hebrew Bible are not anacolutha but systematic Biblical Hebrew patterns. Interrupted relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew, in my opinion, are only one type of a general syntactic organization and conduct whereby interrupted syntactic structures, that is, extraposition, prolepsis, adverbials between logical subject and predicate, broken predicates, objects separated from their verbs, and attributes, appositions, and attributive clauses separated from their heads (relative clauses in Gottstein’s terminology), function as normal components of the language variety, even if they are not as widespread as parallel continuous structures.<sup>100</sup> These interrupted syntactic structures may or may not serve as parenthetical units, and their possible parenthetical action is recognized not due to their being syntactically detached but to other considerations.

In general, attributes, appositions, and attributive clauses, or in Gottstein’s terminology relative clauses, sometimes do and sometime do not carry relative external information. The distinction between those that do and those that do not only partly overlaps the distinction between joint and disjoint heads and attributes, appositions, and attributive clauses. Only some of the interrupting phrases and clauses that break the sequence of the so-called interrupted syntactic structures suit the definition of parenthetical units designated in this book.

One example of an interrupted syntactic structure which may nicely be interpreted as containing a parenthetical unit whose information

---

<sup>99</sup> Kaltenböck 2005:49, and another reference there.

<sup>100</sup> Zewi 1999b. Also see Tsumura 1996 who considers certain similar interrupted constructions in Biblical Hebrew poetic texts and poetic prose as involving insertion of certain elements rather than inversion, break up, or ellipsis, and explains them as stylistic/rhetoric variants. Interest in discontinuous syntactic structures, including parenthetical units, is also manifested in several studies by transformational grammarians, but their main interest is aimed at the preferred grammatical representation of these patterns by generative trees, e.g., McCawley 1982, Espinal 1991:735–751, §2–§3.

is external to the host sentence is 1 Kgs. 11:26—וַיִּרְבֵּעַם בֶּן-נֶבֶט אֶפְרַתִּי מִן-הַצֵּרְדָּה וְשֵׁם אִמּוֹ צְרוּעָה אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה עֶבֶד לְשִׁלְמָה וַיִּרְם יָד בַּמֶּלֶךְ—“Jeroboam the son of Nebat, an Ephraimite of Zeredah, a servant of Solomon, **whose mother’s name was Zeruah, a widow**, also lifted up his hand against the king.” The clause in boldface above, which conveys external parenthetical information regarding Jeroboam’s mother, intervenes in the Biblical Hebrew version between בֶּן-נֶבֶט אֶפְרַתִּי מִן-הַצֵּרְדָּה and the adjacent nominal phrase which continues the description of Jeroboam, עֶבֶד לְשִׁלְמָה. The *RSV* translation, for instance, is uneasy about this Biblical Hebrew word order and changes the places of אֶלְמָנָה אִשָּׁה אֶפְרַתִּי מִן-הַצֵּרְדָּה and וְשֵׁם אִמּוֹ צְרוּעָה אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה, putting the latter before the former, in accordance with English word order conventions. Nonetheless, the phrase עֶבֶד לְשִׁלְמָה itself can be interpreted either as the predicate of מִן-הַצֵּרְדָּה אֶפְרַתִּי בֶּן-נֶבֶט אֶפְרַתִּי מִן-הַצֵּרְדָּה, considering the whole of אֶלְמָנָה אִשָּׁה אֶפְרַתִּי מִן-הַצֵּרְדָּה וְשֵׁם אִמּוֹ צְרוּעָה אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה וַיִּרְבֵּעַם בֶּן-נֶבֶט אֶפְרַתִּי מִן-הַצֵּרְדָּה וְשֵׁם אִמּוֹ צְרוּעָה אִשָּׁה אֶלְמָנָה a complete sentence, or as its apposition, considering the verb וַיִּרְם the predicate.

Miller, in her book on the representation of speech in Biblical Hebrew, also discusses what she calls ‘discontinuous frames’ in which, according to her, “a quotative frame may be interrupted by parenthetical narrative material.”<sup>101</sup> Miller adds: “The parenthetical material is marked off from the frame by being either a nominal clause or a disjunctive verbal clause,”<sup>102</sup> thereby adopting the position of many discourse studies. Miller divides her four instances of this phenomenon into those in which the quotative frame is split into two halves (1 Sam. 22:9 and Judg. 20:27–28a, discussed here) and those in which the quotative frames are stated twice (2 Sam. 21:2–3 and 1 Kgs. 12:10, discussed here).<sup>103</sup>

However, Miller’s example from 1 Sam. 22:9—וַיַּעַן דֹּעַג הָאֶדְוִמִּי וְהוּא נֹב עַל-עֶבְדֵי-שָׁאוּל וַיֹּאמֶר רָאִיתִי אֶת-בֶּן-יֵשׁוּ בָּא נֹבָה אֶל-אַחִימֶלֶךְ בֶּן-אַחִיטוּב—“Then answered Doeg the Edomite, who stood by the servants of Saul, ‘I saw the son of Jesse coming to Nob, to Ahimelech the son of Ahitub’”—is in fact a circumstantial clause וְהוּא נֹבָה עַל-עֶבְדֵי-שָׁאוּל which describes a proper name, and its appearance next to the proper name creates an interrupted syntactic structure which, as suggested in

<sup>101</sup> Miller 1996:217, §4.4.2. On interruption in direct speech see also de Regt 1999:21–22, §2.1.1.

<sup>102</sup> Miller 1996:217–218, §4.4.2.

<sup>103</sup> Miller 1996:218–220, §4.4.2.

my paper on this topic, is natural to Biblical Hebrew.<sup>104</sup> Likewise, 1 Kgs. 12:10—*וַיִּדְבְּרוּ אֵלָיו הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלוּ אֵתוֹ לֵאמֹר כֹּה-תֹאמַר לָעַם הַזֶּה לְאֹשֶׁר דִּבְרוּ אֵלָיֶךָ לֵאמֹר אָבִיךָ הִכְבִּיד אֶת-עַלְנוֹ וְאַתָּה הִקַּל מֵעַלְיָנו כֹּה תִדְבָּר וְאֲשֶׁר דִּבְרוּ אֵלָיֶךָ לֵאמֹר אָבִיךָ הִכְבִּיד אֶת-עַלְנוֹ וְאַתָּה הִקַּל מֵעַלְיָנו כֹּה תִדְבָּר*—“And the young men who had grown up with him said to him, ‘Thus shall you speak to this people who said to you, ‘Your father made our yoke heavy, but do you lighten it for us’; thus shall you say to them, ‘My little finger is thicker than my father’s loins’”’—contains an interrupted syntactic structure of a similar nature, and the repetition of the quotation frame in this verse is probably due to the length of the relative clause and its conclusion of another speech expression within it.

Only two of Miller’s examples truly constitute parenthetical units. These are Judg. 20:27–28a—*וַיִּשְׁאַלוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּה' וַשֵּׁם אַרְוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים וַיִּשְׁאַלוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּה' וַשֵּׁם אַרְוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים וַיִּשְׁאַלוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּה' וַשֵּׁם אַרְוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים*—“And the people of Israel inquired of the LORD (for the ark of the covenant of God was there in those days, and Phinehas the son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, ministered before it in those days), saying, ‘Shall we yet again go out to battle against our brethren the Benjaminites, or shall we cease?’” and 2 Sam. 21:2–3—*וַיִּקְרָא הַמֶּלֶךְ לַגִּבְעֹנִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם וְהַגִּבְעֹנִים לֹא מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הָמָּה כִּי אִם-מִיִּתְרַתְּ הָאֱמֹרִי וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִשְׁבְּעוּ לָהֶם וַיִּבְקֹשׁ שְׂאוֹל לְהַכְתֵּם בְּקִנְאָתוֹ לְבְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל-הַגִּבְעֹנִים מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה לָכֶם וַיִּבְרָחוּ אֶת-נַחְלַת ה'*—“So the king called the Gibeonites. Now the Gibeonites were not of the people of Israel, but of the remnant of the Amorites; although the people of Israel had sworn to spare them, Saul had sought to slay them in his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah. And David said to the Gibeonites, ‘What shall I do for you? And how shall I make expiation, that you may bless the heritage of the LORD?’” The parenthetical units are *וַשֵּׁם אַרְוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים בְּיָמֵם הָהֵם* in the first example, and *וְהַגִּבְעֹנִים לֹא מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הָמָּה כִּי אִם-מִיִּתְרַתְּ הָאֱמֹרִי וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִשְׁבְּעוּ לָהֶם* and *וַיִּבְקֹשׁ שְׂאוֹל לְהַכְתֵּם בְּקִנְאָתוֹ לְבְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה* in the second, and they split the quotative frame into two. Again, the repetition in the second example is probably due to the length of the parenthetical unit, but its context affirms its parenthetical nature. These two examples are discussed below in the appropriate section.

<sup>104</sup> Zewi 1999b.

## 1.5 LITERARY APPROACHES

Like discourse studies, works taking a literary approach to biblical texts, whose main interests are the art and aesthetics of the biblical narrative, have again created a young field of research, compared with biblical exegesis and philology.<sup>105</sup> This fresh field is connected to biblical linguistics through its exponents' awareness of the language means used by the authors of the biblical narrative to achieve their literary goals. The literary approach has made certain contributions to the question of parenthesis, several of which are discussed below.<sup>106</sup>

Robert Alter, a scholar of the biblical text from a literary point of view, made one such important contribution to the subject of parenthetical information. The term in his work relevant to parenthesis is 'exposition,' or 'expository information,'<sup>107</sup> meaning brief, generally verbless statements (excluding forms of הִיהָ). They appear mostly at the start of biblical stories, but also occasionally interrupt the sequence and present general data unrelated to any specific time as background.<sup>108</sup> Another Bible scholar who works in the frame of the literary approach, Berlin, detects a similar feature and describes its use as expressing different points of view in a narrative.<sup>109</sup> On change in tense she says, "sometimes a shift to a nominal construction seems to indicate a shift in perspective, even though this construction is the normal way to form a circumstantial clause."<sup>110</sup>

Sternberg, in his book *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative, Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, employs the term 'exposition' for certain

<sup>105</sup> On the development of this field, see, e.g., Amit 2001:10–14.

<sup>106</sup> This book makes no distinction between biblical authors and biblical editors, since it is generally impossible to identify and separate original texts from editorial changes and additions. On the inability to distinguish between authors and editors of biblical narrative see Amit 1999:15–16. The term 'narrator' is also used in this book not for a character within the story but as an equivalent to the term 'author'.

<sup>107</sup> Alter 1981:80–87.

<sup>108</sup> Literary expositions can be units larger than one clause or sentence. Such units will not be discussed in this book. Exposition in general fiction is explained at length in Sternberg 1978:1–34. Note also Ska's definition of 'exposition': "The 'exposition' is the presentation of *indispensable* pieces of information about the state of affairs that *precedes* the beginning of the action itself. These details are necessary for the understanding of the narration. Logically the exposition is the first moment of a narration, but concretely the action can begin in *medias res* (expression coined by Horace) and the exposition can come afterwards." (in Ska 1990:21, italics are in the original text).

<sup>109</sup> Berlin 1983. On 'point of view' in Hebrew narrative see also Ska 1990:65–81.

<sup>110</sup> Berlin 1983:93.

intrusions of the scribe or narrator into the biblical texts. These expositions, according to him, are the scribe/narrator's commentaries on certain points in the text, and he identifies several such types: "...general information about the world, relate to individuals or groups, consist in external accounts or..." any of character sketches, descriptions of objects, interscenic summaries, retrospects, prospects, genealogies and catalogues, identifications, value judgments, telescoped inside views, notes and stage directions in dialogue, intrusions into direct discourse, bibliographical references, and temporal or cultural bridging.<sup>111</sup> Though the classification of external information reflecting the scribe/narrator's viewpoint in this book does not entirely conform with Sternberg's classification, his observations are significant.<sup>112</sup>

Another scholar concerned with the structure of biblical narrative including exposition is Amit in her books *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* and *Reading Biblical Narrative*.<sup>113</sup> Though Amit does not mention any linguistic means employed for expressing exposition, like parenthesis, change in word order, use of nominal clauses, etc., in either of her books, the role of exposition at the beginning of biblical stories is well defined and summarized. The following is a quote from "Reading Biblical Narrative":

In most cases, the story opens with an exposition, which provides readers with the primary information and basic background materials to enable them to enter the world of the story, at least at the start. These materials may present the central characters, refer to the time and/or place of the action, or depict the prevailing conditions and customs in the story's setting, which introduces the readers to a world that is differently constituted from their own.<sup>114</sup>

She continues:

The exposition is usually made up of descriptive and static information, which can even be determined as habitual, and ends with the transition to the dynamic action in the form of some statement or deed that changes the initial situation. Consequently, the elements from which the exposition is constructed are different from those of the story itself.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Sternberg 1985:120–121. Also see Sternberg's definition of the function of 'exposition' in fiction in Sternberg 1978:1.

<sup>112</sup> Sternberg (1985) also notes other cases in which expositional information is placed in a text, e.g., ironic exposition on pp. 193–194.

<sup>113</sup> Amit 1999, 2001.

<sup>114</sup> Amit 2001:33. Also see Amit 1999:121–122.

<sup>115</sup> Amit 2001:33–34.

Brichto in his book *Toward a Grammar of Biblical Poetics, Tales of the Prophets* evinces his awareness of the role of parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew literature for flashbacks and side information. He mentions this role in relation to resumptive techniques: “The availability of the nominal sentence with *waw*-conjunctive for flashback scenes (actually for parenthetical asides, of which one type is the flashback) points to the resumptive episode as a highly nuanced and flexible device, not limited to parenthetical of flashback functions.”<sup>116</sup>

## 1.6 FRAME OF WORK

The purpose of this study is to identify, collect, classify, describe, and analyze several types of parenthetical means and expressions employed in Classical Biblical Hebrew, and to set out the linguistic options existing in Biblical Hebrew for inserting parenthetical information into a clause or a chain of clauses. The parenthetical means and expressions are classified in two major groups: full parenthetical clauses, which express external information within a main sentence or in a chain of clauses; and parenthetical words and phrases within a clause or a sentence. Parenthetical clauses are described first because their parenthetical nature is more apparent in Biblical Hebrew than is that of parenthetical words and phrases, most of which are on the borderline between adverbs and parenthesis units.

The basic questions confronted and discussed for each example or group of examples are these:

1. Does the parenthetical unit have some sort of syntactic relation to the host clause or not? The answer depends on linguistic syntactic considerations.
2. What is the context in which each parenthetical unit occurs? This question introduces functional-pragmatic considerations into the discussion of each type of parenthesis.
3. Does the parenthetical unit add information or comment on one specific sentence part or on the whole sentence? This question involves linguistic as well as pragmatic considerations.

---

<sup>116</sup> Brichto 1992:16–17.

4. Does the additional information or comment expressed by the parenthetical unit include a subjective opinion of the writer or speaker, namely does it express an epistemic or deontic modal nuance or not? The issue of modality again belongs to the realm of linguistics.
5. Should a certain parenthesis be regarded as a natural spontaneous parenthetical unit which is part of direct speech cited in the story or the general narrative flow, or it is an editorial addition inserted into a text by a later scribe, narrator, or even a later copyist?

The use of the term ‘functional’ in the current work is generally aimed at “the relationship between a linguistic form and other parts of the linguistic pattern or system in which it is used,” according to one definition of ‘function’ in Crystal’s dictionary of linguistics and phonetics.<sup>117</sup> The term ‘pragmatic’ is used very broadly in this book. It is based on the assertion of Brown and Yule that “Any analytic approach in linguistics which involves contextual considerations, necessarily belongs to that area of language study called pragmatics,”<sup>118</sup> and is not restricted to the theory of speech acts.

The gap between the linguistic and discourse approaches to Biblical Hebrew on the one hand, and literary and exegetical approaches to the Hebrew Bible on the other, has considerably widened in the 20th–21st centuries, almost to the point of detachment. Aware of this state of affairs, I have made a special effort to consider all these approaches in explaining and analyzing parenthesis and to benefit from any contribution of each of them to this topic.

The corpus under consideration includes all the books of the Pentateuch and the Early Prophets, some prose parts of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and the book of Ruth, that is, chiefly Classical Biblical Hebrew prose. Late biblical books and earlier and late poetic texts are excluded. The basic English translation employed for each example is the *RSV*, with occasional minor changes whenever they are found to be necessary highlight or clarify a certain construction or meaning.

---

<sup>117</sup> Crystal 2003:191. Ibid. and on p. 193 see more on the connection of this definition to the ‘Functional Sentence Perspective’ (FSP) approach of the Prague School. On the broad scope and the complexity of the term ‘function’, see Crystal 2003:191–192.

<sup>118</sup> Brown & Yule 1983:26, §1.3.4. For the range of definitions related to pragmatics, see Mey 1994, especially p. 3267, §2.3.3 regarding grammar and context. Note also his opening remark: “Among pragmatians, there seems to be no agreement as to how to do pragmatics, nor as to what pragmatics is, nor how to define it, nor even as to what pragmatics is *not*” (Mey 1994:3260, §1.1).

Several mostly Semitic Bible translations have been consulted for this study, and they are cited whenever they seem to contribute to a better or different significant understanding of the syntactic constructions examined. These translations were selected eclectically as a study such as this can benefit from the insights of any Bible translation. Several of these translations are known to be relatively flexible and free. Others are more literal and strict. The Semitic translations are the following: the early 10th-century Arabic translation of Saadya Gaon (882–942 C.E.) of the Pentateuch, famous in its syntactic flexibility; the Christian Arabic Bible known as *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*; the Geez translation of the Octateuch; the Targum Onqelos Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch; the *Targum Jonathan* Aramaic translation of the Former Prophets; and the Syriac translation known as the *Peshitta*.<sup>119</sup> Another non-Semitic English translation, the *JPS*, was consulted in addition to the *RSV*, because the two translations differ in style. The former is generally known for its tendency to translate the biblical passages in a relatively freer style than the latter. Again, the references in this book to these Bible translations are selective. The translation source is not given after each quote except when it sheds special light on certain examples or topics.

Let us turn now to the next stage and discuss the biblical parenthetical units themselves, parenthetical clauses first.

---

<sup>119</sup> Examples in Geez and Syriac are presented both in original orthography and in transliteration. The Geez transliteration conventions are based on Leslau 1989. I thank Prof. Gideon Goldenberg for his assistance and advice regarding the transliterations.





## CHAPTER TWO

### PARENTHETICAL CLAUSES

The issues and examples discussed in this chapter include clauses which present external information within a main sentence or a chain of clauses in discourse and narrative Classical Hebrew prose. Some examples, like appeals and pleas, and expressions affirming God's existence, identity and status, appear in speech expressions inserted into the story line. Others, such as references to speakers, fixed narrative formulas, and circumstantial clauses with additional information, belong to the narrative sequence.

The examples are presented and discussed in three sections. (1) Parenthetical units related to speech, that is, external expressions referring to a speaker; appealing and pleading; affirming God's existence, identity and status or indicating external intervention; oath patterns. (2) Unique narrative formulas introduced by לְכֹן/עַל-כֵּן or וַיִּתֵּר דְּבָרַי and others indicating a proper name, a month name or related information. (3) Other external information, mostly expressed by circumstantial clauses, whereby the narrative is augmented with some background, foreshadowing, and explanation, theological and historical remarks, and other marginal matter.

As explained below some of the clause types and patterns are more easily defined as parenthetical units, while others can be interpreted as such only partially. Sometimes the interpretation of units as parenthetical can be based on both linguistic and functional-pragmatic criteria. In other cases the units examined are linguistically subordinated to, or coordinated with, other sentential elements; syntactically they resemble any other non-parenthetical sentence components, and can be interpreted as parenthetical only from a functional and pragmatic point of view.

#### 2.1 EXTERNAL EXPRESSIONS REFERRING TO A SPEAKER, APPEALING AND PLEADING, AFFIRMING GOD'S EXISTENCE, IDENTITY, AND STATUS OR INDICATING EXTERNAL INTERVENTION, AND OATH PATTERNS

All the examples in this section are related to speech. References to a speaker recall a previous speech act involving a declaration of intentions,

while appeals and pleas, and expressions affirming God's existence, identity, and status, are speech utterances. Since the two latter types appear within speech, they should be considered speech or discourse parenthetical units, while the first type should be considered part of the narrative.

### 2.1.1 *Reference to a Speaker*

Most examples in this section contain references to God or other speaking characters as complete clauses introduced by **כְּאֵשֶׁר**. The information in these clauses is usually the content of the speech, and should be considered an extension of the clause which yields extra information about the speaker. A sub-type of these examples is a pattern which contains a reference to God as the speaker, but also an affirmation that his words will be executed. It is constructed as...**כֵּן**...**כְּדַבֵּר** or as a full clause **כֵּן**...**כְּאֵשֶׁר צִוָּה / אֱשֶׁר / כָּל אֱשֶׁר**. Other analogous examples which contain no more than the phrase...**כְּדַבֵּר** or...**כְּדַבְּרֵי**, but give information of the kind found in the clauses covered in this section, are discussed below, among parenthetical words and phrases.

These clauses, which add external information by referring to the speaker as responsible for certain content, usually appear at the end of the full sentence, but their syntactic structure is not completely independent. The clause type which conveys the external information should in fact be syntactically labeled adverbial; more specifically it can be defined as a comparative adverbial clause because of the use of the comparative **כִּי** in its introduction.<sup>1</sup> This clause type should be regarded as adverbial according to its grammatical pattern and parenthetical according to its context.<sup>2</sup> Examples of this type are presented below, sub-divided into those which refer to God as speaker and to others as speakers.

<sup>1</sup> Desmets & Roussarie 2001, though working in the frame of Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar which is beyond the scope of this work, treat similar clauses introduced by *comme* in French, which they name 'French reportive *comme* clauses,' as a case of parenthetical adjunction. They treat this topic from a semantic standpoint and determine that these clauses are parenthetical since they do not contribute to the referential content of the head-phrase to which they are connected.

<sup>2</sup> Zevit mentions these constructions as examples of anterior past and rightly states that in such examples "the verb alludes to a prior event in the narrative and does not present the prior event itself" (Zevit 1998:67–68).

2.1.1.1 *God as the Speaker*

In the following examples the name of God is mentioned as responsible for certain past, present, or future events and situations. These events and situations are indicated in the clause mentioning God as the speaker, and they are regarded as fulfillments of God's wish expressed by God at a certain point in time. The pattern employed for referring to God as the speaker consists of 'כַּאֲשֶׁר + a verb of speech (mostly דָּבַר, and also נִשְׁבַּע, צָוָה, אָמַר) + the name of God.' This pattern is very common in the corpus examined, and its appearance and function in certain points in the story should probably be regarded as being a certain fixed literary formula. The examples can appear in the course of narrative, e.g., Gen. 17:23, 21:1, Judg. 6:27, 2 Sam. 24:19, 1 Kgs. 5:26, and 2 Kgs. 24:13 below, and in discourse, e.g., Gen. 24:51, Lev. 10:15, Deut. 2:14, 6:19,25, and Josh. 22:3. In 1 Kgs. 6:12 God himself in first person recalls his role as the speaker responsible for a certain earlier promise. In both types, the indication of God as the speaker refers to a previous act of speech ascribed to God.

The first example mentions God as a speaker in the course of narrative, and his speech refers to an earlier instruction made by God regarding circumcision.

Gen. 17:23—וַיִּקַּח אַבְרָהָם אֶת-יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּנוֹ וְאֵת כָּל-יְלִידֵי בֵיתוֹ וְאֵת כָּל-מַקְנֵת כֶּסֶפּוֹ כָּל-זָכָר בְּאֲנָשֵׁי בֵית אַבְרָהָם וַיִּמַּל אֶת-בְּשָׂרוֹ עֲרֻלָּתָם בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֱלֹהִים—“Then Abraham took Ishmael his son and all the slaves born in his house or bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house, and he circumcised the flesh of their foreskins that very day, **as God had said to him.**”

The second example makes two references to God as speaker with the two most common speech verbs in the Bible, אָמַר and דָּבַר, as the verse is parallel in structure. As evident from the examples in this section the verb אָמַר is not commonly used in indications of God as the speaker, probably because this verb is mainly employed elsewhere in the Bible to introduce direct speech.<sup>3</sup> Its appearance here is probably due to the scribe/narrator's wish to use different verbs in the two parts of the parallelism. Other verbs which frequently occur in this pattern and are also demonstrated in other examples below are צָוָה and נִשְׁבַּע. The choice of the latter reflects more obviously the obligatory nature

<sup>3</sup> For the difference between אָמַר and דָּבַר see Goldenberg 1991:85–86.

of God's speech. Note that the *RSV* renders the verb דָּבַר in the following example not as a verb of speech but as expressing promise. This again might be due to the need to use different translations for two closely similar verbs of speech in order to create a parallelism in the translation. However, such rendering appears in other examples as well, e.g., Josh. 22:3 below.

Gen. 21:1—“The LORD visited Sarah **as he had said**, and the LORD did to Sarah **as he had promised.**”

The following verse is part of a direct speech addressed to Abraham's servant by Laban and Bethuel, both of whom acknowledge that their consent to give Rebekah is according to God's wish.

Gen. 24:51—“Behold, Rebekah is before you, take her and go, and let her be the wife of your master's son, **as the LORD has spoken.**”

God's command in the following example concerns the ordained laws of the offerings.

Lev. 10:15—“The thigh that is offered and the breast that is waved they shall bring with the offerings by fire of the fat, to wave for a wave offering before the LORD, and it shall be yours, and your sons' with you, as a due for ever; **as the LORD has commanded.**”

The sense that the clause referring to the speaker has a looser connection to the inner content of the preceding clause than to its other components is sometimes expressed in other modern Bible translations such as the *JPS* by a special punctuation mark, a hyphen, instead of the more common comma, for instance, in the verse above: “...and which are to be your due and that of your children with you for all time—**as the Lord has commanded.**”

The following example recalls the strongest manner of promise, namely an oath.

Deut. 2:14—“And the time from our leaving Kadesh-barnea until we crossed the brook Zered was thirty-eight years, until the entire generation, that is, the men of war, had perished from the camp, **as the LORD had sworn to them.**”

Again, the Biblical Hebrew verb typical of indirect speech, דָּבַר, occurs in the following verse and the whole pattern of indication of God as the speaker is embedded in direct speech.

Deut. 6:19—לְהִדֹּף אֶת-כָּל-אֹיְבֵיךָ מִפְּנֵיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר ה'—"By thrusting out all your enemies from before you, **as the LORD has promised.**"

Another embedding within a direct speech utterance occurs in the next example, and the verb צִוָּנוּ specifically expresses a command.

Deut. 6:25—וְצִדְקָה תְהִיָּה-לָנוּ כִּי-נִשְׁמַר אֶת-כָּל-הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת לִפְנֵי ה'—אֲלֵהִינוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּנוּ—"And it will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to do all this commandment before the LORD our God, **as he has commanded us.**"

The example of Josh. 22:3 is embedded in direct speech as well. The verb used for the indication of God as a speaker is דָּבַר and it is rendered by the *RSV* as expressing promise.

Josh. 22:3—וַעֲתָה הִנִּיחַ ה' אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לְאַחֵיכֶם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר לְהֵם וְעֲתָה פָּנוּ וּלְכוּ וְלָכֶם—"And now the LORD your God has given rest to your brethren, **as he promised them**; therefore turn and go to your home in the land where your possession lies, which Moses the servant of the LORD gave you on the other side of the Jordan."

In contrast to the above translation of the verb דָּבַר as a promise, its translation in Judg. 6:27 is as an ordinary speech verb.

Judg. 6:27—וַיִּקַּח גִּדְעוֹן עֶשְׂרֵה אַנְשִׁים מִעַבְדָּיו וַיַּעַשׂ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֱלֹהֵי ה' וַיְהִי—"So Gideon took ten men of his servants, and did **as the LORD had told him**; but because he was too afraid of his family and the men of the town to do it by day, he did it by night."

The next example is again an indication of a command given by God, and it is embedded in the course of the narrative. God's command in this case is transmitted through Gad whom the scribe/narrator also indicates by the phrase כַּדְּבַר-גָּד—"at Gad's word."

2 Sam. 24:19—וַיַּעַל דָּוִד כַּדְּבַר-גָּד כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה'—"So David went up at Gad's word, **as the LORD commanded.**"

Another example which mentions God's speech, and, according to the *RSV* rendering, God's promise, by using the verb דָּבַר is the following.

וְה' נָתַן חֲכָמָה לְשֹׁלֹמֹה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר-לוֹ וַיְהִי שָׁלֵם בֵּין חִירָם וּבֵין—1 Kgs. 5:26—**שְׁלֹמֹה וַיִּכְרְתוּ בְרִית שְׁנֵיהֶם**—“And the LORD gave Solomon wisdom, **as he promised him**; and there was peace between Hiram and Solomon; and the two of them made a treaty.”

In the next verse God himself recalls, in direct speech in first person, his own earlier promise, and adds to it certain conditions.

וְשָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת-כָּל-מִצְוֹתַי לְלַקֵּת בָּהֶם וַהֲקַמְתִּי אֶת-דִּבְרֵי אֶתָּךְ אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי אֶל-דָּוִד אָבִיךָ—1 Kgs. 6:12—**וְאֶת-מִשְׁפָּטַי תַּעֲשֶׂה**—“Concerning this house which you are building, if you will walk in my statutes and obey my ordinances and keep all my commandments and walk in them, then I will establish my word with you, **which I spoke to David your father**.”

The clause **אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי אֶל-דָּוִד אָבִיךָ** here at first seems to be a relative clause, and is understood as such by many translators. The *JPS*, for instance, translates it: “...I will fulfill for you the promise **that I gave to your father David**.” But note that the relative clause in the Hebrew version is subsequent to the direct object **אֶת-דִּבְרֵי אֶתָּךְ**, as also in the *RSV* translation above. Such a structure, where the relative clause is not immediately adjacent to its head—in this case **דִּבְרֵי**, occurs sporadically in Biblical Hebrew and should be considered, as I have suggested elsewhere,<sup>4</sup> an ordinary construction in that language; yet in this case the original Hebrew could also mean **כַּאֲשֶׁר** (as) instead of **אֲשֶׁר** (which/that).

Finally, in 2 Kgs. 24:13 below the indication of God as the speaker appears again in discourse. Though the verb chosen is the ordinary indirect speech verb, **דִּבֶּר**, it actually refers to a dramatic episode, namely the fulfillment of an important prophecy on the fate of Jerusalem.

וַיֹּצֵא מִשָּׁם אֶת-כָּל-אוֹצְרוֹת בַּיִת ה' וְאוֹצְרוֹת בַּיִת הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּקְצָץ—2 Kgs. 24:13—**אֶת-כָּל-כְּלֵי הַזָּהָב אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה שְׁלֹמֹה מֶלֶךְ-יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּהִיכַל ה' כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר ה'**—“And he carried off all the treasures of the house of the LORD, and the treasures of the king’s house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold in the temple of the LORD, which Solomon king of Israel had made, **as the LORD had foretold**.”

#### 2.1.1.2 *Inclusion of the Pattern* כַּכֵּן... כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה / כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה

The pattern displayed in this section is an extended variant of the foregoing and it similarly conveys an affirmation of God’s wish and respon-

<sup>4</sup> Zewi 1999b, and especially 90–91.

sibility regarding a certain past, present, or future activity or situation. This type is a complete sentence in the pattern **בְּדַבֵּר/בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר/בְּאֲשֶׁר** ... **צִוָּה אֱלֹהִים/ה'** ... **בְּ**. It contains an adverbial comparative clause introduced by the comparative particle **כִּי**, and it involves repetition of previous content by means of an inflected verbal form, usually of **עָשָׂה**. When this pattern appears in direct speech, e.g., 2 Sam. 3:9 below, it does not refer to a speaker only but generally belongs to the realm of deontic modality, since it involves self affirmation by a speaker.

The next two examples demonstrate two modifications of this pattern. The first is '**כָּל אֲשֶׁר**' + a verb of speech **צִוָּה** + the name of God'.

Gen. 6:22—**וַיַּעַשׂ נֹחַ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים כִּן עָשָׂה**—"Noah did this; **he did all that God commanded him.**"

The second example is constructed in the pattern '**כָּאֲשֶׁר**' + a verb of speech **צִוָּה** + the name of God'.

Num. 36:10—**כָּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה' אֶת-מֹשֶׁה בֶּן עֲשׂוֹ בְּנוֹת צֶלְפַחֵד**—"The daughters of Zelophehad **did as the LORD commanded Moses.**"

Another plausible variant of this formula appears as part of an oath in the next example, though the content particle **כִּי** intervenes between the two parts of the pattern and slightly changes its structure.

2 Sam. 3:9—**כֹּה-יַעֲשֶׂה אֱלֹהִים לְאַבְנֵר וְכֹה יִסִּיף לוֹ כִּי כָאֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע ה' לְדָוִד כִּי-בֶן-אֶעֱשֶׂה-לוֹ**—"God do so to Abner, and more also, if **I do not accomplish for David what the LORD has sworn to him.**"

In 1 Kgs. 14:11—**הַמֵּת לְיִרְבֵּעַם בְּעִיר יֹאכָזַב וְהַמֵּת בְּשָׂדֵה יֹאכָלוּ עוֹף**—**הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּי ה' דִּבֶּר**—"Any one belonging to Jeroboam who dies in the city the dogs shall eat; and any one who dies in the open country the birds of the air shall eat; **for the LORD has spoken it,**" what looks like a causal clause, **כִּי ה' דִּבֶּר**, is in use instead of a clause introduced by **כָּאֲשֶׁר**. This clause is furthermore translated as a causal clause by the *RSV*, the Arabic translation *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, and *Targum Jonathan*. However a close examination of the context shows that it is part of God's prophecy dealing with the fate of Jeroboam sent by the prophet Ahijah, and the role of the insertion of the name of God as speaker here is quite similar to that in all the other clauses above.

More examples of this pattern are Gen. 7:16, 21:4, Num. 17:30, Deut. 9:3, 10:9, 11:25, 18:2, 19:8, 26:18, 27:2, Josh. 23:4,9, 1 Kgs. 5:19, 8:20, 56, and 2 Kgs. 15:12.



### 2.1.1.3 *Examples with Other Speakers*

Other characters, usually of a superior status, are also indicated as responsible for a certain wish or command by the same pattern. The first example includes an inflected verbal form of צו"ה, and it refers to a wish and command expressed by Jacob in his last words before his death.

Gen. 50:12—וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בְנָיו לֹא כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה—“Thus his sons did for him **as he had commanded them.**”

The next three examples display inflected forms of the verb דבר, and refer to commands in Lev. 10:5 and Num. 32:27, and a promise in 2 Kgs. 4:17. Moses is indicated as the speaker in Lev. 10:5:

וַיִּקְרְבוּ וַיִּשְׂאֵם בְּכַתְנֵיהֶם אֶל-מַחוּץ לַמִּחֲנֶה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר מֹשֶׁה—“So they drew near, and carried them in their coats out of the camp, **as Moses had said.**”

Num. 32:27 indicates Moses as the speaker once more, though he is not mentioned by his own proper name but by the title אֲדֹנָי:

וַעֲבַדְיָדָי יַעֲבְרוּ כָל-חֲלוּץ צָבָא לִפְנֵי ה' לְמַלְחָמָה כַּאֲשֶׁר אָדֹנָי דִּבֶּר—“But your servants will pass over, every man who is armed for war, before the LORD to battle, **as my lord orders.**”

The next example, 2 Kgs. 4:17, indicates the prophet Elisha as the speaker. A shortened form of כַּאֲשֶׁר, namely the relative particle אֲשֶׁר without the comparative כִּי, appears in this verse. Its meaning and function here, though, are equivalent to כַּאֲשֶׁר:

וַתֵּהָרָה הָאִשָּׁה וַתֵּלֶד בֵּן לְמוֹעֵד הַזֶּה כַּעַת חָיָה אִשָּׁר-דִּבֶּר אֵלֶיהָ אֵלִישָׁע—“But the woman conceived, and she bore a son about that time the following spring, **as Elisha had said to her.**”

### 2.1.1.4 *Examples with the Pattern כַּאֲשֶׁר / אֲשֶׁר... בֵּן*

The extended pattern of a full sentence containing an adverbial comparative clause initiated by כִּי and a repetition of previous content by a certain inflected form, usually of the verb עשה, is also frequent with reference to characters other than God. As in the examples in §2.1.1.2 above, which refer to God, when this pattern appears in direct speech, e.g., Gen. 18:5 and 2 Sam. 9:11 below, it does not refer to a speaker only but generally belongs to the realm of deontic modality, since it involves a subjective affirmation.

In the following example the order of the two main parts of the pattern is inverted, and the adverbial comparative clause, כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ, ap-

pears second, after *בְּנֵי תַעֲשֶׂה*. This modification is not unusual in Biblical Hebrew, and it is demonstrated once more in Josh. 4:8, presented in §2.1.1.5 below. The whole pattern appears in direct speech.

Gen. 18:5—*וְאָקְחָה פֶת-לֶחֶם וְסַעְדוּ לְבַבְכֶם אַחַר תַּעֲבְרוּ בִי-עַל-בֶּן עֲבָרְתֶם*—“...While I fetch a morsel of bread, that you may refresh yourselves, and after that you may pass on—since you have come to your servant.’ So they said, ‘**Do as you have said.**’”

In the next example the verb *הָיָה* appears instead of the more common inflected verbal form of *עָשָׂה*, since it refers to a general situation more than to a specific event. The whole pattern refers to a past situation and appears in narrative, and it is part of the Joseph stories.

Gen. 41:13—*וַיְהִי כִּאֲשֶׁר פָּתַר-לָנוּ כֵּן הָיָה אֵתִי הַשִּׁיב עַל-בְּנֵי וְאֵתוֹ תְּלֶה*—“And **as he interpreted to us, so it came to pass**; I was restored to my office, and the baker was hanged.”

An inflected form of the verb *עָשָׂה* recurs in the following example in a prefix conjugation, and the two prefix conjugation verbs in the pattern refer this time to the future. Again, the whole pattern appears in direct speech, addressed in this case to a superior, a king.

2 Sam. 9:11—*וַיֹּאמֶר צִיבָא אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר יִצְוֶה אֱלֹהֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת-עַבְדּוֹ כֵּן*—“Then Ziba said to the king, ‘**According to all that my lord the king commands his servant, so will your servant do.**’ So Mephibosheth ate at David’s table, like one of the king’s sons.”

More examples are Josh. 4:10,12, 1 Kgs. 8:53, 12:12, 2 Kgs. 7:17.

### 2.1.1.5 *God and Another Speaker*

The following example includes as speakers God and another, in this case, a high ranking leader, Joshua. The first occurrence is constructed according to the long pattern of an adverbial comparative clause initiated by *כִּי* and a reference to previous content by an inflected form of the verb *עָשָׂה* in inverted order, namely *וַיַּעֲשׂוּ-כֵן בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל* first and *כִּי-אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה* second. The second occurrence is the simpler comparative clause, *כִּי-אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר ה' אֶל-יְהוָה*. Both patterns appear within narrative.

Josh. 4:8—*וַיַּעֲשׂוּ-כֵן בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי-אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה וַיֵּשְׂאוּ שְׁתֵּי-עֲשָׂרָה אַבְנִים מִתּוֹךְ הַיַּרְדֵּן - כִּי-אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר ה' אֶל-יְהוָה לְמִסְפַּר שְׁבַטֵי בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעֲבְרוּם עִמָּם אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּנְחֹמוּ שָׁם*—“And the men of Israel did **as Joshua commanded**, and

took up twelve stones out of the midst of the Jordan, according to the number of the tribes of the people of Israel, **as the LORD told Joshua**; and they carried them over with them to the place where they lodged, and laid them down there.”

#### 2.1.1.6 *Other Syntactic Structures Introducing a Speaker*

Another way to refer to a speaker in a sentence is by setting him as the subject/agent of a speech verb, while the content of his speech is the object of that speech verb. In such cases the speech expression is syntactically dependent on the speech verb, and in most cases the clause containing the speaker/agent and the verb of speech is syntactically considered the main clause. Nonetheless, when a speaker and a verb of speech appear in the middle of a speech expression, and in certain cases even when they follow it, they are deemed parenthetical units in many syntactic treatments.<sup>5</sup> Such a duality and ambiguity in placement and analysis regarding speech verbs also exists in scholarly works concerning modal verbs expressing attitude and opinion, e.g., believe, think, etc. In fact, such modal verbs can be syntactically followed by a content clause introduced by ‘that,’ although they can also be used parenthetically without ‘that.’<sup>6</sup> The latter constructions rarely occur in Biblical Hebrew, and a few of them are discussed later.

Miller, in her study of representation of speech in Biblical Hebrew narrative, says that she finds in her corpus only two examples of a speaker and a speech verb in medial position.<sup>7</sup> One is in prose, more specifically in prophetic language, since it concludes a prophecy introduced as *דְּבַר-ה'* and transmitted by Isaiah to Hezekiah:

וַיֹּאמֶר יְשַׁעְיָהוּ אֶל-חֲזַקְיָהוּ שְׁמַע דְּבַר-ה'. הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים—2 Kgs. 20:16–18  
 וְנִשְׂאָ כָל-אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵיתְךָ וְאֲשֶׁר אָצְרוּ אֲבֹתֶיךָ עַד-הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה בְּבֵלָה לֹא-יִוָּתֵר דְּבַר  
 אָמַר ה'. וּמִבְנֵיךָ אֲשֶׁר יֵצְאוּ מִמֶּךָ אֲשֶׁר תוֹלִיד יִקַּח יִקַּח וְהָיוּ סְרִיסִים בְּהֵיכַל מֶלֶךְ  
 בְּבֵלָ—“Then Isaiah said to Hezekiah, ‘Hear the word of the LORD:  
 Behold, the days are coming, when all that is in your house, and that  
 which your fathers have stored up till this day, shall be carried to Babylon;  
 nothing shall be left, **says the LORD**. And some of your own sons, who  
 are born to you, shall be taken away; and they shall be eunuchs in the  
 palace of the king of Babylon.’”

<sup>5</sup> Lyons 1977:738.

<sup>6</sup> On this duality in English, see Reinhart 1983:172–175.

<sup>7</sup> Miller 1996:213–215, §4.4.1.

Miller's other example is in poetry, in the Song of Deborah, and its language in general reflects ancient poetic language.

Judg. 5:23—אָרוּ מְרוֹז אָמַר מִלְאָךְ ה' אָרוּ אָרוּר יִשְׁבִּיָּהּ כִּי לֹא-בָאוּ לְעֹזְרֹת ה' בְּגִבּוֹרִים לְעֹזְרֹת ה' בְּגִבּוֹרִים—“Curse Meroz, **says the angel of the LORD**, curse bitterly its inhabitants, because they came not to the help of the LORD, to the help of the LORD against the mighty.”

As to final position, Miller states that such cases are also very rare. Especially important for this study are those, cited by Miller, in which the speaker and the speech verb are mentioned before the speech expression and are repeated in post-position: repetition of information about a certain speech mentioned earlier in the text is proof of its parenthetical nature.<sup>8</sup> Here is an example:

Exod. 19:3–6—וּמֹשֶׁה עָלָה אֶל-הָאֱלֹהִים וַיְקַרָּא אֵלָיו ה' מִן-הַהָר לֵאמֹר כֹּה תֹאמַר לְבֵית יִעֲקֹב וְחַגִּיד לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. אַתֶּם רְאִיתֶם אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי לְמִצְרַיִם וְאֲשָׂא אֶתְכֶם עַל-כַּנְפֵי נְשָׁרִים וָאֲבֵא אֶתְכֶם אֵלַי. וְעַתָּה אִם-שָׁמַעַתְּ תִשְׁמְעוּ בְקוֹלִי וְשָׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת-בְּרִיתִי וְהָיִיתֶם לִי סֻגְלָה מִכָּל-הָעַמִּים כִּי-לִי כָל-הָאָרֶץ. תִּהְיוּ-לִי מַמְלַכַת כֹּהֲנִים וְגוֹי קְדוֹשׁ אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר תְּדַבֵּר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל—“And Moses went up to God, and the LORD called to him out of the mountain, saying, **Thus you shall say to the house of Jacob, and tell the people of Israel:** You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself. Now therefore, if you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples; for all the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. **These are the words which you shall speak to the children of Israel.**”

Brockelmann gives more such examples regarding parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew in his extensive comparative account of the grammar of the Semitic languages.<sup>9</sup> Two examples are from prose. The first is Genesis 3:3, which displays an utterance attributed to God.

Gen. 3:3—וּמִפְרֵי הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹךְ-הַגֶּן אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא תִגְעוּ—“**But God said,** ‘You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.’”

The second example is in Exod. 5:16, which relates a complaint submitted by the foremen of the Israelites to Pharaoh. The phrase אֶמְרֵי לָנוּ refers to Pharaoh's taskmasters as those uttering the command aimed at the Israelites: וְלַבְּנִים עֲשׂוּ—“Make bricks!”

<sup>8</sup> Miller 1996:215–217, §4.4.1.

<sup>9</sup> Brockelmann 1913:671, §463b.

Exod. 5:16—תָּבֵן אִין נָתַן לְעַבְדֶּיךָ וּלְבָנִים אֲמָרִים לָנוּ עֲשׂוּ—“No straw is given to your servants, **yet they say to us**, ‘Make bricks!’”

The fragile nature of the word order in the examples above is further revealed in certain Bible translations. The *RSV* translation, for example, changes the place of the reference to the speaker in Gen. 3:3 and Exod. 5:16 so that it introduces the speech instead of interrupting it. However, Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translation and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* both are hesitant about the word order in these verses. Saadya Gaon keeps the original word order in Gen. 3:3—לְכֹן מִן תִּמְרֵי אֵלֶּיךָ אֲלֵךְ וְסִטָּה... קָאֵל אֵלֶּיךָ לֹא תֹאכְלֵהּ מִנְהָא... תְּבֵן לָם. <sup>10</sup> But *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* transforms the syntactic structure of the first verse, Gen. 3:3, into a complete extraposition, and the reference to the speaker is set at the beginning of the clause that immediately follows the extraposed part, namely *وَأَمَّا وَتَمْرُ الشَّجَرَةِ الَّتِي فِي وَسَطِ الْجَنَّةِ فَقَالَ اللَّهُ لَا تَأْكُلَا مِنْهُ وَلَا تَمَسَّاهُ لِيَلَّا تَمُوتَاهُ*, while Exod. 5:16 maintains its word order in this translation.

The reference to the speaker is preserved in the middle of Gen. 3:3 in the Geez Bible translation as well, although the verb of speech is repeated at its end. The status of the independent speech is also changed in the Geez Bible translation since the subordinate content particle *kama* twice precedes the speech:<sup>11</sup> ባሕቲ ኣምፍራ ዕዕ ከሀሉ ማእከሉ ንነት ደብሲን ኣግዚአብሔር ከመ ኢንብላዕ ኣምኔሁ ወከመ ኢንግሥሥ ከመ ኢንሙት ደብ / *bāhəttu ʾəm-fəre ʾəd za-hallo māʾəkala gannat yābelana ʾAgziʾabəher kama ʾi-nəblāʿ ʾəmnehu wa-kama ʾi-nəgs(!)əs(!)o kama ʾi-nəmut yābe*. By contrast, the Geez translation of Exod. 5:16 places the word ‘bricks’ at the end of the verse and avoids the break in the word order and the extra position: ...ወደብሊዎሙ ግበሩ ግንፋሉ / *wa-yəbelwomu gəbaru gənfāla*. Of the translations examined, only Onkelos and the *Peshitta* preserve the Hebrew word order in both verses.

The rest of Brockelmann’s examples are from Prophetic books, like the following three.<sup>12</sup> In the first example, Isa. 1:18, the parenthetical clause *הִיאֲמַר ה* appears in middle position.

<sup>10</sup> The translations of Saadya Gaon are cited in this work according to Derenbourg Edition unless otherwise stated. Ms. St. Petersburg and Ḥasid edition are also consulted and are mentioned only where they present dissimilar meaningful versions.

<sup>11</sup> A third occurrence of the content particle *kama* appears in the translation. This time it is not subordinate to the verb of speech but to the verb which precedes the particle *kama*, namely *ʾi-nəgs(!)əs(!)o*, and it renders the Hebrew particle *אֲשֶׁר*.

<sup>12</sup> For more such examples in prophetic language see Brockelmann 1913:671, §463b.

לְכוּ-נָא וְנִבְחַחְהָ יֹאמֵר ה' אִם-יְהִיוּ חַטָּאֵיכֶם כְּשָׁנִים בְּשֹׁלֵג וְלִבֵּינוּ אִם-יֵאדְיִמוּ כְּתוֹלַע בְּצֹמֶר יִהְיוּ—“Come now, let us reason together, **says the LORD**: though your sins are like scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they are red like crimson, they shall become like wool.”

In the second example, Isa. 48:22, the clause **יֹאמֵר ה'** appears in middle position again.

אֵין שְׁלוֹם אָמַר ה' לְרָשָׁעִים—“There is no peace,’ **says the LORD**, ‘for the wicked.’”

In the third example the clause **כֹּה אָמַר ה'** can be considered in initial position since only the coordinate particle **לְכֵן** precedes it.

Jer. 11:11—**לְכֵן כֹּה אָמַר ה' הִנְנִי מְבִיא אֲלֵיהֶם רָעָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יִוָּכְלוּ לְצַאת מִמֶּנָּה**—“Therefore, **thus says the LORD**, Behold, I am bringing evil upon them which they cannot escape; though they cry to me, I will not listen to them.”

In all these last three examples a certain form of the direct speech verb **אָמַר** followed by the name of God as the speaker forms a definite parenthesis.

### 2.1.2 *Appeal and Plea*

Appeal and plea expressions generally belong to the sphere of deontic modality, which reflects a subjective standpoint, and they are not necessarily syntactically parenthetical. The first group of examples includes phrases of appeal and plea that syntactically are full clauses, such as **אִם-נָא מְצַאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ** and the like. These clauses can be analyzed in more than one respect. As for the syntactic status of the idiom **אִם-נָא מְצַאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ**, it is a protasis of a conditional sentence, hence dependent on the main sentence, but this idiom is actually frozen and its content is parenthetical to the main content presented in the main sentence, which is the appeal or plea itself. Other expressions of appeal and plea that are not full clauses but words and phrases are discussed later in the appropriate section.

#### 2.1.2.1 *The Idiom אִם-נָא מְצַאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ*

The following are examples containing the appeal and plea formula **אִם-נָא מְצַאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ**, which introduces a request and fulfill other roles. Many ancient Bible translations of this formula are usually fixed and literal, and do not show its parenthetical nature well enough. A more accurate and adequate translation could have been simply ‘please’,

as in the *JPS* translation in 1 Sam. 20:29; or slightly longer versions, such as the *JPS* translation of Gen. 18:3 below: “If it please you . . .” and the *JPS* translation of the next example, Gen. 33:10: “I pray you . . .” As we will see below, the *JPS*, as may be expected from modern Bible translations, also demonstrates elsewhere a greater flexibility in its translations of this formula. Even the more literal *RSV* translation reveals some flexibility in its rendering of this frozen formula.

As to modal nuances, deontic modality and subjectivity are revealed in the content of this expression and in the fact that almost all appearances of this formula in the examples below, apart from 1 Sam. 1:18, which is third person, are in first person singular or plural. This formula regularly expresses a plea or thanks, but occasionally it stands simply in its literal meaning, as in 2 Sam. 15:25 below.

The *RSV* translations for the following examples are, as stated, somewhat flexible. Its rendering of אִם-נָא מְצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ in both the next examples, Gen. 18:3 and Gen. 33:10, is “if I have found favor in your sight,” but the translation in the third example, Gen. 47:25, is different: “may it please my lord.”

In the first example the clause אִם-נָא מְצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ is in first person singular. The pattern is part of an utterance containing an appeal and made by Abraham to three visitors whom he regards as three messengers of God. This belief, along with the statement of a preceding verse, Gen. 18:1—וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהֵי ה' בְּאֲלֵנִי מִמְרֵא—“And the LORD appeared to him by the oaks of Mamre,” explains why Abraham addresses the three men with the phrase אֲדָנִי in singular, and employs a singular possessive pronoun in the word בְּעֵינֶיךָ.

Gen. 18:3—וַיֹּאמֶר אֲדָנִי אִם-נָא מְצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֶל-נָא תַעֲבֹר מֵעַל עַבְדְּךָ—“And he said, ‘My lord, **if I have found favor in your sight**, do not pass by your servant.’”

In the second clause the phrase אִם-נָא מְצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ is stated again in first person singular. It is spoken this time by Jacob and constitutes an especially polite appeal aimed at his brother, Esau.

Gen. 33:10—וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב אֶל-נָא אִם-נָא מְצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ וְלָקַחְתָּ מִנְּחָתִי מִיָּדִי—“Jacob said, ‘No, I pray you, **if I have found favor in your sight**, then accept my present from my hand; for truly to see your face is like seeing the face of God, with such favor have you received me.’”

In the third example the clause נִמְצָא-חֵן בְּעֵינֵי אֲדָנִי is expressed in first person plural, employing a prefix conjugation verb נִמְצָא instead of מְצָאתִי. The clause נִמְצָא-חֵן בְּעֵינֵי אֲדָנִי in this example is spoken by the Egyptians

to Joseph, and it expresses either a plea or thanks. As expressed by the English translation of Gen. 47:25 below the formula under discussion is interpreted by the *RSV* as a plea. The *JPS* understands it as a thanking formula: “We are grateful to my lord.” This seems more plausible in this case, for according to the context the Egyptians thank Joseph for saving them from famine. It also conforms with other examples presented later on, in which this very formula conveys thanks.

Gen. 47:25—וַיֹּאמְרוּ הַחִיִּיתָנוּ נִמְצָא-חַן בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנָי וְהַיִּינוּ עֲבָדִים לְפָרְעָה—“And they said, ‘You have saved our lives; **may it please my lord**, we will be slaves to Pharaoh.’”

More examples of the plea formula, in the *RSV* translation usually beginning “If we have found favor...” and continuing “in your sight/ with thee/ in your eyes/ in the eyes of the Lord,” are as follows.

The first, Num. 32:5, is in first person plural. It is said by the sons of Gad and the sons of Reuben and is directed mostly at Moses, and also at Eleazar the priest and the leaders of the congregation, as stated in a preceding verse, Num. 32:2. The plea formula אִם-מִצָּאָנוּ חַן בְּעֵינֶיךָ in this case indeed expresses a plea.

Num. 32:5—וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִם-מִצָּאָנוּ חַן בְּעֵינֶיךָ יְתֵן אֶת-הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְעַבְדֶּיךָ לְאֶחְזָה—“And they said, ‘**If we have found favor in your sight**, let this land be given to your servants for a possession; do not take us across the Jordan.’”

The next example, אִם-נָא מִצָּאתִי חַן בְּעֵינֶיךָ, is in first person singular, and it too expresses a plea, made by Gideon to God.

Judg. 6:17—וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו אִם-נָא מִצָּאתִי חַן בְּעֵינֶיךָ וְעֲשִׂיתָ לִּי אוֹת שְׂאֵתָה מְדַבֵּר—“And he said to him, ‘**If now I have found favor with thee**, then show me a sign that it is thou who speakest with me.’”

1 Sam. 20:29 below contains אִם-מִצָּאתִי חַן בְּעֵינֶיךָ in first person singular once more. It again expresses a plea, and it is cited in an utterance by Jonathan in answer to Saul his father’s inquiry regarding the whereabouts of David. The citation itself, according to Jonathan, includes a previous appeal made by David to Jonathan.

1 Sam. 20:29—וַיֹּאמֶר שְׁלַחֵנִי נָא כִּי זָבַח מִשְׁפָּחָה לְנוּ בַעִיר וְהוּא צֹוֶה-לִּי אֶחָי וְעַתָּה אִם-מִצָּאתִי חַן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אִמְלֹטָה נָא וְאֶרְאֶה אֶת-אֶחָי עַל-כֵּן לֹא-בָא אֶל-שְׁלַחַן הַמֶּלֶךְ—“he said, ‘Let me go; for our family holds a sacrifice in the city, and my brother has commanded me to be there. So now, **if I have found favor in your eyes**, let me get away, and see my brothers.’ For this reason he has not come to the king’s table.”



Another example of this pattern follows. This time it is with a prefix conjugation verb, **אֶמְצָא**, also demonstrated in the form **נִמְצָא** in Gen. 47:25 above, instead of the more common suffix conjugation verb **מִצָּאתִי**, and again in first person singular. The formula **אֶם-אֶמְצָא חֵן בְּעֵינַי ה'** in this example is spoken by King David to the priest Zadok. Contrary to all other examples presented here, **אֶם-אֶמְצָא חֵן בְּעֵינַי ה'** is probably neither a plea nor thanks but conveys more or less the actual sense of the phrase: “If God wishes....”

2 Sam. 15:25—**וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ לְצִדּוֹק הַשֵּׁב אֶת-אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים הָעִיר אֶם-אֶמְצָא חֵן בְּעֵינַי ה'**—“Then the king said to Zadok, ‘Carry the ark of God back into the city. **If I find favor in the eyes of the LORD**, he will bring me back and let me see both it and his habitation.’”

Also see 1 Sam. 25:8, 27:5, and many more.

The same idiom appears to be a thanking formula in the three ensuing examples, 1 Sam. 1:18, 2 Sam. 16:4, and Ruth 2:13, though, as suggested above, the *RSV* translations of these examples are often frozen, literal, and do not reflect it as well as they do the foregoing meaning. In the first example the thanking formula follows Eli’s promise that Hannah will see her wishes fulfilled. A non-literal translation of the thanking formula in this verse should be just ‘thanks’, but it is translated literally by an expression analogous to those employed in the previous examples: “Let your maidservant find favor in your eyes.” In the second example Ziba thanks David, and here too the *RSV* provides a literal translation, “let me ever find favor in your sight,” instead of just ‘thanks.’ In the third example Ruth thanks Boaz, and this is the only case of a non-literal translation by the *RSV*: “You are most gracious to me.”

In the first example the verb **תִּמְצָא** is a prefix conjugation verb in third person singular.

1 Sam. 1:18—**וַתֹּאמֶר תִּמְצָא שְׂפָתַיךָ חֵן בְּעֵינַיִךְ וַתֵּלֶךְ וַתֹּאכַל לְדַרְכָּהּ וַתֵּאָכֵל עוֹד**—“And she said, ‘**Let your maidservant find favor in your eyes.**’ Then the woman went her way and ate, and her countenance was no longer sad.”

The next example consists of the verb **אֶמְצָא**, a prefix conjugation verb in first person singular.

2 Sam. 16:4—**וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ לְצִבְאָה הִנֵּה לְךָ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר לְמִפְי-בִשְׁתַּי וַיֹּאמֶר צִבְאָה**—“Then the king said to Ziba, ‘Behold, all that belonged to Mephibosheth is now yours.’ And Ziba

said, ‘I do obeisance; **let me ever find favor in your sight**, my lord the king.’”

The last example displays the prefix conjugation verb אִמְצָא in first person singular.

Ruth 2:13—וַתֹּאמֶר אִמְצָא-חַן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֲדֹנָי כִּי נִחַמְתָּנִי וְכִי דִבַּרְתָּ עִלְ-לִבִּי שִׁפְחָתְךָ—וְאַנְכִי לֹא אֶהְיֶה בְּאַחַת שִׁפְחֹתֶיךָ—“Then she said, **You are most gracious to me**, my lord, for you have comforted me and spoken kindly to your maidservant, though I am not one of your maidservants.’”

### 2.1.2.2 Other Appeal and Plea Expressions

Other appeal and plea expressions which serve in Biblical Hebrew involve the verbs הוֹאִיל and יִיחַר, the latter only in the prefix conjugation and in a negative construction. Syntactically, these expressions are verbs of main clauses so they cannot be defined dispensable, as parenthetical units are expected to be. Nonetheless, once they are analyzed as frozen idioms and their meaning is carefully considered, it is clear that these expressions are actually external to the content of the appeal or plea itself, and function only as introductory formulas. This is the reason for their inclusion in the present discussion. Moreover, these patterns often appear in combination with the particle נָא, whose meaning is discussed in §3.1.5.2 below.

The first example with הוֹאִיל, in Gen. 18:27, includes הוֹאִלְתִּי as part of an appeal and plea formula which contains the self-diminishing clause וְאֲנִי עָפָר וָאֵפֶר—“I who am but dust and ashes.” The appeal is made by Abraham to God as part of a long dialogue regarding the fate of Sodom, stretching from verse 23 to verse 32 of Gen. 18.

Gen. 18:27—וַיַּעַן אַבְרָהָם וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה-נָא הוֹאִלְתִּי לְדַבֵּר אֶל-אֲדֹנָי וְאֲנִי עָפָר וָאֵפֶר—“Abraham answered, **Behold, I have taken upon myself to speak to the Lord, I who am but dust and ashes.**”

In the next example, Judg. 19:6, the phrase הוֹאִלְ-נָא should certainly be regarded as a plea, entirely analogous to the plea word ‘please,’ since it is found in direct speech which expresses pleading. A plea is also revealed in the use of the combination וַיִּפְצַר-בוֹ—“...urged him,” in verse 7 following. A similar meaning is reflected in the *RSV* translation here, as well as other Bible translations.

Judg. 19:6—וַיֵּשְׁבוּ וַיֹּאכְלוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם יַחְדָּו וַיִּשְׁתּוּ וַיֹּאמֶר אָבִי הַנְּעֻרָה אֶל-הָאִישׁ הוֹאִלְ-נָא וְלִין וְיִטֵּב לְבָבְךָ—“So the two men sat and ate and drank together; and the girl’s father said to the man, **Be pleased** to spend the night, and let your heart be merry.’”

The last example of this type, 2 Kgs. 6:3 immediately below, consists again of הוֹאֵל נָא as part of a request. The request is made by a group of people acknowledged as the sons of the prophets to the prophet Elisha.

2 Kgs. 6:3—וַיֹּאמֶר הָאֶחָד הוֹאֵל נָא וְלֵךְ אֶת-עַבְדֵיךָ וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֲנִי אֵלֶיךָ—“Then one of them said, ‘**Be pleased** to go with your servants.’ And he answered, ‘I will go.’”

As stated above, pleas produced with יָחַר are always negative. All four examples given here are rendered as such in the *RSV* translation. Although the full expression includes the negative particle אַל, the prefix conjugation verb יָחַר, and the noun אַר, it is often shortened, omitting the noun אַר.

The first example, Gen. 18:30 includes the particle נָא after the negative particle אַל as part of the pattern, but as we will see below, in Gen. 31:35, Gen. 44:18, and Judg. 6:39 נָא does not always have to be part of this pattern. The noun אַר is also missing in this example. This verse, like Gen. 18:27 presented above, is part of the dialogue between Abraham and God regarding the fate of Sodom in verses 23–32 of Gen. 18.

Gen. 18:30—וַיֹּאמֶר אֵל-נָא יָחַר לֵאדֹנָי וְאִדְבְּרָה אוֹלֵי יִמְצְאוּן שָׁם שְׁלֹשִׁים וַיֹּאמֶר—“Then he said, ‘**Oh let not the Lord be angry**, and I will speak. Suppose thirty are found there.’ He answered, ‘I will not do it, if I find thirty there.’”

The noun אַר is missing in the next example as well. The appeal is made by Rachel to her father, Laban.

Gen. 31:35—וַתֹּאמֶר אֵל-אָבִיהָ אֵל-יָחַר בְּעֵינַי אֲדֹנָי כִּי לֹא אוֹכַל לָקוּם מִפְּנֵיךָ—“And she said to her father, ‘**Let not my lord be angry** that I cannot rise before you, for the way of women is upon me.’ So he searched, but did not find the household gods.”

The full pattern, which contains the noun אַר, is as follows. It is spoken this time by Judah to Joseph, whom Judah at this point in the story regards as a very high-ranking official—in Judah’s own words “... like Pharaoh himself.”

Gen. 44:18—וַיֵּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוּדָה וַיֹּאמֶר בִּי אֲדֹנָי יְדַבֵּר-נָא עַבְדְּךָ דָּבַר בְּאָזְנֵי אֲדֹנָי—“Then Judah went up to him and said, ‘O my lord, let your servant, I pray you, speak a word in my lord’s ears, **and let not your anger burn against your servant**; for you are like Pharaoh himself.’”

The last example also exhibits a full pattern with אף. It is employed by Gideon towards God. The request in this verse follows two previous similar requests by Gideon in verses 17 and 37 of Judges. 6. Judg. 6:17, presented in §2.1.2.1 above, has the plea formula אִם-נָא מְצַאתִי חַן בְּעֵינַיִךְ.

Judg. 6:39—וַיֹּאמֶר גִּדְעוֹן אֶל-הָאֱלֹהִים אֵל-יְחֹר אַפְךָ בִּי וְאִדְבַרְהָ אִךְ הַפַּעַם אֲנֹסָה—“Then Gideon said to God, ‘**Let not thy anger burn against me**, let me speak but this once; pray, let me make trial only this once with the fleece; pray, let it be dry only on the fleece, and on all the ground let there be dew.’”

Other examples are: Gen. 18:31,32, and many more.

### 2.1.3 *Affirmation of God’s Existence, Identity, and Status*

The examples in this section are clauses affirming of God’s existence, identity, and status, often by God himself, and also by others, and all are in direct speech. Most examples are syntactically independent of the sentence in which they appear. They are in initial or final position, preceding or following the speech’s main content, and thus display relatively free word order. Their pronouncements are also detached from the main speech in their content as well, so they should be considered parenthetical both syntactically and functionally-pragmatically.

In the following examples God himself declares his existence, identity or status within his own revelations and speech acts. The parenthetical remark expressed by God as part of his command to Abram in Gen. 17:1, for instance, is probably meant to declare and ensure God’s identity.

Gen. 17:1—וַיְהִי אַבְרָם בֶּן-תְּשׁוּעִים שָׁנָה וַתִּשְׁעַ שְׁנַיִם וַיֵּרָא ה' אֶל-אַבְרָם וַיֹּאמֶר—“When Abram was ninety-nine years old the LORD appeared to Abram, and said to him, ‘**I am God Almighty**; walk before me, and be blameless.’”

In the next example God himself states his title as the introduction to his promise to Jacob in a way reminiscent of the introduction to oath formulas by swearing in the name of God.

Gen. 35:11—וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אֱלֹהִים אֲנִי אֵל שְׁדֵי פְרָה וּרְבֵה גּוֹי וּקְהַל גּוֹיִם יְהִיָּה מִמֶּךָ—“And God said to him, ‘**I am God Almighty**: be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall come from you, and kings shall spring from you.’”



Deut. 5:6—אֲנֹכִי הוּא אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עַבְדִּים—**“I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.”**

In the next two examples, Lev. 11:44 and Lev. 11:45, the clause which affirms God’s status takes the form of a causal clause and follows the causal particle כִּי. In these two cases the clauses are thus syntactically dependent, and can be considered parenthetical units only functionally-pragmatically.

Lev. 11:44—כִּי אֲנִי הוּא אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְהִתְקַדְשֶׁתֶם וְהִיִּיתֶם קְדוֹשִׁים כִּי קְדוֹשׁ אֲנִי וְלֹא—**“For I am the LORD your God; consecrate yourselves therefore, and be holy, for I am holy. You shall not defile yourselves with any swarming thing that crawls upon the earth.”**

Lev. 11:45—כִּי אֲנִי הוּא הַמַּעֲלָה אֲתֶכֶם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לְהִיֵּת לָכֶם לֵאלֹהִים וְהִיִּיתֶם—**“For I am the LORD who brought you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God; you shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.”**

Other examples are Lev. 18:2,6,21,30, 19:3,4,10, 20:7,8, 21:12,15,23, 22:2, 25:55, and many more.

The last two examples in this section are declarations of God’s existence, identity or status not by God himself but by others, in private prayers said by kings. These declarations are in second person, and can be regarded as a sort of exclamations introducing a plea. The affirmative modal statement וְדַבַּרְיָךָ יְהִיוּ אָמֶת, which follows the declaration of God’s identity and status in the first example and the informative statement אֶתְּהָ עָשִׂיתָ אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ, which follows the declaration of God’s status and identity in the second example, further consolidate the first part of each declaration. Both instances can be regarded as a continuation of the exclamation, and perhaps are required here as reinforcement of the plea expressed in these speech acts.

The first example, אֶתְּהָ-הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים, is part of a private prayer offered by King David. The act of prayer is indicated in the previous verse, 2 Sam. 7:28—כִּי-אֶתְּהָ ה' עֲבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל גְּלִיתָהּ אֶת-אֶזְנוֹ עַבְדְּךָ לְאֹמֶר בַּיִת—**“For thou, O LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, hast made this revelation to thy servant, saying, ‘I will build you a house’; therefore thy servant has found courage to pray this prayer to thee.”**

2 Sam. 7:28—וְעַתָּה אֲדֹנָי ה' אֲתָה-הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים וּדְבָרֶיךָ יְהִיו אֱמֶת וְתִדְבָר—אֵל-עַבְדְּךָ אֶת-הַטּוֹבָה הַזֹּאת וְעַתָּה אֲדֹנָי ה' אֲתָה-הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים וּדְבָרֶיךָ יְהִיו אֱמֶת וְתִדְבָר—“And now, O Lord GOD, **thou art God**, and thy words are true, and thou hast promised this good thing to thy servant.”

The second example is also a private prayer by a king, this time Hezekiah. The prayer is indicated in the verse itself by the introductory clause וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל חֲזַקִּיהוּ לְפָנָי ה'.

2 Kgs. 19:15–16—וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל חֲזַקִּיהוּ לְפָנָי ה' וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים יְשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים אֲתָה-הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים לְבַדְּךָ לְכֹל מַמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ אֲתָה עֹשֵׂת אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת-הָאָרֶץ. הִטָּה ה' אֲזַנְךָ וְשָׁמַע פִּקְחָהּ עֵינֶיךָ וּרְאָה וּשְׁמַע אֶת דְּבָרַי סְנַחֲרִיב אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַחוּ לְחַרְךָ אֱלֹהִים חַי—“And Hezekiah prayed before the LORD, and said: “O LORD the God of Israel, who art enthroned above the cherubim, **thou art the God, thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth.** Incline thy ear, O LORD, and hear; open thy eyes, O LORD, and see; and hear the words of Sennacherib, which he has sent to mock the living God.<sup>14</sup>

#### 2.1.4 Oath Patterns

Azar, in his book *Expressions of Commitments in the Old Testament and in the Mishna*,<sup>15</sup> designates two basic types of oaths, those with and without a special opening formula. The first type concerns us here, since the opening formulas might be regarded as external additions to the oath contents, hence parenthetical. Still, this construction requires caution, since most patterns create a syntactic connection between the opening formula and the following content of oath. If such a connection is established the opening formula can no longer be considered parenthetical from a syntactic standpoint.

The oath formulas mentioned by Azar are as follows: נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי, חַי, עֵד ה'/הַמְזַבֵּחַ וכו', הַעֲיִדוֹתֵי בַכֶּם, יִצַף ה', נִשְׁאֲתִי (אֵת) יָדִי, הַרִימוֹתֵי יָדִי, נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי, נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי בַכֶּם, יִצַף ה', נִשְׁאֲתִי (אֵת) יָדִי, יָדִי, וכו'.<sup>16</sup> Among these formulas נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי, נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי בַכֶּם, יִצַף ה', נִשְׁאֲתִי (אֵת) יָדִי, וכו' frequently introduce content clauses containing the oath, many of them followed by the content and conditional particles כִּי and אִם. These content clauses follow oath verbs and are syntactically object clauses subordinate to the preceding oath verbs, so the latter cannot indisputably be regarded as parenthetical

<sup>14</sup> Similar versions appear in Isa. 37:16–17.

<sup>15</sup> Azar 1981.

<sup>16</sup> Azar 1981:12. Also see *GKC* 1910:471–472, §149 and Joüon & Muraoka 2006:582–584, §165.

units. The ambiguity of the role of the oath verbs in these constructions, as main verbs or as parenthetical units, resembles that of speech verbs introducing speech contents. The word *חלילה*, which is found in oath formulas and in contexts other than oaths, probably serves in oaths as an exclamation particle.

The remaining two patterns *הי ה'אני וכו'* and *בה יעשה אלהים/ה'* ... *ונבה יוסיף* ... are also followed by content clauses opening with *כי* or *אם*, but they do not constitute verbs to which object clauses are subordinate. These patterns point at an external entity as a witness to a subsequent act of oath. In addition, in one example below, Gen. 42:15–16, the clause *הי פרעה* is repeated in a second negative part of an oath constructed of two positive and negative conditional clauses, and it is set there in the middle of the oath, thus realizing its potential to enjoy a free word order. We can safely state here that these two oath expressions should be considered parenthetical both syntactically and functionally-pragmatically. Several examples of these last two patterns alone follow.

Examples in which *הי ה'אני וכו'* introduces or interrupts an oath appear in the next three examples. The first, Gen. 42:15–16, shows the pattern *הי פרעה* twice.

Gen. 42:15–16—*בזאת תבחנו חי פרעה אם תצאו מזה כי אם-בבוא אחיכם הקטן-הנה. שלחו מכם אחד ויקח את-אחיכם ואתם האסרו ויבחנו דבריכם האמת אתכם ואם-לא חי פרעה כי מרגלים אתם*—“By this you shall be tested: **by the life of Pharaoh**, you shall not go from this place unless your youngest brother comes here. Send one of you, and let him bring your brother, while you remain in prison, that your words may be tested, whether there is truth in you; or else, **by the life of Pharaoh**, surely you are spies.”

The second example, Num. 14:28, displays the pattern *הי-אני*, which contains the first person independent personal pronoun. Swearing by one's own name is possible in the Bible only when this name refers to God himself and he is the one performing the act of swearing. Accordingly, *הי-אני* is often accompanied by another parenthetical phrase, *נאם-ה'*, or the like, as in the verse below.<sup>17</sup> One more example of *הי-אני* is found in a similar adjacent text, Num. 14:21. Other instances are found only in prophetic books: Isa. 49:18, Jer. 22:24, 46:18, Ezek. 5:11, 14:16, 18, 20, 16:48, 17:16, 19, 18:3, 20:3, 31, 33, 33:11, 27, 34:8, 35:6, 11, and Zeph. 2:9.

<sup>17</sup> On the phrase *נאם-ה'* as a parenthetical unit see 3.1.1.1.2 below.



Num. 14:28—אָמַר אֱלֹהִים חַי-אֲנִי נְאֻם-ה' אִם-לֹא כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתֶּם בְּאָזְנֵי כֹן אֶעֱשֶׂה—לָכֶם—“Say to them, ‘**As I live**,’ says the LORD, ‘what you have said in my hearing I will do to you.’”

The last of these examples displays the pattern חַי-ה' inside an utterance containing an oath, which is sworn by Gideon regarding the two kings of Midian, Zebah and Zalmunna.

Judg. 8:19—וַיֹּאמֶר אַחִי בְנֵי-אִמִּי הֵם חַי-ה' לֹו הַחַיִּיתֶם אוֹתָם לֹא הֲרַגְתִּי אֹתְכֶם—“And he said, ‘They were my brothers, the sons of my mother; **as the LORD lives**, if you had saved them alive, I would not slay you.’”

Two examples in which כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה אֱלֹהִים/ה' וְכֹה יוֹסִיף introduces an oath are the following. The first is part of a direct speech utterance by the priest Eli to Samuel. Eli urges Samuel by this oath to tell him about his previous revelations.

1 Sam. 3:17—כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה-לְךָ אֱלֹהִים וְכֹה יוֹסִיף אִם-תִּכְחַד מִמֶּנִּי דְבַר מִכָּל-הַדְּבָר—אֲשֶׁר-דִּבַּר אֵלַיךָ—“**May God do so to you and more also**, if you hide anything from me of all that he told you.’”

The next example, Ruth 1:17, displays an oath sworn by Ruth to Naomi, her mother-in-law, and it declares Ruth's decisive loyalty to Naomi.

Ruth 1:17—בְּאֲשֶׁר תָּמוּתִי אָמוּת וְשָׁם אֶקְבֹּר כֹּה יַעֲשֶׂה ה' לִי וְכֹה יִסִּיף כִּי הַמּוֹת—יִפְרִיד בֵּינִי וּבֵינֶךָ **May the LORD do so to me and more also** if even death parts me from you.”

## 2.2 NARRATIVE FORMULAS

We now enter the realm of parenthetical formulas in Biblical Hebrew narrative, whose content frequently proves more diverse. In general, narrative formulas include certain patterns which add to the story external information relevant to readers in a later period. This type of formulas is our concern here. These external additions were presumably inserted by ancient scribes or narrators as part of the extensive editorial work that the biblical texts underwent. Such insertions created parenthetical patterns which are not part of spontaneous speech acts but are carefully formulated literary additions. Still, from a syntactic and functional-pragmatic standpoint these insertions enjoy a status similar to any other parenthetical units in the sentence to which they belong. The following examples present clauses in fixed narrative patterns that

fulfill the role of narrative parenthetical units. Since all these patterns appear within a narrative sequence they are labeled here ‘narrative parenthetical units’.

### 2.2.1 *A Formula Introduced by על-בן / לְבִן*

The examples in this section include the general explanatory and etiological explanatory narrative formula introduced by על-בן. This formula always deviates from the main story line, adding new explanatory information. The examples are classified according to a basic bipartite division into those that are generally explanatory and try to present explanations for general human practices or familiar sayings, and those that are etiological and concern origins of proper names. The general explanatory information about human practices or familiar sayings is usually popular, and it touches on topics that stir human curiosity and imagination. The etiological explanations are often popular too, and they usually reflect ideas regarding the origins of proper names based on what seems to be common knowledge accumulated up to the time of the scribe or narrator.<sup>18</sup>

The following are general explanatory examples. The first offers an explanation for the human practice of grown children leaving their parents and starting new families.

Gen. 2:24—עַל-בֶּן יַעֲזֹב אִישׁ אֶת-אָבִיו וְאֶת-אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד—“**Therefore a man leaves his father** and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh.”

The second example concerns a common practice whereby the Israelites, at least at the time of the scribe or narrator, did not use to eat a certain part of animal meat, identified in the verse as גִּיד הַנֶּשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר עַל-כַּף הַיָּרֵךְ and translated by the *RSV* as ‘the sinew of the hip’.

Gen. 32:33—עַל-בֶּן לֹא-יֹאכְלוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-גִּיד הַנֶּשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר עַל-כַּף הַיָּרֵךְ עַד—“**Therefore to this day the Israelites do not eat the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh**, because he touched the hollow of Jacob’s thigh on the sinew of the hip.”

<sup>18</sup> Biblical etiological explanations detail the derivation of place names. For a short discussion of etiological elements in the Bible see, e.g., Amit 2001:122–123. See more in Seeligman 1961 and other references there.

One more example provides an explanation for another practice known up to the time of the scribe or narrator. The reference to the scribe/narrator's era is further expressed by the time phrase **עד היום הזה**, which should be considered as a parenthesis in itself, since it breaks the narrative historical sequence and points to a different time, that of the scribe/narrator. Other examples which include the phrase **עד היום הזה**, not necessarily in the pattern treated in this section but in other constructions as well, are discussed below in the section on parenthetical words and phrases. In any event, the next example explains the practice of the priests of Dagon and other visitors to his shrine in Ashdod not to set foot on its doorstep up to the days of the scribe or narrator.

1 Sam. 5:4-5—**וַיִּשְׁכְּמוּ בַבֹּקֶר מִמַּחֲרַת וְהִנֵּה דָגוֹן נָפֵל לְפָנָיו אֲרָצָה לְפָנָיו אֲרוֹן ה'—עַל-כֵּן לֹא-יֵדְרֹכּוּ וְרֹאשׁ דָּגוֹן וּשְׁתֵּי כַפּוֹת יָדָיו פְּרוּתוֹת אֶל-הַמִּפְתָּח רַק דָּגוֹן נִשְׁאַר עָלָיו. עַל-כֵּן לֹא-יֵדְרֹכּוּ**—“But when they rose early on the next morning, behold, Dagon had fallen face downward on the ground before the ark of the LORD, and the head of Dagon and both his hands were lying cut off upon the threshold; only the trunk of Dagon was left to him. **This is why the priests of Dagon and all who enter the house of Dagon do not tread on the threshold of Dagon in Ashdod to this day.**”

In the next example an explanation is given for Ziklag's belonging to Judah up to the days of the scribe or narrator. Again, the verse includes the phrase **עד היום הזה**, meaning time of the scribe/narrator, and this breaks the historical sequence:

1 Sam. 27:6—**וַיִּתֵּן-לוֹ אַכִּישׁ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא אֶת-צִקְלָג לְכֹן הֵיחָה צִקְלָג לְמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה—עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**—“So that day Achish gave him Ziklag; **therefore Ziklag has belonged to the kings of Judah to this day.**”

The following two examples show the insertion of explanations for sayings which were probably current in the era of the scribe/narrator. The first saying is **ה' בְּנִמְרֹד גְּבוּר צִיד לְפָנָיו ה'** and the second is **הַגִּם שְׂאוּל** בְּנִבְאִים:

Gen. 10:8-9—**וְכוּשׁ יָלַד אֶת-נִמְרֹד הוּא הַחַל לְהִיטֵב גְּבוּר בְּאֲרָץ. הוּא-הִיָּה גְבוּר צִיד—עַל-כֵּן לְפָנָיו ה' בְּנִמְרֹד גְּבוּר צִיד לְפָנָיו ה'**—“Cush became the father of Nimrod; he was the first on earth to be a mighty man. He was a mighty hunter before the LORD; **therefore it is said, 'Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before the LORD.'**”

1 Sam. 10:12—**וַיַּעַן אִישׁ מִשָּׁם וַיֹּאמֶר וּמִי אֲבִיהֶם עַל-כֵּן הֵיחָה לְמִשְׁלַל הַגִּם—שְׂאוּל בְּנִבְאִים**—“And a man of the place answered, ‘And who is their father?’ **Therefore it became a proverb, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?'**”

All the following are etiological explanatory examples, namely they give popular historical explanations for proper names of places. In the next example the name **בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע** is understood as a place of swearing by seven lamps.

Gen. 21:30–31—וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי אֶת־שֶׁבַע כְּבָשֹׂת תִּקַּח מִיַּדִּי בְּעִבּוֹר תְּהִיָּה־לִּי לְעֵדָה—כִּי חִפְרְתִּי אֶת־הַבְּאֵר הַזֹּאת. עַל־כֵּן קָרָא לַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע כִּי שֵׁם נִשְׁבָּעוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם—“He said, ‘These seven ewe lambs you will take from my hand, that you may be a witness for me that I dug this well.’ **Therefore that place was called Beer-sheba**; because there both of them swore an oath.”

An etiological explanation for the same name **בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע**, in another biblical story with other characters, this time Isaac and his servants instead of Abraham and Abimelech who figure in Gen. 21:30–31, appears in the following verse, where the meaning of the name is related to an oath.<sup>19</sup>

Gen. 26:33—וַיִּקְרָא אֹתָהּ שֶׁבַעָה עַל־כֵּן שֵׁם־הָעִיר בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה—“He called it Shibah; **therefore the name of the city is Beer-sheba to this day**.”

The following example involves explanations for both a personal name and a place name, the latter of which employs the formula beginning with **עַל־כֵּן**.

Gen. 16:13–14—וַתִּקְרָא שֵׁם־הָ הַדְּבָר אֲלֵיָהּ אֶתְהָ אֵל רֹאֵי כִּי אָמְרָה הִגַּם—הַלֵּם רֹאִיתִי אַחֲרַי רֹאֵי. עַל־כֵּן קָרָא לַבְּאֵר בְּאֵר לַחֵי רֹאֵי הִנֵּה בֵּין־קַדְשׁ וּבֵין בְּרֶד—“**Therefore the well was called Beer-lahai-roi**; it lies between Kadesh and Bered.”

The next three examples of this type of etiological explanatory formula all begin with **עַל־כֵּן**.

Exod. 15:23—וַיָּבֹאוּ מִרְתָּהּ וְלֹא יָכְלוּ לְשָׁתֵת מִיַּם מִמֶּרְהָ כִּי מָרָה הִם עַל־כֵּן—“When they came to Marah, they could not drink the water of Marah because it was bitter; **therefore it was named Marah**.”

Judg. 15:19—וַיִּבְקַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הַמַּכְתָּשׁ אֲשֶׁר־בְּלַחֵי וַיֵּצְאוּ מִמֶּנּוּ מִיַּם וַיִּשְׁתּוּ וַתִּשָּׁב—רוּחוֹ וַיַּחֲי עַל־כֵּן קָרָא שְׁמָהּ עַיִן הַקּוֹרָא אֲשֶׁר בְּלַחֵי עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה—“And God split open the hollow place that is at Lehi, and there came water from it;

<sup>19</sup> The meaning of the root שבַע (= swear) might be related to the number seven, since it is stated in Gen. 21:30–31 that the practice was to swear by seven witnesses, in this case lamps (*BDB* 92a, 989a).

and when he drank, his spirit returned, and he revived. **Therefore the name of it was called En-hakkore; it is at Lehi to this day.**”

2 Sam. 5:20—אֶת-אֲבִי ה' וַיֵּאמֶר פָּרַץ ה' לְפָנַי בְּפָרֶץ מַיִם עַל-כֵּן קָרָא שְׁם-הַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא בַּעַל פְּרָצִים—“And David came to Baal-perazim, and David defeated them there; and he said, ‘The LORD has broken through my enemies before me, like a bursting flood.’ **Therefore the name of that place is called Baal-perazim.**”

Other examples are Gen. 33:17, 50:11, and more.

Etiological explanations for names might also be introduced into the story by a speech citation, in which the etiological explanation is cited in first person, marked or not by a speech verb, while the story line is expressed in third person. Functionally and pragmatically the information provided in this way is equally external as the information introduced into the story line by the foregoing etiological narrative formula initiated by *על-כן*; but linguistically the construction is not independent since the etiological information is included in a clause which is syntactically the object of the speech verb.<sup>20</sup> Two examples of such a structure follow.

Gen. 26:22—וַיֵּעַתֵּק מִשָּׁם וַיַּחְפֹּר בְּאֵר אַחֶרֶת וְלֹא רָבוּ עָלֶיהָ וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמָהּ רְחוֹבוֹת—“And he moved from there and dug another well, and over that they did not quarrel; so he called its name Rehoboth, **saying, ‘For now the LORD has made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land.’**”

1 Sam. 1:20—וַיְהִי לְתַקְפוֹת הַיָּמִים וַתְּהַר חַנָּה וַתֵּלֶד בֵּן וַתִּקְרָא אֶת-שְׁמוֹ שְׁמוּאֵל—“And in due time Hannah conceived and bore a son, and she called his name Samuel, **for she said, ‘I have asked him of the LORD.’**”

Note that in the last example the *RSV* translation adds the speech clause “for she said”, which is not found in the original Hebrew verse. The *JPS* adds here “meaning...” and similarly *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*: *قَالَتْ* and *Targum Jonathan*: *ארי אמרת*. Of the translations examined for this verse only the *Peshitta* does not add a speech verb. This insertion, wherever it occurs, is certainly based on the appearance of first person pronouns in the speech expression within a narrative verse narrated in third person. The change of third to first person is a clear sign in this case of direct speech.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Ewald includes under the title ‘parenthetical information’ circumstantial clauses, but also clauses introduced by *אשר* and *כי* (Ewald 1881:254, §346c).

<sup>21</sup> For deixis as a parameter for distinguishing between direct and indirect speech, see Miller 1996:62–74, §2.3.1.

### 2.2.2 *A Formula Introduced by וַיִּתֵּר דְּבָרָיו*

The examples in this section consist of the concluding narrative formula... וַיִּתֵּר דְּבָרָיו. This formula too is a scribal addition referring to a historical source documenting the history of the kings of Israel and Judah. Though the clauses which contain these remarks are syntactically coordinated to the preceding clauses by the conjunctive *wāw*, they deviate from, and are external to the story line in respect of time and should therefore functionally and pragmatically be considered as belonging to a different narrative level in the story. Since all examples of this widespread formula are similar in content and structure, only two examples are presented in full below, and they are followed by a few additional references. The resemblance in content and structure of all these examples is also reflected in their uniform translations, demonstrated here by the two *RSV* renderings.

1 Kgs. 14:19—וַיִּתֵּר דְּבָרָיו יִרְבֵּעִים אֲשֶׁר נִלְחַם וְאֲשֶׁר מָלַךְ הֵנָּם כְּתוּבִים עַל-סֵפֶר—**“Now the rest of the acts of Jeroboam,** how he warred and how he reigned, behold, they are written in the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel.”

1 Kgs. 14:29—וַיִּתֵּר דְּבָרָיו רְחֹבָעַם וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה הֲלֹא-הֵמָּה כְּתוּבִים עַל-סֵפֶר—**“Now the rest of the acts of Rehoboam,** and all that he did, are they not written in the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah?”

Other examples are 1 Kgs. 15:7,23,31,16:5,14, and many more.

### 2.2.3 *A Formula Indicating a Proper Name, a Month Name, or Related Information*

The examples discussed in this section are nominal appositional clauses, constructed as bipartite nominal clauses.<sup>22</sup> The new information given in these nominal clauses on the origin of proper names is meant for the story's audience and readers living at the time of the scribe or narrator, who presumes that they are not acquainted with the earlier name or any other relevant information. Other related examples introduce and describe a month name. Formal signs marking the information presented in this pattern as parenthetical are often found in Bible translations. For example, in the majority of the translations

<sup>22</sup> For more on the syntactic structure of these appositional clauses see, e.g., Zewi 1999c.

by the *RSV* the remark regarded as parenthetical is indeed set off by parentheses. In scholarly works these clauses sometimes receive other titles too, including ‘exegetical remarks,’ ‘glosses,’<sup>23</sup> ‘editorial notes,’<sup>24</sup> and ‘parenthetical glosses.’ The last term is used by Muraoka,<sup>25</sup> and it seems to suit our interpretation of this formula very well.

Since a similar nominal appositional pattern is regular and genuine in Arabic, not surprisingly it is maintained in all versions of Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translation. Nevertheless, Arabic translations are not necessarily homogeneous in their treatment of this construction. *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* frequently translates this pattern not by a nominal appositional clause but by a relative clause. One such example is Gen. 14:3, presented below, translated as *إِلَى عُمُقِ السَّدِيمِ الَّذِي هُوَ يَحْرُ الْمَلِح*. Another possible translation which appears in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* is by a circumstantial clause with insertion of the conjunctive *wāw*, serving in such cases as *wāw al-hal*, before the parenthetical clause. The example here is Num. 33:36, translated as *فِي بَرِّيَّةِ صِينٍ وَهِيَ قَادَش*. A translation by a relative clause appears in the Geez Bible translation too, e.g., the use of the feminine relative pronoun *ḥmta* in the translation of Gen. 14:3, 14:7, and 23:2, presented below. A perplexity regarding this structure also appears in the *Peshitta* in which Gen. 14:3,7, 19:37, 23:2, 36:1,24, Num. 21:16, and 2 Sam. 5:7, presented below, maintain the Hebrew pattern; another example presented below, Judg. 1:26, displays a conjunctive *wāw*, and all other examples presented below display a relative clause, e.g., Num. 33:36: *ḥmta* / *da-hū (h)ī Qādeš*, and Deut. 4:48: / *ḥmta* / *da-hūyū Hermōn*, and similarly Josh. 20:6, Judg.

<sup>23</sup> For the terms ‘exegetical remark’ and ‘gloss’ see Muraoka 1990:229, §1.2.1, Baasten 1997:4, and note 12 there. Also see Tov 1994:52–53, who says that “‘Genuine’ reconstructed glosses are rare,” and his conclusions that “most elements which have hitherto been described as glosses, actually are interpolations (exegetical additions)” and that “While some of the elements recognized as interpolations must have been added at the scribal level, many (if not most) of them belonged to a layer (edition) added to an earlier text (edition) at the stage of the literary growth of the biblical books” (Tov 1994:65). Another study in which the clause patterns opening with an independent personal pronoun (and rarely also a demonstrative pronoun) are regarded as glosses is Driver 1957:124–126.

<sup>24</sup> Weingreen strictly differentiates between ‘glosses’ and ‘editorial notes’ and mainly explains the occasionally so-called Biblical Hebrew ‘glosses’ as ‘editorial notes’: “the editorial note is a deliberate insertion and meant to be an integral part of the text, while the accretion of a gloss is due to the activity of a copyist, who copied in, along with the text, notes on words or phrases” (Weingreen 1957:149).

<sup>25</sup> Muraoka 1999:191.





The next example does not identify an early place name by a later one but adds some information about its identity.

Num. 21:16—וּמִשָּׁם בְּאֵרָה הוּא הַבְּאֵר אֲשֶׁר אָמַר ה' לְמֹשֶׁה אֲסֹף אֶת-הָעָם וְאֶתְנָהּ—לָהֶם מַיִם—“And from there they continued to Beer; **that is the well of which the LORD said to Moses, ‘Gather the people together, and I will give them water.’**”

Again, the ensuing verse contains an explanation of an earlier place name, מְדִבְרַת-צִן, by a newer one, קַדְשׁ. However, in this case the name refers to a general area and not to a specific spot.

Num. 33:36—וַיֵּסְעוּ מֵעֵצִיּוֹן גְּבֵר וַיַּחֲנוּ בְּמִדְבַר-צִן הוּא קַדְשׁ—“And they set out from Ezion-geber, and encamped in the wilderness of Zin (**that is, Kadesh**).”

The following example refers to a mountain. The former name, הַר שִׂיֵּאֵן, has been changed to the new one, הַרְמוֹן.

Deut. 4:48—מֵעֲרֹעֵר אֲשֶׁר עַל-שְׂפְתֵי-נַחַל אַרְמוֹן וְעַד-הַר שִׂיֵּאֵן הוּא חֶרְמוֹן—“From Aroer, which is on the edge of the valley of the Arnon, as far as Mount Sirion (**that is, Hermon**).”

The place names קַרְיַת אַרְבַּע and חֶבְרוֹן are again mentioned in the next example, Josh. 20:6.

וַיִּקְדְּשׁוּ אֶת-קַדְשׁ בְּגִלְיָל בְּהַר נַפְתָּלִי וְאֶת-שֶׁכֶם בְּהַר אֶפְרַיִם וְאֶת-קְרִיַת אַרְבַּע הִיא חֶבְרוֹן הַבְּהָר יְהוּדָה—“So they set apart Kedesh in Galilee in the hill country of Naphtali, and Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim, and Kiriath-arba (**that is, Hebron**) in the hill country of Judah.”

The next example contains a slightly different version of the pattern discussed in this section. It relates the founding of a new city, the announcement of its new name, and finally, with the help of a nominal appositional clause, הוּא שְׁמָהּ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, it does not give a new name for an earlier one, but emphasizes the persistence of the earlier name up to the era of the scribe or narrator.

Judg. 1:26—וַיֵּלֶךְ הָאִישׁ אֶרֶץ הַחִתִּים וַיִּבֶן עִיר וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמָהּ לּוֹז הוּא שְׁמָהּ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה—“And the man went to the land of the Hittites and built a city, **and called its name Luz; that is its name to this day.**”

The two last examples concerning place names are related to Jerusalem. The first, Judg. 19:10, explains יְבוּס, and the second, 2 Sam. 5:7, explains מְצֻדַת צִיּוֹן, as follows.

Judg. 19:10—וְלֹא-אָבָה הָאִישׁ לָלוֹן וַיִּקָּם וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיָּבֵא עַד-נֹכַח יְבוּס הַיָּהוּדִים—“But the man would not spend the night; he rose up and departed, and arrived opposite Jebus (**that is, Jerusalem**). He had with him a couple of saddled asses, and his concubine was with him.”<sup>28</sup>

2 Sam. 5:7—וַיִּלְכֹּד דָּוִד אֶת מְצֻדַת צִיּוֹן הִיא עִיר דָּוִד—“Nevertheless David took the stronghold of Zion, **that is, the city of David**.”

We arrive now at the less common type of examples which refer to proper personal names. These display the same syntactic structure of a nominal appositional clause as that of place names.

The next verse does not replace an old personal name by a new one, though it involves an announcement of a new name for a newborn infant. Moreover, the nominal appositional clause in this verse, הוּא הַיּוֹם אָבִי-מוֹאָב עַד-הַיּוֹם, is not meant to display a new name but to add some information regarding the infant's name.

Gen. 19:37—וַתֵּלֶד הַבְּכִירָה בֶן וַתִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ מוֹאָב הוּא אָבִי-מוֹאָב עַד-הַיּוֹם—“The first-born bore a son, and called his name Moab; **he is the father of the Moabites to this day**.”

The next example does identify one name, עֵשָׂו, by another, אֶדוֹם.

Gen. 36:1—וְאֵלֶּה תְּלִדוֹת עֵשָׂו הוּא אֶדוֹם—“These are the descendants of Esau (**that is, Edom**).”

The last example in this section, again, does not present a new personal name for a more ancient one, but supplies additional information regarding a certain personal name, עֵנָה, which is indicated in the verse as that of one of Zibeon's sons. The parenthetical information obtained in the nominal appositional clause, הוּא עֵנָה אֲשֶׁר מְצָא אֶת-הַיָּמִם בְּמִדְבָּר, בְּרָעוֹתוֹ אֶת-הַחֲמֹרִים לְצַבְעוֹן אָבִיו, hints at another story, which is probably understood by the scribe or narrator as belonging to a collection of stories with which the readers or listeners of his era are familiar. The technique of using parenthetical clauses to refer to stories elsewhere, sometimes discloses ones that are not otherwise mentioned in the Bible. Their very existence becomes known only through their intimation in this parenthetical way.

<sup>28</sup> Sternberg 1985:121 refers to this example and the like as an exposition meant for ‘temporal or cultural bridging.’

Gen. 36:24—**ואלה בני-צבעון ואיה וענה חוה ענה אשר מצא את-הים במדבר—ברעתו את-החמרים לצבעון אביו**—“These are the sons of Zibeon: Aiah and Anah; **he is the Anah who found the hot springs in the wilderness, as he pastured the asses of Zibeon his father.**”

Other instances of both place names and personal names are Gen. 14:2,8,17, 19:38, 23:19, 35:6,19,20,27, 36:43, 48:7, Exod. 6:26,27, Josh. 21:10, 1 Kgs. 8:1, 2 Kgs. 10:12, and many more.

The following examples are similar in structure to those referring to proper names, and they introduce and explain a month name.

1 Kgs. 6:1—**ויהי בשמונים שנה וארבע מאות שנה לצאת בני-ישראל מארץ-מצרים—בשנה הרביעית בחודש זו הוא החדש השני למלך שלמה על-ישראל ויבן הבית לה—**“In the four hundred and eightieth year after the people of Israel came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon’s reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv, **which is the second month**, he began to build the house of the LORD.”

1 Kgs. 6:38—**ובשנה האחת עשרה ברח בול הוא החדש השמיני בלה הבית—**“And in the eleventh year, in the month of Bul, **which is the eighth month**, the house was finished in all its parts, and according to all its specifications. He was seven years in building it.”<sup>29</sup>

### 2.3 EXTERNAL INFORMATION MOSTLY EXPRESSED BY CIRCUMSTANTIAL CLAUSES

The examples in this section do not contain specific expressions or formulas considered parenthetical wherever they appear, but several syntactically distinct types of clauses, such as verbal clauses with *qatal*, nominal clauses, existential clauses, and participial clauses, which tend to break the narrative sequence composed regularly of a chain of *wayyiqtol* clauses. The choice of verbs in verbal clauses, the complete absence of verbs in nominal clauses, and the word order of both verbal and nominal clauses show deviation from the main narrative sequence, and they all appear to be playing a role of some sort of adverbial clause type, mostly a circumstantial clause introduced by the conjunctive *wāw*. However, contrary to normal circumstantial clauses, which describe the circumstance of an agent, and thus can be interpreted as attributive

<sup>29</sup> This formula with month names is especially common in the late book of Esther, e.g., 2:16, 3:7,13, 8:9,12, 9:1.

or adverbial, and in fact show features of both, these circumstantial clauses are syntactically independent. They exhibit a new, free subject, and they do not play the part of attributes or complements, obligatory or not, of any specific sentence part or of the sentence as a whole.<sup>30</sup> Their circumstantial attribution of these clauses is only due to the circumstantial information obtained in them.

Since these clause types frequently share an inversion of word order deviating from the common structure in narrative chains of clauses initiated by *wayyiqtol* forms, and their subjects often are in first position, word order inversion itself should be regarded as a means of introducing parenthetical information into a text.<sup>31</sup> Nonetheless, these techniques, that is, using certain type of circumstantial clauses involving either one or more of word order inversion, *qatal* clauses, nominal clauses including participial clauses,<sup>32</sup> and existential clauses, play roles other than introducing parenthetical information to the narrative sequence, the prominent of which are focalization and topicalization. These roles belong to the realm of functional grammar and are outside the scope of this book.<sup>33</sup>

Only examples demonstrating the insertion of parenthetical information are presented here. In many of them the parenthetical information also involves topic shift, a term commonly used in functional and discourse studies, which basically means a change of subject within a clause or a discourse unit.<sup>34</sup> Consequently a connection exists between

---

<sup>30</sup> For references to other works which deal with this function from a linguistic or discourse studies/text linguistic point of view see, e.g., Polotsky 1985, Niccacci 1990, Eskhult 1990, de Regt 1999, and more in §1.3 above. Note also the observations regarding this function made by scholars who work on the structure of biblical narrative from a literary point of view, e.g., Alter 1981 and Berlin 1983, and more in §1.5 above. For circumstantial clauses in Biblical Hebrew grammars see, e.g., *GKC* 1910:489–491, §156, Jöüon & Muraoka 2006:565–566, §159. For the structure and function of circumstantial clauses see also, e.g., Driver 1892:195–211, Andersen 1974:77–91, §5, Eskhult 1990:31–33, §2.3.3.

<sup>31</sup> Word order inversion is indeed recognized as a language device for breaking the narrative flow in general linguistic and Biblical Hebrew studies. For references see, e.g., Eskhult 1990:35–36, §2.4.2.

<sup>32</sup> Participial clauses are treated here as a certain type of nominal clauses, since the two types share similar characteristics in structure and word order possibilities, and since participles and adjectives in Semitic languages share many features with nouns.

<sup>33</sup> On these roles and their influence on sentence structure see, e.g., Zewi 1992, and many more references there.

<sup>34</sup> The term ‘topic’ is employed instead of ‘subject’ because it refers to grammatical subject, but also to logical subjects. For the term ‘topic’ see, e.g., Crystal 2003:468.

the introduction of parenthetical information into a text and the functional structure of the clause performing this task. As for the term ‘topic shift,’ Brown and Yule, for instance, say that “between two contiguous pieces of discourse which are intuitively considered to have two different ‘topics’, there should be a point at which the shift from one topic to the next is marked”; and “if we can characterize this marking of topic-shift, then we shall have found a structural basis for dividing up stretches of discourse into a series of smaller units, each on a separate topic.”<sup>35</sup> The discussion of topic-shift by Brown and Yule, which is aimed at uncovering and defining topic boundary markers, can also assist in identifying units which deviate from the main discourse, namely, parenthetical units.

Since all our examples appear within a narrative sequence, not in discourse, they should all be considered narrative parenthetical units. Yet while many studies might include these or similar examples under the general ‘background’ label,<sup>36</sup> only a small number of our examples come under this title (§2.3.1 below). A more detailed division is offered for all other examples in an attempt to classify the external information in them according to more specific contextual features. The examples are divided into six contextual types:

- (1) Examples which introduce background information.
- (2) Examples which express foreshadowing, i.e., they submit a piece of new information which anticipates a later development in the story.
- (3) Examples which introduce explanatory information
- (4) Examples which display theological apologetic remarks.
- (5) Examples which express historical remarks.
- (6) Examples which introduce other information marginal to the story line.

A description of the parenthetical content, and indication of the particular linguistic means employed to create the deviation from the main narrative line, accompanies each example.

---

<sup>35</sup> Brown & Yule 1983:94–95, §3.6.

<sup>36</sup> For more references regarding ‘background’ see Eskhult 1990:35, §2.4.2. Eskhult himself attaches the label ‘Episode Marginal Circumstantial’ to such constructions, when they introduce episodes, though he is aware of the diversity of nuances expressed by them (Eskhult 1990:45–57, §3). Eskhult suggests that “the use of the essentially descriptive, and static, *subj-qtll* clause in episode-initial position is a trait of classical Hebrew narrative art, perhaps moulded on oral narrative technique” (Eskhult 1990:57, §3.5).

### 2.3.1 *Examples Introducing Background Information*

The term ‘background information’ is widely used as a general label for any information external to the narrative sequence that breaks the narrative flow. In this book it is restricted to extra information inserted into the story by the scribe or narrator to facilitate understanding of certain developments that could not be understood without it. As to syntactic status, these parenthetical examples are all circumstantial clauses introduced by the conjunctive *wāw*. The clause patterns which form these circumstantial clauses vary: they can be nominal, existential, and verbal with a suffix conjugation verb. In many verbal clauses the word order is inverted and the clause opens with a subject instead of the verb–subject word order that typically outlines the narrative sequence.

The first two examples, Gen. 12:6 and 13:7, give information about the inhabitants of the land in which Abram and Lot chose to dwell. This knowledge is important for understanding later developments in the story which include problems in these characters’ interactions with local inhabitants and in finding the land too small for both of them to herd cattle. In both examples the information is displayed by circumstantial nominal clauses.<sup>37</sup> These are evidently scribal or narrator’s additions, since they include the time co-ordinate particle **אז**, which indicates a point in time different from that of the scribe or narrator.

Gen. 12:6—**וַיַּעֲבֹר אַבְרָם בְּאֶרֶץ עַד מְקוֹם שָׁכֵם עַד אֵלוֹן מוֹרְהָ וַהֲכִנְעָנִי אָז בְּאֶרֶץ**—“Abram passed through the land to the place at Shechem, to the oak of Moreh. **At that time the Canaanites were in the land.**”

Gen. 13:7—**וַיְהִי-רִיב בֵּין רְעֵי מִקְנֵה-אַבְרָם וּבֵין רְעֵי מִקְנֵה-לוֹט וַהֲכִנְעָנִי וַהֲפָרְזִי אָז יָשַׁב בְּאֶרֶץ**—“And there was strife between the herdsmen of Abram’s cattle and the herdsmen of Lot’s cattle. **At that time the Canaanites and the Perizzites dwelt in the land.**”

The parenthetical information in the next two verses tells us that the priest of Midian had seven daughters. This information marks the beginning of a new story, and it is indispensable background for understanding the development of the story, in which the daughters of the priest of Midian

<sup>37</sup> Though both clauses are considered nominal in that a participial clause is regarded as a sub-type of a nominal clause, they are not entirely similar in structure. The first clause is an apparent nominal clause whose predicate is the prepositional phrase **בְּאֶרֶץ**; the second is a participial clause whose predicate is **יָשַׁב**, a participle, and a prepositional phrase **בְּאֶרֶץ**, like that in the first clause, plays in it the syntactic role of an adverbial. Nonetheless, the clauses provide similar contents.

play an important part.<sup>38</sup> This parenthetical, albeit very important information, is introduced into the text by a circumstantial nominal clause made of a prepositional phrase and a noun phrase and functioning as a possessive clause, and it breaks a narrative flow composed by many *wayyiqtol* verbs, i.e., וַיִּשְׁמַע, וַיִּבְרַח, וַיִּשָּׁב, וַתְּבַאֲנָה, וַתְּדַלְּנָה, וַתְּמַלְּאֲנָה.

Exod. 2:15–16—וַיִּשְׁמַע פַּרְעֹה אֶת-הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה וַיִּבְקֹשׁ לְהַרְגֵּ אֶת-מֹשֶׁה וַיִּבְרַח- מֹשֶׁה מִפְּנֵי פַרְעֹה וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּאֶרֶץ-מִדְיָן וַיֵּשֶׁב עַל-הַבְּאֵר. וַלִּכְהֵן מִדְיָן שָׁבַע בָּנוֹת וַתְּבַאֲנָה וַתְּדַלְּנָה וַתְּמַלְּאֲנָה אֶת-הַרְהָטִים לְהַשְׁקוֹת צֹאן אֲבִיהֶן—“When Pharaoh heard of it, he sought to kill Moses. But Moses fled from Pharaoh, and stayed in the land of Midian; and he sat down by a well. **Now the priest of Midian had seven daughters**; and they came and drew water, and filled the troughs to water their father’s flock.”

Bible translations might feel a need to signify the shift to the parenthetical clause by some sort of a special marking. For example, the Geez Bible translation marks the first word, וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי, of the parenthetical clause וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי אִז בְּאֶרֶץ of Gen. 12:6 above by attaching the emphatic enclitic particle *-ssa* to its end, *hlnan/ Kana'(!)an-ə-ssa*. This particle usually marks contrast;<sup>39</sup> the *JPS* starts its translation of וַלִּכְהֵן מִדְיָן שָׁבַע בָּנוֹת in Exod. 2:16 above with the word ‘now’: “Now the priest of Midian had seven daughters.”

The parenthetical clause in Exod. 34:29 below tells of Moses having radiant skin when he descended from Mount Sinai. This piece of information is essential background for understanding the ensuing situation, where Aaron and the Israelites are afraid to approach Moses because of the strangely glowing appearance of his skin.

Exod. 34:29–30—וַיְהִי בְרִדַּת מֹשֶׁה מֵהָרְ סִינַי וַשִּׁנִּי לַחַת הַטַּבֵּחַ בְּיַד-מֹשֶׁה בְּרִדְתּוֹ- מִן-הָהָר וּמֹשֶׁה לֹא-יָדַע כִּי קָרַן עוֹר פָּנָיו בְּדַבְּרוֹ אִתּוֹ. וַיֵּרָא אֶהָרָן וְכָל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֵּרָא מֹשֶׁה וְהָיָה קָרַן עוֹר פָּנָיו וַיִּירָאוּ מִנִּשְׁתַּ אֱלֹהֵי—“When Moses came down from Mount Sinai, with the two tables of the testimony in his hand as he came down from the mountain, **Moses did not know that the skin of his face shone because he had been talking with God**. And when Aaron and all the people of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone, and they were afraid to come near him.”

The two following verses, Judg. 4:4 and Judg. 4:5, begin a new story, that of the prophet Deborah who served as a judge. They describe

<sup>38</sup> Andersen 1974:79 mentions this example among others in which the circumstantial clause is “episode-Initial”.

<sup>39</sup> On the function of this particle see Dillmann 1907:412–413, §168,5.

Deborah's marital and professional status and outline her daily work. This information is important background for understanding Deborah's later involvement in the coming war between Barak, son of Abinoam, and Sisera, the commander of Jabin's army. Both verses are circumstantial nominal clauses introduced by a conjunctive *wāw*. The first circumstantial clause, **וְדְבוֹרָה אִשָּׁה נְבִיאָה אֲשֶׁת לְפִידוֹת הִיא שֹׁפֵטָה אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל**, is independent, while the second, **וְהָיָא יוֹשֶׁבֶת תַּחַת-תְּמָר דְּבוֹרָה**, is attributed to a specific head, since it describes a grammatical agent, namely Deborah herself, who is mentioned in the first clause. The special status of Deborah in the latter circumstantial clause is nicely marked in the Geez Bible translation, which repeats the proper name instead of using a personal pronoun and attaches to it the emphatic enclitic particle *-ssa*, which generally marks contrast: **ወ.ደ.ቦ.ራ.ሰ / wa-Diborā-ə-ssa**.<sup>40</sup> Note that the first verse includes the co-ordinate time phrase **בְּעֵת הַהִיא** which should in itself be regarded as a scribe's or narrator's external remark introduced into the text in a later period. Such phrases are very common in biblical narrative, and they are discussed in length below.<sup>41</sup>

Judg. 4:4–5—**וְדְבוֹרָה אִשָּׁה נְבִיאָה אֲשֶׁת לְפִידוֹת הִיא שֹׁפֵטָה אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵת הַהִיא. וְהָיָא יוֹשֶׁבֶת תַּחַת-תְּמָר דְּבוֹרָה בֵּין הַרְמָה וּבֵין בֵּית-אֵל בְּהַר אֶפְרַיִם וַיַּעֲלֶה אֶלֶּהָ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְמִשְׁפַּט**—**“Now Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lappidoth, was judging Israel at that time. She used to sit under the palm of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim; and the people of Israel came up to her for judgment.”**

The information presented in the next example, Judg. 17:6, which relates the absence of leadership and law enforcement in Israel, is probably again a scribal or narrator's later addition, and it is also marked as such by the co-ordinate time phrase **בְּיָמִים הָהֵם**.<sup>42</sup> This addition is essential background information, explaining how the subsequent event, told in Judg. 17:7–13, where a Levite becomes a priest against the ordinary rules, could come about. The clause **אֵין מֶלֶךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל** and its variants also appear elsewhere, in Judg. 18:1, 19:1 and 21:25. In all these cases they precede a discussion of life without law enforcement. In the verse discussed here two formulas actually appear,

<sup>40</sup> Dillmann 1907:412–413, §168,5.

<sup>41</sup> See §3.2.4 below, and also Brin 1986:47–50.

<sup>42</sup> See §3.2.3 below, and also Brin 1986:50–52.



as the formula **בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם אִין מְלֹךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל** is followed by another with similar content: **אִישׁ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵינָיו יַעֲשֶׂה**. As may be expected, the Arabic *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* reflects the habitual past nuance in this verse by inserting the existential Arabic verb **كَانَ** into the translation of the existential clause **בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם אִין מְלֹךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**, conveying the past tense: **وَوَفِي تِلْكَ الْأَيَّامِ لَمْ يَكُنْ مَلِكٌ فِي إِسْرَائِيلَ** and rendering the verb **יַעֲשֶׂה** in the verbal clause **אִישׁ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵינָיו יַעֲשֶׂה** by the verbal phrase **كَانَ يَعْمَلُ**, which conveys habitual practice. Similarly, the *Peshitta* expresses the habitual nuance in this verse by the participle + the auxiliary existential verb: **אֲבַעַד (h)wā**.

Judg. 17:6—**“In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes.”**

The background information in the next example introduces the story told in chapter 18 in the book of Judges about the people of the tribe of Dan looking for a land and taking the law into their own hands by inducing the priest of the local prophet Micah to leave him and join them behind Micah’s back and by taking by force the city of Laish.

Judg. 18:1—**בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם אִין מְלֹךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּבְיָמֵים הָהֵם שָׁבַט הַדָּנִי מִבְּקֹשׁ-לוֹ נִחְלָה—“In those days there was no king in Israel.** And in those days the tribe of the Danites was seeking for itself an inheritance to dwell in; for until then no inheritance among the tribes of Israel had fallen to them.”

The circumstantial clause indicating a lawless state in the following verse introduces the dreadful story of the concubine on Gibeah of Benjamin told in chapters 19–21 of Judges. The concluding verse of the last chapter, Judg. 21:25—**בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם אִין מְלֹךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אִישׁ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵינָיו יַעֲשֶׂה**—**“In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes,”** again, repeats the formula, **בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם אִין מְלֹךְ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**, while adding the other formula exhibiting complementary content: **אִישׁ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵינָיו יַעֲשֶׂה**.

Judg. 19:1—**וַיְהִי בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם וּמְלֹךְ אִין בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהִי אִישׁ לְוִי גֵר בִּירְבֵּתֵי הַר-אֶפְרַיִם—“In those days, when there was no king in Israel,** a certain Levite was sojourning in the remote parts of the hill country of Ephraim, who took to himself a concubine from Bethlehem in Judah.”

The following verse, 1 Sam. 13:19, and the subsequent verses 20 and 21, tell how the Israelites made agricultural tools out of weapons at the Philistines’ orders. This information is provided as a background to

the Israelites' circumstances, revealed in verse 22; they did not possess any weapons that could be used for fighting the impending war with the Philistines. The clause is a circumstantial verbal clause in the order of subject וְחָרֵשׁ—predicate לֹא יִמְצָא, and it therefore involves a word order inversion, opposite to the expected word order in narrative verbal clauses of verb–subject.

1 Sam. 13:19—חָרֵשׁ לֹא יִמְצָא בְּכָל אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי-אָמַר אָמְרוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים פֶּן-יֵעָשׂוּ הָעֶבְרִים חֶרֶב אֹז חֲנִיָּה  
**“Now there was no smith to be found throughout all the land of Israel; for the Philistines said, ‘Lest the Hebrews make themselves swords or spears.’”**

The next parenthetical verse contains several clauses introducing the story of the murder of a grandson of Saul and David's treatment of his killers. The story provides information regarding the special condition of Saul's grandson as crippled, which is important for understanding the essence of this murder and the reason for David's rage at the murderers. As to the syntactic technique, the first clause, וְלִיהוֹנָתָן בֶּן-שָׁאוּל, is circumstantial and nominal, and is composed of a prepositional phrase and a nominal phrase expressing possessiveness. The succeeding clauses tell a secondary parenthetical story, which goes back to earlier events that caused the crippling of Saul's grandson. At this point the syntactic technique changes. First, the verb הָיָה is used in the second nominal clause, בֶּן-חֲמֵשׁ שָׁנִים הָיָה בָּבֵא שְׁמַעְתָּ שָׁאוּל וְיִהוֹנָתָן, affirming its status as occurring in the distant past. The subsequent clauses go back to the verbal pattern typical of a narrative sequence, namely the use of a chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs: וַתִּגַּס, וַתִּשְׂאָהוּ, וַיִּפֹּל, וַיִּהְיֶה. The end of this secondary story is marked again by a nominal clause, וַשְּׁמוֹ מִפִּיבֹשֶׁת.

2 Sam. 4:4—וְלִיהוֹנָתָן בֶּן-שָׁאוּל בֶּן נֹכַח רֵגְלָיִם בֶּן-חֲמֵשׁ שָׁנִים הָיָה בָּבֵא שְׁמַעְתָּ שָׁאוּל וְיִהוֹנָתָן מִיִּזְרְעֵאל וַתִּשְׂאָהוּ אִמָּנָתוֹ וַתִּגַּס וַיְהִי בְחַפְזָהּ לָנוּס וַיִּפֹּל וַיִּפְסַח וַשְּׁמוֹ מִפִּיבֹשֶׁת  
**“Jonathan, the son of Saul, had a son who was crippled in his feet. He was five years old when the news about Saul and Jonathan came from Jezreel; and his nurse took him up, and fled; and, as she fled in her haste, he fell, and became lame. And his name was Mephibosheth.”**

In the last three examples a circumstantial nominal clause introduces a new character and at the same time opens a new story; it does not just convey background information but also marks topic shift. These circumstantial nominal clauses should also be considered parenthetical, since the information they contain is not part of the following story but only adds relevant information.



the subordinate temporal phrase **אול מא** and not the adverb **אולא**.<sup>45</sup> But other translations, like the *RSV* translation above, *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the Geez Bible translation, Onkelos, and the *Peshitta*, take verses 1 and 2 as independent clauses, introducing the narrative with two non-parenthetical clauses expressing background information.<sup>46</sup>

### 2.3.2 Examples of Foreshadowing

As for content, all the examples in this section, like those expressing background information discussed above, introduce extra information important for understanding later developments in the story. This time, however, the extra information also foreshadows a coming event, that is, it intimates a later development in the story. Foreshadowing as both an editorial and a literary technique in Biblical narrative has been observed and recognized by several scholars including medieval Bible interpreters.<sup>47</sup> Regarding syntactic status, as stated above the clause patterns employed for foreshadowing are all circumstantial clauses introduced by the conjunctive *wāw*.<sup>48</sup> The clause patterns which form these circumstantial clauses vary: they can be nominal, existential, and verbal containing a suffix conjugation verb, and can also reveal word order inversion. It is not always easy to distinguish purely background

<sup>45</sup> Derenbourg Edition: 5, note 1. The interpretation reflected in this translation was also suggested by the famous Bible commentator, Rashi: **ואם באת לפרשו כפשוטו**, Rashi: **כך פרשהו בראשית בריאת שמים וארץ והארץ היתה תהו ובהו וחשך ויאמר אלהים יהי אור. ולא בא המקרא להורות סדר הבריאה לומר שאלו קדמו, שאם בא להורות כך, היה לו לכתוב בראשונה ברא את השמים וגו'; שאין לך ראשית במקרא שאינו דבוק לתיבה של אחריו... אף כאן אתה אומר בראשית ברא אלהים וגו', כמו בראשית ברוא**—“If you come to explain it according to its simple meaning, explain it as follows: “In the beginning of the creation of the heavens and the earth, when the earth was bewildered and void and there was darkness..., God said, ‘Let there be light.’” The verse does not come to teach the order of Creation by saying that [the heavens and the earth] came first, for if this is what it came to teach us, it should have written, “At First, He created the Heavens, etc.,” for you have no instance of the word **ראשית** in *Scripture* that is not attached to the word that follows it... Here, too, you should say that the phrase **בראשית ברא אלהים וגו'** *is to be understood* as in the beginning of the creating.” Hebrew version and English translation of Rashi’s comment are according to Herczeg & Others 1995:3. Also note *ibid.*:3, note 6.

<sup>46</sup> For this controversy see, e.g., Goldenberg 1995:28–29 and Winther-Nielsen 1992. Goldenberg considers the first view as superior while Winther-Nielsen prefers the second.

<sup>47</sup> See, e.g., Zakovitch 1985, and p. 85 for other references.

<sup>48</sup> Circumstantial clauses are very frequent in Arabic, so it is not surprising that most of them are translated by a similar circumstantial pattern in Arabic in both Saadya Gaon’s medieval translation for examples from the Pentateuch and in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* for all examples.

information from extra information foreshadowing coming events. Each of the following examples is accompanied by an explanation of how in these cases foreshadowing is accomplished in the content of the parenthesis.<sup>49</sup>

In the first example below, Gen. 3:1, the parenthetical information anticipates the behavior of the snake, which immediately enters the story after the parenthetical information about his cunning is given.<sup>50</sup> Zevit insightfully writes about this verse: “It was mentioned here, however, because it cued the audience to attend carefully to the following conversation which would hardly be as casual and innocent as it may have appeared.”<sup>51</sup> The clause type used for the parenthesis is nominal, opening with a noun phrase **וְהַנָּחָשׁ**, whose syntactic status is the subject.

As in a number of previous examples the special status of the snake in this clause, in contrast to the whole context, is particularly emphasized in the Geez translation by use of the emphatic enclitic particle *-ssa* suffixed to it: **ወአርዌምድርሰ** / *wa-ʾarwe mǝdr-ǝ-ssa*, and in the *JPS* by use of the opening word ‘now.’ The nominal clause intervenes between preceding and following verbal clauses, the verbs of which belong to the prefix conjugation. Whenever possible they follow the so-called conversive *wāw*, namely the *wayyiqtol* forms **וַיְהִי** and **וְלֹא יִתְבַּשֵּׁשׁוּ**<sup>52</sup> in the preceding verse Gen. 2:25, and **וַיֹּאמֶר** in the continuing part of Gen. 3:1, which follows the parenthetical clause.<sup>53</sup>

Gen. 3:1—**וְהַנָּחָשׁ הָיָה עָרוֹם מְכַל חַיַּת הַגָּדֵן אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה ה' אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל-הָאִשָּׁה**—**אָף כִּי-אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכֹּל עֵץ הַגֵּן**—“**Now the serpent was more subtle than any other wild creature that the LORD God had made.** He said to the woman, ‘Did God say, ‘You shall not eat of any tree of the garden?’”

<sup>49</sup> Note also Bailey’s examples of foreshadowing in genealogical lists in Genesis (Bailey 1994:273–274) and Sternberg’s discussion of “modes of shaping the narrative future” which include foreshadowing (Sternberg 1985:268–283) and “epithets and the rule of forward-looking exposition” which also refers to foreshadowing (Sternberg 1985:337–341).

<sup>50</sup> Andersen 1974:79, §5.1.1 explains this example as an “episode-initial circumstantial clause” and gives other examples which play a similar role.

<sup>51</sup> Zevit 1998:22.

<sup>52</sup> The use of the conversive *wāw* is avoided in this verb, since it follows the negation particle **לֹא**.

<sup>53</sup> Note that the division of the Bible into verses and chapters is rather late in time, and though this division conforms in this case to the turning point in the biblical story, the last verse of the preceding chapter 2 should be read with the first verse of the following chapter 3 as one sequence.

The parenthetical remark about Noah in the next examples marks the entrance of this character into the biblical flood story. At the same time it hints at the better fate of Noah than that of the other human beings and other creatures later hit by the flood. This anticipation is formed here by using the Hebrew phrase *מָצָא חֵן*, which shows that God had a better opinion of Noah than of his other creatures. As to the linguistic means used for composing the parenthesis, the clause is a verbal one, whose verb nevertheless belongs to the suffix conjugation.<sup>54</sup> The clause also shows an inversion of word order from the regular third person prefix conjugation verb following a consecutive *wāw*-subject word order of the narrative sequence revealed in the verb *וַיֹּאמֶר* which opens verse 7, to subject-suffix conjugation verb. In fact, the chain of narrative verbs is broken twice in these two verses: once by the speech utterance which employs a first person prefix conjugation verb, *אָמַחָה*, followed by the suffix conjugation verbs *בָּרָאתִי* in a relative clause and *נַחַמְתִּי* and *עָשִׂיתִם* in causal clauses, and again by the parenthetical clause.

Awareness of the break in the narrative flow is further reflected in the *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* translation, which transforms the pattern of the clause *ה' אָמַחָה חֵן בְּעֵינַי ה'* into an explicit extraposition by using the...*أَمَّا* *ف* pattern: *وَأَمَّا نُوحٌ فَوَجَدَ نِعْمَةً فِي عَيْنِي الرَّبِّ*. This pattern stabilizes the initial position of the noun *וְנֹחַ*. Similar sensitivity is revealed in the Geez translation, which employs here the contrastive emphatic enclitic particle *-ssa* attached to the proper name Noah in the beginning of verse 8: *ወኣሱ/ wa-Noḥ-ə-ssa*. The *JPS* takes a similar approach, although it uses the contrastive particle 'but' rather than its more common use of 'now' elsewhere, e.g., Gen. 3:1, Exod. 2:16, and Judg. 4:4 above.

Gen. 6:7–8—*וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אָמַחָה אֶת-הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר-בָּרָאתִי מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה מְאֹד־מֵעַד-בְּהֵמָה עַד-רֶמֶשׂ וְעַד-עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּי נַחַמְתִּי כִּי עָשִׂיתִם. וְנֹחַ מָצָא חֵן בְּעֵינַי ה'*  
 —“So the LORD said, ‘I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the ground, man and beast and creeping things and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them.’ **But Noah found favor in the eyes of the LORD.**”

The external information in the following verse anticipates the story which tells the awful fate of Sodom. In contrast to the pleasant words

<sup>54</sup> See Zevit 1998:16, who considers this example an anterior construction expressing pluperfect, i.e., according to him, involving telicity and punctuality. On the difference between ‘pluperfect’, i.e., involving telicity and punctuality, and ‘preperfect’, i.e., not involving telicity or at least punctuality, according to Zevit, see Zevit 1998:39.



1 Sam. 1:3—וְעַלֵּה הָאִישׁ הַהוּא מֵעִירוֹ מִיָּמִים יְמִימָה לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת וּלְזָבַח לָהּ צְבָאוֹת—“Now this man used to go up year by year from his city to worship and to sacrifice to the LORD of hosts at Shiloh, **where the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were priests of the LORD.**”

The next verse is a circumstantial nominal clause referring to Samuel’s role as a servant of God. Another circumstantial nominal clause revealing information about Samuel appears later in 1 Sam. 2:26: וְהַנֶּעֱר וְהַנְּעָר—“Now the boy Samuel continued to grow both in stature and in favor with the LORD and with men.” The latter clause adds to the gradually accumulating information about Samuel’s good qualities, and at the same time it foreshadows later positive developments related to him. This goes on until the point where Samuel finally becomes the main character in the story line, and he is found worthy of receiving God’s revelation, as the story tells us from 1 Sam. 3:4 on.

1 Sam. 2:18—וְשִׁמוּאֵל מְשַׁרְתֵּת אֶת-פָּנָיו ה' נֶעַר חָגוּר אֶפּוֹד בָּד—“Samuel was ministering before the LORD, a boy girded with a linen ephod.”

The parenthetical information in the next example is a scribe’s or narrator’s historical remark regarding the rarity of prophecies in the days when the event of God’s revelation to Samuel occurred. This remark counters the occurrence of that revelation, yet it foreshadows it by creating expectations of it. The parenthetical information is provided by a circumstantial nominal clause, וּדְבַר-ה' הָיָה יָקָר בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם, followed by another nominal clause, אִין חֲזוֹן נִפְרָץ, containing a similar message. The phrase בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם provides a time co-ordinate which shows that these clauses are late scribal or narrator’s additions.

1 Sam. 3:1—וְהַנֶּעַר שִׁמוּאֵל מְשַׁרְתֵּת אֶת-ה' לְפָנָיו עָלֵי וּדְבַר-ה' הָיָה יָקָר בְּיָמֵים—“Now the boy Samuel was ministering to the LORD under Eli. **And the word of the LORD was rare in those days; there was no frequent vision.**”

### 2.3.3 *Examples Introducing Explanatory Information*

The following examples are clauses which provide explanations for certain states, events, and instructions, and their development or implementation in the story. As previously indicated, most of the information conveyed in these examples is inserted into the text by circumstantial clauses introduced by the conjunctive *wāw*. Again, the circumstantial clause patterns can be nominal, existential, or verbal containing a suffix



conjugation verb, and they occasionally involve word order inversion. The examples begin with circumstantial clauses and continue with several other clause types.

The parenthetical information in the first example, Exod. 1:5, is in its second clause, וַיֹּסֶף הָיָה בְּמִצְרַיִם. This clause deviates from the general portrayal of Jacob's descendents who went to Egypt, conveyed in the first clause of this verse. The parenthetical information in the second clause is meant to clarify the vague whereabouts of one of Jacob's offspring, namely Joseph, but its connection to the first clause is contextually loose and creates uncertainty, which as we shall see below has led to various alternatives in Bible translations. Syntactically the circumstantial parenthetical clause contains an auxiliary verb in the suffix conjugation, הָיָה, and it should be considered as involving word order inversion, compared with the first clause initiated by a *wayyiqtol* form, וַיְהִי, since it opens with a nominal subject, וַיֹּסֶף, and the suffix conjugation auxiliary verb stands in second position.

Exod. 1:5—וַיְהִי כֹל-נֶפֶשׁ יֹצְאֵי יִרְדֵּי-יַעֲקֹב שִׁבְעִים נֶפֶשׁ וַיֹּסֶף הָיָה בְּמִצְרַיִם—“All the offspring of Jacob were seventy persons; **Joseph was already in Egypt.**”

To tackle the aforementioned uncertainty of this verse several of the translations suggest easier amended versions. Contrary to the *Peshitta*, which translates literally—*w-Yāwsep hwā b-Mesrēn*, other translations examined for this study are more flexible. For example, all versions of Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation add *ع* before Joseph's name in the second clause, to indicate that Joseph is also considered one of Jacob's offspring and at the same time to create a logical connection between the two parts of the verse. However, the rendering of the continuation of this circumstantial clause has more than one variant in these Arabic versions. The version found in Ms. St. Petersburg, maintains a circumstantial clause initiated by *ع*, while the Derenbourg edition and the Ḥasīd edition have relative clauses in that place. In contrast, the modern Christian Arabic *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* translates the entire clause by a causal clause pattern.

These Arabic translations in full are as follows. Ms. St. Petersburg: *וכאן גמלה אלכארגון מן צלב יעקוב סבעין נפסא מע יוסף והו במצר*—“All the offspring of Jacob were seventy persons including Joseph, while he was in Egypt.” Derenbourg edition: *וכאן ג'מלה אלנפוס אלכ'ארג'ה*—“All the offspring of Jacob were seventy persons including Joseph, who was in Egypt.”

Hasīd edition: וכאן גמלה אלנפוס אלכ' ארגה מן צלב יעקוב סבעין נפסא מע — יוסף אלד' י כאן במצר וכאנת' גמיע' — *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*: “All the offspring of Jacob were seventy persons including Joseph, who was in Egypt.” — نفوس الخارجين من صلب يعقوب سبعين نفسا ولكن يوسف كان في مصر — “All the offspring of Jacob were seventy persons, but Joseph was in Egypt.” The variety demonstrated here undoubtedly exposes the translators' hesitation regarding the loose connection between this clause and the preceding one, and regarding the structure of the circumstantial clause in itself.

Uncertainty about the connection between the two clauses is also revealed in the Geez Bible translation, which inverts their order, thus allowing Joseph to be included in the counting of Joseph's offspring: ወዮሴፍና ሁሉ ብሔረ ግብጽ ወከነት ኩላ ነፍሱ እንተ እምያዕቆብ ሰብዓ/ *wa-Yosef-a-ssa hallo bəḥera Gəbš wa-konat kʷalla nafs ʾanta ʾəm-Yāʿqob sab ā*. Furthermore, the attachment of the emphatic enclitic particle *-ssa* to the proper name of Joseph marks its special position in contrast to the surrounding clauses. The *JPS* too establishes some sort of a connection between the two clauses by using the gerund in the second clause: “The total number of persons that were of Jacob's issue came to seventy, Joseph **being** already in Egypt.” Onkelos II provides several Aramaic versions which deviate from the Hebrew construction by adding the Aramaic relative particle *-d*, and turning the clause *וְיוֹסֵף הָיָה בְּמִצְרַיִם* into a phrase, namely *וְיוֹסֵף* becomes a head and *הָיָה בְּמִצְרַיִם* a relative clause functioning as its attribute: *וְיוֹסֵף דְּהוּוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם*. These versions are found alongside other more literal versions lacking the Aramaic relative particle. Versions with the preposition *עם*, ‘with’, namely *עם יוסף*, similarly to Saadya Gaon, also exist in a few Aramaic versions.<sup>56</sup>

The parenthetical information in the next example immediately follows the threat of a plague on the cattle belonging to the Egyptians. Its content, *וְהָפְלָה ה' בֵּין מִקְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵין מִקְנֵה מִצְרַיִם וְלֹא יָמוּת מִכָּל-לֶבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּבָר*, explains that contrary to the losses that the Egyptians were expected to suffer, nothing ill was projected for the Israelites' cattle. However, an understanding of this clause part as parenthetical is not the only one possible, and Bible translations suggest other interpretations. Both the *RSV* translation cited below and the *JPS* translation regard the explanation regarding the cattle of the Israelites as part of God's speech intended to be delivered by Moses to Pharaoh. The *JPS*

<sup>56</sup> Onkelos II:89.

even stretches Moses' speech farther, setting the close quote marks at the end of the last clause in verse 5. The Geez translation suggests an interpretation similar to the *JPS*. It sets in the translation of 'וְהִפְלָה ה' in this clause a first personal pronoun instead of the name of God, making it, again, part of God's speech.

However, the clause 'בֵּין מִקְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵין מִקְנֵה מִצְרַיִם וְלֹא יִמּוּת מִכָּל-לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּבַר' may possibly also be regarded as parenthetical information deviating from God's speech intended to be delivered to Pharaoh by Moses, and offering an external parenthetical explanation regarding Moses, not Pharaoh. As to syntax, this clause does not involve word order change since it opens with a verb. But the verb itself belongs to the suffix conjugation, and if one regards it as part of the narrative and not the speech utterance the suffix conjugation should be understood as standing in contrast to the previous prefix *wayyiqtol* form, וַיֹּאמֶר, and to the later one, וַיֵּשֶׁם, which create the narrative flow in this text.

Exod. 9:1–5—'אֱלֹהֵי ה' אֵל-מֹשֶׁה בָּא אֶל-פַּרְעֹה וַדְּבַרְתָּ אֵלָיו כֹּה-אָמַר ה' אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים שְׁלַח אֶת-עַמִּי וַיַּעֲבֹדֵנִי. כִּי אִם-מֵאֵן אֶתָּה לְשַׁלַּח וְעוֹדָךְ מַחֲזִיק בָּם. הִנֵּה יָד-ה' הוֹיָה בְּמִקְנֶךָ אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה בְּסוֹסִים בְּחֻמְרִים בְּגִמְלִים בְּבָקָר וּבְצֹאֵן דְּבַר כֶּבֶד מְאֹד. וְהִפְלָה ה' בֵּין מִקְנֵה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבֵין מִקְנֵה מִצְרַיִם וְלֹא יָמוּת מִכָּל-לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּבַר. וַיֵּשֶׁם ה' מוֹעֵד לֵאמֹר מִחָר יַעֲשֶׂה ה' הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה בְּאַרְצְךָ—'Then the LORD said to Moses, 'Go in to Pharaoh, and say to him, 'Thus says the LORD, the God of the Hebrews, 'Let my people go, that they may serve me. For if you refuse to let them go and still hold them, behold, the hand of the LORD will fall with a very severe plague upon your cattle which are in the field, the horses, the asses, the camels, the herds, and the flocks. **But the LORD will make a distinction between the cattle of Israel and the cattle of Egypt, so that nothing shall die of all that belongs to the people of Israel.**' And the LORD set a time, saying, 'Tomorrow the LORD will do this thing in the land.'"

An interchange between verb types similar to the one found in the Biblical Hebrew text above, namely between *wayyiqtol* forms for the narrative sequence and *qatal* forms for breaking the sequence with a circumstantial clause, also appears in the Arabic translations of Saadya Gaon and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*; however, the verbs in Arabic are the reverse, that is, *qatal* forms for the narrative sequence and *yiqtol* for breaking it by a circumstantial clause. Saadya Gaon's translation is: ת'ם קאל אללה למוסי אדכ'ל אלי פרעון וקל לה כד'א קאל אללה אללה אלעבראניין אטלק קומי יעבדוני. פאנדן אן אבית אן תטלקהם ועאדך מתמסך בהם. פאן אפה אללה כאינה פי מואשיך אלתי פי אלצחרא פי אלכ'יל ואלחמיר

ואלג'מאל ואלגנם ואלבקר ובא עט'ים ג'דא. ויבין אללה בין מואשי בני אסראיל ומואשי אלמצריין ולא ימות שי מן ג'מיע מא הו לבני אסראיל. ויצר אללה וקתא קאילא ג'דא יצנע אללה הד'א אל'אמר פי אלבלד. The translation of *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* is: ثُمَّ قَالَ الرَّبُّ لِمُوسَى ادْخُلْ إِلَى فِرْعَوْنَ وَقُلْ لَهُ هَكَذَا يَقُولُ الرَّبُّ إِلَهُ الْعِبْرَانِيِّينَ أَطْلِقْ شَعْبِي لِيَعْبُدُونِي. فَإِنَّهُ إِنْ كُنْتَ تَأْتِي أَنْ تَطْلُقَهُمْ وَكُنْتَ تُمْسِكُهُمْ بَعْدَ يَدِ الرَّبِّ تَكُونُ عَلَيَّ مَوَاشِيكَ الَّتِي فِي الْحَقْلِ عَلَى الْخَيْلِ وَالْحَمِيرِ وَالْجِمَالِ وَالْبَقَرِ وَالْغَنَمِ وَبِأَثْقَالِهَا جَدًّا. وَيُمَيِّزُ الرَّبُّ بَيْنَ مَوَاشِي إِسْرَائِيلَ وَمَوَاشِي الْمِصْرِيِّينَ فَلَا يَمُوتُ مِنْ كُلِّ مَلَأِ الْبَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ شَيْءٌ. وَعَيْنَ الرَّبِّ وَقْتًا قَائِلًا غَدًا يَفْعَلُ الرَّبُّ هَذَا الْأَمْرَ فِي الْأَرْضِ<sup>57</sup>

The last clause in the next example describes the Israelites' situation, in contrast to the preceding clauses which talk about the Egyptians' situation. A syntactic change occurs in word order and type of clause, and the information about the Israelites is introduced into the text by a possessive clause composed of a prepositional phrase, the verb הָיָה, and a noun phrase functioning as a subject. The circumstantial clause in this case thus shows contrast and topic shift, and it provides information external to the story line and explains how the Israelites did not suffer the blows that befell the Egyptians. The contrast between the parenthetical clause and the preceding is well expressed in the Geez translation by the attachment of the contrastive emphatic particle *-ssa* to יִשְׂרָאֵל *ʾAṣrāʾel-ssa*...

ויט משה את-ידו על-השמים ויהי חשך-אפלה בכל-ארץ מצרים שלשת ימים. לא-ראו איש את-אחיו ולא-קמו איש מתחתיו שלשת ימים ולכל-בני ישראל היה אור במושבם. —“So Moses stretched out his hand toward heaven, and there was thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days; they did not see one another, nor did any rise from his place for three days; **but all the people of Israel had light where they dwelt.**”

The parenthetical circumstantial clause in the following example, וְהָיָה כִּשְׂרָאֵל לְמֶלֶךְ אֲרָץ מִצְרָיִם, explains the instructions regarding the behavior expected from a future king. The parenthetical information recalls a promise or command made previously by God, which still holds. In this case the Hebrew construction provides a verbal clause containing a suffix conjugation verb, אָמַר. Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation does not just employ for this parenthetical clause a suffix conjugation verb but attaches to it the particle *qad*: ואללה פקד קאל... לכם. In this case *qad* probably functions in a complex tense referring

<sup>57</sup> The underlined words are the verbs maintaining the narrative sequence.

to an earlier time line. In addition, the clause is constructed in the pattern of an extraposition by using the particle *fa* between the subject וְהָ and the rest of the clause, thereby marking it as deviating from the main flow of instructions, which precede and follow it. *qad* appears in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* as well. Reflecting the clause's actual meaning as explanatory, the *JPS*, like the *RSV* below, chooses to translate it as a causal clause: "...since the Lord has warned you..."

Deut. 17:16—רַק לֹא-יִרְבֶּה-לוֹ סוּסִים וְלֹא-יֵשִׁיב אֶת-הָעַם מִצְרַיִמָּה לְמַעַן הַרְבוֹת עוֹד סוּס וְהָ אָמַר יְהוָה לְכֶם לֹא תִסְפוּן לָשׁוּב בְּדֶרֶךְ הַזֶּה עוֹד  
 “Only he must not multiply horses for himself, or cause the people to return to Egypt in order to multiply horses, since the LORD has said to you, ‘You shall never return that way again.’”

The parenthetical information in the next example states that Samuel never before saw a vision. It is inserted in the midst of a story about God's first revelation to him. God calls Samuel twice, but Samuel, not expecting a call from God, runs to Eli instead of responding to it. Only after God's third call, which appears in the next verse (1 Sam. 3:8), does Eli realize that it is God who is calling Samuel, and he explains to him how to react. The parenthetical information is required at this point in the story because it explains how and why Samuel turns first to Eli instead of God every time he hears someone calling his name. The syntax of the parenthetical information is two verbal clauses, and the word order of each is twice subject-verb, one a suffix conjugation verb and the other a prefix conjugation verb following the time particle טָרַם. The prefix verb is in indicative mood as is clearly evident from the regular form of a root with a third radical *yod* (גל"ה), a use typical of verbs following טָרַם. Verbs of this group can also take a shortened form, and they usually do so after the conversive *wāw*, but in this case the form is a regular indicative, probably expressing past continuous.<sup>58</sup> On account of word order and verbal forms that appear in the parenthesis, these clauses can clearly be considered as deviating from the main narrative sequence, in which we see, in the preceding and following verses, a chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs.

1 Sam. 3:7—וְשָׂמוּאֵל טָרַם יָדַע אֶת-ה' וְטָרַם יְגִלָּה אֵלָיו דְּבַר-ה'—**Now Samuel did not yet know the LORD, and the word of the LORD had not yet been revealed to him.**

<sup>58</sup> On the use of *yiqtol* forms after טָרַם for past and present see, e.g., *GKC* 1910:314–315, §107c, 481, §152r, Joüon & Muraoka 2006:342, §113J.

The parenthetical information in the next verses explains the need expressed by David to compensate the Gibeonites for Saul's annoyance at the alliance between the Gibeonites on one side and Joshua and the Israelites on the other, described in Josh. 9:3–15. The parenthesis in this case introduces a speech act, and it is composed of three clauses: the first clause is a nominal clause involving extraposition and an exceptive phrase, *והגבענים לא מבני ישראל הָמָה כִּי אִם-מִיֶּתֶר הָאֲמֹרִי*.<sup>59</sup> The second is a verbal clause in the order subject–verb, where the verb is a suffix conjugation verb, *וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִשְׁבְּעוּ לָהֶם*. The third is a verbal clause initiated by a prefix conjugation verb prefixed by a conversive *wāw*, *וַיִּבְקֶשׂ שָׁאוּל לְהַכְתֵּם בְּקִנְיָתוֹ לְבְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה*. The structure of the first two clauses is untypical of the narrative. The structure of the third is typical of a narrative, but in this case it refers to an earlier story according to which Saul tried to harm the Gibeonites, and not to the speech event in which the parenthesis actually appears. The parenthesis in this text has a more obvious sign too, observed in the repetition of the verb of speech, coming once before the parenthesis and once after it.<sup>60</sup>

2 Sam. 21:2–3—*יִקְרָא הַמֶּלֶךְ לְגִבְעֹנִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם וְהַגְּבֻעִים לֹא מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל—*הָמָה כִּי אִם-מִיֶּתֶר הָאֲמֹרִי וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִשְׁבְּעוּ לָהֶם וַיִּבְקֶשׂ שָׁאוּל לְהַכְתֵּם בְּקִנְיָתוֹ לְבְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל-הַגְּבֻעִים מָה אַעֲשֶׂה לָכֶם וּבְמָה אֲכַפֵּר וּבְרַכּוּ אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה ה'—*“So the king called the Gibeonites. **Now the Gibeonites were not of the people of Israel, but of the remnant of the Amorites; although the people of Israel had sworn to spare them, Saul had sought to slay them in his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah.** And David said to the Gibeonites, ‘What shall I do for you? And how shall I make expiation, that you may bless the heritage of the LORD?’”*

In the remaining examples the parenthetical information is conveyed not in circumstantial clauses but in other clause types: causal in 1 Sam.

<sup>59</sup> On the structure of nominal clauses involving extraposition see Zewi 1994. The structure of the nominal clause *הָמָה כִּי אִם-מִיֶּתֶר הָאֲמֹרִי* is according to type B (extraposed subject–predicate clause (composed of predicate–subject)) described in Zewi 1994:159–160, §9, 164, §12. On the structure of exceptive phrases in Biblical Hebrew see Zewi 1998.

<sup>60</sup> On this repetition of the verb of speech see Miller 1996:219, §4.4.2, and the discussion of her view in section 1.4 above. Also see Sternberg 1985:120, where the lines about the Gibeonites in 2 Sam. 21:1–3 are considered expositional; also, “The exposition may unfold specific or general (Judg 16:4) information about the world, relate to individuals or groups,....” See there also the list of other exposition possibilities.

14:18 and 2 Kgs. 18:4 below, asyndetic in 1 Kgs. 13:18 below, and appositional in 2 Kgs. 15:12 below.

The verses preceding and following the one cited below describe the fear of Saul and the Israelites of an impending war with the Philistines. While waiting for the war to break out Saul decides to consult the ark of God. The information marked as parenthetical below was probably inserted into the text to explain how it was possible to consult the ark of God at that time, considering the stories of the capture of the ark of God by the Philistines (1 Sam. 4:11) and its placement in Kiriath-jearim after it returned to Israel (1 Sam. 7:1). Though the parenthesis does not say how the ark came to be with Ahijah, it mentions that at that time it remained with the Israelites. Unlike most parenthetical clauses, this one is not a circumstantial but a causal clause, and as expected from many parenthetical clauses the type of verb used is a suffix conjugation verb, deviating from the regular narrative chain of prefix conjugation verbs following a consecutive *wāw*.

1 Sam. 14:18—**וַיֹּאמֶר שָׂאוּל לְאַחִיָּה הַגִּישָׁה אֶרֶוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים כִּי-הָיָה אֶרֶוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים—**“And Saul said to Ahijah, ‘Bring hither the ark of God.’ **For the ark of God went at that time with the people of Israel.**”

The following example of 1 Kgs. 13:18 contains two verbal clauses referring to one speech act: **וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ** and **בַּחֹשׁ לוֹ**. The latter is repetitive of the former and appears superfluous, disconnected, and external to the whole clause. Nevertheless, this verbal clause does add parenthetical explanatory information, attached to the end of the verse probably by the scribe or narrator to explain the falsity of the preceding direct speech act. In syntactic structure the verbal clause **וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ** is asyndetic, consisting of a suffix conjugation verb as expected in many deviations from the main narrative flow, marked here by the *wayyiqtol* verb of speech **וַיֹּאמֶר**. Bible translations may render this verse as a contrastive clause (the *RSV* has ‘but’), or employ a conjunctive particle (the *Peshitta* has the conjunctive *wāw*), or render it as an asyndetic clause, lacking any conjunctive or contrastive particle (*JPS, al-kitāb al-muqaddas, Targum Jonathan*).<sup>61</sup>

<sup>61</sup> I thank Prof. Jan Joosten for mentioning this example to me and for sending me his comments on it from his forthcoming book on the verbal system of Biblical Hebrew: “As signaled by the asyndesis and the verbal form, the last words are a digression from the narrative. “He lied to him” is not an event linked into the narrative sequence but an aside from the writer to the reader” (Joosten, in preparation).

1 Kgs. 13:18—וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ גַם-אֲנִי נְבִיא כְמוֹךָ וּמַלְאָךְ דִּבֶּר אֵלַי בְּדַבַּר ה' לֵאמֹר—“And he said to him, ‘I also am a prophet as you are, and an angel spoke to me by the word of the LORD, saying, ‘Bring him back with you into your house that he may eat bread and drink water.’” **But he lied to him.**”

The example in 2 Kgs. 15:12 below indicates the fulfillment of God’s promise to Jehu mentioned in 2 Kgs. 10:30—וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֶל-יְהוָה יַעֲזֹר אֲשֶׁר-הִטִּיבֹתָ לַעֲשׂוֹת הַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינַי כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר בִּלְבָבִי עָשִׂיתָ לְבֵית אַחָאב בְּנֵי רִבְעִים אֲשֶׁר-הִטִּיבֹתָ לַעֲשׂוֹת הַיָּשָׁר לְךָ עַל-כִּסֵּא יִשְׂרָאֵל—“And the LORD said to Jehu, ‘Because you have done well in carrying out what is right in my eyes, and have done to the house of Ahab according to all that was in my heart, your sons of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel.’” Zechariah, the king of Israel mentioned in 2 Kgs. 15:11, is a fifth-generation descendent of Jehu, the king of Israel. Syntactically, in contrast to the majority of the examples above the parenthetical clause is not circumstantial but appositional. It is also a nominal clause initiated by a personal pronoun which functions as a predicate and at the same time refers to antecedent content. Its structure is similar to appositional clauses providing an older place name or personal name, or information on month name, discussed in section 2.2.3 above. Note the brackets marking this piece of information in the *RSV* translation.

2 Kgs. 15:12—הוּא דָבַר-ה' אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֶל-יְהוָה לֵאמֹר בְּנֵי רִבְעִים יֵשְׁבוּ לְךָ—עַל-כִּסֵּא יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהִי-כֵן (This was the promise of the LORD which he gave to Jehu, ‘Your sons shall sit upon the throne of Israel to the fourth generation.’ And so it came to pass.)”

The external information in the next verse explains that a need to destroy the bronze serpent was still felt in that period, because the people of Israel still practiced burning incense to it. Once more, the clause holding the parenthetical information is not circumstantial but causal. The verbal usage in this verse, that is, the use of suffix conjugation form of הִיהָ + participle, is one possible way to express habitual past in Biblical Hebrew.<sup>62</sup>

2 Kgs. 18:4—הוּא הִסִּיר אֶת-הַבָּמוֹת וְשָׁבַר אֶת-הַמְצֻבֹת וְכָרַת אֶת-הָאֲשֵׁרָה וְכָתַת לוֹ נַחֲשֹׁת נָחַשׁ הַנְּחָשֹׁת אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה מִשָּׁה כִּי עַד-הַיָּמִים הַהֵמָּה הָיוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל מְקַטְרִים לוֹ וַיִּקְרָא לוֹ נַחֲשֹׁתָן—“He removed the high places, and broke the pillars, and

<sup>62</sup> For the use of suffix conjugation form of הִיהָ + participle for habitual past in Biblical Hebrew see, e.g., *GKC* 1910:360, §116r, Joüon & Muraoka 2006: 381–382, §121f.



cut down the Asherah. And he broke in pieces the bronze serpent that Moses had made, **for until those days the people of Israel had burned incense to it**; it was called Nehushtan.”

#### 2.3.4 *Theological Remarks*

The following are theological remarks, probably inserted by the scribe or narrator, to elucidate that the story develops as it does according to God’s will. Clauses giving this information might be circumstantial, introduced by the conjunctive *wāw*, but other clause types, mostly causal, fulfill this role as well. Contrary to all types of parenthetical clauses discussed so far, such content might also appear as part of the narrative sequence, with regular narrative syntax of a *wayyiqtol* verb preceding its subject. In such cases the clause does not break the narrative flow but creates continuation, so it cannot syntactically be considered as parenthetical. The assertion that it contains parenthetical information can be considered true only from a functional-pragmatic standpoint, not syntactically. As to the patterns of these clauses, those that are circumstantial and causal diverge from the regular narrative syntactic chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs preceding their subjects by possibly being nominal, existential, or verbal containing a suffix conjugation verb; they occasionally reveal word order inversion.

The following example indicates God’s decision not to let the Israelites go through the land of the Philistines. The *RSV*, and likewise the *JPS*, Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translations, *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the Geez translation, Onkelos, and the *Peshitta*, translate the clause providing this information syntactically as a main clause following a temporal one. Nonetheless, the clause וְלֹא-נָחַם אֱלֹהִים דְּרָדָּךְ אֶרֶץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים כִּי קָרוֹב הוּא is introduced by the conjunctive *wāw*, and its verbal pattern containing a suffix conjugation verb breaks the narrative chain of the *wayyiqtol* verbs, namely the preceding וַיְהִי in the same verse and the following וַיִּסַּב in the next verse. These features suggest another possible analysis, that this clause is circumstantial, following a temporal clause, while the main clause is וַיִּסַּב אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָעָם דְּרָדָּךְ הַמִּדְבָּר יַם-סוּף —“...God led the people round by the way of the wilderness toward the Red Sea,” which belongs the subsequent verse 18. Whether a main or a circumstantial clause, it deviates in syntactic structure from the main narrative sequence by using a suffix conjugation verb. This deviation calls for attention, although the typical narrative verb–subject word order is retained in this example, and it suffices to conclude that the clause can be regarded as parenthetical.

Exod. 13:17—וַיְהִי בְשַׁלַּח פַּרְעֹה אֶת-הָעָם וְלֹא-נָחַם אֱלֹהִים דָּרָךְ אֶרֶץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים כִּי—**When Pharaoh let the people go, God did not lead them by way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, ‘Lest the people repent when they see war, and return to Egypt.’**”

The next example contains a circumstantial clause which indicates the involvement of God in Samson’s decision to take a Philistine wife. The clause’s word order is subject–verb and the verb itself is a suffix conjugation verb. This clause interferes in the general narrative syntax of *wayyiqtol* verb–subject, revealed in this case by two appearances of the prefix conjugation verb וַיֹּאמֶר in the preceding verse and the two prefix conjugation verbs וַיָּבֵאוּ and וַיִּרְדּוּ in the next.

Judg. 14:4—וַאֲבִיו וְאִמּוֹ לֹא יָדְעוּ כִּי מִהָיָה בֵּית-אֲנָנָה הוּא-מִבְּקֹשׁ מִפְּלִשְׁתִּים—**“His father and mother did not know that it was from the LORD; for he was seeking an occasion against the Philistines. At that time the Philistines had dominion over Israel.”**

The remark of the scribe or narrator presented below regarding God’s being behind the change in the course of events, and behind making Absalom prefer the bad advice to the good, is again a circumstantial clause. It is composed of a verbal clause in the order of subject–verb, where the latter is a suffix conjugation verb, so it breaks the narrative chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs followed by their subjects. The *RSV* translates the suffix conjugation verb by a past perfect tense, to reflect the anteriority of the parenthetical remark.<sup>63</sup>

2 Sam. 17:14—וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְשָׁלוֹם וְכָל-אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל טוֹבָה עֲצַת חוּשֵׁי הָאֲרָבִי מֵעֲצַת אַחִיתֹפֶל הִיא צְנֹה לְהִפָּר אֶת-עֲצַת אַחִיתֹפֶל הַטּוֹבָה לְבַעֲבוֹר הַבֵּיָא הִיא אֶל-אַבְשָׁלוֹם וְאֶת-הָרָעָה—**“And Absalom and all the men of Israel said, ‘The counsel of Hushai the Archite is better than the counsel of Ahithophel.’ For the LORD had ordained to defeat the good counsel of Ahithophel, so that the LORD might bring evil upon Absalom.”**

The next example concerns the persistence of the Israelites’ wrongdoing in Judah in consequence of God’s choosing not to destroy them. This information is given in a circumstantial clause, and its inner structure breaks the narrative flow by a verbal clause with a suffix conjugation verb instead of the typical narrative *wayyiqtol* chains.

<sup>63</sup> See a discussion of this example in Eskhult 1990:65.

2 Kgs. 8:19—ולא־אָבָה ה' לְהַשְׁחִית אֶת־יְהוּדָה לְמַעַן הָרַד עַבְדּוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר־לוֹ לֵתֵת—**“Yet the LORD would not destroy Judah, for the sake of David his servant, since he promised to give a lamp to him and to his sons for ever.”**

A similar remark regarding God’s preferring to refrain from destroying Israel also appears in the following example, which shows a structure similar to the previous one in using a circumstantial clause composed of a verbal clause with a suffix conjugation verb.

2 Kgs. 14:27—ולא־דָבַר ה' לְמַחֲזוֹת אֶת־שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיּוֹשִׁיעַם בְּיַד־בְּנֵי־יֹאָשׁ—**“But the LORD had not said that he would blot out the name of Israel from under heaven,** so he saved them by the hand of Jeroboam the son of Joash.”

God is pronounced by the scribe or narrator as responsible for the tension between Israel and Aram in the next example, and for the tension between Judah and Aram in the example after that. These two statements employ a similar construction, namely בְּיָמִים הָהֵם הַחֵל ה'. This construction is not a circumstantial clause and still it deviates from the main narrative structure due to its use of a suffix conjugation verb instead of a prefix conjugation *wayyiqtol* form. The construction בְּיָמִים הָהֵם הַחֵל ה' also contains a time co-ordinate בְּיָמִים הָהֵם, which sets it on a time level which is different from that of the scribe or narrator.

2 Kgs. 10:32—בְּיָמִים הָהֵם הַחֵל ה' לְקַצּוֹת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּבֶם חֲזָאֵל בְּכָל־גְּבוּל—**“In those days the LORD began** to cut off parts of Israel. Hazael defeated them throughout the territory of Israel.”

2 Kgs. 15:37—בְּיָמִים הָהֵם הַחֵל ה' לְהַשְׁלִיחַ בִּיהוּדָה רֶצִין מֶלֶךְ אַרָם וְאֵת פֶּקַח־בֶּן־רִמְלִיָּהוּ—**“In those days the LORD began** to send Rezin the king of Syria and Pekah the son of Remaliah against Judah.”

The next verse suggests that God is behind David’s counting of the Israelites, which is in fact a result of God’s anger. However, contrary to the previous clauses this information, which functionally-pragmatically is outside the story line, is given in a regular narrative structure with *wayyiqtol* prefix conjugation verbs preceding their subject, and God’s anger being one of the participants in the chain of events. By using this non-parenthetical syntax the outside information regarding God’s responsibility for David’s decision to count the Israelites finds its way better into the story line and looks less like an external addition inserted into the text at a later time by a scribe or a narrator.

2 Sam. 24:1—**אֵת-יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֵת-יְהוּדָה** וַיִּסַּף אֶת-דָּוִד בְּקֶהֱם לֵאמֹר לֵךְ מִנָּה—**“Again the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel, and he incited David against them, saying, ‘Go, number Israel and Judah.’”**

A similar syntactic structure, which does not break the narrative sequence but joins in it, appears in the following three examples, 2 Kgs. 13:3, 2 Kgs. 13:4–5, and 2 Kgs. 13:23. The scribe or narrator notes God’s involvement in bringing triumph or defeat and causing salvation or loss of life in war, often as a result of his anger aimed at the Israelites, or his historic promise to keep them alive and safe, respectively.

2 Kgs. 13:3—**בְּיַד-חֲזַאֵל בֶּן-חֲזַאֵל מֶלֶךְ-אַרָּם וּבְיַד-בֶּן-הַדָּד** וַיִּתֶּנּוּם לְיַד-חֲזַאֵל בֶּן-חֲזַאֵל כֹּל-הַיָּמִים—**“And the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel, and he gave them continually into the hand of Hazael king of Syria and into the hand of Ben-hadad the son of Hazael.”**

2 Kgs. 13:4–5—**וַיִּחַל יְהוֹאָחָז אֶת-פְּנֵי ה’ וַיִּשְׁמַע אֵלָיו ה’ כִּי רָאָה אֶת-לַחֲץ יִשְׂרָאֵל** כִּי-לַחֲץ אֲתָם מֶלֶךְ אַרָּם. וַיִּתֵּן ה’ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מוֹשִׁיעַ וַיִּצְאוּ מִתַּחַת יַד-אַרָּם וַיָּשׁוּבוּ בְּיַד-לַחֲץ אֲתָם מֶלֶךְ אַרָּם—**“Then Jehoahaz besought the LORD, and the LORD hearkened to him; for he saw the oppression of Israel, how the king of Syria oppressed them. Therefore the LORD gave Israel a savior, so that they escaped from the hand of the Syrians; and the people of Israel dwelt in their homes as formerly.”**

The third example below contains a narrative structure evident in the use of the prefix *wayyiqtol* verbs, וַיִּחַן, וַיִּרְחַמֵם, and וַיִּפֶן, preceding their subjects. But it also has a chain of suffix conjugation verbs, אָבָה and הִשְׁלִיכֶם, perhaps because these verbs are negated in this example.

2 Kgs. 13:23—**וַיִּחַן ה’ אֲתָם וַיִּרְחַמֵם וַיִּפֶן אֲלֵיהֶם לְמַעַן בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת-אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב**—**“But the LORD was gracious to them and had compassion on them, and he turned toward them, because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and would not destroy them; nor has he cast them from his presence until now.”**

In the following examples, 1 Sam. 2:25, 1 Kgs. 12:15, and 2 Kgs. 24:20, God’s will and its intervention in the course of events are introduced into the text by causal clauses opening with the particle כִּי. The verbal form in these causal clauses, as might be expected, is a suffix conjugation in verbal or existential patterns.

1 Sam. 2:25—**אִם-יַחַטָּא אִישׁ לְאִישׁ וּפָלְלוּ אֱלֹהִים וְאִם לֹה’ יַחַטָּא-אִישׁ מִי יִתְפַּלֵּל-לוֹ**—**“If a man sins against a man, God will mediate for him; but if a man sins against the LORD, who can**

intercede for him?’ But they would not listen to the voice of their father; **for it was the will of the LORD to slay them.**”

1 Kgs. 12:15—וְלֹא-שָׁמַע הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל-הָעָם כִּי-הִיָּתָה סָבָה מֵעַם הַיְּלָמְעָן הַקִּיָּים—“So the king did not hearken to the people; **for it was a turn of affairs brought about by the LORD that he might fulfill his word, which the LORD spoke by Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam the son of Nebat.**”

2 Kgs. 24:20—כִּי עַל-אַף הָיָה הַיְּהוָה בִּירוּשָׁלַם וּבִיהוּדָה עַד-הַשְּׁלֹכּוֹ אֹתָם מֵעַל-בָּבֶל—“**For because of the anger of the LORD it came to the point in Jerusalem and Judah** that he cast them out from his presence. And Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon.”

Very similar in content and structure to 1 Kgs. 12:15 and 2 Kgs. 24:20 above, and to all the examples that are syntactically constructed in a narrative structure as part of the narrative sequence, namely, with *wayyiqtol* verbs preceding their subjects, is the following example. In it, several means of reference to God, his standpoint, and his intervention in the course of events are assembled. These are first, regular narrative syntax in *בו* וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' וַיִּשְׁלַח ה'; second, a reference phrase mentioning the speaker in *בְּדַבַּר ה'* וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' וַיִּשְׁלַח ה'; and finally, a deviation of the narrative syntax by *הַיְּהוָה בִּיהוּדָה* וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' לְסַלַח אֶת-עַבְדָּיו הַנְּבִיאִים.

2 Kgs. 24:2-4—וַיִּשְׁלַח ה' בּוֹ אֶת-גְּדוּדֵי כַשְׂדִּים וְאֶת-גְּדוּדֵי אַרְם וְאֶת גְּדוּדֵי-מוֹאָב וְאֶת גְּדוּדֵי בְנֵי-עַמּוֹן וַיִּשְׁלַח בִּיהוּדָה לְהַאֲבִידוֹ כְּדַבַּר ה' אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים. אַךְ עַל-פִּי ה' הִיָּתָה בִּיהוּדָה לְהַסִּיר מֵעַל פְּנֵיו בְּחַטָּאת מְנֻשָּׂה כָּל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה. וְגַם דָּם-הַנְּקִי אֲשֶׁר שָׁפַךְ וַיִּמְלֵא אֶת-יְרוּשָׁלַם דָּם נְקִי וְלֹא-אָבָה לְסַלַח ה'—“**And the LORD sent** against him bands of the Chaldeans, and bands of the Syrians, and bands of the Moabites, and bands of the Ammonites, and sent them against Judah **to destroy it, according to the word of the LORD which he spoke by his servants the prophets. Surely this came upon Judah at the command of the LORD**, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he had done, and also for the innocent blood that he had shed; for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, **and the LORD would not pardon.**”

The technique discussed in this section of inserting external editorial remarks into the story line to confront theological difficulties and explain them by God's involvement and interference in the course of events has been further developed in the course of time by certain Bible translators. Typical examples are found in the translations of Onkelos and Saadya Gaon to the Pentateuch. These translations do not hesitate at



the first two initial examples. The inner structure of the parenthetical clauses in this section, like in previous types, can be nominal clauses or verbal clauses with suffix conjugation verbs, but also simply regular narrative constructions, whose parenthetical nature is revealed only by observing their content: they can be defined as parenthetical units only functionally-pragmatically, not syntactically.

The first example is an explanation for the universal human practice where every man usually leaves his parents and joins a woman. The verse uses the explanatory narrative formula introduced by **עַל-כֵּן**. The inner construction of the parenthetical clause that occupies the first half of the verse is regularly verbal, involving a prefix conjugation verb, **יַעֲזֹב**. But note that this verb expresses habitual aspect, which is one of the roles of prefix conjugation verbs not introduced by a consecutive *wāw* in Biblical Hebrew.<sup>67</sup>

עַל-כֵּן יַעֲזֹב אִישׁ אֶת-אָבִיו וְאֶת-אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר—**Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother** and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh.”

The second example explains the general practice whereby the Israelites avoid eating a certain cut of meat called ‘the sinew of the hip.’ This verse likewise uses the explanatory narrative formula introduced by **עַל-כֵּן**, and it also contains the time co-ordinate phrase **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**, whose content is parenthetical in itself, since it refers to the scribe/narrator’s times. The inner structure of the parenthetical clause again displays a verbal clause involving a prefix verb conjugation, **יֹאכְלוּ**, and like the preceding example the prefix verb expresses habitual aspect. Scholars who concur with the classification of this example as a historical remark are Sternberg, who regards it as an exposition aimed at “temporal or cultural bridging,”<sup>68</sup> and Weingreen, who considers it “an editorial addendum, designed to link the established prohibition against the eating of this sinew with the legend of Jacob’s encounter with the angel.”<sup>69</sup>

<sup>67</sup> For the continuous and habitual role of prefix conjugation verbs see, e.g., *GKC* 1910:314–315, §107b,d,e and Joüon & Muraoka 2006:339–340, 113e,f,g. The use of prefix conjugation verbs for continuous and habitual aspect is found elsewhere in the Bible, e.g., Gen. 2:6—**וַיֵּאָדָר יַעֲלֶה מִן-הָאָרֶץ**—“But a mist went up from the earth.” See also, e.g., Rainey 1986:6–8, 1988:36–37, who refers to it as a tense, not an aspect, but recognizes that it expresses not just past but continuous past.

<sup>68</sup> Sternberg 1985:121.

<sup>69</sup> Weingreen 1957:150.

על-כן לא-יאכלו בני-ישראל את-גיד הנשה אשר על-כף הירך עד—Gen. 32:33—**Therefore to this day the Israelites do not eat the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh**, because he touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh on the sinew of the hip.”

The next four verses, Exod. 12:39–42, contain concluding remarks about the Exodus from Egypt. They open with a comment on the type of food eaten by the Israelites during the Exodus due to shortage of time for preparations: וַיֹּאפּוּ אֶת-הַבֶּצֶק אֲשֶׁר הוּצִיאוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם עֲגַת מִצּוֹת כִּי לֹא חָמֵץ בִּי-גֵרְשׁוֹ מִמִּצְרַיִם וְלֹא יָכְלוּ לְהַתְמַהֵמָה וְגַם-צִדָּה לֹא-עָשׂוּ לָהֶם. They continue by summing the length of the period in which the Israelites dwelt in Egypt, וּמוֹשָׁב בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשְׁבוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וָאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה. וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וָאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיְהִי בַעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה. וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וָאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיְהִי בַעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה. Finally, the text indicates the special practice, לַיְלַת שְׁמֵרִים, a night of watching, performed by the Israelites on a special memorial night dedicated to the Exodus from Egypt.

This last exposition is further divided into two parts, one noting that God held a night of watching while the Israelites left Egypt: לַיְלַת שְׁמֵרִים הָיָה בְּיֵצֵאוֹ מִצְרָיִם, and the other being a comment by the scribe or the narrator on a traditional practice developed by the Israelites after the Exodus from Egypt. That event is marked by a special night of watching: הוּא-הַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה לַלַּיְלַת שְׁמֵרִים לְכָל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. לַדֹּרֹתָם. This traditional practice, according to the scribe or the narrator has existed up to their own days. The second comment also includes a time co-ordinate referring to the scribe's or narrator's time, namely the prepositional phrase לַדֹּרֹתָם. This extensive summation of the Exodus from Egypt continues with a series of subsequent verses providing details about חֻקַּת הַפֶּסַח, the ordinance of the Passover.

Now, what may be considered parenthetical in these four verses? The first two verses seem to present only concluding historical information that is not parenthetical, while the two following verses, with their two clauses just outlined above, do seem to convey parenthetical information. Both these clauses are syntactically nominal, while the second also shows the structure of an appositional clause, reflected in its use of a third personal pronoun in first position, and in this way it adds information to the first. This last syntactic structure recalls other appositional clauses which add information to proper names, such as Gen. 14:3—עַמְקַת הַשְּׂדִימִים הוּא יָם הַמֶּלַח—“...the Valley of Siddim (that is, the Salt Sea),” or month names, such as 1 Kgs. 6:1—בְּשָׁנָה הָרְבִיעִית—“...in the fourth year



of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv, which is the second month....," discussed above in the relevant section.<sup>70</sup>

Exod. 12:39–42—לא—מִצוֹת בִּי לֹא—וַיֵּצֵאוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם עֲגַת מִצוֹת בִּי לֹא—וּמוֹשָׁב בְּנֵי חָמֶץ בִּי-גִרְשׁוֹ מִמִּצְרַיִם וְלֹא יָכְלוּ לְהִתְמַהֵמֶה וְגַם-צֶדֶה לֹא-עָשׂוּ לָהֶם. וַיְהִי מִקֶּץ שְׁלֹשִׁים יְשָׁנָה וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה. וַיְהִי מִקֶּץ שְׁלֹשִׁים יְשָׁנָה וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיְהִי בַעֲמֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יָצְאוּ כָל-עֲבָאוֹת ה' מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. לֵיל שְׁמֵרִים הוּא לֵה' לְהוֹצִיאָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם הוּא-הַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה לֵה' שְׁמֵרִים לְכָל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְדֹרֹתָם—“And they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they had brought out of Egypt, for it was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any provisions. The time that the people of Israel dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years. And at the end of four hundred and thirty years, on that very day, all the hosts of the LORD went out from the land of Egypt. **It was a night of watching by the LORD, to bring them out of the land of Egypt; so this same night is a night of watching kept to the LORD by all the people of Israel throughout their generations.**”

The next example deals with the consequences of Jephthah's vow to the Lord and the general practice of lamentations for his daughter which arose and spread after her death. The example includes a time co-ordinate, *מִיָּמִים יְמִימָה*, which reflects a habitual practice, and its syntax is first a regular narrative pattern and word order, as revealed in the clause *וַתְּהִי-חַק בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל* which opens with the *wayyiqtol* narrative verb. This clause is continued by another, opening with the temporal adverbial prepositional phrase *מִיָּמִים יְמִימָה* followed by a prefix conjugation verb *תִּלְכְּנָה*, which expresses a habitual situation.<sup>71</sup> Neither clause is circumstantial, nor deviates in its syntax from the main narrative, although the content of both is functionally-pragmatically external to the narrative sequence.

A syntactic connection between the two verses of this example, Judg. 11:39 and Judg. 11:40, is established in the *RSV* translation, in the *JPS*, and in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, where the second verse, *מִיָּמִים יְמִימָה תִּלְכְּנָה*, is set as a content clause in the role of subject of the clause *וַתְּהִי-חַק בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל*. This content clause is introduced by the subordinate particle ‘that’ in English and *وَأَنَّ* in Arabic, namely “And it became a custom in Israel that....,” accord-

<sup>70</sup> See §2.2.3 above.

<sup>71</sup> On the use of the prefix conjugation verbs for continuous and habitual tense see examples Gen. 2:24 and Gen. 32:33 above.

ing to the *RSV*, and... *فَصَارَتْ عَادَةً فِي إِسْرَائِيلَ أَنْ*, according to *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*. In the *RSV* translation a cataphoric empty pronoun ‘it’ precedes the content subject clause, and it serves as a formal subject, whose real content is expressed in the succeeding content clause.

Judg. 11:39–40—*וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ שְׁנַיִם חֳדָשִׁים וַתָּשֻׁב אֶל-אָבִיהָ וַיַּעַשׂ לָהּ אֶת-נִדְרוֹ—אֲשֶׁר נָדָר וְהִיא לֹא-יָדְעָה אִישׁ וַתְּהִי-חֹק בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל. מִיָּמִים יָמִימָה תִּלְכְּנָה בְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל לְחַנּוּת לְבַת-יִפְתָּח הַגִּלְעָדִי אַרְבַּעַת יָמִים בַּשָּׁנָה*—“And at the end of two months, she returned to her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had made. She had never known a man. **And it became a custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel went year by year to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in the year.**”

The next example is an explanation of the general practice of the priests of Dagon not stepping on the threshold of Dagon’s house, which is known right up to the time of the scribe or narrator. The external information thus describes a tradition and its historical origins. The verse also contains the phrase *עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה* which, as discussed below, is functionally-pragmatically parenthetical in itself, and it uses the explanatory narrative formula introduced by *עַל-כֵּן*, demonstrated in two prior examples in this section, Gen. 2:24 and Gen. 32:33. Syntactically it is again a verbal clause where the verb is a prefix conjugation verb expressing habitual aspect.

*עַל-כֵּן לֹא-יִדְרְכוּ כַהֲנֵי דַגּוֹן וְכָל-הַבָּאִים בֵּית-דַגּוֹן עַל-מַפְתָּן דַגּוֹן—בְּאַשְׁדּוֹד עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה*—“**This is why the priests of Dagon and all who enter the house of Dagon do not tread on the threshold of Dagon in Ashdod to this day.**”

The information in the next example, Ruth 4:7, describes the practice of sealing transactions by one party presenting shoes to the other. This practice is actually performed in the following verse, Ruth 4:8—*וַיֹּאמֶר וַיִּגְאֹל לְבָעִזוֹ קְנָה-לָךְ וַיִּשְׁלַף נַעְלוֹ*—“So when the next of kin said to Boaz, ‘Buy it for yourself,’ he drew off his sandal.” Contrary to the previous practices described above, this one is not said to be still current at the time of the scribe or narrator but ancient and apparently obsolete. The scribe or narrator feels a need to explain it to the readers or listeners, since it no longer exists. Like the previous examples, this one too contains a time co-ordinate, *וְזֹאת לְפָנַיִם*, except that it does not refer to the times of the scribe or narrator but to an earlier period.

The syntactic structure of this parenthetical remark has three clauses. The first is nominal, *וְזֹאת לְפָנַיִם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל-הַגְּאוּלָּה וְעַל-הַתְּמוּרָה*. The

second is verbal, initiated by an infinitival phrase expressing purpose and followed by two suffix conjugation verbs and their subject and objects, *לְקַיֵּם כָּל-דְּבַר שְׁלֹף אִישׁ נָעְלוּ וְנָתַן לְרַעְהוּ*. The third is nominal again, *וְזֹאת הַתְּעוּדָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל*. In all three cases there is a clear deviation from the main narrative line and structure.

Ruth 4:7—*וְזֹאת לְפָנִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל-הַגְּאֻלָּה וְעַל-הַחֲמוּדָה לְקַיֵּם כָּל-דְּבַר שְׁלֹף*—**“Now this was the custom in former times in Israel concerning redeeming and exchanging: to confirm a transaction, the one drew off his sandal and gave it to the other, and this was the manner of attesting in Israel.”**

The time co-ordinate *לְפָנִים* which appeared in the previous example reappears in the following one. The content is a little different from the previous examples as it deals not with ancient practice but with ancient lexicography. More specifically, it explains the meaning of an ancient term, *הַרְאָה*, which apparently, according to the scribe or narrator, is archaic. The syntax of this parenthesis is a verbal clause with the suffix conjugation verb of speech *אָמַר*, which is followed by the contents of the speech. These two are followed by a causal clause explaining the historical background of what seems in the time of the scribe or the narrator a strange use of words in this speech utterance. Note the parentheses set around these verses in the *RSV* translation, which indeed emphasize their being a parenthesis. Also note Sternberg’s correct observation that this example is an exposition meant for ‘temporal or cultural bridging.’<sup>72</sup>

1 Sam. 9:9—*לְפָנִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל כֹּה-אָמַר הָאִישׁ בְּלִקְתּוֹ לְדָרוֹשׁ אֱלֹהִים לָכֵן וְנִגְלָה*—**“(Formerly in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, he said, ‘Come, let us go to the seer’; for he who is now called a prophet was formerly called a seer.)”**

The parenthetical clauses in the following example are meant to explain to readers or listeners in a later period the situation in Bethel in earlier times. The historical nature of the parenthesis here is evident in the use of the time co-ordinate *בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם* twice, and even more prominently in the gap that the parenthetical information creates between the speech verb *וַיִּשְׁאַלְוּ* and the speech utterance preceded by the word introducing

<sup>72</sup> Sternberg 1985:121.

direct speech **לֵאמֹר**. In this the example resembles others such as 1 Sam. 22:9, 2 Sam. 21:2–3, and 1 Kgs. 12:10, which evince a twofold use of a verb of speech or a certain split in conveying speech content.

The present example and its like are treated above under §1.4 in a discussion of interrupted syntactical structures as possible parentheses in Biblical Hebrew, and more specifically in the discussion of the contribution of Miller to explaining these patterns as special types of quotative frames.<sup>73</sup> As to syntax, both clauses that form the parenthesis in this case are circumstantial and open with the conjunctive *wāw*, and their inner structure is nominal. Note again the parentheses in the *RSV* translation.

Judg. 20:27–28a—וַיִּשְׁאַלוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּה' וְשֵׁם אָרוֹן בְּרִית הָאֱלֹהִים בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם וּפִינָחִס בֶּן-אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן-אֶהֱרֹן עָמַד לְפָנָיו בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם לֵאמֹר הַאֲוֹסֶף עוֹד לְצֵאת לְמִלְחָמָה אֶם-אֶחָדָּל עִם-בְּנֵי-בְנִימִן אֲחֵי אִם-אֶחָדָּל  
 “And the people of Israel inquired of the LORD (for the ark of the covenant of God was there in those days, and Phinehas the son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, ministered before it in those days), saying, ‘Shall we yet again go out to battle against our brethren the Benjaminites, or shall we cease?’”

The next four examples present information about an ancient people and proper place names for readers living in the scribe’s or narrator’s times. In three of the four examples a time co-ordinate **לְפָנִים** is used. In the last example another time co-ordinate appears, namely **לְרֵאשִׁנָּה**. All four examples are circumstantial, with the inner structure of a nominal clause. In two examples the information is set in parentheses in the *RSV* translation, which thereby indicates their interpretation as parenthesis. Again, Sternberg’s approach which regards such information as an exposition meant for ‘temporal or cultural bridging’ conforms with the classification of this example as a historical remark.<sup>74</sup>

The first example refers to an ancient people and employs the time coordinate **לְפָנִים**.

Deut. 2:10—הָאֱמִיִּם לְפָנִים יָשְׁבוּ בָּהּ עִם גְּדוֹל וְרַב וְרַם כְּעֲנָקִים—“The Emim formerly lived there, a people great and many, and tall as the Anakim.”

The second example refers to an ancient place name and also employs the time coordinate **לְפָנִים**.

<sup>73</sup> Miller 1996:218–220, §4.4.2.

<sup>74</sup> Sternberg 1985:121. Sternberg mentions among other examples Judg. 19:10, which identifies the place name Jebus as Jerusalem.

Judg. 1:11—וַיֵּלֶךְ מִשָּׁם אֶל-יֹשְׁבֵי דְבִיר וְשָׁם-הָבִיר לְפָנִים קְרִית-סֶפֶר—“From there they went against the inhabitants of Debir. **The name of Debir was formerly Kiriath-sopher.**”

Similarly, the third example refers to an ancient proper place name and again employs the time coordinate לְפָנִים.

Judg. 1:23—וַיִּתְּרוּ בֵּית-יוֹסֵף בְּבֵית-אֵל וְשָׁם-הָעִיר לְפָנִים לוֹ—“And the house of Joseph sent to spy out Bethel. **(Now the name of the city was formerly Luz.)**”<sup>75</sup>

The fourth example refers once more to an ancient place name but, unlike the three previous examples it employs another time coordinate, namely לְרֵאשִׁיטָה.

Judg. 18:29—וַיִּקְרְאוּ שֵׁם-הָעִיר דָּן בְּשֵׁם דָּן אֲבִיהֶם אֲשֶׁר יוֹלַד לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְאוֹלָם—“And they named the city Dan, after the name of Dan their ancestor, who was born to Israel; **but the name of the city was Laish at the first.**”

### 2.3.6 *Examples Introducing Other Marginal Information*

The following examples contain circumstantial clauses which express information that is marginal or wholly irrelevant to the story line. These examples are unique in that their substance does not show any common features, and they do not conform to any of the instances in the previous sections. In certain cases, like Gen. 1:11–13 and Gen. 4:22, the marginal information might hint at other stories or pieces of information that the scribe or narrator assumes are known to the readers or listeners; still, these stories and pieces of information are not mentioned anywhere else in the Bible and are not familiar to us.

In contrast to the content of these clauses, their syntactic structure is similar to the majority of the examples in the previous sections: they are all circumstantial, initiated by the conjunctive *wāw*. Likewise, the clause patterns that form the inner structure of these circumstantial clauses can be nominal, existential, or verbal containing a suffix conjugation verb, and they sometimes also show word order inversion.

In the first example the scribe or narrator assumes that the target readers or audience have some knowledge of a territory whose name is Havilah and of its gold. This can be observed from the use of the

<sup>75</sup> For more references to examples with לְפָנִים see §3.2.2 below, and also Brin 1986:53–54, 1995:7–15.



the order subject–predicate, in contrast to the chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs, וַיִּתֵּן and וַיֹּאמֶר, surrounding it.

Exod. 11:3—בְּאֶרֶץ—מֵאֵד מִצְרַיִם גַּם הָאִישׁ מֹשֶׁה גָדוֹל מְאֹד בְּאֶרֶץ—וַיִּתֵּן ה' אֶת-חַן הָעַם בְּעֵינֵי מִצְרַיִם גַּם הָאִישׁ מֹשֶׁה גָדוֹל מְאֹד בְּאֶרֶץ—“And the LORD gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians. **Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants and in the sight of the people.**”

The inversion in word order and the initial position of the subject in the circumstantial clause of this verse is more clearly emphasized by Saadya Gaon’s choosing in his translation to shape it in the pattern of extraposition, in which the subject is isolated by the phrase *أَمَّا... ف*: פִּאֲעֵטָא אֱלֵלָה אֱלֵקוֹם חֲטִיאָא עֲנַד אֱלִמְצִרְיִין וְאִמָּא מוֹסִי אֱלִרְסוֹל פִּעֲטִים גִּדָּא פִי גִמִיע בִּלְד מִצְר עֲנַד קוֹאֵד פִּרְעוֹן וְעֲנַד אֱלִקוֹם. The Geez translation similarly employs a demonstrative pronoun to introduce Moses and to highlight his position at the beginning of the clause: *ወዚ ስጊሱ.../wa-zə bəʾəsi Muse... literally: “...and this man, Moses,...”*

The parenthetical information inserted into the next example can be interpreted as telling us that the Israelites were capable of fighting when they left Egypt, and the decision of God to change their course was not based on their inability to fight. In that case the example below could be considered explanatory, or at least as contributing to the background of the story. But since the meaning of this example and the reason for its insertion in this place are not entirely clear, it is placed in this section, and not in §2.3.1, dedicated to background information.

Again, the syntactic pattern of this clause is circumstantial, yet it is composed of a verbal clause, not a nominal one. Nevertheless, in contrast to the regular narrative chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs in first position, the verb in this case is a suffix conjugation verb in second position, following its subject. As stated before, this type of verbal clause is also common in introducing parenthetical clauses into the story. The deviation of this clause from the main narrative is further marked in the *JPS* translation by its introduction with the word ‘now’: “Now the Israelites went up armed out of the land of Egypt,” and by opening with it a new paragraph.<sup>78</sup> The *RSV* has the more literal translation of a conjunctive *wāw*.

<sup>78</sup> As noted by the *JPS* the meaning of *הַמְשִׁים* is uncertain (*JPS*:105, note d). This term appears three more times in the Bible: Josh. 1:14, 4:12, and Judg. 7:11. In all cases its meaning seems to be related to preparations for war or situations related to

Exod. 13:18—וַיִּסַּב אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָעָם דְּרֹד הַמִּדְבָּר יַם-סוּף וַחֲמֹשִׁים עָלוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל—מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם—“But God led the people round by the way of the wilderness toward the Red Sea. **And the people of Israel went up out of the land of Egypt equipped for battle.**”

In the next example the circumstantial clause provides information as to the nature and taste of the unfamiliar food called מַן introduced to the Israelites in the desert. This information is additional and marginal to the story line told by a chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs. The inner structure of this circumstantial clause is a nominal clause in the order subject–predicate, so it obviously deviates syntactically from the main narrative clauses opening with *wayyiqtol* forms.

Exod. 16:31—וַיִּקְרְאוּ בֵּית-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-שְׁמוֹ מִן וְהוּא כֹרֶע גַּד לְבָן וְטַעְמוֹ—כְּצַפְיֹחַ בְּרֶבֶשׂ—“Now the house of Israel called its name manna; **it was like coriander seed, white, and the taste of it was like wafers made with honey.**”

The last example in this section, occurring in verse 16 of Exod. 32:15–16 presented below, includes a circumstantial clause which describes the nature of the tables brought down by Moses from the mountain. This circumstantial clause follows two previous circumstantial clauses in verse 15, and each of them is attributed to a specific noun that serves as its head. The first is וַיִּשְׁנֵי לַחַת הָעֵדוּת בְּיָדוֹ and it is attributed to Moses. The second is מִשְׁנֵי עֲבֹרֵיהֶם מִזֶּה וּמִזֶּה הֵם כְּתוּבִים and it is attributed to the tables. Contrary to these two, the two circumstantial clauses of verse 16, like all others that provide parenthetical information, are not attributed either to any specific noun or to the entire previous clause. Quite the contrary: they are independent clauses adding extra information to the whole story. The inner syntactic pattern of these circumstantial clauses is nominal, involving extraposition in the order subject–predicate. This nominal pattern stands again in contrast to the regular *wayyiqtol* verb–subject word order typical of the narrative flow.

Exod. 32:15–16—וַיִּפֹּן וַיֵּרֵד מֹשֶׁה מִן-הָהָר וַיִּשְׁנֵי לַחַת הָעֵדוּת בְּיָדוֹ לַחַת כְּתוּבִים—וַיִּשְׁנֵי עֲבֹרֵיהֶם מִזֶּה וּמִזֶּה הֵם כְּתוּבִים. וְהַלַּחַת מַעֲשֵׂה אֱלֹהִים הָמָּה וְהַסְּכָתָב מִכְּתָב—“And Moses turned, and went down from the mountain with the two tables of the testimony in his hands, tables that were written on both sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. **And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables.**”

war. *BDB* (*BDB*:332b) also indicates Num. 32:17, where the word חֲשִׁים is found with a similar meaning, and it can probably be related by emendation. Again, the *JPS* indicates that the meaning of this word is uncertain (*JPS*:264, note a).





## CHAPTER THREE

### PARENTHETICAL WORDS AND PHRASES

External information which does not form a complete clause, but is present within a clause or introduces a clause, is mostly expressed in words and phrases that syntactically cannot be regarded as full parenthetical expressions. Most of them are various types of relatively restricted and even fossilized phrases, narrative formulas, and certain adverbs and adverbial phrases. The last-named are either adverbs syntactically connected to individual clause parts or they refer to the sentence as a whole, namely to the predicative relation itself, and accordingly they are identified as ‘sentence adverbials.’<sup>1</sup> These types of words and phrases therefore do not conform to the syntactic definitions of a real full parenthesis, which is expected to show syntactic independence and disconnection. Nonetheless, we are by now acquainted with a broader and more flexible definition of parenthesis which recognizes as belonging to this category patterns which are strictly parenthetical in structure but also those which convey parenthetical content in patterns that can otherwise be interpreted as syntactically attached to other sentence parts.

This broad definition of parenthesis leaves no real common denominator for the examples discussed in this chapter except that they all contain short units of information with content that belongs outside the clause in which it appears. Since the main issue in the description of these words and phrases is the nature of their content, they are mostly presented as limitedly parenthetical, namely only from a functional-pragmatic standpoint, which is sensitive to context. The content also impacts the classification of the examples assembled in this chapter, so they are divided into two primary groups and into subgroups according to context. One of the two basic sections is words and phrases referring to a speaker, an observer’s identity, God’s standpoint, appeal and plea, and addresses, and epistemic modal adverbials. These types have no

---

<sup>1</sup> On the role of sentence adverbials in describing the predicative relation see Goldenberg 1985:186, §17.

real positive common denominator apart from giving extra information. They are put together to differentiate them, as non-narrative formulas, from the second of the two sections, namely specific narrative formulas in the form of time co-ordinates.

### 3.1 EXTERNAL EXPRESSIONS REFERRING TO A SPEAKER, AN OBSERVER'S IDENTITY OR AN INDIVIDUAL STANDPOINT, EPISTEMIC MODAL ADVERBIALS, APPEAL AND PLEA, AND ADDRESS

These expressions do not belong syntactically or contextually to one group. The examples below are gathered in one section because of their distinctiveness from other external expressions that display narrative formulas related to time, that is, narrative time co-ordinates. The only feature common to the examples in this section is their expression of extra information, namely they share only functional-pragmatic characteristics. The inner classification in this section is based on the type of extra information displayed in the examples; the sub-classification of each type similarly rests on common content-related features. Whenever a subtype of words and phrases resembles a subtype of clauses discussed in the preceding chapter the same heading is chosen, that is, 'reference to a speaker' and 'appeal and plea,' which might be expressed by full clauses or by certain words and phrases.

#### 3.1.1 *Reference to a Speaker*

The following examples are phrases which break the narrative to indicate a speaker: *בְּדַבֵּר ה'*, *בְּדַבְרִי*, *בְּדַבְרֵי*, and *נְאֻם ה'*, *עַל-פִּי/אֶל-פִּי ה'*, *עַל-פִּי*. By content the expressions generally belong to the domain of speech expressions. When speech verbs are used for this function, instead of speech nouns, speech expressions acquire the structure of a clause, and were accordingly treated in §2.1.1 above.<sup>2</sup> In fact, the separation of references to a speaker by clauses from references to a speaker by

---

<sup>2</sup> On the linguistic debate over the syntactic status of verbs of speech, believing, thinking, etc., and their parenthetical contents and status, see Lyons 1977:738, Hopper & Traugott 2003:207–209, §7.5.3. See also Hand 1993 who discusses the possible omission of 'that' before English indirect speech and its significance for syntax. Hand is aware of the distinction between indirect speech propositions with 'that,' which introduces embedded constructions, and others without 'that,' whose speech expression should be interpreted as parenthetical. Though Hand tries to minimize the need to differentiate between the syntax of these two constructions, he distinguishes them pragmatically.

words and phrases is somewhat artificial contextually. It is applied here because of the linguistic interest in separating all types of parenthetical clauses from all types of parenthetical words and phrases.

This slight artificiality is well reflected in Bible translations. The renderings of the expressions below that mention the speaker, including the *RSV* translations given for all the examples, might use clauses where the original Hebrew has phrases, or the reverse, haphazardly. This freedom supports the assumption that phrases and clauses alike referring to a speaker provide similar parenthetical information. In either case the information rendered by the expressions is external to the story line, so functionally-pragmatically at least it can be considered parenthetical.

Phrases like *כְּדַבֵּר* and *כְּדַבְרֵי* seem to be adverbial in syntax as they open with the comparative particle *כְּ*, and they should be regarded as non-obligatory complements of the predicate. Since one sign of parenthetical units is their ability to take any position in a clause, that position should be noted.<sup>3</sup> That both initial and final position are occupied by these phrases in the examples below is significant, though initial position is rarely found (it perhaps occurs in Josh. 8:8 below). Moreover, since the middle position is not attested, these phrases do not seem to enjoy complete freedom, and they tend to prefer one position in the word order, the final, to the others.

The phrase *נְאֻם ה'* appears to be truly parenthetical both syntactically and functionally-pragmatically.<sup>4</sup> Syntactically, as expected from parenthetical units, it does not depend on any clause part, nor does it function as an adverbial complement. It enjoys complete freedom of position: initial, middle, or final. Though *כְּדַבֵּר ה'* and *נְאֻם ה'* differ in the degree of their parenthetical status they may still reveal great resemblance. In the example of 2 Kgs. 9:26 below, both appear in one verse and fulfill similar functional-pragmatic roles. This example supports the assumption that though the two speech references differ in syntax they are functionally-pragmatically similar.

Similar information is conveyed by the prepositional phrase *עַל-פִּי*, and its variant *אֶל-פִּי*. It occurs in references to God as well as other

<sup>3</sup> Free position of parenthetical units is indicated by Ziv 1985:182–183 among others.

<sup>4</sup> On the phrase *נְאֻם ה'*, its distribution and meaning, see Baumgärtel 1961.

characters, and it also has a parenthetical content. Its syntax is less clear: it has no fixed position in the clause and it is an independent phrase, yet it can also be understood as a non-obligatory complement of a predicate serving an adverbial role, hence as dependent.

Other expressions and constructions related to the foregoing exist, namely *כְּכַתּוּב* and *כְּכַתּוּב וְכַל הַחַיּוֹן הַזֶּה*. The last, *כְּכַתּוּב*, “according to what is written/as it is written,” refers to a written document rather than a speech. All these are presented and discussed below. Also briefly discussed is a related speech pattern which contains *כְּדַבֵּר* as part of a larger comparative construction, *כְּדַבֵּר ... בְּן ...*. This pattern is again similar to a clause pattern made of *כְּדַבֵּר ... בְּן ...*, discussed in §2.1.1.2 and §2.1.1.4 above, and likewise it might belong to the sphere of deontic modality, when involving subjective affirmation, especially in direct speech.

Because a considerable number of examples refer to God as a speaker, these form a subsection of their own, separate from speech expressions that refer to other characters.

### 3.1.1.1 *Examples Mentioning God as the Speaker*

#### 3.1.1.1.1 Examples with *כְּדַבֵּר ה'*

In the following example the phrase *כְּדַבֵּר ה'* appears in initial position. Other examples of the initial position are of the type *כְּדַבֵּר ... בְּן ...*, but as this pattern is demonstrated only with speakers other than God it is discussed only in the next section. As noted above, Bible translations reflect the similarity between clauses and phrases referring to a speaker in that they might differ in the construction they use for the translation of the same original, a clause or a phrase. Among our translations the *RSV*, the *JPS*, and the Geez translate the prepositional phrase *כְּדַבֵּר ה'* in the verse below by a clause; *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, *Targum Jonathan* and the *Peshitta* prefer a prepositional phrase. Such a difference between the various translations might occur in the subsequent examples as well.

Josh. 8:8—*וְהָיָה כִּתְפֹשֶׁכֶם אֶת-הָעִיר תִּצְיִתוּ אֶת-הָעִיר בְּאֵשׁ כְּדַבֵּר ה'*  
 —*תַּעֲשׂוּ רְאוּ צִוִּיתִי אֶחְכֶּם*—“And when you have taken the city, you shall set the city on fire, **doing as the LORD has bidden; see, I have commanded you.**”

In the next example the phrase *כְּדַבֵּר ה'* appears in final position. Here the phrase is extended by a relative clause *אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֶת-יְהוָה*, which

refers to the individual transmitting God's words. As we will see in the ensuing examples, **כְּדַבַּר ה'** is normally extended in this way.

Josh. 8:27—**וְשָׁלַל הָעִיר הַהִיא בָּזוּזוּ לָהֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּדַבַּר ה' אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֶת-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ**—“Only the cattle and the spoil of that city Israel took as their booty, **according to the word of the LORD which he commanded Joshua.**”

The next example again demonstrates the phrase **כְּדַבַּר ה'** followed by a relative clause, **אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר-לוֹ**, referring to the prophet mentioned in the beginning of the verse.

1 Kgs. 13:26—**וַיִּשְׁמַע הַנְּבִיא אֲשֶׁר הָשִׁיבוּ מִן-הַדֶּדֶךָ וַיֹּאמֶר אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים—הוּא אֲשֶׁר מָרָה אֶת-פִּי ה' וַיִּתְּנֶהוּ ה' לְאַרְיֵה וַיִּשְׁבְּרֶהוּ וַיִּמָּתֶהוּ כְּדַבַּר ה' אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר-לוֹ**—“And when the prophet who had brought him back from the way heard of it, he said, ‘It is the man of God, who disobeyed the word of the LORD; therefore the LORD has given him to the lion, which has torn him and slain him, **according to the word which the LORD spoke to him.**’”

1 Kgs. 14:18 below displays once more the phrase **כְּדַבַּר ה'**, and it is once more extended by a relative clause, **כְּדַבַּר ה' אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד-עַבְדּוֹ אַחִיָּהוּ**, referring to the prophet who transferred the words of God.

1 Kgs. 14:18—**וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ וַיִּסְפְּדוּ-לוֹ כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּדַבַּר ה' אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד-עַבְדּוֹ אַחִיָּהוּ הַנְּבִיא**—“And all Israel buried him and mourned for him, **according to the word of the LORD, which he spoke by his servant Ahijah the prophet.**”

In the next example **כְּדַבַּר ה'** follows the main verb **וַיָּמָת**, and it is again extended by a relative clause, **אֲשֶׁר-דִּבֶּר אֵלָיו**, referring to Elijah as transmitting God's words.

2 Kgs. 1:17—**וַיָּמָת כְּדַבַּר ה' אֲשֶׁר-דִּבֶּר אֵלָיו וַיִּמְלֹךְ יְהוֹרָם תַּחְתָּיו בְּשָׁנָת—שָׁתַיִם לַיהוֹרָם בֶּן-יְהוֹשָׁפָט מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה כִּי לֹא-הָיָה לוֹ בֶּן אֲשֶׁר-דִּבֶּר אֵלָיו**—“So he died **according to the word of the LORD which Elijah had spoken.** Jehoram, his brother, became king in his stead in the second year of Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, because Ahaziah had no son.”

Not just **כְּדַבַּר ה'** but **כְּדַבַּר ה' אֵלָיו** appears in the following example, once more accompanied by a relative clause, **אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד-עַבְדּוֹ**, mentioning the prophet by whom God sent his words.



below.<sup>6</sup> Note too that like the *RSV*, the *JPS* translation, Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation, *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the Geez translation, Onkelos, and the *Peshitta* use a clause to translate **נְאֻם־ה'** in this verse instead of a noun phrase: "...the Lord declares...", **يَقُولُ الرَّبُّ**, **יְקוּל אֱלֹהִים**, **ይቤ እግዚአብሔር** / *yabe 'Agzi'abəher*, **אָמַר**, and **אָמַר מָרְיָא** / *āmar māryā*, respectively.

Gen. 22:16—**וַיֹּאמֶר בִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי נְאֻם־ה' כִּי יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וְיָדִידְךָ אֶת־בְּנִיךָ אֶת־שִׁכְתְּךָ אֶת־בְּנִיךָ**—“And he said, ‘By myself I have sworn, **says the LORD**, because you have done this, and have not withheld your son, your only son.’”

Again, in the next example **נְאֻם־ה'** is part of an oath, and in this case the whole utterance is attributed to God. Also, **נְאֻם־ה'** appears immediately after the opening oath formula, **חִי־אֲנִי**, separating it from the oath content. A clause, "...says the Lord...", appears in the *JPS* translation, similarly to the *RSV* translation. A clause, **יְקוּל אֱלֹהִים** / **يَقُولُ الرَّبُّ**, appears in the Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*. Likewise, a clause, **ይቤ እግዚአብሔር** / *yabe 'Agzi'abəher*, appears in the Geez translation, a clause, **אָמַר**, appears in Onkelos, and a clause, **אָמַר מָרְיָא** / *āmar māryā*, appears in the *Peshitta*. All these clauses replace the original Hebrew noun phrase **נְאֻם־ה'**.

Num. 14:28—**אָמַר אֱלֹהִים חִי־אֲנִי נְאֻם־ה' אִם־לֹא כִּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּם בְּאָזְנֵי כֹן אֶעֱשֶׂה לְכֶם**—“Say to them, ‘As I live,’ **says the LORD**, ‘what you have said in my hearing I will do to you.’”

The remaining examples are utterances attributed to God. The phrase **נְאֻם־ה'** might appear at the beginning of the utterance, as in the first appearance in 1 Sam. 2:30, it can follow an adverb and separate it from the following clause as in the second appearance in 1 Sam. 2:30, it may be in the middle of an utterance, as in Jer. 1:19, and it may be in final position as in 2 Kgs. 19:33 and 2 Kgs. 22:19 below. This flexibility in word order of **נְאֻם־ה'** is a prominent sign of its being a full parenthesis from a functional-pragmatic and from a linguistic-syntactic standpoint.

<sup>6</sup> References to this phrase in prophetic language are numerous, e.g., Isa. 14:22, 17:6, 30:1, Jer. 2:3,9,12, 31:34,37,38.



The phrase **נָאֵם-ה'**, in apposition to the name of God **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, introduces the word of God in first half of the next verse, and intervenes between the adverb **וְעַתָּה** and the word of God in the second half of the verse.

1 Sam. 2:30—**לְכֹן נָאֵם-ה' יִשְׂרָאֵל אָמַר אֶמְרָתִי בֵּיתָךְ וּבֵית אָבִיךָ—**“Therefore **the LORD the God of Israel declares**: ‘I promised that your house and the house of your father should go in and out before me for ever’; but now **the LORD declares**: ‘Far be it from me; for those who honor me I will honor, and those who despise me shall be lightly esteemed.’”

**נָאֵם-ה'** signifies the end of the word of God in the following example.

2 Kgs. 19:33—**בְּדֶרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר-יָבֵא בָּהּ יָשׁוּב וְאֶל-הָעִיר הַזֹּאת לֹא יָבֵא נָאֵם-ה'—**“By the way that he came, by the same he shall return, and he shall not come into this city, **says the LORD**.”

Next, **נָאֵם-ה'** again marks the conclusion of the word of God.

2 Kgs. 22:19—**יַעַן כִּדְ-לִבְבְּךָ וַתִּכְנַע מִפְּנֵי ה' בְּשָׁמַעְךָ אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי עַל-הַמָּקוֹם—**הַזֶּה וְעַל-יִשְׁבִּיּוֹ לַהֲיוֹת לְשִׁמָּה וְלִקְלָלָהּ וַתִּקְרַע אֶת-בְּגָדֶיךָ וַתִּבְכֶּה לְפָנַי וְגַם אָנֹכִי שָׁמַעְתִּי **נָאֵם-ה'**—“Because your heart was penitent, and you humbled yourself before the LORD, when you heard how I spoke against this place, and against its inhabitants, that they should become a desolation and a curse, and you have rent your clothes and wept before me, I also have heard you, **says the LORD**.”

In the next example **נָאֵם-ה'** separates the nominal clause **אֲנִי אֶתָּךְ** from its extension by a construct infinitive complement expressing purpose, **לְהַצִּילְךָ**.

Jer. 1:19—**וְנִלְחַמוּ אֵלֶיךָ וְלֹא-יִוָּכְלוּ לָךְ כִּי-אֶתָּךְ אֲנִי נָאֵם-ה' לְהַצִּילְךָ—**“They will fight against you; but they shall not prevail against you, for I am with you, **says the LORD**, to deliver you.”

An example with both **נָאֵם ה'** and **כְּדָבַר ה'** side by side in the same verse is the following, 2 Kgs. 9:26. The two appearances of **נָאֵם ה'** take part in swearing by the name of God as evident from the use of a negative conditional clause beginning **אִם-לֹא**.<sup>7</sup> The phrase **כְּדָבַר ה'** refers to an

<sup>7</sup> For oath formulas in Biblical Hebrew including those containing negative conditional clauses see §2.1.4 above, and, e.g., *GKC* 1910:471–472, §149, Joüon & Muraoka 2006:582–584, §165, and Azar 1981:11–38.

order by the wish of God: וְעֵתָהּ שָׂא הַשְּׁלֵכְהוּ בַחֲלֵקָה. The *RSV* omits one of the Biblical Hebrew occurrences of הַנְּאֻם ה'.

2 Kgs. 9:26—ה' אִם-לֹא אֶת-דְּמֵי נְבוֹת וְאֶת-דְּמֵי בָנָיו רָאִיתִי אִמְשׁ הַנְּאֻם-ה' וְשִׁלַּמְתִּי לְךָ בַחֲלֵקָה הַזֹּאת נְאֻם-ה' וְעֵתָהּ שָׂא הַשְּׁלֵכְהוּ בַחֲלֵקָה כְּדָבָר ה'—“As surely as I saw yesterday the blood of Naboth and the blood of his sons—**says the LORD**—I will requite you on this plot of ground. Now therefore take him up and cast him on the plot of ground, **in accordance with the word of the LORD.**”

### 3.1.1.1.3 Example with הַנְּאֻם ה' / אֶל-פִּי ה'

The following examples usually illustrate a specific speech or command attributed to God, and frequently a less specific utterance, but to what seems to be a recollection and fulfillment of God's will. In all cases the functional-pragmatic role of the prepositional phrases הַנְּאֻם ה' and אֶל-פִּי ה' is parenthetical. The free position of these phrases within the clauses in which they appear, which is initial, middle, or final, makes their parenthetical status more prominent from a linguistic-syntactic standpoint.

In the next example the phrase הַנְּאֻם ה' appears in the middle of the whole verse, but at the end of the clause וַיִּסְעוּ כָל-עֵדֻת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּדְבַּר-סִינַי לְמִסְעֵיהֶם, which conveys a previous command attributed to God. Therefore, the syntactic position of הַנְּאֻם ה' here should probably be considered final.

Exod. 17:1—וַיִּסְעוּ כָל-עֵדֻת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּדְבַּר-סִינַי לְמִסְעֵיהֶם אֶל-פִּי ה'—“All the congregation of the people of Israel moved on from the wilderness of Sin by stages, **according to the commandment of the LORD**, and camped at Rephidim; but there was no water for the people to drink.”

The following example demonstrates again the occurrence of the phrase הַנְּאֻם ה' in final position.

Lev. 24:12—וַיִּנְחֲלוּהוּ בַמִּשְׁמֶר לְפָרֹשׁ לָהֶם אֶל-פִּי ה'—“And they put him in custody, till **the will of the LORD** should be declared to them.”<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The *RSV* translation correctly conveys the content of the clause, but deviates from the Hebrew syntax, which uses a construct infinitive and a prepositional clause referring to God.

In contrast to the previous examples, Num. 3:16 demonstrates a middle position of *עַל-פִּי ה'*, though the clause extension following it, *בְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה*, is in fact another reference to God as responsible for the act of counting by Moses.

Num. 3:16—*וַיִּפְקֹד אֹתָם מֹשֶׁה עַל-פִּי ה' בְּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה*—“So Moses numbered them **according to the word of the LORD**, as he was commanded.”

Another example which clearly reveals middle position of *עַל-פִּי ה'* is Num. 3:39.

Num. 3:39—*כָּל-פְּקוּדֵי הַלְוִיִּם אֲשֶׁר פָּקַד מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן עַל-פִּי ה' לְמִשְׁפַּחְתָּם*—“All who were numbered of the Levites, whom Moses and Aaron numbered **at the commandment of the LORD**, by families, all the males from a month old and upward, were twenty-two thousand.”

Next, *עַל-פִּי ה'* appears twice, each time referring to a different clause. Its position is initial both times.

Num. 9:18—*עַל-פִּי ה' יִסְעוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל-פִּי ה' יִחַנו כָּל-יְמֵי אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכֹּן*—“**At the command of the LORD** the people of Israel set out, and **at the command of the LORD** they encamped; as long as the cloud rested over the tabernacle, they remained in camp.”<sup>9</sup>

Another apparent middle position is shown next, where *עַל-פִּי ה'* separates Moses' declaration conveying God's command to the Israelites, *וַיֵּצֵא וַיִּצְוֶה*, from the following infinitive, *לֵאמֹר*, which introduces the direct speech of the command.

Num. 36:5—*וַיֵּצֵא מֹשֶׁה אֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל-פִּי ה' לֵאמֹר כִּן מַטֵּה בְנֵי-יוֹסֵף*—“And Moses commanded the people of Israel **according to the word of the LORD**, saying, “The tribe of the sons of Joseph is right.””

The following example contains the phrase *אֶל-פִּי ה'*, which is fully equivalent in content to *עַל-פִּי ה'*. Again, the Hebrew version reveals middle position of *אֶל-פִּי ה'*, and the extension of the verse that follows it is in apposition to the sentence component that precedes it.

<sup>9</sup> This phrase is especially common in Numbers, and see other examples in Num. 3:51, 4:37,41,45,49, 9:20,23, 10:13, 13:3, 33:2,38, 36:5.

Josh. 15:12—**וּלְכֹלֵב בֶּן-יִפְנֶה נָתַן חֶלֶק בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי-יְהוּדָה אֶל-פִּי ה' לַיהוֹשֻׁעַ**—**According to the commandment of the LORD to Joshua**, he gave to Caleb the son of Jephunneh a portion among the people of Judah, Kiriath-arba, that is, Hebron (Arba was the father of Anak)."

**אֶל-פִּי ה'** appears in the next verse too, again in middle position, between the verb **וַיִּתֵּן** and its direct object **נַחֲלָה**. Here its parenthetical content refers to God, but also to his messenger Joshua: **אֶל-פִּי ה' לַיהוֹשֻׁעַ**.

Josh. 17:3—**וַתִּקְרַבְנָה לִפְנֵי אֶלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן וּלְפָנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן-נּוּן וּלְפָנֵי הַנְּשִׂאִים**—**לֵאמֹר ה' צִוָּה אֶת-מֹשֶׁה לְתֵת-לָנוּ נַחֲלָה בְּתוֹךְ אַחֵינוּ וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם אֶל-פִּי ה' נַחֲלָה**—**They came before Eleazar the priest and Joshua the son of Nun and the leaders, and said, 'The LORD commanded Moses to give us an inheritance along with our brethren.'** So **according to the commandment of the LORD** he gave them an inheritance among the brethren of their father."

Another example, showing initial position of **עַל-פִּי ה'**, is the following.

Josh. 19:49—**עַל-פִּי ה' נָתַנוּ לוֹ אֶת-הָעִיר אֲשֶׁר שָׁאַל אֶת-תִּמְנַת-סֶרַח בְּהַר**—**בְּיָמֵינוּ אֶת-הָעִיר וַיֵּשֶׁב בָּהּ**—**אֶפְרַיִם וַיְבַנֶּה אֶת-הָעִיר וַיֵּשֶׁב בָּהּ**—**By command of the LORD** they gave him the city which he asked, Timnath-serah in the hill country of Ephraim; and he rebuilt the city, and settled in it."

**אֶל-פִּי ה'** appears in the next example of Josh. 21:2, again in middle position, between a verb **וַיִּתְּנוּ** and its direct object **אֶת-הָעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה** and **וְאֶת-מִגְרָשֵׁיהֶן**.

Josh. 21:2—**וַיִּתְּנוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל לְלוֹוִיִּם מִמִּנְחֹתָם אֶל-פִּי ה' אֶת-הָעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה**—**וְאֶת-מִגְרָשֵׁיהֶן**—**So by command of the LORD** the people of Israel gave to the Levites the following cities and pasture lands out of their inheritance."

**עַל-פִּי ה'** reappears in the following example in the final position. The parenthetical content refers to God and his messenger Moses.

Josh. 22:8—**וַיָּשׁוּבוּ וַיָּלְכוּ בְנֵי-רְאוּבֵן וּבְנֵי-גַד וַחֲצֵי שִׁבְטِ הַמְּנַשֶּׁה מֵאֶת בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִשְׁלָה אֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ-כְּנָעַן לְלֶכֶת אֶל-אֶרֶץ הַגִּלְעָד אֶל-אֶרֶץ אַחֲזַתָּם**—**אֲשֶׁר נִאֲחֲזוּ-בָהּ עַל-פִּי ה' בְּיַד-מֹשֶׁה**—**So the Reubenites and the Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh returned home, parting from the people of Israel at Shiloh, which is in the land of Canaan, to go to the land of Gilead, their own land of which they had possessed themselves by command of the LORD through Moses.**"

The last example has *על-פי ה'* in the initial position. Its parenthetical information seems to express a reference to God as responsible for the fate of Jehoiakim and Judah, like the parenthetical clauses collected as expressing theological remarks and discussed in §2.3.4 above. This example is mentioned there along with similar clauses and phrases referring to the fate of Judah in verses 2–4 of 2 Kgs. 24.

2 Kgs. 24:3—*אָךְ עַל-פִּי ה' הִיָּתְתָה בִיהוּדָה לְהִסִּיר מֵעַל פְּנֵיו בְּחַטָּאת מַנְשֵׁה—כָּבַל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה*—“Surely this came upon Judah **at the command of the LORD**, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he had done.”

### 3.1.1.2 *Examples with Other Speakers*

The following examples demonstrate the use of the phrase *בְּדָבָר*, including its appearance in the comparative pattern *... כֵּן ... בְּדָבָר*, and the phrase *על-פי*. The discussion ends with a few constructions referring not to individuals but to spoken words, written documents, and similar content. These are treated here because of their similarity in structure and content to the other constructions in this section. Again, as in previous examples referring to God in §3.1.1.1.1 above, Bible translations differ in their choice of pattern for the translation of the prepositional phrase *בְּדָבָר*: sometimes a full clause involving prediction and sometimes only a phrase.

#### 3.1.1.2.1 *Examples with בְּדָבָר*

The phrase *בְּדָבָר* accompanied by a name of a speaker generally serves as a parenthesis which refers to the name of a speaker. However, in a few cases, like Gen. 47:30 and Num. 14:20 below, it might also contain a modal nuance of affirmation or submission, which belong to the realm of deontic modality. This modal nuance contributes to the treatment of this phrase as a parenthetical unit, since modal nuances often appear in parentheses.

The first example shows the prepositional phrase *בְּדָבָר* with a 2nd person suffix in the form *בְּדָבָרְךָ*. It stands in initial position and introduces an address followed by a direct speech. Syntactically, this phrase in the whole clause is of independent status. It is not a complement of the following components or any other clause part, and it might be understood as a one-member clause expressing parenthesis, external to whatever follows.

1 Kgs. 20:4—וַיַּעַן מֶלֶךְ-יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר כְּדַבַּרְךָ אֲדֹנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵךְ אֵינִי לִי וְכָל-אֲשֶׁר-לִי  
 O king, I am yours, and all that I have.”

The one-member clause status, just a possibility in the foregoing structure, is the only possible interpretation in the next example. Here it appears again in speech and as a reply to another speaker, and it is clearly detached from the following purpose clause לְמַעַן תִּדַּע כִּי-אֵין בּוֹ אֱלֹהִינוּ.

Exod. 8:6—וַיֹּאמֶר לְמֹחֵר וַיֹּאמֶר כְּדַבַּרְךָ לְמַעַן תִּדַּע כִּי-אֵין בּוֹ אֱלֹהִינוּ—“And he said, ‘Tomorrow.’ Moses said, ‘**Be it as you say**, that you may know that there is no one like the LORD our God.’”

In the next example, Gen. 30:34, as in all the other examples below, the prepositional phrase כְּדַבַּר is set in final position. The *RSV* renders it by a clause: “... as you have said.”

Gen. 30:34—וַיֹּאמֶר לָבָן הֲזֶן לִי יְהִי כְּדַבַּרְךָ—“Laban said, ‘Good! Let it be **as you have said**.’”

The next example again shows כְּדַבַּר in final position. This time it does not stand by itself but is continued by the name of the speaker, Joseph, but also by a relative clause, אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר. This relative clause repeats the fact that the preceding action is executed according to the word of Joseph. The duplication of this content also involves a repetition in the use of the root דב, once in a noun, דָּבָר, and once in a verb, דִּבֶּר, creating alliteration. Relative clauses often form such repetitions and alliterations in Biblical Hebrew, and this means is considered typical of biblical style.<sup>10</sup>

Gen. 44:2—וְאֶת-גְּבִיעֵי גְבִיעַ הַכֶּסֶף תָּשִׂים בְּפִי אֲמַתְחַת הַקֶּטָן וְאֶת כֶּסֶף יוֹסֵף אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר  
 “And put my cup, the silver cup, in the mouth of the sack of the youngest, with his money for the grain.”  
 And he did **as Joseph told him**.”

The next example displays once more כְּדַבַּר in final position, and it is employed here to mention a certain speaker, but also as an affirmation that his death wish and command, cited in the first half of the verse,

<sup>10</sup> On these repetitions see Peretz 1967:146–148, §15.

will be executed. This additional meaning incorporates a nuance of deontic modality.

Gen. 47:30—**וְשָׁכַבְתִּי עִם-אֲבוֹתַי וְנִשְׂאָתֹנִי מִמִּצְרַיִם וְקִבְרָתִנִּי בְּקִבְרָתָם וַיֹּאמֶר—**“... But let me lie with my fathers; carry me out of Egypt and bury me in their burying place.’ He answered, ‘I will do **as you have said.**’”

The position of **כְּדָבַר** should also be regarded final in the following example, since it follows and concludes the clause **וַיַּעַשׂ ה’**.

Exod. 8:9—**וַיַּעַשׂ ה’ כְּדָבַר מֹשֶׁה וַיָּמָתוּ הַצְּפַרְדְּעִים מִן-הַבָּתִּים מִן-הַחֲצֵרוֹת וּמִן-הַשָּׂדֵה**—“And the LORD did **according to the word of Moses**; the frogs died out of the houses and courtyards and out of the fields.”

The function of **כְּדָבַר** in the next example seems again to involve more than just indicating a speaker’s name. In this case God acquiesces to the Moses’ plea to forgive the Israelites’ sins, so **כְּדָבַר** might be understood as carrying a nuance of deontic modality related to a plea.

Num. 14:20—**וַיֹּאמֶר ה’ סְלַחְתִּי כְּדָבָרְךָ**—“Then the LORD said, ‘I have pardoned, **according to your word.**’”

The phrase **כְּדָבַר-גָּד**, which appears in the next example, recalls a certain prophecy revealed through the prophet Gad.

2 Sam. 24:19—**וַיַּעַל דָּוִד כְּדָבַר-גָּד כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ה’—**“So David went up **at Gad’s word**, as the LORD commanded.”

The following verse describes certain activities of a widow whom the prophet Elijah chanced to meet on his way to a place called Zarephath. The phrase **כְּדָבַר אֱלִיָּהוּ** here might be regarded as standing in middle position, because it appears in the middle of a chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs, **וַתֵּלֶךְ, וַתֹּאכַל, וַתַּעֲשֶׂה, וַתֵּלֶךְ**. On the other hand, the third verb, **וַתֹּאכַל**, might also be understood as opening a second clause, detailing the type of activities done by the widow.

1 Kgs. 17:15—**וַתֵּלֶךְ וַתַּעֲשֶׂה כְּדָבַר אֱלִיָּהוּ וַתֹּאכַל הוּא הִיא-וְהִיא וְהוּא—**“And she went and did **as Elijah said**; and she, and he, and her household ate for many days.”

The following phrase **כְּדָבַר אֱלִישָׁע אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר**, like the majority of the examples so far, is in final position, and as in Gen. 44:2 above it involves alliteration by repetition of the root **דב** in the subsequent relative clause. Its meaning refers to a prophecy, **וַיֹּאמֶר כֹּה-אָמַר ה’ רַפְּאֵתִי לְמִים**,

הַאֵלֶּה לֹא-יְהִיֶּה מִשֶּׁם עוֹד מָוֶת וּמִשְׁכָּלֶת, which is mentioned in the previous verse and spoken by Elisha in the name of God.

2 Kgs. 2:22—וַיִּרְפוּ הַמַּיִם עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כְּדִבְרֵי אֱלִישָׁע אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר—“So the water has been wholesome to this day, **according to the word which Elisha spoke.**”

כְּדִבְרֵי again appears in middle position in the next verse, but seems to conclude the first clause, *וַיֵּרֶד וַיִּטְבַּל בִּירְדֵּן שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים*, while the following verb, *וַיֵּשֶׁב*, appears to open a second clause which describes the consequence of the activities indicated in the first.

2 Kgs. 5:14—וַיֵּרֶד וַיִּטְבַּל בִּירְדֵּן שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים כְּדִבְרֵי אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּשָׂרוֹ—“So he went down and dipped himself seven times in the Jordan, **according to the word of the man of God**; and his flesh was restored like the flesh of a little child, and he was clean.”

The last example shows *כְּדִבְרֵי* in final position. Again God fulfills the request of an individual, in this case the prophet Elisha.

2 Kgs. 6:18—וַיִּרְדּוּ אֱלֹוֵי וַיַּחַפְּלֵל אֱלִישָׁע אֶל-ה' וַיֹּאמֶר הֲדָ-נָא אֶת-הַגּוֹי-הַזֶּה בְּסַנּוּרִים—“And when the Syrians came down against him, Elisha prayed to the LORD, and said, ‘Strike this people, I pray thee, with blindness.’ So he struck them with blindness **in accordance with the prayer of Elisha.**”

### 3.1.1.2.2 The Pattern ... כְּדִבְרֵי ... בְּ

The ensuing examples contain a pattern with a reference to a speaker and with an affirmation that his words will be executed. It is constructed either of *... כְּדִבְרֵי ... בְּ* or of a full clause *כְּכָל אֲשֶׁר / כְּאֲשֶׁר* *בְּ*. The examples with a full clause, discussed in §2.1.1.2 and §2.1.1.4 above, include references to God as the speaker or to other characters. When this pattern appears in direct speech, both types, phrase and clause, belong to the realm of deontic modality, since they convey a subjective affirmation expressed by the speaker. As for word order flexibility, contrary to our expectations of parenthetical phrases the prepositional phrase *כְּדִבְרֵי* always appears in initial position in the following examples.

The first example is a direct speech which is part of the dialogue between Joseph and his brothers in the cycle of the Joseph stories. The speech utterance is made by Joseph to his brothers, accepting their offer to become his slaves should he find the stolen money in their possessions.



Gen. 44:10—וַיֹּאמֶר גַּם-עִתָּהּ כְּדַבְרֵיכֶם כִּן-הוּא אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצָא אֹתוֹ יְהִי-לִי עֶבֶד—וְאַתֶּם תְּהִיוּ נְקִיִּים—“He said, **Let it be as you say**: he with whom it is found shall be my slave, and the rest of you shall be blameless.”

The next example again has the phrase ... כִּן ... כְּדַבְרֵי in direct speech. The speech utterance contains only this phrase, and it is said by Rahab confirming the suggestion made by the two Israelite spies hidden in her house that she mark her window with a scarlet cord to save her life.

Josh. 2:21—וַתֹּאמֶר כְּדַבְרֵיכֶם כִּן-הוּא וַתְּשַׁלְּחֵם וַיֵּלְכוּ וַתְּקַשֵּׁר אֶת-תְּקוּנַת הַשָּׁנִי בַחֲלוֹן—“And she said, **According to your words, so be it**.’ Then she sent them away, and they departed; and she bound the scarlet cord in the window.”

Another example of the phrase ... כִּן ... כְּדַבְרֵי in direct speech is the following. However, contrary to the previous example this time ... כְּדַבְרֵי ... כִּן appears in a larger pattern of an oath. The oath-introducing formula is הִי יְהִיָּה שְׂמֵעַ בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ, and it is followed by the negative conditional pattern אִם-לֹא, which conveys positive intentions.<sup>11</sup> The oath frame in which the phrase ... כִּן ... כְּדַבְרֵי appears confirms its deontic modal meaning and its function as a strong affirmation.

Judg. 11:10—וַיֹּאמְרוּ זִקְנֵי-גִלְעָד אֶל-יִפְתָּח הִי יְהִיָּה שְׂמֵעַ בֵּינוֹתֵינוּ אִם-לֹא כְּדַבְרֶיךָ—וַיִּשְׁמָע—“And the elders of Gilead said to Jephthah, **The LORD will be witness between us; we will surely do as you say**.’”

Contrary to all other examples in this section, which are direct speech, the following is not part of a speech utterance but of the narrative. ... כִּן ... כְּדַבְרֵי is the general frame of a content which concludes a preceding prophecy revealed to the prophet Nathan by God, and it mentions that the revelation was eventually transmitted by Nathan to King David.

2 Sam. 7:17—כָּל-הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וְכָל-הַחֲזוֹן הַזֶּה כִּן דִּבֶּר נָתָן—אֶל-דָּוִד—“**In accordance with all these words, and in accordance with all this vision, Nathan spoke to David**.”

The last example again displays direct speech. Nevertheless, contrary to the examples involving direct speech in Gen. 44:10, Josh. 2:21, and

<sup>11</sup> Again, for more on oath formulas in Biblical Hebrew including negative conditional clauses see §2.1.4 above, and, e.g., *GKC* 1910:471–472, §149, Joüon & Muraoka 2006:582–584, §165, and Azar 1981:11–38.

Judg. 11:10 above, which convey affirmation regarding a future event, in 2 Sam. 13:35 below the phrase ... בְּנֵי ... בְּדָבָר confirms a contemporary situation, since it refers to what Jonadab perceives in the very moment of his speech.

2 Sam. 13:35—וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹנָדָב אֶל-הַמֶּלֶךְ הִנֵּה בְנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ בָּאוּ כְּדָבָר עַבְדְּךָ כֵּן-הִיא—“And Jonadab said to the king, ‘Behold, the king’s sons have come; **as your servant said, so it has come about.**’”

### 3.1.1.2.3 Examples with על-פי

Similarly to the findings for על-פי הַ and אֶל-פִּי הַ in §3.1.1.1.3 above, the following examples show that the prepositional phrase על-פי does not have a fixed position in the clause. Again, the original Hebrew word order is not always kept in the *RSV*, and the position of על-פי might be different from that in the original. Such rendering suggests that the *RSV* interprets על-פי as a parenthesis. Here too, Bible translations might occasionally translate this phrase by a clause, e.g., the Geez translation of Gen. 45:21 below by በከመ ይህሉ ፈርዖን / *bakama yabelo Far'on*—“... as Pharaoh told him...”

In the first example the phrase על-פי פְּרָעָה appears in the middle, between two verbal clauses opening with a similar verb, וַיִּתֵּן, and sharing one subject, Joseph.

Gen. 45:21—וַיַּעֲשׂוּ-בֶן בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּתְּנוּ לְהֵם יוֹסֵף עֲגֻלוֹת עַל-פִּי פְּרָעָה וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם צָדָה לַדֶּרֶךְ—“The sons of Israel did so; and Joseph gave them wagons, **according to the command of Pharaoh**, and gave them provisions for the journey.”

Another middle position is demonstrated in the following example, where a series of attributives to פְּקוּדֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן is split by this phrase.

Exod. 38:21—אֵלֶּה פְּקוּדֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן מִשְׁכַּן הָעֵדוּת אֲשֶׁר פָּקַד עַל-פִּי מֹשֶׁה עֲבַדְתָּ—“This is the sum of the things for the tabernacle, the tabernacle of the testimony, as they were counted **at the commandment of Moses**, for the work of the Levites under the direction of Ithamar the son of Aaron the priest.”

Next, the phrase על-פי אֶהְרֹן וּבְנָיו is set in initial position, introducing a verbal clause.

Num. 4:27—עַל-פִּי אֶהְרֹן וּבְנָיו תְּהִיָּה כָּל-עֲבֹדַת בְּנֵי הַגֵּרְשֹׁנִי לְכָל-מִשְׁאֵם וְלִכְל-מִשְׁאֵם—“All the service of the sons of the Gershonites shall be **at the command of Aaron and his**

sons, in all that they are to carry, and in all that they have to do; and you shall assign to their charge all that they are to carry.”

Initial position is found in the next example as well. Although the phrase *על-פי* occurs in the middle of the verse, *על-פי* is in initial position in the second clause: *על-פי שני עדים או על-פי שלשה-עדים*: *יקום דבר לא-יקום עד אחד באיש לכל-עון ולכל-חטאת*. This is probably for pragmatic reasons, namely the content is almost certainly brought up first, in opposition to the content of the preceding negative clause, *בכל-חטא אשר יחטא*. Still, the possibility to change the position of this phrase is typical of parenthetical units.

Deut. 19:15—*לא-יקום עד אחד באיש לכל-עון ולכל-חטאת בכל-חטא אשר יחטא*—*על-פי שני עדים או על-פי שלשה-עדים יקום דבר*—“A single witness shall not prevail against a man for any crime or for any wrong in connection with any offense that he has committed; **only on the evidence of two witnesses, or of three witnesses**, shall a charge be sustained.”<sup>12</sup>

In the following verse too a pragmatic factor probably causes the phrase *ועל-פיהם* to stand in initial position, as a logical predicate of the clause *ועל-פיהם יהיה כל-ריב וכל-נגע* in which it appears. The initial position of this phrase is parallel to the initial position of the direct object *בם* in the preceding clause: *כי בם בחר ה' אלהיך לשרתו ולברך בשם ה'*.

Deut. 21:5—*ונגשו הכהנים בני לוי כי בם בחר ה' אלהיך לשרתו ולברך בשם ה'*—*ועל-פיהם יהיה כל-ריב וכל-נגע*—“And the priests the sons of Levi shall come forward, for the LORD your God has chosen them to minister to him and to bless in the name of the LORD, and **by their word** every dispute and every assault shall be settled.”

The example in 2 Sam. 13:32 below displays the phrase *על-פי אבשלום* once more in initial position, and once more for pragmatic reasons, since the clause *כי-על-פי אבשלום היתה שומה מיום ענתו את תמר ויאמר אל-יאמר אדני את* stands in opposition to the second preceding clause, *כל-הנערים בני-המלך המיתו*, and functions as a causal clause of the preceding clause *כי-אמנון לבדו מת*.

2 Sam. 13:32—*ויען יונדב בן-שמעה אחי-דוד ויאמר אל-יאמר אדני את כל-הנערים בני-המלך המיתו כי-אמנון לבדו מת כי-על-פי אבשלום היתה שומה מיום ענתו את תמר אחתו*—“But Jonadab the son of Shimeah, David’s brother, said, ‘Let

<sup>12</sup> See a closely similar example in Deut. 17:6.

not my lord suppose that they have killed all the young men the king's sons, for Amnon alone is dead, for **by the command of Absalom** this has been determined from the day he forced his sister Tamar.”

The phrase **עַל-פִּי פָרְעָה** in the last example in this section appears in final position. Although in the middle of the verse, it concludes the clause to which it belongs: **אֵד הָעֵרִיד אֶת-הָאָרֶץ לְתֵת אֶת-הַכֶּסֶף עַל-פִּי פָרְעָה**.

2 Kgs. 23:35—**וְהַכֶּסֶף וְהַזָּהָב נָתַן יְהוֹיָקִים לְפָרְעָה אֵד הָעֵרִיד אֶת-הָאָרֶץ לְתֵת אֶת-הַכֶּסֶף עַל-פִּי פָרְעָה** אִישׁ כְּעָרְכוֹ נָגַשׁ אֶת-הַכֶּסֶף וְאֶת-הַזָּהָב אֶת-עַם פָּרְעָה—“And Jehoiakim gave the silver and the gold to Pharaoh, but he taxed the land to give the money **according to the command of Pharaoh**. He exacted the silver and the gold of the people of the land, from every one according to his assessment, to give it to Pharaoh Neco.”

#### 3.1.1.2.4 Reference to Spoken Words

In all the previous examples the reference expressed by the prepositional phrase **עַל-פִּי** indicates an individual. In the following examples the reference is to the spoken words themselves.

In the first example the prepositional phrase **עַל-פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה** refers to a specific speech utterance in the first half of the verse. The phrase is similar to references illustrated in the preceding section, which include **עַל-פִּי** followed by an individual name or a reference to an individual, but its content is slightly different. In the following case **עַל-פִּי** refers to two questions posed in the first half of the verse, **הָעוֹד אַחַךְ וְנָגַד-לוֹ עַל-פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה**, and it denotes a reply as well as a reference. As to word order, the phrase **עַל-פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה** stands in final position in the clause **וְנָגַד-לוֹ עַל-פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה**.

Gen. 43:7—**וַיֹּאמְרוּ שְׂאוֹל שְׂאוֹל-הָאִישׁ לָנוּ וְלִמּוֹלְדָתָנוּ לֵאמֹר הָעוֹד אַבְיָכֶם חַי ה' אֵת-אַחֵיכֶם לָכֶם אַחַךְ וְנָגַד-לוֹ עַל-פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה הַיְדוּעַ גִּדַּע בִּי יֹאמֵר הוֹרִידוּ אֶת-אַחֵיכֶם**—“They replied, ‘The man questioned us carefully about ourselves and our kindred, saying, ‘Is your father still alive? Have you another brother?’ What we told him was **in answer to these questions**; could we in any way know that he would say, ‘Bring your brother down?’”

The second example contains two references which involve **עַל-פִּי**. One refers to a speech utterance, **הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר יִגִּידוּ לָךְ**, the other to instructions, **הַמְשַׁפֵּט אֲשֶׁר-יֹאמְרוּ לָךְ** and **הַתּוֹרָה אֲשֶׁר יוֹרִיד**. The two references differ in word order. The first is in middle position, the second in initial position.



These examples do not really belong to the sphere of speech references, and they are given only because their structure is similar to previous examples. The phrases below that involve על-פי, like previous examples with this phrase, demonstrate flexible clausal position.

In the first example the phrase על-פי אשר תשיג יד הנדר occurs in first position. Since the clause introduced by this phrase, יעריכנו הבהן, repeats the content of the preceding clause, והעריך אתו הבהן, we can safely assume that its role is to set the phrase על-פי אשר תשיג יד הנדר in initial position. This position allows the phrase על-פי אשר תשיג יד הנדר to fulfill a pragmatic function of a logical predicate in the clause it introduces.

Lev. 27:8—ואם-מך הוא מערכך והעמידו לפני הבהן והעריך אתו הבהן על-פי—“And if a man is too poor to pay your valuation, then he shall bring the person before the priest, and the priest shall value him; **according to the ability of him who vowed** the priest shall value him.”

In the next verse the phrase על-פי השנים הנותרות עד שנת היבל appears in middle position.

Lev. 27:18—ואם-אחר היבל יקדיש שדהו וחשב-לו הבהן את-הכסף על-פי השנים—“but if he dedicates his field after the jubilee, then the priest shall compute the money-value for it **according to the years that remain until the year of jubilee**, and a deduction shall be made from your valuation.”

Initial position is demonstrated once more with על-פי הגורל in the last example.

Num. 26:56—על-פי הגורל תחלק נחלתו בין רב למעט—“Their inheritance shall be divided **according to lot** between the larger and the smaller.”

### 3.1.1.2.5 Reference to Written Documents

Contrary to the examples cited in §3.1.1.2.3 above, where על-פי refers to an individual, and §3.1.1.2.4, where על-פי mainly refers to spoken words, the following examples refer to certain written documents. These references are not conveyed by the phrase על-פי but through

—“These are the numbers of the divisions of the armed troops, who came to David in Hebron, to turn the kingdom of Saul over to him, **according to the word of the LORD.**”

a phrase beginning כְּכַתּוּב—“...according to what is written/as it is written.” These examples are syntactically and functionally-pragmatically related to all examples discussed so far that refer to speakers or to spoken words.

However, while the earlier examples display non-obligatory complements or parenthetical units which play integral part in the narrative or discourse embedded in the narrative, the next example might suggest another interpretation. The complement or parenthetical unit of the following verse, כְּכַתּוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר-צִוָּה ה' לֵאמֹר לֹא-יּוֹמְתוּ אָבוֹת, עַל-בְּנֵים וּבָנִים לֹא-יּוֹמְתוּ עַל-אָבוֹת כִּי אִם-אִישׁ בְּחַטָּאוֹ יָמוּת יוֹמַת seems most likely a remark by the scribe or the narrator, aimed at explaining a deviation from an expected common practice. It is an aside explaining why Amaziah, the son of Joash, refrained from killing the descendents of his father's killers. Although long, this remark is syntactically a phrase, not a clause, because it starts with a prepositional phrase initiated by the comparative preposition כִּי, and the clauses that follow are embedded in this prepositional phrase. As to word order, this phrase stands in final position.

2 Kgs. 14:6— וְאֵת-בְּנֵי הַמְּכִים לֹא הִמִּית כְּכַתּוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת-מֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר-צִוָּה ה' לֵאמֹר לֹא-יּוֹמְתוּ אָבוֹת עַל-בְּנֵים וּבָנִים לֹא-יּוֹמְתוּ עַל-אָבוֹת כִּי אִם-אִישׁ בְּחַטָּאוֹ יָמוּת יוֹמַת —“But he did not put to death the children of the murderers; **according to what is written in the book of the law of Moses, where the LORD commanded, ‘The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, or the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall die for his own sin.’**”

The phrase כְּכַתּוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה in the next example might also be a comment by the scribe or narrator. It follows a reference to a speaker, כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה עֶבֶד-ה' אֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, thus affirming twice, orally and in a written document, the content of the command. As to word order, the phrase כְּכַתּוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה might be regarded as standing in middle position, following a reference to a speaker and introducing the other part of the verse. Another possibility is to regard כְּכַתּוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה as standing in initial position, since its syntactic status is equal to that of the preceding reference to the speaker, אֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and both can be regarded as two coordinated sentence members sharing similar syntactic status. In any event, this position differs from the final position demonstrated in the previous example, 2 Kgs. 14:6; clearly, phrases opening with כְּכַתּוּב enjoy freedom of position.

Josh. 8:31—בְּאֶשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה עֶבֶד-ה' אֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּכָתוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה—מִזְבַּח אֲבָנִים שְׁלֵמוֹת אֲשֶׁר לֹא-הֵנִיף עָלֶיהֶן בְּרִזָּל וַיַּעֲלוּ עָלָיו עֹלוֹת לַה' וַיִּזְבְּחוּ שְׁלָמִים—“As Moses the servant of the LORD had commanded the people of Israel, **as it is written in the book of the law of Moses**, ‘an altar of unhewn stones, upon which no man has lifted an iron tool’; and they offered on it burnt offerings to the LORD, and sacrificed peace offerings.”

In contrast to the previous example, the middle position is definitely found in the next, which, however, differs from the preceding two in that the phrase *בְּכָתוּב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה* is in direct speech, and therefore is not a later addition by the scribe or the narrator but an integral part of the utterance.

1 Kgs. 2:3—וְשָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת-מִשְׁמַרְתּוֹ ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְלַכֵּת בְּדַרְכָּיו לְשָׁמֵר חֻקֹּתָיו מִצְוֹתָיו וּמִשְׁפָּטָיו וְעֵדוּתָיו כְּכָתוּב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה לְמַעַן תִּשְׁכַּל אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה וְאֵת שְׁמֵי אֱשֶׁר תִּפְנֶה שָׁם—“And keep the charge of the LORD your God, walking in his ways and keeping his statutes, his commandments, his ordinances, and his testimonies, **as it is written in the law of Moses**, that you may prosper in all that you do and wherever you turn.”

Another case of direct speech is found in the following example, where *עַל סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית הַזֶּה* is within the utterance and in final position.

2 Kgs. 23:21—וַיֹּצֵא הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת-כָּל-הָעָם לֵאמֹר עֲשׂוּ פֶסַח לַה' אֱלֹהֵיכֶם כְּכָתוּב עַל-סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית הַזֶּה—“And the king commanded all the people, ‘Keep the passover to the LORD your God, **as it is written in this book of the covenant.**’”

### 3.1.2 *Observer's Identity*

This section covers prepositional phrases *הַלְפָּנַי ה'* / *אֶת פָּנַי ה'* / *בְּעֵינַי ה'*, which identify God or any other character as approving or judgmental observers. These phrases convey modal asides to the clause in which they appear, so at least functionally-pragmatically they deserve to be treated as a borderline type of parenthesis. The syntactic status of these phrases, however, is more problematic and less clear.<sup>14</sup> Phrases like *הַלְפָּנַי ה'* and *אֶת פָּנַי ה'* can be regarded as adverbial non-obligatory predicate complements or as parenthetical units.

<sup>14</sup> Livnat, for instance, classifies these phrases as a separate group sharing certain qualities with adverbs and others with parenthetical units; see, e.g., Livnat 1994a.



The prepositional phrase pattern ‘בְּעֵינַי + a proper name or its replacement’ shows characteristics of an idiom, and it is often restricted to being combined with adjectival verbs constructed from **יִשֵּׁר**, **מִצָּא חֵן**, **טוֹב**, **רַע**, and the like. Such combinations form a single syntactic unit. More significantly, as part of an idiom, even to a relatively limited degree, the phrase ‘בְּעֵינַי + a proper name or its replacement’ does not usually enjoy freedom of position in a clause, and since the idiom as a whole contains both the predicate and its complement the phrase ‘בְּעֵינַי + a proper name or its replacement’ is an obligatory adverbial complement to the predicates it accompanies. Accordingly, the prepositional phrase ‘בְּעֵינַי + a proper name or its replacement’ cannot be regarded as independent, hence as possibly parenthetical, syntactically.

Now, what can we learn from Bible translations about the syntactic status of these prepositional phrases and how far they can be considered parenthetical units? Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translation, in the examples for which it is available, renders most of these phrases in connection with God’s name, namely **בֵּין**, **בְּעֵינַי ה**, **אֶת פְּנֵי ה**, **לְפָנַי ה**, by one phrase, **בֵּין ... יְדִי**, and those without God’s name by the prepositions **עַלִּי** or **עִנְד**. These uniform translations reveal Saadya Gaon’s interpretation of all these prepositional phrases as similar in meaning and probably also as having similar syntactic function.

The Geez translation of the Octateuch is relatively uniform in this matter too. It mostly renders **בְּעֵינַי**, **לְפָנַי**, **אֶת פְּנֵי ה**, **לְפָנַי ה**, in combination with God’s name or other names, by the prepositions **በጳድመ** / *ba-qadma*, ‘in front of’. Once the Geez translation employs instead the preposition **በገራ** / *bahāba*—‘in the presence of’ (in Deut. 24:3 below), whose meaning is similar; once it uses the preposition **ለ** / *la*, ‘to’ (in Gen. 34:18); and once, where both **לְפָנַי** and **בְּעֵינַי** occur in the same verse (Gen. 20:15 below), both **በጳድመ** / *ba-qadma* and **በገራ** / *hāba*, a short form of **በገራ** / *bahāba*, appear. Onkelos’ translation for this last example also employs two distinct prepositions: Aramaic **קדם** for **לְפָנַי** and Aramaic **בעיני** for **בְּעֵינַי**; at first sight this might look literal and fixed. The latter translation in this case might similarly be due to the wish to provide two distinct translations for **לְפָנַי** and **בְּעֵינַי**, especially since **לְפָנַי** holds a physical meaning in this verse, and **בְּעֵינַי** does not.

The distribution of the Aramaic translations in Onkelos is somewhat more complicated. While the common translation of Onkelos for **לְפָנַי ה**, **לְפָנַי**, **אֶת פְּנֵי ה**, **בְּעֵינַי ה** is in all cases by the particle **קדם**, the particle **בעיני** seems to be the preferred translation for all examples

in which **בְּעֵינַי** appears beside individuals other than God (examples of which are displayed in 3.1.2.2.2 below). This twofold translation of **בְּעֵינַי**, when it appears with the name of God or of another individual, by **קדם** and **בעיני** respectively, might suggest that the latter is avoided in reference to God in order to refrain from anthropomorphism. Exactly the same choices are made by *Targum Jonathan* of the former prophets, which usually employs **קדם** for **לְפָנַי** and for **בְּעֵינַי** accompanied by the name of God, and prefers **בעיני** for all examples in which it is attached to individuals other than God.

Identical particles also appear in the *Peshitta*, though the differentiation between them in reference to God or other individuals is not as apparent. In any case, all Aramaic translations examined for this book, that is, Onkelos, *Targum Jonathan*, and the *Peshitta*, reveal only two possible translations, and hence should be regarded, like Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation and the Geez translation, as uniform. To conclude so far, Saadya Gaon's translation, the Geez translation, Onkelos, *Targum Jonathan*, and the *Peshitta* all interpret **הַ לְפָנַי** / **הַ אֶת פָּנַי** / **לְפָנַי**, **בְּעֵינַי** **הַ**, and **בְּעֵינַי** as generally similar in meaning and use.

Some Bible translations do not conform to this interpretation. *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* offers more diverse translation possibilities, using a variety of prepositions in combination with God's name or names of other individuals for the prepositional phrases **הַ לְפָנַי** / **הַ אֶת פָּנַי** / **לְפָנַי**. The most common preposition is **أَمَامَ**, in Gen. 6:11, 19:13, Num. 15:15, Deut. 6:25, and 1 Sam. 20:1 below; also **لَدَى** in Gen. 7:1 and Deut. 24:3 below, and **قَدَامَ** in Josh. 6:26 below. The prepositional phrases **בְּעֵינַי** 'הַ and **בְּעֵינַי** + a name of another individual are translated literally in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* by the preposition **فِي عَيْن**. Analogous variety exists in the *RSV* and *JPS* translations. These translations, then, reflect a more flexible and manifold interpretation of **הַ לְפָנַי** / **הַ אֶת פָּנַי** / **לְפָנַי**, **בְּעֵינַי** **הַ**, and **בְּעֵינַי**. Examples and discussion of these prepositional phrases are presented in the series of sub-sections following.

### 3.1.2.1 *Examples with הַ לְפָנַי / לְפָנַי and the Like*

Note first that the phrase **לְפָנַי** might mean a genuine physical appearance before God or any other individual; such cases are irrelevant and are excluded from the present discussion. What then remains for consideration? What might still be considered relevant for a possible parenthetical interpretation from a syntactic or at least functional-pragmatic standpoint?

Only one type of prepositional phrases involving לְפָנָי might be regarded as belonging to the realm of parenthesis, namely that where the phrase לְפָנָי mentions a subjective viewpoint expressed by God or any other individual regarding a situation, an event, certain qualities, or certain conduct. This latter non-physical meaning is common as regards God in the combination הַ לְפָנָי, but it is relatively rare in reference to individuals other than God. As we can learn from the only example displaying this option, 1 Sam. 20:1 below, the interpretation of the phrase לְפָנָי followed by a reference to an individual as conveying a subjective opinion might be amenable to a physical interpretation as well. In any event, of the examples discussed next only this one might display a non-physical interpretation by a phrase involving לְפָנָי and an individual other than God. All other phrases refer to the subjective viewpoint of God by the combination הַ לְפָנָי.

What can we learn this time from Bible translations? The English *RSV* and *JPS*, the Arabic of Saadya Gaon and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the Geez, and the Aramaic of Onkelos, *Targum Jonathan*, and the *Peshitta* all translate הַ לְפָנָי and לְפָנָי followed by an individual other than God with prepositional phrases which generally express a basic physical meaning. These translations do not readily support the interpretation of these phrases as expressing God's or another individual's viewpoint, so the Hebrew phrases themselves as well as their rendering in translation should be considered as reflecting a continuous process of a semantic shift. The basic physical meaning passes to a more mental one involving deontic modality.

Syntactically the prepositional phrases הַ לְפָנָי, לְפָנָי followed by an individual name, and the like, are non-obligatory sentence components. With a physical meaning they should probably be considered adverbial, but when they convey a subjective viewpoint, namely a non-physical meaning involving deontic modality, they can be treated as parenthetical units as well.

In the first example, although the phrase לְפָנָי הָאֱלֹהִים may carry no more than a simple physical meaning it can also be interpreted as indicating God's viewpoint on the state of corruption described in the verse. In that case, this is a type of parenthesis both syntactically and functionally-pragmatically. Syntactically a non-obligatory sentence component composed of a prepositional phrase can play an adverbial or a parenthetical role, and functionally-pragmatically it inserts a subjective opinion on a situation, hence conforms to the nuance of modality which is frequently embedded in parenthesis.



abomination **before the LORD**, and you shall not bring guilt upon the land which the LORD your God gives you for an inheritance.”

The next example has the phrase **לפני ה'** within an oath containing a curse. Again, this phrase conveys a non-physical meaning of **לפני**, since God is called on as responsible for executing the curse. **לפני ה'** is set between the head, **הָאִישׁ**, and its attributive clause ... **וְבָנָהּ**, although it can be regarded as an adverbial of **אָרָוּר**. This less obvious interrupted position of **לפני ה'** might support a parenthetical interpretation of this phrase.

Josh. 6:26—**וַיִּשָׁבַע יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּעַת הַהֵיאָלָא לֵאמֹר אָרוּר הָאִישׁ לְפָנַי ה' אֲשֶׁר יָקוּם וּבָנָהּ**—**אֶת-הָעִיר הַזֹּאת אֶת-יְרִיחוֹ בְּבָכְרוֹ יִסְדְּנָהּ וּבְצַעֲרוֹ יִצִּיב דְּלָתֶיהָ**—“Joshua laid an oath upon them at that time, saying, ‘Cursed **before the LORD** be the man that rises up and rebuilds this city, Jericho. At the cost of his first-born shall he lay its foundation, and at the cost of his youngest son shall he set up its gates.’”<sup>15</sup>

A similar non-physical meaning appears in the following example, in which instead of the more common prepositional phrase **לפני ה'** another preposition, **אֶת**, is in use in the prepositional phrase **אֶת-לפני ה'**. Similarly to Gen. 6:11 above, God’s opinion on corrupt conduct is expressed by the phrase **אֶת-לפני ה'**.

Gen. 19:13—**כִּי-מִשְׁחָתִים אֲנַחְנוּ אֶת-הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי-גְדֹלָה צַעֲקַתָּם אֶת-לפני ה'**—**וַיִּשְׁלַחַנוּ ה' לְשַׁחֲתָהּ**—“For we are about to destroy this place, because the outcry against its people has become great **before the LORD**, and the LORD has sent us to destroy it.”

All the examples above carry the meaning ‘before God’ as a non-physical appearance, actually reflecting God’s opinion. This meaning is generally absent in references to other individuals in the Bible. Still, the following example, 1 Sam. 20:1, might present such a meaning in the phrase **חַטָּאתַי לְפָנַי אָבִיךָ**—“What is my sin before your father.” The phrase **לפני** can be interpreted here both as non-physical and physical. The non-physical interpretation is possible, and **חַטָּא לפני** might

<sup>15</sup> More references are Gen. 10:9, Num. 18:19, Deut. 24:12, 1 Sam. 26:19. Note also a related meaning in the idiom **לפני ה' הלך**, which does not necessarily mean physical walking before God but a certain relation to God and behavior which God favors, in, e.g., Gen. 17:1, 24:40, 48:15, 1 Sam. 2:30,35. For such a meaning see, e.g., *BDB* 236a. See a similar meaning with **הלך** in, e.g., 1 Kgs. 2:4, 3:6, 8:23.

mean ‘to sin against someone according to his opinion’. The physical interpretation is also possible in this case since it speaks of David who used to spend time with Saul, and this activity is described in the Bible through the term *לָפְנֵי* in other verses, that is, 1 Sam. 16:21—*וַיָּבֹא דָוִד*—“And David came to Saul, **and entered his service**. And Saul loved him greatly, and he became his armor-bearer,” 1 Sam. 16:22—*וַיִּשְׁלַח שָׂאוּל אֶל-יֵשׁוּי לֵאמֹר*—“And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, ‘**Let David remain in my service**, for he has found favor in my sight’,” and 1 Sam. 19:7—*וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹנָתָן לְדָוִד וַיַּגִּד-לוֹ יְהוֹנָתָן אֵת כָּל-הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה*—“And Jonathan called David, and Jonathan showed him all these things. And Jonathan brought David to Saul, and he was **in his presence** as before.” Here is the example of 1 Sam. 20:1.

1 Sam. 20:1—*וַיִּבְרַח דָּוִד מִנְּזוּת מִיְּזוּת בְּרָמָה וַיָּבֹא וַיֹּאמֶר לְפָנָי יְהוֹנָתָן מָה עֲשִׂיתִי*—“Then David fled from Naioth in Ramah, and came and said before Jonathan, ‘What have I done? What is my guilt? And what is my sin **before your father**, that he seeks my life?’”

### 3.1.2.2 *Examples with הַ בְּעֵינַי / בְּעֵינַי*

Contrary to *לָפְנֵי*, the prepositional phrase and idiom *בְּעֵינַי* holds no physical literal meaning but refers exclusively to someone’s opinion. Moreover, in contrast to the dearth of examples with *לָפְנֵי* carrying this meaning, *בְּעֵינַי* is frequently employed, and it is common in reference to God and to other individuals. In all its uses *בְּעֵינַי* serves as an obligatory complement of an adjectival verb or an adjective, like *יָשָׁר*, *טוֹב*, *רַע*, and its position is usually fixed, following, not preceding, this verb or the verb and its subject (except in one example, 2 Sam. 3:36 below, which has an opposite word order). In this respect, phrase *בְּעֵינַי* does not function as a full and obvious parenthesis syntactically. On the other hand, it does show one case of more flexible (2 Sam. 3:36 below) word order, it is part of an expression conveying a modal nuance referring to a certain subjective opinion, and it adds to this modal expression an aside regarding the name of the holder of this opinion. In these latter respects, *בְּעֵינַי* presents parenthetical features at least from a functional-pragmatic standpoint. This phrase is widely used both in biblical narrative and in biblical discourse.

The following clauses are only a small number of the many instances present in Biblical Hebrew. Since the many cases referring to God’s

viewpoint form a uniform group, the examples here are divided into those in which **בְּעֵינֵי ה'** appears in combination with the name of God, namely, **בְּעֵינֵי ה'**, and those which appear in combination with other individuals.

### 3.1.2.2.1 Examples with **בְּעֵינֵי ה'**

Here **בְּעֵינֵי ה'** in combination with the name of God follows an adjectival verb or an adjective expressing a subjective opinion. In certain cases **בְּעֵינֵי ה'** follows more than the verb, generally the verb and its subject. The syntactic status of the combination **בְּעֵינֵי ה'** in the examples is obligatory complement of the adjectival verbs or adjectives, and it adds asides by mentioning God as the holder of the subjective opinion expressed by the verb.

The first example contains an instruction to behave in a certain way that is considered righteous and good, according to God, in order to win a good future.

Deut. 6:18—**וַעֲשִׂיתָ הַיָּשָׁר וְהַטּוֹב בְּעֵינֵי ה' לְמַעַן יִיטֵב לְךָ וּבָאתָ וְרָשַׁתְּ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ**—“And you shall do what is right and good **in the sight of the LORD**, that it may go well with you, and that you may go in and take possession of the good land which the LORD swore to give to your fathers.”

The following example displays God's negative opinion of a previous wrongdoing and a description of its consequences.

Gen. 38:10—**וַיֵּרַע בְּעֵינֵי ה' אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וַיָּמַת גַּם-אֹתוֹ**—“And what he did was displeasing **in the sight of the LORD**, and he slew him also.”

Next, God's negative opinion to a certain conduct of the Israelites.

Judg. 2:11—**וַיַּעַשׂוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-הָרָע בְּעֵינֵי ה' וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ אֶת-הַבְּעָלִים**—“And the people of Israel did what was evil **in the sight of the LORD** and served the Baals.”

Another expression which indicates a negative opinion attributed to God appears in the following example.

2 Sam. 7:19—**וַתִּקְטַן עוֹד זֹאת בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֲדֹנָי ה' וַתְּדַבֵּר גַּם אֶל-בֵּית-עַבְדְּךָ לְמַרְחוֹק**—“And yet this was a small thing **in thy eyes, O Lord GOD**; thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come, and hast shown me future generations, O Lord GOD!”

The last example in this section mentions again a negative opinion attributed to God and its consequences.

2 Kgs. 3:18—וְנָקַל זֹאת בְּעֵינַי ה' וְנָתַן אֶת-מוֹאָב בְּיַדְכֶם—“This is a light thing **in the sight of the LORD**; he will also give the Moabites into your hand.”

### 3.1.2.2.2 Examples with בְּעֵינַי

Here individuals other than God are shown to have various opinions on a certain conduct, situation, or event. These are mostly positive or negative, and less frequently some other attitude (e.g., disbelief in Gen. 19:14 below, humiliation in 2 Sam. 6:22 below, and wonder in 2 Sam. 13:2 below). Accordingly, the first group of examples, Gen. 20:15, 34:18, Josh. 22:32, 1 Sam. 1:23, 16:22, 18:20, and 2 Sam. 3:36, reflects positive attitudes. The second group, displaying Gen. 21:11,12 and Num. 22:34, reflects negative attitudes. The third group, Gen. 19:14, 2 Sam. 6:22, and 2 Sam. 13:2, presents other attitudes. As to syntactic position, only one example, 2 Sam. 3:36, has an inverted word order, in which בְּעֵינַי precedes a verb or a verb and its subject. This sole example of a different word order involving בְּעֵינַי supports possible parenthetical information being conveyed by these prepositional phrases.

The first example appears in direct speech uttered by Abimelech to Abraham. The prepositional phrase בְּעֵינַיִךְ is an obligatory complement of the positive adjectival verb and adjective טוב.

Gen. 20:15—וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ הַנֶּה אֶרְצִי לְפָנֶיךָ בְּטוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ שָׁב—“And Abimelech said, ‘Behold, my land is before you; dwell where it pleases **you**.’”

The next phrases, בְּעֵינַי חָמור וּבְעֵינַי שָׁכָם בֶּן-חָמור, appear within narrative, and they refer to the reaction of Hamor and Hamor’s son to a previous suggestion made by Jacob’s sons. Again, these phrases are obligatory complements of the adjectival verb וַיִּיטְבוּ.

Gen. 34:18—וַיִּיטְבוּ דְבָרֵיהֶם בְּעֵינַי חָמור וּבְעֵינַי שָׁכָם בֶּן-חָמור—“Their words pleased **Hamor and Hamor’s son Shechem**.”

The phrase בְּעֵינַי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in the next example appears again in narrative, and it is once more an obligatory complement of the verb וַיִּיטְבוּ. It refers to previous explanatory words spoken by the people of the tribes of Reuben and Gad in order to prevent a projected attack on them by the Israelites.



Josh. 22:32—וַיִּטֵב הַדְּבָר בְּעֵינֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְבָרְכוּ אֱלֹהִים בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא אָמְרוּ—“And the report pleased the people of Israel; and **the people of Israel** blessed God and spoke no more of making war against them, to destroy the land where the Reubenites and the Gadites were settled.”

The following phrase, בְּעֵינֶיךָ, appears in direct speech, and it too follows the adjectival verb and adjective טוב.

1 Sam. 1:23—וַיֹּאמֶר לָהּ אֶלְקָנָה אִשָּׁה עָשִׂי הַטוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ שְׁבִי עַד-גְּמֻלָּךְ אִתּוֹ—“Elkanah her husband said to her; ‘Do what seems best **to you**, wait until you have weaned him; only, may the LORD establish his word.’ So the woman remained and nursed her son, until she weaned him.”

The next example in direct speech introduces a new positive verbal phrase, מְצָא חֵן, into the discussion. בְּעֵינֶיךָ is again an obligatory complement of the verbal phrase מְצָא חֵן, and like previous examples it maintains its position after the verb.

1 Sam. 16:22—וַיִּשְׁלַח שָׁאוּל אֶל-יֵשׁוּעַ לֵאמֹר יַעֲמַד-נָא דָוִד לְפָנַי בִּי-מְצָא חֵן—“And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, ‘Let David remain in my service, for he has found favor **in my sight**.’”

Next, another adjectival verb conveys positive content of a kind we have not yet observed, namely וַיִּשֶׁר. The prepositional phrase בְּעֵינָיו which follows וַיִּשֶׁר and its subject הַדְּבָר, is an obligatory complement of this verb in this example too, and it appears this time in narrative.

1 Sam. 18:20—וַתֶּאֱהָב מִיכַל בֶּת-שָׁאוּל אֶת-דָּוִד וַיִּגְדּוּ וַיִּגְדּוּ לְשָׁאוּל וַיִּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר בְּעֵינָיו—“Now Saul’s daughter Michal loved David; and they told Saul, and the thing pleased **him**.”

The last example of a positive verb is part of the narrative, and it displays two phrases, בְּעֵינֵיהֶם and בְּעֵינֵי כָל-הָעָם, accompanying similar adjectival verbs, וַיִּטֵב and טוב, which we have frequently observed above. In these respects the example does not convey any new information, in contrast to the foregoing. Its significance lies in its less typical and less fixed word order, revealed in the position of the second phrase בְּעֵינֵי כָל-הָעָם. This precedes the adjectival phrase and adjective טוב in contrast to all other examples, in which בְּעֵינֶיךָ follows a verb or a verb and its subject. The very fact that such an atypical position exists, albeit only once, supports at least a partial interpretation of such phrases as parenthetical units.

2 Sam. 3:36—**וְכָל-הָעָם הִפִּירוּ וַיִּטֹּב בְּעֵינֵיהֶם כָּכָל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּעֵינָי**—**כָּל-הָעָם טוֹב**—“And all the people took notice of it, and it pleased **them**; as everything that the king did pleased **all the people**.”

The next example is the first with a negative opinion. The verb is **וַיִּרַע**, and it is followed by its subject **הַדָּבָר**, an adverb **מְאֹד**, and finally the phrase **בְּעֵינֵי אַבְרָהָם**, indicating the holder of the negative attitude. This word order is typical of the prepositional phrase **בְּעֵינֵי**, this being in a position which does not precede the verb. Yet note that in this example it follows the verb and its subject, but also the adverb **מְאֹד**. In this respect the phrase **בְּעֵינֵי אַבְרָהָם** shows the lesser connection to the preceding verb than to all other clause components, and it seems unique among all examples involving **בְּעֵינֵי** introduced so far and following. The example is part of the narrative.

Gen. 21:11—**וַיִּרַע הַדָּבָר מְאֹד בְּעֵינֵי אַבְרָהָם עַל אוֹדֹת בְּנוֹ**—“And the thing was very displeasing **to Abraham** on account of his son.”

Next is another example of a negative attitude, where **בְּעֵינֵיךָ** follows a negated verb **אַל-יִרַע**, this time in direct speech.

Gen. 21:12—**וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל-אַבְרָהָם אַל-יִרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ עַל-הַנְּעִר וְעַל-אִמְתְּךָ כֹּל**—**אֲשֶׁר תֹּאמַר אֵלֶיךָ שָׂרָה שְׁמַע בְּקוֹלָהּ כִּי בִיִצְחָק יִקְרָא לָךְ זֶרַע**—“But God said to Abraham, **Be not displeased because of the lad and because of your slave woman; whatever Sarah says to you, do as she tells you, for through Isaac shall your descendants be named.**”

In the last example of negative attitude the phrase **בְּעֵינֶיךָ** follows the adjectival verb and adjective **רַע**. Here too **בְּעֵינֶיךָ** is in direct speech.

Num. 22:34—**וַיֹּאמֶר בַּלְעָם אֶל-מִלְאָךְ ה' חָטָאתִי כִי לֹא יָדַעְתִּי כִי אִתָּהּ נִצָּב**—**לִקְרָאתִי בְּדַרְךָ וְעַתָּה אִם-רַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֲשׁוּבָה לִי**—“Then Balaam said to the angel of the LORD, **I have sinned, for I did not know that thou didst stand in the road against me. Now therefore, if it is evil in thy sight, I will go back again.**”

The next example does not display a positive or negative attitude, but indicates disbelief. After Lot predicts the destruction of Sodom and suggests that his sons-in-law and daughters flee Sodom in time, his sons-in-law express disbelief revealed in the participle **מִצְחָק**. This is followed by the prepositional phrase **בְּעֵינֵי חֲתָנָיו**, referring to Lot's sons-in-law, to whom the disbelief is attributed. The combination of the participle and the prepositional phrase **בְּעֵינֵי** appear here in narrative, describing a reaction to a previous speech utterance.

Gen. 19:14—וַיֵּצֵא לוֹט וַיְדַבֵּר אֶל-חֲתָנָיו לֵקְחֵי בְנֹתָיו וַיֹּאמֶר קוּמוּ צֵאוּ מִן-הַמָּקוֹם—“So Lot went out and said to his sons-in-law, who were to marry his daughters, ‘Up, get out of this place; for the LORD is about to destroy the city.’ But he seemed **to his sons-in-law** to be jesting.”

The following example has the phrase בְּעֵינַי<sup>16</sup> following the adjective שָׁפַל in direct speech. In content it is part of David’s response to his wife, Michal, after she indicates David’s humiliation by dancing among others in front of God. The combination וְהִיִּיתִי שָׁפַל בְּעֵינַי expresses humiliation and the prepositional phrase בְּעֵינַי indicates the individual who interprets a certain conduct as humiliating.

2 Sam. 6:22—וּנְקַלְתִּי עוֹד מְזוּאָתִי וְהִיִּיתִי שָׁפַל בְּעֵינַי וְעַם-הָאֲמָהוּת אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתָּ וְנִקְבְּדָה עִמָּם אֲכַבְדָּה—“I will make myself yet more contemptible than this, and I will be abased **in your eyes**; but by the maids of whom you have spoken, by them I shall be held in honor.”

The last example in this section deals with a reaction of wonder, and the phrase בְּעֵינַי אֲמַנּוֹן refers to the individual reacting that way. As to syntactic position, the phrase בְּעֵינַי אֲמַנּוֹן follows the verb וַיִּפְּלֵא and the whole combination of the verb and the prepositional phrase appears in narrative.

2 Sam. 13:2—וַיֵּצֵר לְאֲמַנּוֹן לְהִתְחַלְלוֹת בְּעֵבוֹר תָּמָר אָחֹתוֹ כִּי בְתוּלָה הִיא וַיִּפְּלֵא—“And Amnon was so tormented that he made himself ill because of his sister Tamar; for she was a virgin, and it seemed impossible **to Amnon** to do anything to her.”<sup>17</sup>

### 3.1.3 *God’s Standpoint*

The following are two unique examples in which God’s attitude is expressed in the parenthetical expressions הַבְּחַמְלָתָהּ and הַבְּאַהֲבָתָהּ, which appear nowhere else. The *RSV* translates הַבְּחַמְלָתָהּ as part of a parenthesis, between commas: “. . ., the LORD being merciful to him,” and הַבְּאַהֲבָתָהּ as part of a causal clause: “Because the LORD loved Israel for ever.” For the first example a parenthetical phrase between

<sup>16</sup> According to the context, the translation assumes that the personal pronoun affixed to בְּעֵינַי should be 2nd and not 1st person.

<sup>17</sup> Other examples are: Judg. 3:12, 4:1, 10:6, 14:7, 1 Sam. 8:6, 18:26, 29:6, 2 Sam. 3:19, 10:12, 11:25,27, 12:9, 15:26, 17:4, 18:4, 1 Kgs. 3:10, 9:12, 2 Kgs. 3:2; many more exist.

dashes appears in the *JPS* translation too: "...—in the Lord's mercy on him—...", and for the second again a causal clause. The interpretation of בְּאַהֲבַת ה' as a causal clause is reasonable, but it can perhaps also be translated otherwise, better to reflect this phrase's adverbial or parenthetical nature: "**In accordance with** God's everlasting love for Israel, he has made you king, that you may execute justice and righteousness."

In the first of these two examples בְּחַמְלַת ה' occurs in middle position, and in fact in final position syntactically, since it follows a complete clause וַיִּתְמַהֲמַה וַיַּחֲזְקוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים בְּיָדוֹ וּבִיד-אִשְׁתּוֹ וּבִיד שְׁתֵּי בָנָתָיו

Gen. 19:16—וַיִּתְמַהֲמַה וַיַּחֲזְקוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים בְּיָדוֹ וּבִיד-אִשְׁתּוֹ וּבִיד שְׁתֵּי בָנָתָיו בְּחַמְלַת ה'—עָלָיו וַיִּצְאֵהוּ וַיִּנְחֵהוּ מִחוּץ לְעִיר  
 "But he lingered; so the men seized him and his wife and his two daughters by the hand, **the LORD being merciful to him**, and they brought him forth and set him outside the city."

In the second example בְּאַהֲבַת ה' likewise appears in the middle of the verse, and also in final position as regards syntactic structure since it follows a full clause יְהִי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּרוּךְ אֲשֶׁר חָפַץ בְּךָ לְתִתְּךָ עַל-כִּסֵּא יִשְׂרָאֵל.

1 Kgs. 10:9—יְהִי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּרוּךְ אֲשֶׁר חָפַץ בְּךָ לְתִתְּךָ עַל-כִּסֵּא יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאַהֲבַת ה'—ה' אֱת-יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעֵלָם וַיִּשְׂמַח לְמַלְךְ לַעֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה  
 "Blessed be the LORD your God, who has delighted in you and set you on the throne of Israel! **Because the LORD loved Israel for ever**, he has made you king, that you may execute justice and righteousness."

As to other Bible translations, the phrase בְּחַמְלַת ה' עָלָיו (Gen. 19:16 above) is translated by Saadya Gaon בשפּקָה אֵלֵּהָ עֲלֶיהָ and in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* لِشَفَقَةِ الرَّبِّ عَلَيْهِ, namely a syntactic construction of a prepositional phrase, similar to the Biblical Hebrew original structure; likewise, it can safely be interpreted as a parenthesis. But the Geez translation offers a causal clause: አስመ ምክርሙ እግዚአብሔር / *ʾasma mahkomu ʾAgziʾabəher*—"...because God was merciful to them..." and similarly the *Peshitta*: מַלְאךְ דַּסְּמָא מַרְכָּה חַלְמָה / *mettol da-ḥas māryā lāw(hy)*. The interpretation of בְּחַמְלַת ה' עָלָיו as a clause, as in the last two translations, is comparable to an interpretation in several Bible translations of the second example, בְּאַהֲבַת ה' אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעֵלָם, from 1 Kgs. 10:9, as a causal clause. As it is from 1 Kings, Saadya Gaon's translation and the Geez translation of the Octateuch are not available for it. But *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* and the *Peshitta* for 1 Kgs. 10:9, like the *RSV* and *JPS* translations, use a causal clause here. Only *Targum Jonathan* maintains the original Hebrew prepositional phrase: ברחמת יוֹי ית ישראל לְעֵלָם.

3.1.4 *Epistemic Modal Adverbials*

This section treats special words which affirm the truth of, or cast doubt on, a certain clausal content: אָכֵן, אֶמְנָה /הָאֶמְנָם/, אֶמְנָם, אֶמְתָּ, כֵּן, אֶמְנָ and אֶמְלִי. These words do not depend syntactically on any clause part but refer to a whole clause or a chain of clauses, and they operate on the functional-pragmatic level by adding to the clauses in which they appear external epistemic modal information. These sentence units are considered epistemic in modality since they always display the belief or knowledge of a speaker in direct speech, concerning the truth or falsity of his words. These units mostly do not reflect deontic modality as they do not involve a subjective expression of will, command, and similar emotions, though nuances of deontic modality might occasionally arise and co-exist alongside the basic expression of epistemic modality.<sup>18</sup>

In syntax these units are frequently called ‘epistemic modal adverbials’ or ‘sentence adverbials,’<sup>19</sup> though they seem to be on the border between adverbials and parenthetical units. These words can be regarded as parenthetical units since they do not function as adverbial complements of certain specific predicates but of the whole clause or the predicative relation, and they display a statement which refers to a full clause or utterance. They are also syntactically independent, and they hold dispensable non-obligatory information without which a sentence still remains complete.

All these arguments can hold for sentence adverbials as well as parenthetical units, yet regarding syntax one criterion with respect to the position of these so-called adverbials within a clause remains to be checked. Parenthetical units are deemed to hold a free position, while sentence adverbials are expected to have a fixed position. If so, what can we learn from word order of these mostly epistemic units? All the epistemic words and phrases discussed here present a somewhat fixed position, because they are usually in first position in direct speech utterances, at once introducing and affirming the speech. In this regard they act like sentence adverbials and introductory particles simultaneously. Their introductory role might still be understood as parenthetical.

<sup>18</sup> For definitions of epistemic modality and their complexity see, e.g., Lyons 1977:793–809, §17.2, Palmer 1986:51–95, and *ibid.* 96–125 for deontic modality. Also see Crystal 2003:130, 163.

<sup>19</sup> Especially see Blau’s treatment of such examples in Blau 1977:18–30, §2.1.

The examples below are presented in separate sections for each type.

### 3.1.4.1 *Examples with אֶכֶן*

The word אֶכֶן is employed to affirm a certain content, hence it belongs to the domain of epistemic modal adverbs. *BDB* classifies this word as an adverb, and mentions its asseverative force.<sup>20</sup> A different definition of the role of this word appears in *HALOT* which labels it an “exclamation to emphasize the unexpected.” Yet *HALOT* translates this word like *BDB*, namely by the adverbs ‘surely’ and ‘however.’<sup>21</sup> The four examples discussed below, Gen. 28:16, Exod. 2:14, 1 Sam. 15:32, and 1 Kgs. 11:2, are the only cases of אֶכֶן appearing in our corpus of Classical Hebrew prose. Other examples of אֶכֶן belong to the later prophets, e.g., Isa. 40:7, 45:15, and more, or to the Hagiographa, e.g., Ps. 31:23, Job 32:8, and more. In any event, all examples of אֶכֶן, from our corpus or from other types of biblical texts, appear in direct speech.

The first example presents the word אֶכֶן within an affirmation of the existence of God as a result of his revelation to Joseph in a dream. It appears in direct speech and in initial position.

Gen. 28:16—וַיִּקַּץ יַעֲקֹב מִשְׁנָתוֹ וַיֹּאמֶר אֶכֶן יֵשׁ ה' בַּמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וְאֲנֹכִי לֹא יָדַעְתִּי—“Then Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, ‘Surely the LORD is in this place; and I did not know it.’”

Derenbourg edition of Saadya Gaon’s translation of אֶכֶן in this verse is אִיקִינָא, namely a question meaning ‘Is it surely so?’<sup>22</sup> Like the *RSV* translation and the identical *JPS* translation, Ḥasīd edition of Saadya Gaon’s translation gives אֶכֶן for אֶכֶן, namely a regular affirmative adverb. An affirmative adverb, חַמָּא, also appears in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, and likewise *ሀሳላሳ* / *ṣarā’ā’ū* in the *Peshitta*. The Geez translation avoids any rendering of this word in this verse. Only Saadya Gaon’s Arabic in Derenbourg edition, ‘Is it surely so?’ is in fact a full clause, and syntactically too it is completely independent and parenthetical.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> *BDB*:38b. Muraoka describes this word as asseverative-emphatic (Muraoka 1985:132–133).

<sup>21</sup> *HALOT* I:47.

<sup>22</sup> Derenbourg indicates that the version with a question mark appears in the manuscript of Constantinople, and mentions two other versions in which the translation is אִם כֵּן, namely a protasis of a conditional clause which means: ‘If so’ (Derenbourg Edition:43, note 5).

<sup>23</sup> The translation of Ms. St. Petersburg is missing.

Yet its absence from the Geez translation is meaningful as well because it reflects אָכֵן as dispensable. Similar Arabic versions also occur for the following verse, Exod. 2:14, though their distribution is somewhat reversed: Derenbourg edition and Ms. St. Petersburg exhibit אָדֵן; a comment by Derenbourg indicates that in another manuscript the version is איקינא;<sup>24</sup> and איקינא also appears in Ḥasīd edition.

The next verse, Exod. 2:14 has אָכֵן in an expression of affirmation uttered by Moses, when he finds out that his involvement in a previous killing is known to others. The affirmative word is found again in direct speech and in initial position.

Exod. 2:14—וַיֹּאמֶר מִי שְׂמֹךְ הָאִישׁ שֶׁר וְשִׁפְט עָלֵינוּ הֲלִהְרַגְנִי אִתָּהּ אָמַר כְּאִשֶׁר—וַיֹּאמֶר אָכֵן נֹדַע הַדְּבָר הַהֵנּוּ—הֲרָגְתָּ אֶת-הַמִּצְרִי וַיִּירָא מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר אָכֵן נֹדַע הַדְּבָר הַהֵנּוּ—“He answered, ‘Who made you a prince and a judge over us? Do you mean to kill me as you killed the Egyptian?’ Then Moses was afraid, and thought, ‘**Surely** the thing is known.’”

A third example, 1 Sam. 15:32 below, again has the affirmative word אָכֵן in direct speech and in initial position. The affirmation is part of the response reflecting the awareness of Agag, the Amalekites’ king, of his forthcoming death (described in 1 Sam. 15:33).

1 Sam. 15:32—וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂמוּאֵל הַגִּישׁוּ אֵלַי אֶת-אַגַּג מֶלֶךְ עַמְלֵק וַיֵּלֶךְ אֵלָיו אַגַּג—מֵעֵדֻנָת וַיֹּאמֶר אַגַּג אָכֵן כִּר מֶר-הַמָּוֶת—“Then Samuel said, ‘Bring here to me Agag the king of the Amalekites.’ And Agag came to him cheerfully. Agag said, ‘**Surely** the bitterness of death is past.’”

Like the *RSV* translation of 1 Sam. 15:32 above, *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* translates אָכֵן in this verse by the affirmative adverb حَقًّا and the *Peshitta* gives the affirmative adverb ለሁሉ / *šarwā’ā*. A complete deviation from the expected translation by affirmative adverbs is the rendering of *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* of the next example, from 1 Kgs. 11:2, אָכֵן אֶת-לִבְבְּכֶם אֲחֲרֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם יִטּוּ: instead of an affirmative adverb it has a causal clause ... لأنهم يميلون قلوبكم ... “...because they will turn away your hearts...” Another deviation, though opposite in content, appears in *Targum Jonathan*, which translates אֶת-לִבְבְּכֶם אֲחֲרֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם as a negative purpose clause: דלמא יטעון ית לבכון בתר טעותהון. A similar translation containing a negative purpose clause also appears in the *Peshitta*: دالمآ نستعّيان لببکون / *dalmā nastəyān lebbakōn*

<sup>24</sup> Derenbourg Edition:83, note 1.

*bātar alāhayhēn*. These latter translations should actually be regarded as some sort of a commentary. They reflect the difficulty in understanding *את-לבבכם אחרי אלהיהם* as affirmative, and suggest a solution which does not exist in the Hebrew original.

In the last example of this section *אכן* appears again in direct speech and should be considered in initial position as regards the clause *יתו את-לבבכם אחרי אלהיהם*.

1 Kgs. 11:2—*מִן־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר אָמַר־ה' אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא־תִבְאוּ בָהֶם וְהֵם לֹא־יָבֹאוּ בָכֶם אָכֵן יִטּוּ אֶת־לִבְבְּכֶם אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם*—“From the nations concerning which the LORD had said to the people of Israel, ‘You shall not enter into marriage with them, neither shall they with you, for **surely** they will turn away your heart after their gods’; Solomon clung to these in love.”

### 3.1.4.2 *Examples with אָמְנָם / הָאֲמָנָם / אֲמָנָה*

The word *אָמְנָם*, and its variants *הָאֲמָנָם* in questions and *אֲמָנָה* elsewhere, are again affirmative, and accordingly they too belong to the field of epistemic modal adverbs. The *BDB* and *HALOT* also mark these words as adverbs.<sup>25</sup> The adverbial origin of *אָמְנָם* and *הָאֲמָנָם* is reflected in the suffix *-ām* attached to these words.<sup>26</sup> They usually appear in initial position in direct speech.

In the first example below, Gen. 18:13, *אָמְנָם* appears in a rhetorical question, which is similar in meaning to a negative statement. Here *אָמְנָם* should therefore be understood as part of a negative statement, and it consequently renders Sarah’s doubt regarding the prediction of her future pregnancy, instead of her affirmation.

Gen. 18:13—*וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֶל־אַבְרָהָם לְמָה זֶה צָחֻקָה שָׂרָה לֵאמֹר הֲאֵף אֲמָנָם אֵלֶּךָ וַאֲנִי זָקְנָתִי*—“The LORD said to Abraham, ‘Why did Sarah laugh, and say, ‘Shall I **indeed** bear a child, now that I am old?’”

All versions of Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translation of *הֲאֵף אֲמָנָם* here combine the Arabic question particle *ʔ* and the affirmative adverb *יקינא*, namely, *איקינא*. The same Arabic translation occasionally appears for *אָכֵן* noted in the previous section, indicating that this scholar probably took Hebrew *אָמְנָם* and *אָכֵן* to share the same meaning. *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*

<sup>25</sup> *BDB*:53b, *HALOT* I:65, and similarly Muraoka 1985:133–134.

<sup>26</sup> On this suffix see Kogut 2002:115. Kogut suggests that *אֲמָנָה* is an alternate form reflecting another adverbial suffix: *-ā* (Kogut 2002:117–118).



translates **הָאֵף אֲמַנָּם** by **فَبِالْحَقِيقَةِ**, using a prepositional phrase analogous to the adverb **حَقًّا** employed for **אָכֵן** above. Again, a connection between **אֲמַנָּם** and **אָכֵן** is evident in this translation.

This connection is more apparent in the following example, Gen. 20:12, for which all versions of Saadya Gaon's translation and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* use a variant of the prepositional phrase employed by *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* for Gen. 18:13: **ועלי אלחקיקה** (Derenbourg edition), **ועלי חקיקה** (Ms. St. Petersburg), **ובאלחקיקה** (Hasīd edition and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the last obviously in Arabic script). The *Peshitta* employs the affirmative adverb **ܫܪܝܪܐ** / *šarīrā'ū*, likewise regularly found as the translation of **אָכֵן**, for Gen. 18:13 above and Gen. 20:12 below, and of **אֲמַנָּם** in Josh. 7:20, 1 Kgs. 8:27, 2 Kgs. 19:17, below. Exceptions are Num. 22:37, which has an entirely different version in the *Peshitta*, and Ruth 3:12, which has a similar adverb **ܒܚܫܬܐ** / *b-quštā*.<sup>27</sup> Gen. 20:12 contains the variant **אֲמַנָּה** in direct speech and in initial position, introducing the subsequent clause.

Gen. 20:12—**וְגַם-אֲמַנָּה אֶחְתִּי בַת-אָבִי הוּא אָדָּ לֹא בַת-אִמִּי וְתַהִי-לִי לְאִשָּׁה**—  
 “Besides she is **indeed** my sister, the daughter of my father but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife.”

The translation by **حَقًّا** in combination with the question particle **أ** occurs again for **הָאֲמַנָּם** of the following verse, Num. 22:37, in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*. A translation by **حَقًّا** also appears in the remaining verses in this section, for which Saadya Gaon's translation is not available (except for Ruth 3:12, where the translation is by **صحيح**). For Num. 22:37, though, this translation has another version which deviates from the original meaning and is exegetical. The variant found in Derenbourg edition is **אתראני לסת אקדר אן אכרמד**—“Do you consider me unable to honor you?” and it involves prolepsis.<sup>28</sup> A similar version without prolepsis appears in Hasīd edition: **אתרא ליס אטיק אן אכרמד**.<sup>29</sup> The word **הָאֲמַנָּם** in the following verse introduces a question in direct speech. Since the question is rhetorical and negative it actually indicates a positive content, affirmed by the word **הָאֲמַנָּם**.

<sup>27</sup> The *Peshitta* translation of the book of Ruth is according to the edition of the Syriac Bible.

<sup>28</sup> For the syntactic pattern of prolepsis see Zewi 1996.

<sup>29</sup> This verse was not preserved in Ms. St. Petersburg.

Num. 22:37—לָמָּה לִּקְרָא לְךָ אֵלֵי וְשָׁלַח שְׁלַחְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ לְמָּה—“And Balak said to Balaam, ‘Did I not send to you to call you? Why did you not come to me? Am I not able to honor you?’”

The next example contains the variant אָמְנָה in first position in direct speech and it serves to affirm Achan’s admission of his sins against God before Joshua.

Josh. 7:20—וַיַּעַן עָכָן אֶת-יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וַיֹּאמֶר אָמְנָה אֲנֹכִי חָטָאתִי לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכֹזַאת עָשִׂיתִי—“And Achan answered Joshua, ‘**Of a truth** I have sinned against the LORD God of Israel, and this is what I did.’”

The following example again presents האָמְנָם initiating a rhetorical question in direct speech. The question in this case anticipates a negative reply, namely it indicates that God does not dwell on the earth, and the word האָמְנָם should be understood as casting doubt on the supposition conveyed in the question that God dwells on earth, or as affirming its negative reply.

1 Kgs. 8:27—כִּי הָאֲמָנָם יֹשֵׁב אֱלֹהִים עַל-הָאָרֶץ הַגֵּיהַ שְׁמַיִם וְשְׁמַיִם הַשְּׁמַיִם לֹא—“But will God **indeed** dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain thee; how much less this house which I have built!”<sup>30</sup>

The next example presents the word אָמְנָם in a positive statement, which is part of Hezekiah’s prayer to God. It is in initial clausal position and in direct speech.

2 Kgs. 19:17—אָמְנָם ה' הַחֲרִיבוּ מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר אֶת-הַגּוֹיִם וְאֶת-אַרְצָם—“**Of a truth**, O LORD, the kings of Assyria have laid waste the nations and their lands.”<sup>31</sup>

The last example also displays a positive statement, in which אָמְנָם is in initial position and in direct speech. But in syntactic structure it deviates from all constructions we have discussed so far since here אָמְנָם plays a role of a predicate to a content clause, כִּי אִם זֹו גֵּאֵל אֲנֹכִי, and is introduced by the content particle כִּי. Being a predicate אָמְנָם cannot be considered parenthetical or dispensable as it is essential syntactically in the clause. Such a syntactic movement from a

<sup>30</sup> Compare this example with 2 Chron. 6:18.

<sup>31</sup> A similar version appears in Isa. 37:18.

parenthetical to a predicate role is familiar elsewhere. Modern Hebrew *בנראה*, which plays a role of a parenthesis, can be substituted by *נראה ש*, in which *נראה* plays a predicate role of a content clause introduced by *ש*. Another example is Modern Hebrew *כידוע*, which may be replaced by *ידוע ש*, in which *ש* introduces a content clause, etc.

Ruth 3:12—*וְעַתָּה כִּי אָמַנְתָּ כִּי אִם זֶה גֹאֵל אֲנֹכִי וְגַם יֵשׁ גֹּאֵל קְרוֹב מִמֶּנִּי*—“And now **it is true** that I am a near kinsman, yet there is a kinsman nearer than I.”

### 3.1.4.3 *Examples with אָמֵן*

The word *אָמֵן* is another biblical affirmative, and it is formed from the same root as *אָמַנְתָּ*. Likewise, it belongs to the sphere of epistemic modal adverbs; *BDB* marks it as an adverb and *HALOT* translates it as the adverb ‘surely,’ defining it as “...solemn formula, ... by which the hearer accepts a) the validity of a curse of declaration...; b) an acceptable order... or announcement...; c) belonging to a doxology.”<sup>32</sup> Nonetheless, contrary to the affirmative words discussed previously, the word *אָמֵן* is mostly not translated in Bible translations. The *RSV*, the *JPS*, Saadia Gaon’s Arabic translation *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the Geez translation, Onkelos, *Targum Jonathan*, and the *Peshitta* all eschew rendering it by another language, choosing instead to transcribe the Hebrew form. This choice is probably due to the widespread use of the word *אָמֵן* in liturgy in later periods. Its public use is already revealed in biblical texts, like the sequence of examples with *אָמֵן* appearing in Deut. 27:14–25.

In the first example *אָמֵן* appears as the sole content of a speech utterance, thus serving as a one-member clause. This also applies to verses 15–25 of Deut. 27. In all these examples *אָמֵן* affirms a previous statement containing a curse.

Deut. 27:14—*אָרוּר הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה פֶסֶל וּמִסְכָּה תּוֹעֵבֹת ה’ מַעֲשֵׂה יָדַי חָרָשׁ—וְשָׁם בְּסֻתֵּר וְעָנּוּ כָּל-הָעָם וְאָמְרוּ אָמֵן*—“‘Cursed be the man who makes a graven or molten image, an abomination to the LORD, a thing made by the hands of a craftsman, and sets it up in secret.’ And all the people shall answer and say, ‘**Amen.**’”

<sup>32</sup> *BDB*:53a, *HALOT* I:64.

In the next example אָמֵן introduces direct speech, whose content it affirms.

1 Kgs. 1:36—וַיַּעַן בְּנֵיהוּ בֶן-יְהוֹיָדָע אֶת-הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֹּאמֶר אָמֵן בֶּן יֹאמֵר ה' אֱלֹהֵי אֲדֹנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ—“And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada answered the king, ‘Amen! May the LORD, the God of my lord the king, say so.’”

The following example is from Jeremiah and is presented here since it demonstrates a similar use of אָמֵן in introducing and affirming direct speech.

Jer. 28:6—וַיֹּאמֶר יִרְמְיָהּ הַנְּבִיא אָמֵן בֶּן יַעֲשֶׂה ה' יְקֻם ה' אֶת-דְּבָרָיו אֲשֶׁר נְבִאֲתָהּ הִזָּה—“And the prophet Jeremiah said, ‘Amen! May the LORD do so; may the LORD make the words which you have prophesied come true, and bring back to this place from Babylon the vessels of the house of the LORD, and all the exiles.’”

The next example demonstrates again a similar use of אָמֵן in Jeremiah. However, in contrast to all the *RSV* translations displayed above, this one is rendered by an affirmative meaning “So be it”. *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* and the *JPS* keep the Hebrew form in transcription.<sup>33</sup>

Jer. 11:5—לְמַעַן הִקִּים אֶת-הַשְּׁבוּעָה אֲשֶׁר-נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם לָתֵת לָהֶם אֶרֶץ—“That I may perform the oath which I swore to your fathers, to give them a land flowing with milk and honey, as at this day.’ Then I answered, ‘So be it, LORD.’”

### 3.1.4.5 Examples with אָמֵן and בֶּן

The majority of appearances of אָמֵן is in nominal use and is irrelevant to this study. However in several instances אָמֵן plays a modal adverbial and partially parenthetical role.<sup>34</sup> As to the next example, though *BDB* and *HALOT* generally treat אָמֵן as a noun,<sup>35</sup> *HALOT* is aware of its adjectival and adverbial roles.<sup>36</sup> The *RSV* considers it an adjective, like

<sup>33</sup> The Arabic translation of Saadya Gaon for this verse is not extant.

<sup>34</sup> *BDB*:54a, number 5, indicates the adverbial meaning of אָמֵן. Muraoka 1985:133–134 regards this word, as well as אָמֵן and its variants, as emphatic, and indicates the derivation of both from the same root. Muraoka also mentions that the emphatic particle אֵף is sometimes combined with these words, e.g., Gen. 18:13, Job 19:4, 34:12 (Muraoka 1985:134).

<sup>35</sup> *BDB*:54a, where Deut. 13:15 and Deut. 17:4 are mentioned under number 4. *HALOT* I:68–69.

<sup>36</sup> *HALOT* mentions these roles regarding Deut. 13:15, Deut. 17:4, and a few other examples (*HALOT* I:69).

the following affirmative particle נָכוֹן: “if it be **true** and certain”; and similarly the *JPS* translation: “if it is **true**, the fact is established.” All versions examined of Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translation also employ an adjective here, חַק taking the form חַקֵּא in the accusative (object/adverbial) case (نَصْب), since it functions as a predicate of the copula כָּאֵן.<sup>37</sup> Confusion regarding the translation of אֱמֶת in this example appears in the *Peshitta*. Its translation for אֶכֶן, אֱמֶת, and אֱמֶת in Deut. 13:15 is by the affirmative adverb ܫܪܝܪܐ ܗܝܘܘܬܐ / *šarīrā ḥī ūtāw(hy) petgāmā*, but for Deut. 17:4 it is by an adjective: ܫܪܝܪܐ ܗܝܘܘܬܐ / *šarīrā (h)ī mellatā*. In any case, the translation by an adverb demonstrates that an adverbial translation, namely “...if it be **truly** certain...,” is also acceptable.

Deut. 13:15 / Deut. 17:4—וְדַרְשֵׁת וְחִקְרֶת וְשִׁאלֶת הֵיטֵב וְהִנֵּה אֱמֶת נָכוֹן הַדָּבָר—“Then you shall inquire and make search and ask diligently; and behold, if it be **true** and certain that such an abominable thing has been done among you.”

A clearer modal adverbial role of אֱמֶת is revealed in the following example from Jeremiah. This role is wholly adverbial and not at all parenthetical, since the word אֱמֶת in this verse is the complement of a specific predicate. The affirmative word אֱמֶת also appears in this clause in final position, in contrast to all the other affirmative words, which are in initial position. An adverbial role is also reflected in the *JPS* translation which is similar to the *RSV*, and in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, where the translation is by a prepositional phrase employed adverbially فَلْيَتَكَلَّمْ بِكَلِمَتِي بِالْحَقِّ. Such a prepositional phrase is also attested in Biblical Hebrew itself, as in Judg. 2:11 below and in its translation by the *RSV* and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*. Again, the *JPS* employs in the latter an adverb: “honorably.” The Geez translation, which is available only for Judg. 9:15, has a prepositional phrase, albeit quite literal: ܒܐܡܢܐ / *ba’amān*.

Jer. 23:28—הַנְּבִיא אֲשֶׁר-אֵתוֹ חִלּוֹם יְסַפֵּר חִלּוֹם וְאֲשֶׁר דִּבְרֵי אֱמֶת אֵתוֹ יְדַבֵּר דְּבַרֵי אֱמֶת—“Let the prophet who has a dream tell the dream, but let him who has my word speak my word **faithfully**. What has straw in common with wheat? says the LORD.”

<sup>37</sup> *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* settles for one translation, צחיה, either for נָכוֹן alone or for נָכוֹן אֱמֶת together.

Another important use of the word אַמְתָּ, this time set in first position, is within the prepositional phrase בְּאַמְתָּ. This use is closely akin to the use of the other affirmative words mentioned above and it can be interpreted as adverbial and parenthetical alike.

Judg. 9:15—וַיֹּאמֶר הָאֵטָד אֶל-הָעֵצִים אִם בְּאַמְתָּ אֶתֶם מְשֻׁחִים אֹתִי לְמֶלֶךְ עָלֵיכֶם—“And the bramble said to the trees, ‘If **in good faith** you are anointing me king over you, then come and take refuge in my shade; but if not, let fire come out of the bramble and devour the cedars of Lebanon.’”

Like the *RSV* translation of אַמְתָּ above, the word כֵּן is considered an adjective by the *RSV* in the translation of the next example, “The daughters of Zelophehad **are right**,” and the closely similar *JPS* translation: “The plea of Zelophehad’s daughters is just.” Still, this word can also be translated adverbially: “The daughters of Zelophehad speak **honestly**.” An adverbial interpretation is further supported by Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translation, *نعما كآل بنآآآ آلفآآ*, where the verb is preceded by the form *نعما* which is adverbially marked by the accusative (object/adverbial) case (نُصَبَ), and by *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, بِحَقِّ, تَكَلَّمَتِ بَنَاتُ صَافِحَادَ, where the verb is preceded by a prepositional phrase, بِحَقِّ, expressing an adverbial role. An adverbial translation should also be applied to the Geez translation by ራቲ—*ratu*, ‘honest’, probably ‘honestly’ in this case since it accompanies a verb of speech; the *Peshitta* has the adverb አረአረ / *kēnā’it*, ‘rightly’. In any event, again, like אַמְתָּ above, כֵּן plays a wholly adverbial non-parenthetical role here, because it is an adverbial complement of a specific predicate.

Num. 27:7—כֵּן בְּנוֹת צִלְפָּחָד דְּבָרַת נָתַן תִּתֶּן לָהֶם אֲחֻזַּת נַחֲלָה בְּתוֹךְ אַחֵי אֲבֵיהֶם—“The daughters of Zelophehad **are right**; you shall give them possession of an inheritance among their father’s brethren and cause the inheritance of their father to pass to them.”

#### 3.1.4.4 *Examples with אולי*

In contrast to all the epistemic modal words and phrases discussed so far, which play an affirmative role, the word אולי covered in this section casts doubt and at the same time exhibits certain expectations, encouraging or discouraging, regarding a state or a situation. Nevertheless, the word אולי still belongs to the same category of modal words and phrases, namely to epistemic modal adverbs, not as an affirmative particle but as a particle exhibiting uncertainty.

As to scholarly treatments of this particle, Livnat insightfully claims that Biblical Hebrew **יְהִי** evolved from an epistemic modal adverb, reflecting reservation on the part of some individual about a certain state or situation, into an adverb combining both an epistemic and a deontic expression of modality. That is, **יְהִי** refers to the uncertainty of a proposition and also displays the type of modality involving an expression of will. The roots of this development may lie in the existence of positive and negative expectations expressed through **יְהִי** by participants in biblical episodes. Expectations, positive or negative, at least partially semantically overlap expressions of will.<sup>38</sup>

Syntactically **יְהִי** is considered an adverb in two major Biblical dictionaries, *BDB* and *HALOT*.<sup>39</sup> Its fixed position in the beginning of a clause, introducing direct speech utterances, as well as its function as a non-obligatory complement of the predicate, confirm its adverbial, possibly non-parenthetical, sentence role. The adverbial interpretation is also found in Bible translations. All versions of Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation for the verses below translate **יְהִי** by **لَعَلَّ**, that is, adverbially. *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* also gives only an adverbial meaning in all its renderings, though it exhibits alongside **لَعَلَّ** other translations, like **عَسَى** **أَنْ** for Gen. 18:24 and **رُبَّمَا** for Gen. 24:39 below.

The Geez translation shows diverse possibilities. It sometimes ignores this particle (Gen. 16:2, Exod. 32:3 below), elsewhere it translates it by the adverb **ዮጊ** / *yogi*, meaning 'perhaps' (Josh. 9:7 below), on occasion uses the conditional particle **ለእመ** / *la'amma* (Gen. 18:24 below), and at times combines the adverb **ዮጊ** / *yogi* with the conditional particle **ለእመ** / *la'amma* (Gen. 24:39 below). Some sort of a conditional pattern for the two last verses also appears in the *JPS* translation, which translates **יְהִי** by "What if..." Such is the regular translation of Onkelos, **מֵאֵם/מֵאֵם**, as well. *Targum Jonathan*, however, employs **אמלמ**, 'perhaps' (Josh. 9:7 below), and likewise the *Peshitta* renders **יְהִי** by the particle **ܚܒܪ** / *khar*, 'perhaps.'

In the first example, Gen. 16:2, **יְהִי** conveys uncertainty. It is used by Sarai regarding the possibility that her maid replace her in bearing

<sup>38</sup> Livnat 2001 & Livnat 2002. Livnat 2001:83 and Livnat 2002:109–110 indicate the occurrence of **יְהִי** in Biblical Hebrew in directive speech acts which are, as she states, indirectly related to deontic modality, but she still insists that **יְהִי** functions in the "modal framework known as epistemic" (Livnat 2001:89).

<sup>39</sup> *BDB*:19b, *HALOT* I:21.





Gen. 24:5—אֵל-הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו הַעֲבֹד אֹלֵי לֹא-תֵאבְדָה הָאִשָּׁה לְלַכֵּת אַחֲרַי אֶל-הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת—“The servant said to him, ‘Perhaps the woman may not be willing to follow me to this land; must I then take your son back to the land from which you came?’”

The following example reveals once more both doubts and expectations, this time positive, side by side. It contains a direct speech utterance expressed by Moses, in which he offers to accept the Israelites’ repentance. Implicit in the use of אֹלֵי are Moses’ doubts regarding his ability to make good, and also his hopes that his offer is realized.<sup>43</sup>

Exod. 32:30—וַיְהִי מִמָּחָרָת וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל-הָעָם אַתֶּם חָטֵאתֶם חֲטָאָה גְדוֹלָה—“On the morrow Moses said to the people, ‘You have sinned a great sin. And now I will go up to the LORD; perhaps I can make atonement for your sin.’”

The last example of אֹלֵי given here shows the Israelite’s uncertainty about the geographical status of the Hivites, namely the inhabitants of Gibeon, he being concerned that these inhabitants might not be what they claim.<sup>44</sup> Again, אֹלֵי introduces direct speech and refers to the whole subsequent clause, אֹלֵי בְקִרְבֵי אֶתָּה יוֹשֵׁב.

Josh. 9:7—וַיֹּאמְרוּ וַיִּשְׂרְאֵל אֶל-הַחִוִּי אֹלֵי בְקִרְבֵי אֶתָּה יוֹשֵׁב וַאֲיֵךְ אִכְרוֹת—“But the men of Israel said to the Hivites, ‘Perhaps you live among us; then how can we make a covenant with you?’”<sup>45</sup>

### 3.1.5 *Appeal and Plea*

The examples in this section contain the words and phrases of appeal and plea אֹלֵי אֶתָּה אֶתָּה אֶתָּה, בִּי אֶתָּה אֶתָּה אֶתָּה.<sup>46</sup> They are included in this book since they serve as modal parenthetical units.

<sup>43</sup> See a discussion of אֹלֵי in this verse in Livnat 2001:87.

<sup>44</sup> For a discussion of אֹלֵי in this example see Livnat 2001:88 and Livnat 2002:109.

<sup>45</sup> More examples are Gen. 18:29, 24:5, Num. 22:6, 1 Sam. 6:5, 2 Sam. 14:15, 1 Kgs. 18:5.

<sup>46</sup> Another possible appeal and plea interjection is אֶתָּה/אֶתָּה אֶתָּה which appears only once in Classical Biblical Hebrew prose in the form אֶתָּה in 2 Kgs. 5:3—אֶתָּה אֶתָּה אֶתָּה—“She said to her mistress, ‘Would that my lord were with the prophet who is in Samaria! He would cure him of his leprosy.’” This particle is probably more a wish than a plea particle, and it is similar in meaning to לוֹ “would that,” also reflected in the translation of the *RSV*. It appears only twice in the Bible, and its second appearance is in the form אֶתָּה in Ps. 119:5, where it functions as a wish particle.

As to the basic meaning of the phrase **בִּי אֶדְנִי**, *BDB*, for example, explains the word **בִּי** as a “particle of entreaty,” “craving permission to address a superior,” and this dictionary points out its constant combination with **אֶדְנִי**.<sup>47</sup> Another major biblical dictionary, *HALOT*, treats the particle **בִּי** only in combination with **אֶדְנִי** and explains the two as a “formula beginning a conversation with a person of higher rank.”<sup>48</sup>

The word **אֶנָּה/הֶנָּה** is again treated in *BDB* and *HALOT* as an entreaty particle, but in the *BDB* it is initially marked as an interjection.<sup>49</sup> *BDB* defines **אֶנָּה** as a “particle of entreaty or exhortation,”<sup>50</sup> so already according to the *BDB* **אֶנָּה** is only partially an appeal and plea particle. *HALOT* defines this particle as “giving emphasis,”<sup>51</sup> and thus avoids attaching to it a meaning of plea. Fassberg takes this line of thought even farther, showing that the main role of **אֶנָּה** is in reference to consequence and that it functions as an appeal and plea particle only alongside **אֶנָּה** and **בִּי אֶדְנִי**.<sup>52</sup> Kaufman disagrees, and still regards all appearances of **אֶנָּה** as expressing a plea, defining it as enclitic and belonging to the sphere of direct address.<sup>53</sup> Whether **אֶנָּה** is always a plea particle or not, it anyway functions as an enclitic modal marking of verbs or certain particles.<sup>54</sup> Therefore, it is not parenthetical by itself, and can be regarded as such only as part of a longer pattern with **בִּי אֶדְנִי** or **אֶנָּה**.

Appeal and plea are also expressed by the idiom **אֶם-אֶנָּה מְצַאֲתִי הֵן** and more phrases which are syntactically considered full clauses, and are consequently discussed above among other parenthetical or

<sup>47</sup> *BDB*:106b.

<sup>48</sup> *HALOT* I:121–122.

<sup>49</sup> *BDB*:58a, *HALOT* I:69–70.

<sup>50</sup> *BDB*:609a–b.

<sup>51</sup> *HALOT* II:656–657.

<sup>52</sup> Fassberg 1994:71. For the complete description of the syntax of **אֶנָּה**, including syntagms in which it follows **אֶנָּה** or **בִּי אֶדְנִי**, see Fassberg 1994:36–73. Lambdin 1971:170 reaches a similar conclusion: “the particle seems rather to denote that the command in question is a logical consequence, either of an immediately preceding statement or of the general situation in which it is uttered.” See also Waltke & O’Connor 1990:684, §40.2.5.

<sup>53</sup> Kaufman 1991. On the role of the address itself as parenthesis see §3.1.6 below.

<sup>54</sup> For more references on the origins of this particle and its modal marking see, e.g., Gottlieb 1971 who connects **אֶנָּה** with the energeticus in form, meaning, and use, and Zewi 1999a who objects to this connection, because the use of the energeticus is related to the indicative while the particle **אֶנָּה** occurs with jussive, cohortative, and imperative Moods as well as other particles (Zewi 1999a:153–155, §3.2.7). For additional references see Zewi 1999a:153–154, notes 263–265.

semi-parenthetical clauses in the appropriate section (§2.1.2 above). The appeal and plea words and phrases mentioned in the current section are very common in Biblical Hebrew, and most examples of each type are generally similar in use and meaning. They are demonstrated below with only a few examples of each.

What can we learn about these words and phrases from Bible translations? The *RSV* translation of **יְדַבֵּר בְּי**, the *JPS* translation, the Arabic translations of Saadya Gaon for examples of the Pentateuch and *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* for all examples, the Geez Bible translation for the Octateuch, Onkelos for the Pentateuch, *Targum Jonathan* for the former prophets, and the *Peshitta* for all examples are mostly fixed and idiomatic, and use a certain form of an address. Nevertheless, we can still observe a certain variation in all these translations.

First, the *RSV* occasionally adds the appeal and plea verb ‘pray.’ It appears in Judg. 6:13 below for **יְדַבֵּר בְּי** without **נָי** in the Biblical Hebrew original, and it appears again in all other examples below for **יְדַבֵּר בְּי** accompanied by **נָי**. Our other English translation, the *JPS*, often uses the plea word ‘please.’ *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* adds a preceding verb, either **أَسْأَلُكَ**, in the majority of the examples below, or **اسْتَمِعْ**, in 1 Kgs. 3:17 and Exod. 4:13 below. The Geez translation sometimes adds a plea verb as well, such as **ና / አስተበቀሐ** / *nā/āstabaqq<sup>wa</sup>akka*. This possibility appears in Gen. 43:20 and Exod. 4:13 below. Onkelos and *Targum Jonathan* employ **בבעו**, namely ‘please’. This translation appears in Gen. 43:20 below in Onkelos and in Josh. 7:8, Judg. 6:13, 1 Sam. 1:26, and 1 Kgs. 3:17 below in *Targum Jonathan*. Finally, the *Peshitta* mostly employs a similar appeal and plea verb in various declensions: **ܒܥܢܐ** / *bāʿēnan* in Gen. 43:20 below, **ܒܥܢܐ** / *bāʿē nā* in Judg. 6:13, Exod. 4:13 below, **ܒܥܢܐ** / *bāʿyā nā* in 1 Sam. 1:26, 1 Kgs. 3:17 below, and **ܒܥܢܐ** / *bā-bāʿū* ‘please’ in Judg. 13:8 below, for **יְדַבֵּר בְּי** without **נָי** or with **נָי**. Since address in itself should be considered parenthetical, the translations of these words and phrases as addresses support the interpretation of the phrase **יְדַבֵּר בְּי** as parenthetical.<sup>55</sup>

The words **נָי** and **יְדַבֵּר בְּי**, when standing alone, are mostly translated in the *RSV* by the appeal and plea verb ‘pray,’ in the *JPS* by ‘please,’ in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* by the interjection **ه**, in Onkelos, for the verses from the Pentateuch, and *Targum Jonathan*, for the former prophets,

<sup>55</sup> On address see below §3.1.6.

בען, and in the *Peshitta* by either **ܒܥܢ** / *ba-bā'ū* ‘please’ (Gen. 50:17 in §3.1.5.2.2 below) or, like *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the interjection **ܐܢ** / *ān* (2 Kgs. 20:3 in §3.1.5.2.2 below). Saadya Gaon’s Arabic translation of the verses from the Pentateuch and the Geez Bible translation for the verses from the Octateuch below choose to ignore these words in their translations.

Though a certain variation exists among these translations in their choices for **בִּי אֲדֹנָי**, **בִּי אֲדֹנָי אֲנִי**, and **אֲנִי**, they mostly share the inclusion of a modal nuance of appeal and plea alongside an address. Both this nuance of deontic modality and the definite parenthetical syntactic status of an address support the assumption that **בִּי אֲדֹנָי**, **בִּי אֲדֹנָי אֲנִי**, and **אֲנִי** belong to the realm of parenthesis.

### 3.1.5.1 *Examples of בִּי אֲדֹנָי*

In all these examples **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** appears without a following **אֲנִי**. This phrase in combination with **אֲנִי** is demonstrated in the next section.

**בִּי אֲדֹנָי** in the first example here is a special form of an address, introducing direct speech utterance. It is said by Joseph’s brothers to someone of a higher rank, namely Joseph’s house steward.

Gen. 43:20—**וַיֹּאמְרוּ בִּי אֲדֹנָי יְרֵד יָרְדְנוּ בְּתַחֲלָה לְשִׁבְר־אֶכֶל**—‘And they said, **Oh, my lord**, we came down the first time to buy food.’”

The next example is again a special type of an address introducing direct speech. This time the higher-ranking addressee is God, and the speaker is Joshua, turning to God after the defeat of the Israelites by the people of the Ai. The address by **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** is preceded by a simpler form in which the name of God is indicated following the exclamation **אָהָה**, in Josh. 7:7—**וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אָהָה אֲדֹנָי הִ**—‘And Joshua said, ‘Alas, O Lord GOD.’” The choice of **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** for a second address might be due to the need to include here a nuance of plea.

Josh. 7:8—**בִּי אֲדֹנָי מָה אֶמַר אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר הִפְךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַרְף לִפְנֵי אֹיְבָיו**—‘**O Lord**, what can I say, when Israel has turned their backs before their enemies!’<sup>56</sup>

A nuance of plea is found again in the following example, in which **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** introduces direct speech. The speaker this time is Gideon and

<sup>56</sup> Fassberg shows that **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** appears without **אֲנִי** when it does not precede a modal verbal form (Fassberg 1994:45).

he turns to God's angel in reply to the angel's prior approach to him. Gideon's employment of **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** precedes his complains about the troubles caused to the Israelites by Midian. The nuance of plea is rendered in the *RSV* by the word 'pray.'

Judg. 6:13—**וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו גְּדֵעוֹן בִּי אֲדֹנָי וַיֵּשׁ ה' עִמָּנוּ וְלָמָּה מִצַּאתָנוּ כָּל-זֹאת-כָּל-וַעֲתָהּ וַאֲיִה כָּל-נִפְלְאוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר סָפְרוּ-לָנוּ אֲבוֹתֵינוּ לֵאמֹר הֲלֹא מִמִּצְרַיִם הֶעֱלָנוּ ה' וְעַתָּה וַיִּתְּנֵנוּ בְּכַף-מִדְיָן וְנִטְשָׁנוּ ה'—**“And Gideon said to him, **Pray, sir**, if the LORD is with us, why then has all this befallen us? And where are all his wonderful deeds which our fathers recounted to us, saying, ‘Did not the LORD bring us up from Egypt?’ But now the LORD has cast us off, and given us into the hand of Midian.”

Another example, 1 Sam. 1:26 following, has the phrase **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** in introduction to a direct speech utterance addressed at Eli, God's priest, by a simple lower rank woman, Hannah, who approaches him in order to fulfill her vow to God. The employment of **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** in this verse is again related to plea, since the content of the direct speech is plea and prayer.

1 Sam. 1:26—**וַתֹּאמֶר בִּי אֲדֹנָי חַי נַפְשְׁךָ אֲדֹנָי אֲנִי הָאִשָּׁה הַנִּצְצֶבֶת עִמָּכָה בְּזֶה—**“And she said, **Oh, my lord!** As you live, my lord, I am the woman who was standing here in your presence, praying to the LORD.”

The last example again contains the phrase **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** in introduction to a direct speech utterance, and it is once more expressed by a simple lower rank woman. This time it is addressed to a king, Solomon. The general scene to which this direct speech belongs is a court case heard by king and awaiting his judgment.

1 Kgs. 3:17—**וַתֹּאמֶר הָאִשָּׁה הָאֶחָת בִּי אֲדֹנָי אֲנִי וְהָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת יֹשֵׁבֶת בְּבַיִת אֶחָד—**“The one woman said, **Oh, my lord**, this woman and I dwell in the same house; and I gave birth to a child while she was in the house.”

### 3.1.5.2 *Examples of **נָא** in Combination with **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** or **אֲנָא***

The discussion of the phrase **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** above showed examples in which it stands by itself, not accompanied by **נָא**. In this section a few examples are given in which **בִּי אֲדֹנָי** appears in combination with **נָא**. Of **אֲנָא** Fassberg rightly says that it can only appear in combination with a following **נָא**,<sup>57</sup> and accordingly **אֲנָא** also features in this section when

<sup>57</sup> Fassberg 1994:44.

it is combined with **נָּ**, although without the phrase **בִּי אֲדַנִּי**. Examples include **נָּ** in combination with **בִּי אֲדַנִּי**, and with **אֲנָּ** but without **בִּי אֲדַנִּי**, in two subsections respectively.

### 3.1.5.2.1 Examples of **נָּ** in Combination with **בִּי אֲדַנִּי**

Fassberg indicates that **בִּי אֲדַנִּי נָּ** occurs with **נָּ** almost always only in combination with some sort of modal expression. This is demonstrated in two examples.<sup>58</sup>

The first example displays **בִּי אֲדַנִּי נָּ** in introduction of direct speech initiated by a verb combined with **נָּ**: **שְׁלַח-נָּ**. The content of this verse is certainly a plea, and it is made by Moses to God. God demands that Moses go to speak before Pharaoh; Moses declines this mission, making a plea to God to send someone else.

Exod. 4:13—**וַיֹּאמֶר בִּי אֲדַנִּי שְׁלַח-נָּ בִיד-תְּשַׁלַּח**—“But he said, ‘**Oh, my Lord**, send, **I pray**, some other person.’”

In the second example **בִּי אֲדַנִּי נָּ** again introduces direct speech, which also includes a verb, **יְבוֹא-נָּ**, combined with the particle **נָּ**: **יְבוֹא-נָּ**. The speech is spoken by Manoah and addressed to God. The content of the speech is definitely a plea, as evinced by the use of the verb **וַיַּעֲתַר**—‘entreated’—at the beginning of the verse.

Judg. 13:8—**וַיַּעֲתַר מְנוּחַ אֶל-ה' וַיֹּאמֶר בִּי אֲדַנִּי אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַחְתָּ**—“Then Manoah entreated the LORD, and said, ‘**O, LORD, I pray thee, let** the man of God whom thou didst send come again to us, and teach us what we are to do with the boy that will be born.’”<sup>59</sup>

### 3.1.5.2.2 Examples of **נָּ** in Combination with **אֲנָּ**

The two examples in this section comprise both **נָּ** and **אֲנָּ** with and without the phrase **בִּי אֲדַנִּי**.

In the first example the two words **נָּ** and **אֲנָּ** are reflected in the *RSV* translation, as well as in the *JPS, al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, and the *Peshitta*, by one translation only. This choice is probably due to the repetition in meaning implicit in the duplicate use of **נָּ** and **אֲנָּ**. Another choice, the omission of both particles, is made in all versions of Saadya Gaon’s

<sup>58</sup> Fassberg 1994:45–46.

<sup>59</sup> More examples of this pattern are Gen. 44:18, Num. 12:11, and 1 Sam. 25:24–25. Also see Fassberg 1994:45.

Arabic translation and in the Geez translation. Onkelos shows a third preference, translating both **נָא** and **אָנָא** literally by a form of **בע"ה** and **כען** respectively.

Gen. 50:17—**כֹּה-תֹאמְרוּ לְיוֹסֵף אָנָא שָׂא נָא פִּשַׁע אֲחֵיךָ וְחַטָּאתָם כִּי-רָעוּהָ גָּמְלוּךָ**—“Say to Joseph, Forgive, **I pray** you, the transgression of your brothers and their sin, because they did evil to you. And now, **we pray you**, forgive the transgression of the servants of the God of your father.’ Joseph wept when they spoke to him.”

The second example contains both **אָנָא** and **נָא**, and again only one translation for the two words appears in the *RSV*, the *JPS*, *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, and the *Peshitta* for similar reasons, while *Targum Jonathan* literally translates both by a form of **בע"ה** and **כען**.

2 Kgs. 20:3 (= Isa. 38:3)—**אָנָה ה' זָכַר-נָא אֶת אֲשֶׁר הִתְהַלַּכְתִּי לְפָנֶיךָ בְּאֵמֶת**—“Remember now, **O LORD**, I beseech thee, how I have walked before thee in faithfulness and with a whole heart, and have done what is good in thy sight.’ And Hezekiah wept bitterly.”<sup>60</sup>

### 3.1.6 Address

The term address, also known as vocative, is here applied to the sentence part which mentions the addressee, usually a proper name or its substitute, that is, a personal pronoun, a title, a nickname, etc. Syntactically the address is external to the clause or phrase it precedes. It is usually, though not always, in initial position and it is frequently, yet not necessarily, followed by a reference to the addressee in the following clause or phrase. This external position imparts to the address a syntactic status similar to any other full parenthetical unit. More support for applying parenthetical status to the address arises from the fact that it does not depend syntactically on, and is not a complement of, any sentence part or the sentence as a whole.<sup>61</sup>

Where a certain reference to a previous address appears in the subsequent clause, the address might also be considered an extraposed

<sup>60</sup> One more reference in Classical Biblical Hebrew is Exod. 32:31–32, and see other references in Late Biblical Hebrew in Fassberg 1994:44.

<sup>61</sup> On the similarity between parenthetical clauses and vocatives and interjections regarding syntactic status and non-syntagmatic relations to their host clause, see Peterson 1999:231–232, §2.1.

part in a pattern of extraposition, which usually includes an anaphoric or cataphoric pronoun referring to the extraposed part. In general, parenthetical units and extraposed sentence parts share an equal external status as regards the clause to which they are adjacent. However, parenthetical units and extraposed sentence parts differ in the type of information they convey. Parenthetical units hold external information, which is marginal and outside the clause in which they appear; extraposed sentence parts play the crucial role of logical subject to which a complete clause refers as its logical predicate.

Addresses are very common in the Bible, and their structure is usually ordinary and unsophisticated. Any example of an address will do for explaining and demonstrating this construction, and only a few examples are presented.<sup>62</sup>

The first example displays the address **אֲדֹנָי ה'** in first position in direct speech, and it is followed by a reference to the addressee, which is implicit in the verb agreement pronoun.

Gen. 15:2—**וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם אֲדֹנָי ה' מֵה־תִּתֶנּוּ לִי וְאֲנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ עֲרִירִי וְבֵן־מֶשֶׁק בֵּיתִי—**הוא דַּמְשֶׁק אֱלִיעֶזֶר—“But Abram said, ‘**O Lord GOD**, what wilt thou give me, for I continue childless, and the heir of my house is Elie’zer of Damascus.’”

In the following example the address **בְּרוּךְ ה'** is in second position in direct speech, following a verb in the imperative. It mediates between an anaphoric pronoun implicit in the agreement of the imperative form of the preceding verb **בּוֹא** and a cataphoric pronoun implicit in the agreement of following prefix conjugation verb **תַּעֲמֹד**.

Gen. 24:31—**וַיֹּאמֶר בּוֹא בְרוּךְ ה' לָמָּה תַעֲמֹד בַּחוּץ וְאֲנֹכִי פְּנִיתִי הַבַּיִת וּמְקוֹם—**לְגַמְלִים—“He said, ‘**O blessed of the LORD**; why do you stand outside? For I have prepared the house and a place for the camels.’”

The last example displays an address in the form of a proper name, **חַנָּה**, set in initial position and introducing a direct speech. Again, an anaphoric reference occurs in the agreement pronouns of the subsequent verbs **תִּבְבְּי**, **תֵּאכְלִי**, and in the possessive pronoun **לְבָבְךָ**.

<sup>62</sup> I would like to thank Prof. Gideon Goldenberg who kindly indicated to me the necessity to include address in this discussion.



ויאמר לה אלקנה אישה חנה למה תבכי ולמה לא תאכלי ולמה ירע—1 Sam. 1:8—  
 ולבבך הלוא אנכי טוב לך מעשרה בנים—“And Elkanah, her husband, said to  
 her, ‘**Hannah**, why do you weep? And why do you not eat? And why is  
 your heart sad? Am I not more to you than ten sons?’”

### 3.2 NARRATIVE TIME CO-ORDINATES

The foregoing three types of parenthetical and semi-parenthetical units, that is, epistemic modal adverbial (§3.1.4 above), appeal and plea (§3.1.5 above), and address (§3.1.6 above) were all related to direct speech. All the phrases discussed in this section appear in narrative. They are particular syntagms which add external, marginal information to the story flow. The content concerns the time of an episode, and it is relevant to audience or readers in later periods. The best definition for these phrases is ‘time co-ordinates.’<sup>63</sup>

Time co-ordinates might refer to points in time which are earlier or later than the time of the story, and they try to bridge the interval between the time a certain event or situation actually takes place or exists and the time the story is written, told, or edited. We should probably see these time co-ordinates not as integral spontaneous sentence components, which are part of a living fluid language, but as some sort of literary formulas, artificially and deliberately inserted into texts through later intervention of scribes, narrators, or editors. Still, from the syntactic and functional-pragmatic points of view both types, either certain words and phrases appearing in direct speech or narrative formulas, should be considered parenthetical, since they are unattached to the clause in which they appear both syntactically and contextually.

Syntagms of time co-ordinates also appear very frequently as part of larger narrative formulas, which take the form of clauses. These clause types are discussed above in §2.2, which conveys narrative formulas that form parenthetical clauses.<sup>64</sup> Examples of all major types of time co-ordinate which exist in Biblical Hebrew, that is, **עד היום הזה** and **מִיָּמִים יְמִימָה**, **בְּעֵת הַהִיא**, **בְּיָמִים הָהֵם** and **בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא**, **לְפָנַיִם**, **עַד הַיּוֹם**, are presented in separate sections below.

<sup>63</sup> For the term ‘time co-ordinates’ see Lewis 1972:175–176, Brown & Yule 1983:40–41, §2.2.1, and §1.2 above.

<sup>64</sup> On the role of these time co-ordinates in the biblical narrator’s insertions in the text see Sternberg 1985:121.

3.2.1 *The Phrases* **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** and **עַד הַיּוֹם**

The time formulas **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** and **עַד הַיּוֹם** often occur alongside explanatory narrative clauses introduced by **לְכֹן/עַל-כֵּן**. These extended types of narrative formula are discussed above in §2.2.1, and can be observed once more in examples Gen. 26:33, 32:33 below. As stated above regarding time co-ordinates in general, the phrases **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** and **עַד הַיּוֹם** are external to the content of the clause in which they appear, since they are mentioned by the scribe or the narrator in reference to a period later than that of the story line. They should generally be considered a scribe's or a narrator's later editorial insertion.<sup>65</sup>

The examples below are presented in two sub-sections, those with the longer formula **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** and those with shortened formula **עַד הַיּוֹם**. Bible translations might switch between the two. Examples of such exchanges are the Geez translation for Gen. 26:33 cited below, in which a short translation lacking a demonstrative pronoun **እስከ ዮም** / *ʾaska yom* appears for the longer Hebrew formula **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**, and the longer translation of Onkelos **עַד יוֹמָא דִּין** for the shorter Hebrew formula **עַד הַיּוֹם** in Gen. 19:37 below. Once, in Josh. 5:9 below, the Geez translation use two formulas for only one Hebrew formula, **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**: **እስከ ዮም ወእስከ ዛቲ ዕለቲ** / *ʾaska yom wa-ʾaska zāti ʾlat*.

Another possibility is the rendering of both the short and the long formulas in one way. The *Peshitta*, for example, offers only one uniform translation for both the longer and the short Hebrew formulas: **דַּמְמָא לַיְיָוְמָנָא** / *ḏammā la-yāwmanā* = “to our day.” This translation refers to the scribe or the narrator by a 1st personal pronoun in plural attached to the time expression. This is an exceptional indication of the scribe or the narrator in the text itself and it provides the reader or the audience with external information referring to a later period which is additional to the time co-ordinate. As we will see in §3.2.1.1, traces of translations which contain a 1st personal pronoun occasionally appear in Saadya Gaon's translation of the Pentateuch as well.

As to syntax, though the position of the time co-ordinates discussed below is usually fixed, it might still change in Bible translation, for

<sup>65</sup> Note de Regt's interpretation of the phrase **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** in Deut. 10:6–9 as information given to the reader by a narrator (de Regt 1999:89, §3.5.1). See more information on this formula and its variants in Brin 2005, and also DeVries 1975:51, 151–154, who considers the role of these phrases as synchronism, sequence, and time-identification.

example, the *RSV* and *JPS* translations for Gen. 32:33 cited below, where the time co-ordinate moves from the end of the clause to a preverbal position. As we have stated many times, freedom of position of a phrase is typical of a full parenthesis.

### 3.2.1.1 *Examples with עד היום הזה*

The usual Arabic translation of the time phrase עד היום הזה, in Saadya Gaon's translation and in *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, is אלי הד'א אליום. Nevertheless, several occurrences of a different translation, אלי יומנא הד'א = "to our day," appear in two examples of Saadya Gaon's translation of the Pentateuch, one for עד היום הזה in Ḥasīd edition of Gen. 32:33 cited below and another for עד היום in Derenbourg edition, Ḥasīd edition and Ms. St. Petersburg for Deut. 3:14 cited below. As stated previously, the representation of the scribe or the narrator by the 1st personal pronoun in plural in a few examples of Saadya Gaon's translation of the Pentateuch probably follows the similar practice in the *Peshitta*, where עד היום הזה and עד היום are regularly translated by *ܕܡܡܢܐ ܠܝܘܡܢܐ* / *ḏammā l-yāwmānā* = "to our day." Such a translation by the *Peshitta* exists for all examples in this section and the next.

The first example, Deut. 2:22, has the time co-ordinate עד היום הזה in a verse that is part of Moses' speech to the Israelites. Though this verse should be considered direct speech, the content is mostly a narrative about earlier historical events. This particular verse refers to an earlier episode describing the fate of the Horites and its consequences for the sons of Esau. The phrase עד היום הזה within the verse relates the situation of the sons of Esau to the very day when the speech is spoken. עד היום הזה appears here in final position, the most common with this phrase.

Deut. 2:22—כְּאַשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְבְנֵי עֵשָׂו הַיְשָׁבִים בְּשֵׁעִיר אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁמִיד אֶת-הַחֲרִי—מִפְּנֵיהֶם וַיִּירָשׁוּם וַיֵּשְׁבוּ תַּחְתָּם עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה  
 "As he did for the sons of Esau, who live in Seir, when he destroyed the Horites before them, and they dispossessed them, and settled in their stead **even to this day.**"

The next example, Josh. 4:9, should probably be understood as offering a historical explanation for a construction of twelve stones still extant in the time of the narrator or scribe. Again, the phrase עד היום הזה appears in final position.

Josh. 4:9—וַשְׁתִּים עָשָׂרָה אֲבָנִים יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּתוֹךְ הַיַּרְדֵּן תַּחַת מַצֵּב רְגְלֵי הַכְּהֹנִים—  
 "And Joshua set up twelve stones in

the midst of the Jordan, in the place where the feet of the priests bearing the ark of the covenant had stood; and they are there **to this day**.”

The following example tells us that Rahab was allowed to live among the Israelites as a reward for aiding the Israelite spies in Jericho. The time co-ordinate **עד היום הזה** states that her life among the Israelites has continued to the time of the scribe or narrator. Again, **עד היום הזה** should be regarded as standing in final position, because it appears at the end of the main clause **וַתָּשָׁב בְּקִרְבַּי יִשְׂרָאֵל**.

Josh. 6:25—**וְאֶת-רַחֲבַת הַזֹּנָה וְאֶת-בֵּית אָבִיהָ וְאֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר-לָהּ הִחְיָה יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וַתָּשָׁב בְּקִרְבַּי יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה כִּי הִחְבִּיֵּאתָ אֶת-הַמַּלְאָכִים אֲשֶׁר-שָׁלַח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְרַגְלֵי אֶת-יְרִיחוֹ**—“But Rahab the harlot, and her father’s household, and all who belonged to her, Joshua saved alive; and she dwelt in Israel **to this day**, because she hid the messengers whom Joshua sent to spy out Jericho.”

The following verse is a narrative telling us about an earlier event, the conquest of Ai. The phrase **עד היום הזה** here relates to a certain ruin, where Ai supposedly stood, which the narrator or scribe interpret as the remains of that conquest and which still exists in his own day. Here too **עד היום הזה** is in final position.

Josh. 8:28—**וַיִּשְׂרֹף יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת-הָעִיר וַיַּעַשׂ לָהּ עֹלָם שְׂמָמָה עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**—“So Joshua burned Ai, and made it for ever a heap of ruins, as it is **to this day**.”

Next, 2 Kgs. 16:6 is again a narrative. It probably tells us about the settling in Elath in southern Israel of Edomites, not Arameans, according to conventional emendation, also reflected in the *RSV*. **עד היום הזה** connects this settling to the period of the scribe or narrator. The whole verse should in fact be considered a historical explanation for Edomites inhabiting Elath in his day.

2 Kgs. 16:6—**בַּעַת הַהִיא הִשְׁיִב רְצִין מֶלֶךְ-אֲרָם אֶת-אֵילַת לְאָרֶם וַיִּנְשַׁל אֶת-הַיְהוּדִים מֵאֵילַת הַזֶּה מֵאֵילוֹת וְאֲרָמִים וְאֲדוֹמִים בָּאוּ אֵילַת וַיִּשְׁבוּ שָׁם עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**—“At that time the king of Edom recovered Elath for Edom, and drove the men of Judah from Elath; and the Edomites came to Elath, where they dwell **to this day**.”

The formula **עד היום הזה** might also appear in connection with a description and an explanation of an ancient custom practiced uninterruptedly up to the time of the scribe or narrator. Such customs feature in the next two examples, Gen. 32:33 and 1 Sam. 5:5. These were previously

discussed in §2.3.5 above on historical comments, and are cited here again due to the appearance of **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** in them.

Gen. 32:33 following describes a custom related to food restrictions. Note that both the *RSV* and the *JPS* translations change the position of the time-coordinate **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**. The *RSV* changes it from final to initial position, “Therefore to this day...,” and the *JPS* changes it to middle position, “That is why the children of Israel to this day...” These changes are significant since, as frequently noted, freedom of position of a phrase is typical of full parenthesis.

Gen. 32:33—עַל-כֵּן לֹא-יֵאָכְלוּ בְנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-גֵּיד הַנֶּשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר עַל-כַּף הַיָּרֵךְ עַד—“Therefore **to this day** the Israelites do not eat the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh, because he touched the hollow of Jacob’s thigh on the sinew of the hip.”

The next example is a conclusion of a historical explanation for a certain practice in a holy place, in this case the house of Dagon, which is familiar up to the time of the scribe or narrator. The phrase **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** is again set in final position.

1 Sam. 5:5—עַל-כֵּן לֹא-יֵדְרְכוּ כַהֲנֵי דָגוֹן וְכָל-הַכֹּהֲנִים בֵּית-דָּגוֹן עַל-מַפְתַּח דָּגוֹן—“This is why the priests of Dagon and all who enter the house of Dagon do not tread on the threshold of Dagon in Ashdod **to this day**.”

As is clear from the next examples, **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** often appears in connection with explanations provided for place names or proper names. The four examples below, Gen. 26:33, Deut. 3:14, Josh. 5:9, and 2 Sam. 6:8, all indicate place names. Another example, Gen. 19:37, presented in the next sub-section, because it contains the shortened syntagm **עַד הַיּוֹם**, refers to a personal name. In all these examples the phrase **עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** appears in final position.

Gen. 26:33 below is an explanation of the place name Beer-sheba, so known up to the time of the scribe or narrator.

Gen. 26:33—וַיִּקְרָא אֹתָהּ שִׁבְעָה עַל-כֵּן שֵׁם-הָעִיר בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה—“He called it Shibah; therefore the name of the city is Beer-sheba **to this day**.”

The next example explains the place name Havvoth-jair.

Deut. 3:14—יָאִיר בֶּן-מְנַשֶּׁה לָקַח אֶת-כָּל-חֶבְלֵי אַרְגֹּב עַד-גְּבוּל הַגִּשּׁוּרִי וְהַמְעֻכְתִּי—“Jair the Manassite took all the region of Argob, that is, Bashan, as far as the border of the



3.2.2 *The Phrase* לְפָנִים

The prepositional phrase לְפָנִים is another type of Biblical Hebrew time co-ordinate. In biblical texts the phrase occurs 20 times, 13 of them in Classical Hebrew prose: Deut. 2:10,12,20, Josh. 11:10, 14:15, 15:15, Judg. 1:10,11,23, 3:2, 1 Sam. 9:9 (twice), and Ruth 4:7. Contrary to the time co-ordinates discussed previously, לְפָנִים refers to a period not later but earlier than the era of the scribe or narrator. Mostly these examples refer to the earlier existence of a certain people (Deut. 2:10,12,20) or an earlier place name (Josh. 11:10 conveys information about a certain place and Josh. 14:15, 15:15, Judg. 1:10,11,23 refer to more ancient place names).

Since these examples convey historical notes, several are indicated in the appropriate section, §2.3.5 above. In syntax, לְפָנִים and the whole clause containing this phrase should in fact be regarded as parenthetical. Following are three typical examples of לְפָנִים. One indicates a certain people (Deut. 2:12 below), the next indicates a certain place name (Josh. 14:14 below), and the third adds information about a place name (Josh. 11:10 below). This third example, Josh. 11:10, refers to the status of a certain city in ancient times.

Two other examples which contain this time phrase are 1 Sam. 9:9, which refers to an ancient term, כִּי לְנִבְיָא הַיּוֹם יִקְרָא לְפָנִים הָרֵאָה, Since the whole clause, not just its time co-ordinate, should be treated as a parenthetical historical note, it is discussed only in the appropriate section, §2.3.5 above. A further example with such a time phrase is Ruth 4:7, and it deals with an ancient practice, וְזֹאת לְפָנִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל-הַגְּאֻלָּה, וְעַל-הַתְּמוּרָה לְקַיֵּם כָּל-דְּבַר שְׁלֹף אִישׁ נָעֲלוּ וְנָתַן לְרַעְהוּ. This example too contains a complete clause, not only a time co-ordinate, that should be considered parenthetical, so it too is discussed in §2.3.5 above.

All the examples cited here are part of the narrative, and accordingly can be regarded as a later scribe's or narrator's insertion into the text of some marginal information on ancient times. This narrative's use of לְפָנִים as part of the editing contrasts with the use of this adverb in discourse, for instance, in Ps. 102:26—לְפָנִים הָאָרֶץ יִסְדָּתָ וּמַעֲשֵׂהָ יָדֶיךָ—“Of old thou didst lay the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands,” where לְפָנִים is an ordinary temporal adverb.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Regular use of a similar temporal adverb is attested in the Akkadian dialect of the El-Amarna letters, which was heavily influenced by Canaanite. The temporal adverb

לְפָנִים is found in all possible syntactic positions, initial, middle, and final, and thus enjoying completely free word order, as expected from a parenthetical unit. Examples are as follows.<sup>68</sup>

The first example is information regarding a certain people, the Horites. The content of this verse is similar to Deut. 2:22—כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְבְנֵי עֵשָׂו הַיִּשְׁבִּים בְּשֵׁעִיר אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁמִיד אֶת-הַחֲרִי מִפְּנֵיהֶם וַיִּירָשׁם וַיֵּשְׁבוּ תַחְתָּם—“As he did for the sons of Esau, who live in Seir, when he destroyed the Horites before them, and they dispossessed them, and settled in their stead even to this day.” This verse is discussed in §3.2.1.1 above because it contains the phrase הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה. As to word order, ובְּשֵׁעִיר יֵשְׁבוּ הַחֲרִים is in final position following the clause

Deut. 2:12—וּבְשֵׁעִיר יֵשְׁבוּ הַחֲרִים לְפָנִים וּבְנֵי עֵשָׂו יִירָשׁוּם וַיִּשְׁמְדוּם מִפְּנֵיהֶם—“The Horites also lived in Seir **formerly**, but the sons of Esau dispossessed them, and destroyed them from before them, and settled in their stead; as Israel did to the land of their possession, which the LORD gave to them.”<sup>69</sup>

Of the Arabic translations examined for Deut. 2:12, only *al-kitāb al-muqaddas* translates the adverbial prepositional phrase לְפָנִים by the independent adverbial form قَبْلًا. This translation also appears in the following verses from Joshua. By contrast, all versions of Saadya Gaon’s translation, available only for the verse from Deuteronomy, change the verse’s syntactic structure entirely, using an extraposition in which the adverbial prepositional phrase לְפָנִים introduces another noun: **פי ואמא** ... שְׁעִיר פִּיאָקָאם אֶלְחֹרִיוֹן קַבֵּל בְּנֵי עֵשָׂו ...

The second example connects a later place name to its earlier name. לְפָנִים is set in this example in middle position, between the subject, וְשֵׁם, and predicate, קְרִית אַרְבַּע, of a nominal clause.

Josh. 14:14—וְשֵׁם חֶבְרוֹן לְפָנִים קְרִית אַרְבַּע הָאָדָם הַגָּדוֹל בְּעֵנְקִים הוּא וְהָאֶרֶץ—“Now the name of Hebron **formerly** was Kiriath-arba; this Arba was the greatest man among the Anakim. And the land had rest from war.”<sup>70</sup>

The last example indicates the status of the city Hazor in ancient times. It is cited here because of the phrase לְפָנִים, though in fact the whole

*pānānu(m)* is found in several examples of this dialect in direct speech. For explanation and examples see Rainey 1996 III:123–126.

<sup>68</sup> Also see Brin 1986:53–54, 1995:7–15.

<sup>69</sup> More examples are Deut. 2:10 and Deut. 2:20.

<sup>70</sup> More examples are Josh. 15:14, Judg. 1:10, 11, 23.



clause, *בִּי-הַחֲצוֹר לְפָנִים הִיא רֹאשׁ כָּל-הַמַּמְלָכוֹת הָאֵלֶּה*, should be considered a parenthetical historical comment indicating the grounds for Joshua's treatment of Hazor. The phrase *לְפָנִים* appears here again in middle position, between a subject of a nominal clause, *חֲצוֹר*, and its predicate, *הִיא רֹאשׁ כָּל-הַמַּמְלָכוֹת הָאֵלֶּה*.

Josh. 11:10—*וַיָּשָׁב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בָּעֵת הַהִיא וַיִּלְכֹּד אֶת-חֲצוֹר וְאֶת-מֶלֶכָּהּ הָבָה בְּחָרֶב*—“And Joshua turned back at that time, and took Hazor, and smote its king with the sword; for Hazor **formerly** was the head of all those kingdoms.”

Since all the three examples in this section present only middle and final position of *לְפָנִים*, we should note that initial position also occurs once, in 1 Sam. 9:9: *... לְפָנִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל*—“Formerly in Israel...”

### 3.2.3 *The Phrases בְּיוֹם הַהוּא and בְּיָמִים הָהֵם*

The basic meanings of the phrase *בְּיוֹם הַהוּא* and its plural form *בְּיָמִים הָהֵם*, when referring to the past, are ‘that/those day/days,’ ‘on that/those day/days,’ and ‘then’. This phrase is very common in Biblical Hebrew, with over 200 occurrences. Some refer to the past, others to the future, the latter mainly in the prophetic books. Mostly the occurrences are not an external scribe's or narrator's comment, but function as time co-ordinates within the sequence of the story. Nevertheless, in some examples referring to the past these time co-ordinates seem to have been inserted into the story later, to bridge the gap between the scribe's or narrator's time and the time of the event. Such examples belong here, and several are demonstrated below.<sup>71</sup>

In all these examples the time co-ordinates *בְּיוֹם הַהוּא* and *בְּיָמִים הָהֵם* appear in narrative, at the end of a story and playing a part in its conclusion. However, in syntactic word order *בְּיוֹם הַהוּא* and *בְּיָמִים הָהֵם* may appear in initial, middle, and in final position in a clause. They thus display freedom of word order, typical of parenthetical units.

<sup>71</sup> For more information on the role of these time expressions see Brin 1986:50–52, and also DeVries 1975:51–52, 57–136, who considers this phrase part of a gloss, an incorporated supplement, a concluding formula, a transitional formula between episodes, and a narrative element in non-narrative pericopes. Especially note DeVries' assertion that “... there are a considerable number of occurrences in the narrative literature of the Old Testament, almost always referring to events that are past from the point of view of the speaker or writer” (DeVries 1975:57).

The first example, Gen. 15:18, concludes the event of the making of a covenant between God and Abram. By using the phrase **בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** the scribe or narrator clearly refers to this event as occurring at a point in time earlier than his own. **בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** appears in initial position.

Gen. 15:18—**בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** כָּרַת ה' אֶת-אַבְרָם בְּרִית לֵאמֹר לְזַרְעֲךָ נָתַתִּי אֶת-הָאָרֶץ—**On that day** the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, 'To your descendants I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates'.<sup>72</sup>

The next example, Exod. 14:30, concludes the story of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt through the Red Sea. Again, the phrase **בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** points to the earlier time of the event. Its position here is in the middle of the clause, between the verb and its subject, **וַיּוֹשַׁע ה'** and the objects, **אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם**.

Exod. 14:30—**וַיּוֹשַׁע ה' בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם וַיֵּרָא יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת-מִצְרַיִם—**Thus the LORD saved Israel that day** from the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore.<sup>73</sup>

The following example, Deut. 31:21, concludes the era of Moses as the leader of the Israelites by his writing and teaching them whatever they need to know after his imminent death. The phrase **בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** again refers to an earlier point in time. The position of this phrase in the clause is final, since it appears at the end of the clause **וַיִּכְתֹּב מֹשֶׁה** **אֶת-הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת**.

Deut. 31:21—**וַיִּכְתֹּב מֹשֶׁה אֶת-הַשִּׁירָה הַזֹּאת בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** וַיְלַמְּדָהּ אֶת-בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל—**So Moses wrote this song the same day**, and taught it to the people of Israel.<sup>74</sup>

The next verse refers to a covenant made by Joshua and the Israelites at the end of the era of his leadership. **בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** indicates once more an earlier point in time. Its position is final, at the end of the clause **וַיִּכְרַת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּרִית לָעָם**.

<sup>72</sup> DeVries considers this use not as a synchronism but as emphatically indicating a unique moment in Abram's life (DeVries 1975:73–74).

<sup>73</sup> DeVries connects this verse to a cultic celebration of the event (DeVries 1975:75).

<sup>74</sup> Note DeVries' assertion that "*bayyôm hahû'* stands here as a highly artificial synchronism, connecting the secondary command to write the song with the speaking of it" (DeVries 1975:69).

Josh. 24:24—וַיִּכְרַת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּרִית לְעַם בְּיָוִם הַהוּא וַיִּשָּׂם לוֹ חֻק וּמִשְׁפָּט בְּשֶׁכֶם—“So Joshua made a covenant with the people **that day**, and made statutes and ordinances for them at Shechem.”<sup>75</sup>

The last example, which also consists of the phrase **בְּיָוִם הַהוּא**, concludes the event of the Israelites’ victory in the battle against Jabin the king of Canaan, in this case with a poem. Again, **בְּיָוִם הַהוּא** refers to an earlier point in time. The phrase should be regarded as set in the middle of the clause: although it is at the end of the clause **וַתִּשָּׂר דְּבוֹרָה וּבָרַק בֶּן-אֲבִינָעַם**, it still mediates between this clause and the direct speech introductory particle **לֵאמֹר** which belongs to it, hence its middle position.

Judg. 5:1—וַתִּשָּׂר דְּבוֹרָה וּבָרַק בֶּן-אֲבִינָעַם בְּיָוִם הַהוּא לֵאמֹר—“Then sang Deborah and Barak the son of Abinoam **on that day**.”<sup>76</sup>

The last example in this section displays the plural form of this time co-ordinate **בְּיָוִם הַהוּא**, namely **בְּיָמִים הֵהֵם**. This time coordinate is not a concluding remark but introduces the wars between the Israelites and the Arameans. Still, **בְּיָמִים הֵהֵם**, like **בְּיָוִם הַהוּא**, refers to a point in time earlier than the time of the scribe or narrator. It is in initial position here.

2 Kgs. 10:32—בְּיָמִים הֵהֵם הָחַל ה' לְקַצֹּת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּכֶם חֲזָאֵל בְּכָל-גְּבוּל יִשְׂרָאֵל—“**In those days** the LORD began to cut off parts of Israel. Hazael defeated them throughout the territory of Israel.”

### 3.2.4 *The Phrase בְּעַת הַהֵיא*

**בְּעַת הַהֵיא** is another time co-ordinate which might be used in Biblical Hebrew as a scribe’s or narrator’s insertion referring to an earlier period. This phrase was previously mentioned in §2.3.1 above on background information, where it is noted that it should be regarded as a scribe’s or narrator’s external remark introduced into the text later. All three examples of **בְּעַת הַהֵיא** below appear in narrative, and the phrase is in various positions: initial in 2 Kgs. 16:6 and Judg. 14:4, middle in 1 Kgs. 8:65.

<sup>75</sup> DeVries regards this use as a “formal conclusion to the covenant narrative itself” (DeVries 1975:76–77).

<sup>76</sup> Note DeVries’ observation about this phrase: “The introductory verse of Judges 5, containing the phrase under study, is clearly recognizable as an editorial device for connecting two originally independent sources of tradition concerning the battle at Kishon. Here *bayyôm hahû*’ functions as an artificial synchronism between the two reports” (DeVries 1975:63). DeVries clearly considers this use an editorial insertion into the text.

The following example, 2 Kgs. 16:6, is also cited above (in §3.2.1.1) since it contains the time co-ordinate *עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה* alongside *בְּעֵת הַהִיא*.<sup>77</sup> While *עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה* relates to the time of the scribe or narrator, *בְּעֵת הַהִיא* refers to an earlier time. *בְּעֵת הַהִיא* is in initial position in this example.

2 Kgs. 16:6—*בְּעֵת הַהִיא הִשִּׁיב רַצִּין מֶלֶךְ-אֲרָם אֶת-אֵילַת לְאָרֶם וַיִּנְשַׁל אֶת-הַיְהוּדִים—*“At that time the king of Edom recovered Elath for Edom, and drove the men of Judah from Elath; and the Edomites came to Elath, where they dwell to this day.”

*בְּעֵת הַהִיא* is in initial position in the following example too, where it refers again to a time earlier than that of the narrator or the scribe.

Judg. 14:4—*וְאָבִיו וְאִמּוֹ לֹא יָדְעוּ כִּי מַה' הִיא כִּי-תֵאָנֶה הוּא-מִבְּקֵשׁ מִפְּלִשְׁתִּים—*“His father and mother did not know that it was from the LORD; for he was seeking an occasion against the Philistines. **At that time** the Philistines had dominion over Israel.”

In the last example the phrase *בְּעֵת הַהִיא* appears after a previous verse, 1 Kgs. 8:64, which refers to events connected to the dedication of the temple to God and contains the phrase *בְּיוֹם הַהוּא*. Other examples are in Jer. 33:15, 50:4,20, where both *בְּעֵת הַהִיא* and plural variants of *בְּיוֹם הַהוּא* appear side by side, though in a context of prophecies referring to future events, not the past. This time *בְּעֵת הַהִיא* is in middle position, between the predicate and the subject, *וַיַּעַשׂ שְׁלֹמֹה*, and a following object *אֶת-הַחֹךְ*.

1 Kgs. 8:65—*וַיַּעַשׂ שְׁלֹמֹה בְּעֵת הַהִיא אֶת-הַחֹךְ וְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל עִמּוֹ קֵהַל גְּדוֹל מִלְּבוּא—*“So Solomon held the feast **at that time**, and all Israel with him, a great assembly, from the entrance of Hamath to the Brook of Egypt, before the LORD our God, seven days.”

### 3.2.5 *The Phrase מִיָּמִים יָמִימָה*

The basic meaning of the phrase *מִיָּמִים יָמִימָה* is ‘year by year’/‘every year’/‘annually’. Accordingly, it occurs with habitual repeated practices.

<sup>77</sup> On the role of such phrases in indicating synchronicity, see Talmon 1978:11. Talmon actually employs the term ‘synchronicity,’ which refers, according to him, to “in-between situations” (Talmon 1978:17). For more information on the role of this time expression see Brin 1986:47–50.

Still, this phrase is not always a time co-ordinate inserted by a later scribe or narrator in reference to practices known to him as recurring every year in a certain period, and even up to his own day. It might also appear in regular discourse indicating routine practices contemporaneous with the story time. One such case is Exod. 13:10—*וְשָׁמַרְתָּ אֶת-הַחֻקָּה—*“You shall therefore keep this ordinance at its appointed time from year to year,” in which *יְמֵימָה* refers to God’s command. Another is Judg. 21:19—*וַיֹּאמְרוּ הִנֵּה חֹג-ה’ בְּשָׁלוֹ מִיָּמִים—* *יְמֵימָה* אֲשֶׁר מִצְפוֹנָה לְבֵית-אֵל מִזְרְחָהּ הַשָּׁמֶשׁ לְמִסְלָהּ הָעֹלָה מִבֵּית-אֵל שְׂכֻמָּה *יְמֵימָה*—*וּמִנְגִּב לְלִבְנוֹהָ*—“So they said, ‘Behold, there is the **yearly** feast of the LORD at Shiloh, which is north of Bethel, on the east of the highway that goes up from Bethel to Shechem, and south of Lebonah’”; here the reference to a repeated holiday is part of a conversation.

Moreover, in two instances *יְמֵימָה*, which occurs in a narrative, refers to habitual practices limited to the story itself, and carries no implications for a later period or for that of the scribe or the narrator. One is 1 Sam. 1:3—*וְעָלָה הָאִישׁ הַהוּא מֵעִירוֹ מִיָּמִים יְמֵימָה לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת וּלְזָבַח—*“Now this man used to go up year by year from his city to worship and to sacrifice to the LORD of hosts at Shiloh, where the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were priests of the LORD.” The other is 1 Sam. 2:19—*וּמַעִיל קִטְוֹן תַּעֲשֶׂה-לוֹ אִמּוֹ וְהֵעֲלִתָהּ לוֹ מִיָּמִים יְמֵימָה בַּעֲלוֹתָהּ אֶת-אִשָּׁה לְזָבַח אֶת-זָבַח הַיָּמִים—*“And his mother used to make for him a little robe and take it to him **each year**, when she went up with her husband to offer the yearly sacrifice.”

Only Judg. 11:40—*מִיָּמִים יְמֵימָה תִּלְכְּנָה בָּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל לְתַנּוֹת לְבַת-יַפְתָּח—*“That the daughters of Israel went **year by year** to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in the year,” seems to be a scribe’s or narrator’s insertion telling a common practice among the Israelites’ young women, probably still in his own day. Since this example is also a historical remark, it is displayed and discussed in the relevant section, §2.3.5 above.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CONCLUSION

This monograph was meant to offer a complete description of parenthetical units in Biblical Hebrew, through integration of several research disciplines and scientific approaches. The fields of research consulted in this study include linguistics, discourse studies, text linguistics, textual philology, comparative Semitics, and literature. The review and analysis of the linguistic aspects of parenthesis have taught us that the identification and definition of a parenthetical unit is elusive from a linguistic viewpoint, and that it is often more productive to pinpoint parenthesis by employing functional-pragmatic and literary perspectives, namely issues usually discussed in discourse studies or text linguistics, and up to a point in literary studies.

More specifically, we have learned that parenthetical units are expected to be syntactically unattached to the clause or sequence of clauses in which they appear, though frequently parenthetical information is conveyed within a clause or a sequence of clauses by constructions which maintain a certain syntactic connection, occasionally loose, to their host clause. Still, in this study the aim was to analyze parenthetical units by linguistic means as much as possible. Therefore the collection and classification of the parenthetical units according to their context and content-related contribution to their host clauses were joined by an effort to indicate their linguistic properties as well.

By this method the division and classification of the examples of parenthesis was based first on linguistic criteria and only later on functional-pragmatic ones. The main division of the parenthetical units was first according to their basic linguistic structure: clauses or words and phrases. The type and degree of syntactic attachment of each parenthetical unit to the clause or sequence of clauses in which it appeared remained to be discussed separately for each kind, mostly because it was often impossible to decide whether to consider a certain construction attached or unattached syntactically to its host clause or sequence of clauses. For many examples this question was left unanswered. In any event, only then, at the second stage, was each division, clauses or words and phrases, subdivided into sub-sections according to content-related considerations.

Several patterns of parenthetical clauses and parenthetical words and phrases were found typically related to discourse prose, for example, appeal and plea, oath patterns, epistemic modal adverbials, and address; others were usually related to narrative prose, for example, special narrative formulas and narrative time co-ordinates. A criterion differentiating discourse and narrative might also be productive and frequently serve as a main divider between two major groups of examples—in discourse versus narrative; however, this differentiation did not always work, and parenthetical clauses and parenthetical words and phrase appeared in both types of prose, for example, references to a speaker and the mention of an observer's identity or an individual standpoint. Therefore, syntactic and content-related criteria for the main division and sub-division of the examples were preferred to the criterion of appearance within discourse or narrative. Nevertheless, special attention was certainly paid to the latter question in the individual treatment of each construction discussed.

Additional issues were tackled regarding each type of parenthesis: the degree of syntactic relation between a parenthetical unit and its host clause; the context of a parenthetical unit; its function in inserting extra information or commenting on a certain sentence component or on the whole sentence; whether that information expressed epistemic or deontic modality and possibly subjectivity or not; and whether it was a spontaneous parenthetical remark, mainly in discourse, namely direct speech, or an editorial contribution to the text, mainly in narrative, in consequence of the author's, narrator's or perhaps even another editor's interference.

The constructions in the first section, namely parenthetical clauses, consisted of three major groups. The first was references to a speaker, appeal and plea, affirmation of God's existence, identity, and status, or references to external interference, and oath patterns. Second, narrative formulas were discussed: a formula introduced by *עַל-כֵּן / לְכֵן*, another introduced by *וַיִּתֵּן דְּבָרָי*, and another indicating a proper name, a month name, or related information. Third, other types of narrative information were displayed and examined, the common denominator being that they were mostly expressed by circumstantial clauses. Examples of mainly circumstantial clauses, occasionally along with several other subordinate clause types, which conveyed marginal information, were divided according to the type of information they held: background, foreshadowing, explanatory, theological comments, historical comments, and lastly other marginal information.

The constructions tackled in the second section, namely parenthetical words and phrases, were presented in only two major groups. The first covered all types of parenthetical words and phrases other than narrative time co-ordinates, that is, references to a speaker, mention of an observer's identity or an individual standpoint, epistemic modal adverbials, appeal and plea, and address. The second group consisted of special types of narrative time co-ordinates whose role was to fill a gap in time. These were the phrases *בְּיּוֹם הַהוּא*; *לְפָנַי*; *עַד הַיּוֹם*; and *עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה*; and *מִיָּמַי יְמִימָה*; *בְּעֵת הַהִיא*; and *בְּיָמַי הַהֵם*.

As to the other levels of Hebrew, all in all the variety of constructions, both clauses and words and phrases, which form parenthetical or semi-parenthetical units in Biblical Hebrew differs from that found in later stages of Hebrew. Modern Hebrew demonstrates many types of parenthetical expressions whose use, at least as parentheses, does not originate in Biblical Hebrew. More specifically, most Modern Hebrew adverbs, sentence adverbials, and parenthetical words and phrases arose in Medieval Hebrew, in the Hebrew of the enlightenment and revival, and in later Hebrew phases. Most of them do not exist at all in Biblical Hebrew. Moreover, parenthetical clauses, many in the form of circumstantial clauses, are very common in Biblical Hebrew narrative, considerably more than in later stages of Hebrew. By contrast, the variety of parenthetical words and phrases seems to be sparser and more limited in Biblical Hebrew.

This book turned its attention to Bible translations of the original biblical passages, to see if they shed any specific light on parenthetical constructions or reflected them in any particular manner. Several representative Semitic and non-Semitic translations were chosen, and examined for each of the parenthetical units presented. Semitic Bible translations included Saadya Gaon's early 10th-century Arabic translation of the Pentateuch, the Christian Arabic translation known as *al-kitāb al-muqaddas*, the Geez Bible translation of the Octateuch, Onkelos Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch, *Targum Jonathan* Aramaic translation of the former Prophets, and the *Peshitta* Syriac Bible translation. The non-Semitic *RSV* was chosen as a standard basic English translation for all verses cited, and the *JPS* English translation was sometimes cited to support a significant *RSV* translation or offered a notably different interpretation.

The contributions of these translations to the understanding of the syntax of parenthetical constructions and their functional-pragmatic status were regarded as a sort of exegetical approach to the biblical



text. Bible translations in general, and those chosen here in particular, sometimes conform to the plain and straightforward sense of a construction, and sometimes suggest other interpretations. But like Bible exegesis, the translated renderings were treated as additional viewpoints offering diverse understandings of certain texts and constructions. No one interpretation was ever deemed decisive and conclusive, ruling out the others.

The contribution of Bible translations to the current study emphasizes the importance of translation studies in general and of Bible translations in particular for syntactic and discourse studies. Only few translations were selected for the current study, mostly Semitic Bible translations; considering the overwhelming number of Bible translations in numerous languages, much still remains to be done. This monograph is offered not as the final word on parenthesis, but in the hope of stimulating more studies on this topic.

As stated, the intention of this monograph was to integrate various research fields related to Biblical Hebrew and general Bible studies. Bible translation studies also join other disciplines consulted for this study, that is, linguistics, discourse studies, text linguistics, textual philology, comparative Semitic, and literature. Finally, the wish to combine various fields of research should not be restricted to parenthesis but applied to other topics in Biblical research as well.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ANES</i>	Ancient Near Eastern Studies = formerly <i>Abr-Nahrain</i>
<i>ATSAT</i>	Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament
<i>BDB</i>	Brown, F. Driver, S. R. & Briggs, Ch. A. 1906. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford: Clarendon Press
<i>BZAW</i>	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CLS</i>	Chicago Linguistic Society Papers
<i>GKC 1910</i>	Kautzsch, E. Ed. 1910. <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Oxford: Clarendon Press (translated by A. E. Cowley).
<i>HALOT</i>	Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W. 1994–2000. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Leiden: Brill.
<i>HDO I</i>	Handbuch der Orientalistik / Handbook of Oriental Studies, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten / The Near and Middle East
<i>JBL</i>	Journal of Biblical Literature
<i>JNSL</i>	Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages
<i>JQR</i>	Jewish Quarterly Review
<i>JSOT</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
<i>JSS</i>	Journal of Semitic Studies
<i>SBL</i>	Society of Biblical Literature
<i>VT</i>	Vetus Testamentum
<i>ZAH</i>	Zeitschrift für Althebraistik

### PRIMARY SOURCES

- Beentjes, C. P. 1997. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill (*Supplements to VT* 68).  
Derenbourg edition = Derenbourg, J. & Others. Eds. 1893. *Oeuvres complètes de R. Saadia ben Josef al-Fayyūmī I, Version arabe du pentateuque*. Paris (reprint 1979, Hildesheim & New York).  
Geez Bible Translation = ብሉይ ኪዳን—*bəly kidān*. 1955A.M./1962. Asmara.  
Ḥasīd edition = Ḥasīd, A. 1968. ספר כתר תורה הנקרא בלשון קדמונינו תאג. Jerusalem.  
*JPS* = *Tanakh, A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text*. 1985. Philadelphia, New York & Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society.  
*al-kitāb al-muqaddas* = الكتاب المقدس. 1985. دار الكتاب المقدس في الشرق الأوسط.  
Ms. St. Petersburg = Ms. St. Petersburg. National Library Ebr. II C. <1009> (Israel National Library—Mic. 69089, 69895).  
Onkelos = *Vocalized Translation of Onkelos according to the Yemenite Tradition*. 2005. Mechon-Mamre. <http://www.mechon-mamre.org/i/v/u/u0.htm>.  
Onkelos II = Sperber, A. Ed. 1992. *The Bible in Aramaic, Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts I, The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos*. Leiden: Brill.  
*Peshitta* = *The Old Testament in Syriac, According to the Peshitta Version I–II*. 1976, 1977, 1978, 1991. The Peshitta Institute, Leiden: Brill.  
Syriac Bible = *Syriac Bible*. 1979. United Bible Societies.  
*RSV* = May H. G. & Metzger, B. M. Eds. 1977. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha, Revised Standard Version*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press = <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/rsv/browse.html>.

*Targum Jonathan* = Sperber, A. Ed. 1992. *The Bible in Aramaic, Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts II, The Former Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*. Leiden: Brill.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Alter, R. 1981. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books.
- Amit, Y. 1999. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Leiden: Brill.
- 2001. *Reading Biblical Narratives, Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Andersen, F. I. 1970. *The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch* (*JBL* Monograph Series 14). Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press.
- 1974. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1994. "Salience, Implicature, Ambiguity, and Redundancy in Clause-Clause Relationships in Biblical Hebrew." In: Bergen 1994a: 99–116.
- Aristar Dry, H. 1992. "Foregrounding: An Assessment." In: Hwang & Merrifield 1992: 435–450.
- Azar, M. 1981. *Expressions of Commitments in the Old Testament and in the Mishna*. Haifa: University of Haifa & Pinath Hasefer (in Hebrew).
- Baasten, M. F. J. 1997. "Nominal Clauses Containing a Personal Pronoun in Qumran Hebrew." In: Elwolde, J. F. & Muraoka, T. Eds. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira, Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995* (*Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 26). Leiden: Brill: 1–16.
- Bailey, N. A. 1994. "Some Literary and Grammatical Aspects of Genealogies in Genesis." In: Bergen 1994a: 267–282.
- Bandstra, B. L. 1992. "Word Order and Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Syntactic Observations on Genesis 22 from a Discourse Perspective." In: Bodine 1992: 109–123.
- Baumgärtel, F. 1961. "Die Formel *n'um jahwe*." *ZAW* 73: 277–290.
- Bergen, R. D. Ed. 1994a. *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Dallas, Texas: International Academic Bookstore, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- 1994b. "Evil Spirits and Eccentric Grammar, A Study of the Relationship between Text and Meaning in Hebrew Narrative." In: Bergen 1994a: 320–335.
- Berlin, A. 1983. "Points of View in Biblical Narrative." In: *A Sense of Text, The Art of Language in the Study of Biblical Literature, Papers from a Symposium at the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, May 11, 1982* (*JQR Supplement*). Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns: 71–113.
- Biber, D. & Others. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Blau, J. 1977. *An Adverbial Construction in Hebrew and Arabic, Sentence Adverbials in Frontal Position Separated from the Rest of the Sentence* (*The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities Proceedings* 6/1). Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
- Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York (reprint 1984. University of Chicago).
- Bodine, W. R. Ed. 1992. *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Ed. 1995a. *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature, What It Is and What It Offers*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Ed. 1995b. "Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers." In: Bodine 1995a: 1–18.
- Brin, G. 1986. "Studies in Biblical Phrases Indicating Time." In: Friedman, M. A. & Gil, M. Eds. *Te'uda IV, Studies in Judaica*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University: 37–54 (in Hebrew).
- 1995. "The Expressions **לפנים בראשונה** et al. as Descriptions of the Distant Past in the Bible." In: Dotan, A. & Tal, A. Eds. *Te'uda IX, Studies in Hebrew Language in Memory of Eliezer Rubinstein*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University: 7–17 (in Hebrew).

- 2005. “On the Uses of the Formula “Until This Day” (עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה).” In: Bar-Asher, M. & Florentin, M. Eds. *Samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic Studies Presented to Professor Abraham Tal*. Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute: 109–119 (in Hebrew).
- Brichto, H. Ch. 1992. *Toward a Grammar of Biblical Poetics, Tales of the Prophets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brockelmann, C. 1913. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen II*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton-Roberts, N. 1999. “Language, Linear Precedence and Parentheticals.” In: Collins & Lee 1999: 33–52.
- Buth, R. J. 1987. *Word Order in Aramaic from the Perspectives of Functional Grammar and Discourse Analysis*. PhD thesis. University of California, Los Angeles (UMI Dissertation Services. Ann Arbor, Michigan. 1995).
- 1995. “Functional Grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic: An Integrated, Textlinguistic Approach to Syntax.” In: Bodine 1995a: 77–102.
- Collins, P. & Lee, D. Eds. 1999. *The Clause in English*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Cook, J. A. 2004. “The Semantics of Verbal Pragmatics: Clarifying the Roles of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* in Biblical Hebrew Prose.” *JSS* 49: 247–273.
- Corum, C. 1975. “A Pragmatic Analysis of Parenthetic Adjuncts.” *CLS* 11: 133–141.
- Crystal, D. 2003. *A Dictionary of Linguistics & Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell (5th edition).
- Dawson, D. A. 1994. *Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew (JSOT Supplement Series 177)*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- De Regt, L. J. 1999. *Participants in Old Testament Texts and the Translator. (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 39)*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- 2006. “Hebrew Syntactic Inversions and Their Literary Equivalence in English: Robert Alter’s Translations of Genesis and 1 & 2 Samuel.” *JSOT* 30: 287–314.
- Desmets, M. & Roussarie, L. 2001. “French Reportive *Comme* Clauses: A Case of Parenthetical Adjunction.” In: Flickinger, D. & Kathol, A. Eds. *Proceedings of the 7th International Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar Conference, UC Berkeley (22–23 July, 2000)*. Stanford: CSLI Publications: 43–62.
- DeVries, S. J. 1975. *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, Time and History in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Dillmann, A. 1907. *Ethiopic Grammar*. Amsterdam (2nd edition by C. Bezold, translated by A. Crichton, reprint 1974).
- Driver, G. R. 1957. “Glosses in the Hebrew Text.” In: *L’Ancien testament et l’orient, Études présentées aux VI<sup>es</sup> Journées Bibliques de Louvain (11–13 septembre 1954)*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires & Instituut voor Oriëntalisme: 123–161.
- Driver, S. R. 1892. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Dubnov (Medvedev), Q. 2005. “The Development of Parenthesis with Emotional Meaning in Modern Hebrew.” *Lěšonénu* 67: 65–77 (in Hebrew).
- Emonds, J. 1973. “Parenthetical Clauses.” In: Corum, C. & Others. Eds. *You Take the High Node and I’ll Take the Low Node*. Chicago: Linguistic Society: 333–347.
- Eskhult, M. 1990. *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 12)*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Espinal, T. M. 1991. “The Representation of Disjunct Constituents.” *Language* 67: 726–762.
- Ewald, H. 1881. *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark (translated by J. Kennedy).
- Fassberg, S. E. 1994. *Studies in Biblical Syntax*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press (in Hebrew).
- Fassberg, S. E. & Hurvitz, A. Eds. 2006. *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting*,

- Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns & Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Gibson, J. C. L. 1995. "Coordination by *Vav* in Biblical Hebrew." In: Davies, J. & Others. *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed* (JSOT Supplement Series 195). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 272–279.
- Givón, T. 1977. "The Drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The Pragmatics of Tense-Aspect." In: Li, C. N. Ed. *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*. Austin & London: University of Texas Press: 181–254.
- Goldenberg, G. 1983. "On Syriac Sentence-Structure." In: Sokoloff, M. Ed. *Arameans, Aramaic and the Aramaic Literary Tradition*. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press: 97–140 (= Goldenberg 1998: 525–568).
- 1985. "On Verbal Structure and the Hebrew Verb." In: Bar-Asher, M. Ed. *Language Studies I*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University in Jerusalem: 295–348 (in Hebrew) (= Goldenberg 1998: 148–196 (English translation)).
- 1991. "On Direct Speech and the Hebrew Bible." In: Jongeling, K. and Others. Eds. *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Leiden: Brill: 79–96 (= Goldenberg 1998: 197–214).
- 1995. "Bible Translations and Syriac Idiom." In: Dirksen, P. B. & van der Kooij, A. Eds. *The Peshitta as a Translation: Papers Read at the II Peshitta Symposium, Held at Leiden, 19–21 August* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute 8). Leiden: Brill: 25–39 (= Goldenberg 1998: 591–604).
- 1998. *Studies in Semitic Linguistics*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.
- Goldfajn, T. 1998. *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative* (Oxford Theological Monographs). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gottlieb, H. 1971. "The Hebrew Particle *ná*." *Acta Orientalia* 33: 47–54.
- Gottstein, M. H. 1949. "Afterthought and the Syntax of Relative Clauses in Biblical Hebrew." *JBL* 68: 35–47.
- Greenbaum, S. 1969. *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London: Longmans.
- Greenstein, E. L. 2006. "Forms and Functions of the Finite Verb in Ugaritic Narrative Verse." In: Fassberg & Hurvitz 2006: 75–102.
- Gross, W. 1981. "Syntaktische Erscheinungen am Anfang althebräischer Erzählungen: Hintergrund und Vordergrund." In: Emerton, J. A. Ed. Congress Volume, Vienna 1980 (Supplements to VT 32). Leiden: Brill: 131–145.
- 1994. "Is There Really a Compound Nominal Clause in Biblical Hebrew?" In: Miller 1994: 19–49.
- 1996. *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa, Untersucht an den Büchern Dtn, Ri und 2Kön*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 17). Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- 2001. *Doppelt besetztes Vorfeld: Syntaktische, pragmatische und übersetzungstechnische Studien zum althebräischen Verbalsatz* (BZAW 305). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Haegeman, L. 1991. "Parenthetical adverbials: The Radical Orphanage Approach." In: Chiba, Shukin and Others. Eds. *Aspects of Modern English Linguistics, Papers Presented to Masamoto Ukaji on his 60th Birthday*. Tokyo: Kaitakushi: 232–254.
- Hand, M. 1993. "Parataxis and Parentheticals." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16: 495–507.
- Hatav, G. 1997. *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality, Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Heimerdinger, J. 1999. *Topic, Focus and Foreground in Ancient Hebrew Narratives* (JSOT Supplement Series 295). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Heller, R. L. 2004. *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Harvard Semitic Studies 51). Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Herczeg, Y. I. Z. & Others. 1995. *The Torah: With Rashi's commentary, Translated, Annotated, and Elucidated*. New York: Mesorah.

- Hoffmann, L. 1998. "Parenthesen." *Linguistische Berichte* 175: 299–328.
- Hopper, P. J. & Traugott, E. C. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2nd edition).
- Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hwang, Sh. J. & Merrifield, W. R. Eds. 1992. *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*. Arlington: The Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas.
- Jespersen, O. 1937. *Analytic Syntax*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (reprint 1984).
- Joosten, J. 1997a. "The Indicative System of the Biblical Hebrew Verb and Its Literary Exploitation." In: van Wolde 1997a: 51–71.
- 1997b. "Workshop: Meaning and Use of the Tenses in 1 Samuel 1." In: van Wolde 1997a: 72–83.
- (in preparation). *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*.
- Joüon, P. & Muraoka, T. 2006. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew (Subsidia Biblica 27)* Rome: Editrice pontificio istituto biblico (revised English edition).
- Kaltenböck, G. 2005. "Charting the Boundaries of Syntax: A Taxonomy of Spoken Parenthetical Clauses." *View[z]*, *Vienna English Working Papers* 14: 21–53.
- Kaufman, S. A. 1991. "An Emphatic Plea for Please." *Maarav* 7: 195–198.
- Khan, G. 1988. *Studies in Semitic Syntax (London Oriental Series 38)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kogut, S. 2002. "The Status of Adjectives and Adverbs in Biblical Hebrew: Morphological and Syntactic Studies and Exegetical Implications." In: Japhet, S. Ed. *Shnaton, An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies XIII*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press: 111–137 (in Hebrew).
- Kotze, R. J. 1989. "The Circumstantial Sentence—A Catch-Them-All Term? A Study in Sentence Relationships in 1Samuel 1–12." *JNSL* 15: 109–126.
- Lambdin, T. O. 1971. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Leslau, W. 1989. *Concise Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Lewis, D. 1972. "General Semantics." In: Davidson, D. & Harman, G. H. Eds. *Semantics of Natural Language (Synthese Library 40)*. Dordrecht & Boston: Reidel (2nd edition): 169–218.
- Livnat, Z. 1994a. "The Biblical Phrase **בְּעֵינַי** + PN": Semantic Shifts and Syntactic Structures." *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, June 22–29, 1993*. Division D, V. 1. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press (in Hebrew).
- 1994b. *Parenthetic Sentential Adverbials in Contemporary Hebrew*. PhD thesis. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University (in Hebrew).
- 1999. "Epistemic Modality as Materialized in Modern Hebrew." In: Sharvit, Sh. Ed. *Studies in Ancient and Modern Hebrew in Honour of M. Z. Kaddari*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press: 345–354 (in Hebrew).
- 2000. "Domain Adverbs." In: Schwarzwald, O. & Others. Eds. *Raphael Nir Jubilee Book, Studies in Communication, Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Jerusalem: Carmel (in Hebrew).
- 2001. "אָרְלִי from Biblical to Modern Hebrew: A Semantic-Textual Approach." *Hebrew Studies* 42: 81–104.
- 2002. "From Epistemic to Deontic Modality: Evidence from Hebrew." *Folia Linguistica Historica* 23: 107–114.
- Longacre, R. E. 1979. "The Discourse Structure of the Flood Narrative." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 47: 89–133.
- 1983. *The Grammar of Discourse*. New York: Plenum Press.
- 1989. *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39–48*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

- 1992a. “The Analysis of Preverbal Nouns in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Some Overriding Concerns.” *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5: 208–224.
- 1992b. “Discourse Perspective on the Hebrew Verb: Affirmation and Restatement.” In: Bodine 1992: 177–189.
- 1994. “*Wegatal* Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose, A Discourse-Modular Approach.” In: Bergen 1994a: 50–98.
- 1995. “A Proposal for a Discourse-Modular Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.” In: Talstra & Others 1995a: 99–103.
- Longacre, R. E. & Hwang, Sh. J. 1994. “A Textlinguistic Approach to the Biblical Hebrew Narrative of Jonah.” In: Bergen 1994a: 336–358.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics* 1–2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCawley, J. D. 1982. “Parentheticals and Discontinuous Constituent Structure.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 91–106.
- 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English* II. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- McFall, L. 1982. *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System, Solutions from Ewald to the Present day* (*Historic Texts and Interpreters in Biblical Scholarship* 2). Sheffield: The Almond Press.
- Mey, J. L. 1994. “Pragmatics.” In: Asher R. E. & Simpson, J. M. Y. Eds. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press: 3260–3278.
- Miller, C. L. 1996. *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative, A Linguistic Analysis* (*Harvard Semitic Monographs* 55). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- 1999. Ed. *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew, Linguistic Approaches*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Mittwoch, A. 1979. “Final Parentheticals in English Questions—Their Illocutionary Function and Grammar.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 401–412.
- Muraoka, T. 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem & Leiden: The Magnes Press & Brill.
- 1990. “The Nominal Clause in Late Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew.” In: Bar-Asher, M. Ed. *Language Studies* 4. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University: 219–252 (in Hebrew).
- 1999. “The Tripartite Nominal Clause in Biblical Hebrew Revisited.” In: Miller, C. L. Ed. *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns: 187–213.
- Myhill, J. & Xing, Z. 1993. “The Discourse Functions of Patient Fronting: A Comparative Study of Biblical Hebrew and Chinese.” *Linguistics* 31: 25–57.
- Niccacci, A. 1990. *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* (*JSOT Supplement Series* 86). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press (translated by W. G. E. Watson).
- 1994a. “On the Hebrew Verbal System.” In: Bergen 1994a: 117–137.
- 1994b. “Analysis of Biblical Narrative.” In: Bergen 1994a: 175–198.
- 1995. “Essential Hebrew Syntax.” In: Talstra & Others 1995a: 111–125.
- 1997. “Workshop: Narrative Syntax of Exodus 19–24.” In: Van Wolde 1997a: 203–228.
- 1999. “Types and Functions of the Nominal Sentence.” In: Miller 1999: 187–213.
- 2006. “The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in Poetry.” In: Fassberg & Hurvitz 2006: 247–268.
- Nöldeke, Th. 1904. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. London: Williams & Norgate (translated by J. A. Crichton from the 2nd German edition).
- Palmer, F. R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peretz, Y. 1967. *The Relative Clause*. Tel Aviv: Dvir (in Hebrew).
- Peterson, P. 1999. “On the Boundaries of Syntax: Non-Syntagmatic Relations.” In: Collins & Lee 1999: 229–250.
- Polotsky, H. J. 1985. “A Note on the Sequential Verb-Form in Ramesside Egyptian and in Biblical Hebrew.” In: Israelit-Groll, S. Ed. *Pharaonic Egypt*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press: 157–161.

- Quirk, R. & Others. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London & New York: Longman.
- Rainey, A. F. 1986. "The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation in the Light of Amarnah Canaanite." *Hebrew Studies* 27: 4–19.
- 1988. "Further Remarks on the Hebrew Verbal System." *Hebrew Studies* 29: 35–42.
- 1996. *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets, A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by the Scribes from Canaan I–IV (HDO I 25)*. Leiden: Brill.
- 2003a. "The *Yāqtul* Preterite in Northwest Semitic." In: Baasten, M. F. J. & van Peursen, W. Th. Eds. *Hamlet on a Hill, Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Leuven: Peeters & Departement Oosterse Studies.
- 2003b. "The Suffix Conjugation Pattern in Ancient Hebrew Tense and Modal Functions." *ANES* 40: 3–42.
- Reckendorf, H. 1921. *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Reinhart, T. 1983. "Point of View in Language." In: Rauch, G. Ed., *Essays on Deixis*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag: 169–194.
- 1984. "Principles of Gestalt Perception in the Temporal Organization of Narrative Texts." *Linguistics* 22: 779–809.
- Revell, E. J. 1985. "The Battle with Benjamin (Judges XX 29–48) and Hebrew Narrative Techniques." *VT* 35: 417–433.
- Rouchota, V. 1998. "Procedural Meaning and Parenthetical Discourse Markers." In: Jucker, A. H. & Ziv, Y. Eds. *Discourse Markers, Descriptions and Theory (Pragmatics & Beyond, New Series 57)*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 97–126.
- Sailhamer, J. H. 1990. "A Database Approach to the Analysis of Hebrew Narrative." *Maarav* 5–6: 319–335.
- Sarfatti, G. B. 2003. "Parenthetical Laudatory Formulas." *Leshonenu la'am* 53: 80–83 (in Hebrew).
- Schlesinger, K. 1953. "Zur Wortfolge im hebräischen Verbalsatz." *VT* 3: 380–390.
- Schneider, W. 1978. *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch*. München: Claudius Verlag.
- Seeligman, J. L. 1961. "Aetiological Elements in Biblical Historiography." *Zion* 26: 141–169 (in Hebrew).
- Sharvit, Sh. 2001. "Invocations for the Dead: Of Blessed Memory." *Hebrew Linguistics* 48:81–91 (in Hebrew).
- Ska, J. L. 1990. *"Our Fathers Have Told Us", Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives*. Rome: Editrice pontificio istituto biblico.
- Smith, M. S. 1991. *The Origins and Development of the Waw-Consecutive, Northwest Semitic Evidence from Ugarit to Qumran (Harvard Semitic Studies 39)*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Sternberg, M. 1978. *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 1985. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative, Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Taglicht, J. 1984. *Message and Emphasis, On Focus and Scope in English*. London & New York: Longman.
- Talmon, Sh. 1978. "The Presentation of Synchronicity and Simultaneity in Biblical Narrative." In: Heinemann, J. & Werses, Sh. Eds. *Studies in Hebrew Narrative Art Throughout the Ages*. Jerusalem: Institute of Jewish Studies, The Hebrew University at the Magnes Press: 9–26.
- Talstra, E. & Others. Eds. 1995a. *Narrative and Comment, Contributions to Discourse Grammar and Biblical Hebrew Presented to Wolfgang Schneider*. Amsterdam: Societas Hebraica Amstelodamensis.
- Talstra, E. 1995b. "Clause Types and Textual Structure, An Experiment in Narrative Syntax." In: Talstra & Others 1995a: 166–180.



- Tov, E. 1994. "Glosses, Interpolations and Other Types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible." In: Balentine, S. E. & Barton, J. Eds. *Language, Theology and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr*. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 40–66.
- Trumer, P. 1987. "The Status of Parentheses from a Pragmatic Viewpoint." *Lěšonenu* 51: 171–187.
- Tsumura, D. T. 1996. "Coordination Interrupted, or Literary Insertion AX&B Pattern, in the Books of Samuel." In: De Regt, L. J. & Others. Eds. *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*. Van Gorcum: Eisenbrauns. 117–132.
- Urmson, J. O. 1952. "Parenthetical Verbs." *Mind* 61: 480–496.
- Waltke, B. K. & O'Connor, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Weingreen, J. 1957. "Rabbinic-Type Glosses in the Old Testament." *JSS* 2:149–162.
- Weinrich, H. 1971. *Tempus, Besprochene und erzählte Welt*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer (2nd edition).
- Williams, R. J. 1976. *Hebrew Syntax, An Outline*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (2nd edition).
- Wither-Nielsen, N. 1992. "'In the Beginning' of Biblical Hebrew Discourse: Genesis 1:1 and the Fronted Time Expression." In: Hwang & Merrifield 1992: 67–80.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1990. *The Old Hebrew Particle gam, a Syntactic-Semantic Description of gam in Gn-2Kg*. St (ATSAT 34). Ottilien: EOS-Verlag.
- 1994. "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar." In: Bergen 1994a: 13–49.
- 1997a. "An Overview of Hebrew Narrative Syntax." In: Van Wolde 1997a: 1–20.
- 1997b. "A Critical Analysis of Narrative Syntactic Approaches, with Special Attention to their Relationship to Discourse Analysis." In: Van Wolde 1997a:133–156.
- 1997c. "Reference Time in Some Biblical Hebrew Temporal Expressions." *Biblica* 78:502–524.
- 1999. "Explaining Fronting in Biblical Hebrew." *JNSL* 25:173–186.
- Van Wolde, E. Ed. 1997a. *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible, Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*. Leiden: Brill.
- 1997b. "Linguistic Motivation and Biblical Exegesis." In: Van Wolde 1997a: 21–50.
- Zakovitch, Y. 1985. "Foreshadowing in Biblical Narrative." In: Cogan, M. Ed. *Beer-Sheva, Studies by the Department of Bible and Ancient Near East presented to Shmuel Abramsky on his Retirement, V. II*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, The Magnes Press: 85–105 (in Hebrew).
- Zevit, Z. 1998. *The Anterior Construction in Classical Hebrew (SBL Monograph Series)*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Zewi, T. 1992. *Syntactical Modifications Reflecting the Functional Structure of the Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. PhD thesis. The Hebrew University in Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- 1994. "The Nominal Sentence in Biblical Hebrew." In: Goldenberg, G. & Raz, Sh. Eds. *Semitic and Cushitic Studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag: 145–167.
- 1996. "Subordinate Nominal Sentences Involving Prolepsis in Biblical Hebrew." *JSS* 41: 1–20.
- 1998. "The Syntactical Status of Exceptive Phrases in Biblical Hebrew." *Biblica* 79: 542–548.
- 1999a. *A Syntactical Study of Verbal Forms Affixed by -u(n) Endings in Classical Arabic, Biblical Hebrew, El-Amarna Akkadian and Ugaritic*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- 1999b. "Interrupted Syntactical Structures in Biblical Hebrew." *ZAH* 12: 83–95.
- 1999c. "Tripartite Nominal Clauses and Appositional Clauses in Biblical Hebrew." *ANES* 36: 36–47.

- 2001. “Review of Tal Goldfajn. *Word Order and Time in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1998. xvi + 169pp. ISBN: 0-19-826953-6.” *JSS* 46: 143-146.
- 2004. “Review of Roy L. Heller. *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Indiana. 2004.” *Hebrew Studies* 45: 298-302.
- Ziv, Y. 1985. “Parentheticals and Functional Grammar.” In: Bolkestein, A. M. and Others. Eds. *Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications: 181-213.
- 2002. “This, *I believe*, Is a Processing Instruction: Discourse Linking via Parentheticals.” In: Falk, Y. N. Ed. *Proceedings of Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics 18, Bar-Ilan University, June 24-25, 2002*. <http://micro5.mssc.huji.ac.il/~english/IATL/18/:1-13>.



## INDEX OF CITATIONS

<i>Genesis</i>			
1:1-3	72	18:30 × 2	48 × 2
1:11-13	98	18:31	49
2:11-13	99	18:32	49
2:24 × 4	55, 92, 94 (note 71), 95	19:13 × 2	127, 130
	74	19:14 × 3	133 × 2, 136
2:25	74	19:16 × 2	137 × 2
2:6 × 2	67, 92 (note 67)	19:37 × 7	60, 63, 159, 162, 163 × 3
3:1 × 4	74 × 3, 75		64, 163, 163 (note 66)
3:3 × 6	41 × 2, 42 × 4	19:38 × 3	
3:9	91		142 × 4
4:21	20	20:12 × 4	126, 133 × 2
4:22 × 3	20, 98, 99	20:15 × 3	33, 34
6:7-8 × 2	16, 75	21:1 × 2	37
6:11 × 3	127, 129, 130	21:4	37
6:22	37	21:11 × 2	133, 135
7:1 × 3	127, 129 × 2	21:12 × 2	133, 135
7:16	37	21:30-31 × 3	57 × 2, 57 (note 19)
8:4-5	16	22:16	109
10:8-9	56	23:2 × 3	60 × 2, 61
10:9	130 (note 15)	23:19	64
11:5	91	24:5 × 2	150, 150 (note 45)
12:6 × 3	67 × 2, 68	24:31	157
13:7 × 2	67 × 2	24:39 × 3	148 × 2, 149
13:12-13	76	24:40	130 (note 15)
14:2	64	24:51 × 2	33, 34
14:3 × 6	60 × 3, 61 × 2, 93	26:22	58
14:7 × 3	60 × 2, 61	26:33 × 6	57, 159 × 2, 162 × 3
14:8	64		139 × 2
14:17	64	28:16 × 2	115 × 2
15:2	157	30:34 × 2	16
15:18 × 2	167 × 2	31:25	16
16:2 × 3	148 × 2, 149	31:35 × 2	48 × 2
16:13-14	57	32:33 × 11	55, 93, 94 (note 71), 95, 159, 160 × 2, 161, 162 × 2, 163 (note 66)
17:1 × 3	49 × 2, 130 (note 15)		
17:23 × 2	33 × 2	33:10 × 3	44 × 3
18:1	44	33:17	58
18:3 × 3	44 × 3	34:18 × 3	126, 133 × 2
18:5 × 2	38, 39	35:6	64
18:13 × 5	141 × 2, 142 × 2, 145 (note 34)	35:11	49
	149	35:19	64
18:20	149	35:20 × 2	64, 163
18:23-32 × 2	47, 48	35:27	64
18:23-33	149	36:1 × 2	60, 63
18:24 × 3	148 × 2, 149	36:24 × 2	60, 64
18:27 × 3	47 × 2, 48	36:43	64
18:29	98, 150 (note 45)	37:2-3	16

38:1	20	<i>Leviticus</i>	
38:10	132	10:5 × 2	38 × 2
40:9	11	10:15 × 2	33, 34
41:13	39	11:44 × 2	51 × 2
42:15–16 × 3	53 × 3	11:45 × 2	51 × 2
43:7	121	18:2	51
43:20 × 4	152 × 3, 153	18:4	50
44:2 × 2	115, 116	18:5 × 2	50 × 2
44:10 × 2	118 × 2	18:6	51
44:18 × 3	48 × 2, 155 (note 59)	18:21	51
45:21 × 2	119 × 2	18:30	51
46:3	50	19:3	51
47:25 × 4	44, 45 × 2, 46	19:4	51
47:30 × 2	114, 116	19:10	51
48:7	64	20:7	51
48:15	130 (note 15)	20:8	51
50:11	58	21:12	51
50:12	38	21:15	51
50:17 × 2	153, 156	21:23	51
		22:2	51
<i>Exodus</i>		24:12	111
1:5 × 2	78 × 2	25:55	51
2:14 × 4	139, 140 × 3	27:8 × 3	122 × 2, 123
2:15–16	68	27:18 × 3	122 × 2, 123
2:16 × 2	68, 75		
4:13 × 4	152 × 3, 155	<i>Numbers</i>	
5:16 × 6	41, 42 × 5	3:16 × 2	112 × 2
6:26	64	3:39 × 2	112 × 2
6:27	64	3:51	112 (note 9)
8:6	115	4:27	119
8:9	116	4:37	112 (note 9)
9:1–5	80	4:41	112 (note 9)
10:22–23	81	4:45	112 (note 9)
11:3	100	4:49	112 (note 9)
12:12	50	9:18	112
12:39–42 × 2	93, 94	9:20	112 (note 9)
13:10	170	9:23	112 (note 9)
13:17	87	10:13	112 (note 9)
13:18	101	12:11	155 (note 59)
14:30 × 2	167 × 2	13:3	112 (note 9)
15:23	57	14:20 × 2	114, 116
16:31	101	14:21	53
17:1	111	14:28 × 3	53, 54, 109
19:3–6	41	15:15 × 2	127, 129
28:21	15 (note 54)	17:30	37
32:3	148	18:19	130 (note 15)
32:15–16 × 2	101 × 2	21:16 × 2	60, 62
32:30	150	22:6	150 (note 45)
32:31–32	156 (note 60)	22:34 × 2	133, 135
34:27	122	22:37 × 4	142 × 3, 143
34:29	68	26:56 × 3	122 × 2, 123
34:29–30	68	26:59	20
38:21	119	27:7	147
chapters 19–24	17 (note 70)	32:2	45
		32:5 × 2	45 × 2

32:17	101 (note 78)	4:12 × 2	39, 100 (note 78)
32:27 × 2	38 × 2	5:9 × 3	159, 162, 163
33:2	112 (note 9)	6:25	161
33:36 × 3	60 × 2, 62	6:26 × 2	127, 130
33:38	112 (note 9)	7:7	153
36:5 × 2	112, 112 (note 9)	7:8 × 2	152, 153
36:10	37	7:20 × 2	142, 143
		7:26	163 (note 66)
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		8:8 × 2	105, 106
2:10 × 4	97, 164 × 2, 165 (note 69)	8:27	107
		8:28	161
2:12 × 5	164 × 3, 165 × 2	8:29	163 (note 66)
2:14 × 2	33, 34	8:31	125
2:20 × 3	164 × 2, 165 (note 69)	9:3–15	83
		9:7 × 3	148 × 2, 150
2:22 × 3	160 × 2, 165	11:10 × 5	164 × 4, 166
3:14 × 3	160, 162 × 2	13:13	163 (note 66)
4:48 × 2	60, 62	14:13	163 (note 66)
5:6 × 2	50, 51	14:14 × 2	164, 165
6:18	132	14:15 × 2	164 × 2
6:19 × 2	33, 35	15:12	113
6:25 × 5	33, 35, 127, 129 × 2	15:14	165 (note 70)
9:3	37	15:15 × 2	164 × 2
10:6–9	159 (note 65)	17:3	113
10:8	163 (note 66)	19:49	113
10:9	37	20:6 × 2	60, 62
11:25	37	21:2 × 2	113 × 2
13:15 × 4	145 (note 35), 145 (note 36), 146 × 2	21:10	64
		22:3 × 4	33, 34, 35 × 2
17:4 × 4	145 (note 35), 145 (note 36), 146 × 2	22:8	113
		22:32 × 2	133, 134
17:6	120 (note 12)	23:4	37
17:10–11	122	23:9	37
17:16	82	24:24	168
18:2	37		
19:8	37	<i>Judges</i>	
19:15	120	1:10 × 3	164 × 2, 165 (note 70)
21:5	120	1:11 × 4	98, 164 × 2, 165 (note 70)
24:3 × 3	126, 127, 129	1:23 × 4	98, 164 × 2, 165 (note 70)
24:12	130 (note 15)	1:26 × 3	60, 62, 163 (note 66)
26:18	37	2:11 × 2	132, 146
27:2	37	3:2	164
27:14	144	3:12	136 (note 17)
27:14–25	144	4:1 × 2	16, 136 (note 10)
27:15–25	144	4:4 × 2	68, 75
31:21 × 2	167 × 2	4:4–5	69
34:5	163 (note 66)	4:5	68
		5:1	168
<i>Joshua</i>		5:23	41
1:14	100 (note 78)	6:13 × 4	152 × 3, 154
1:15	21 (note 96)	6:17 × 3	45, 49 × 2
2:21 × 2	118 × 2	6:27 × 3	33, 35 × 2
4:8 × 2	39 × 2		
4:9 × 2	160 × 2		
4:10	39		

6:37	49	5:5 × 3	95, 161, 162
6:39 × 2	48, 49	6:5	150 (note 45)
7:11	100 (note 78)	6:18	163 (note 66)
8:19	54	7:1	84
9:15 × 2	146, 147	8:6	136 (note 17)
10:6	136 (note 17)	9:9 × 4	96, 164 × 2, 166
11:10 × 2	118, 119	10:12	56
11:39	94	13:19	71
11:39–40	95	13:19–22	70–71
11:40 × 2	94, 170	14:18 × 2	83–84, 84
13:8 × 2	152, 155	15:32 × 4	139, 140 × 3
14:4 × 3	87, 168, 169	15:33	140
14:7	136 (note 17)	16:21	131
15:19 × 2	57, 163 (note 66)	16:22 × 3	131, 133, 134
16:4	83 (note 60)	17:13	20
16:31	16	18:20 × 2	133, 134
17:6 × 2	69, 70	18:26	136 (note 17)
17:7–13	69	19:7	131
18:1 × 2	69, 70	20:1 × 5	127, 128, 130, 131 × 2
18:29	98	20:29 × 3	44, 45 × 2
19:1 × 2	69, 70	22:9 × 3	23 × 2, 97
19:6 × 2	47 × 2	25:8	46
19:10 × 4	60–61, 62, 63, 97 (note 74)	25:24–25	155 (note 59)
20:27–28a × 3	23, 24, 97	26:19	130 (note 15)
20:29–48	18 (note 78)	27:5	46
21:19	170	27:6	56
21:25 × 2	69, 70	29:6	136 (note 17)
<i>1 Samuel</i>			
1:2	76	<i>2 Samuel</i>	
1:3 × 2	77, 170	3:9 × 2	37 × 2
1:8	158	3:19	136 (note 17)
1:18 × 3	44, 46 × 2	3:36 × 5	131 × 2, 133 × 2, 135
1:20	58	4:4	71
1:23 × 2	133, 134	5:7 × 3	60, 62, 63
1:26 × 4	152 × 2, 154 × 2	5:20	58
2:12–17	76	6:8 × 3	162, 163 × 2
2:18	77	6:22 × 4	37, 133 × 2, 136
2:19	170	7:17	118
2:25 × 2	89 × 2	7:19	132
2:26	77	7:28 × 2	51, 52
2:30 × 4	109 × 2, 110, 130 (note 15)	9:11 × 2	38, 39
2:35	130 (note 15)	10:12	136 (note 17)
3:1	77	11:25	136 (note 17)
3:4	77	11:27	136 (note 17)
3:7	82	12:9	136 (note 17)
3:8	82	13:2 × 3	133 × 2, 136
3:13–14	76	13:32 × 2	120 × 2
3:17	54	13:35 × 2	119 × 2
4:11 × 2	76, 84	14:15	150 (note 45)
5:4–5	56	15:25 × 2	44, 46
		15:26	136 (note 17)

16:4 × 2	46 × 2	17:1	122 (note 13)
17:4	136 (note 17)	17:5	108 (note 5)
17:14	87	17:15	116
18:4	136 (note 17)	17:16	108 (note 5)
18:18	163 (note 66)	18:5	150 (note 45)
21:1-3	83 (note 60)	20:4	115
21:2-3 × 4	23, 24, 83, 97	22:38	108 (note 5)
24:1	89		
24:19 × 3	33, 35, 116		
		<i>2 Kings</i>	
<i>1 Kings</i>		1:17	107
1:36	145	2:22	117
2:3	125	3:2	136 (note 17)
2:4	130 (note 15)	3:4	72
3:6	130 (note 15)	3:18	133
3:10	136 (note 17)	4:17 × 2	38 × 2
3:17 × 4	152 × 3, 154	4:44	108 (note 5)
5:19	37	5:3	150 (note 46)
5:26 × 2	33, 36	5:14	117
6:1 × 3	61, 64, 93	6:3 × 2	48 × 2
6:12 × 2	33, 36	6:18	117
6:38 × 2	61, 64	7:16	108 (note 5)
8:1	64	7:17	39
8:20	37	8:19	88
8:23	130 (note 15)	8:22	163 (note 66)
8:27 × 2	142, 143	9:26 × 3	105, 110, 111
8:53	39	10:12	64
8:56	37	10:17	108 (note 5)
8:64	169	10:27 × 3	163 × 3
8:65 × 2	168, 169	10:30	85
9:12	136 (note 17)	10:32 × 2	88, 168
10:1	72	13:3 × 2	89 × 2
10:9 × 3	137 × 3	13:4-5 × 2	89 × 2
10:12	163 (note 66)	13:23 × 2	89 × 2
11:2 × 3	139, 140, 141	14:6 × 2	124 × 2
11:26	23	14:25	108
12:10 × 3	23, 24, 97	14:27	88
12:12	39	15:11	85
12:15 × 3	89, 90 × 2	15:12 × 4	37, 84, 85 × 2
12:19	163 (note 66)	15:37	88
13:18 × 3	84 × 2, 85	16:6 × 5	161 × 2, 168,
13:26	107		169 × 2
14:11	37	18:4 × 2	84, 85
14:18 × 2	107 × 2	19:15-16	52
14:19	59	19:17 × 2	142, 143
14:29	59	19:33 × 2	109, 110
15:7	59	20:3 × 2	153, 156
15:23	59	20:16-18	40
15:29	108 (note 5)	22:19 × 2	109, 110
15:31	59	23:16	108
16:5	59	23:21	125
16:14	59	23:35	121
16:34	108 (note 5)	24:2	108 (note 5)
		24:2-4 × 2	90, 114



24:3	114	20:31	53
24:13 × 3	33, 36 × 2	20:33	53
24:20 × 3	89, 90 × 2	33:11	53
		33:27	53
<i>Isaiah</i>		34:8	53
1:18	42	35:6	53
14:22	109 (note 6)	35:11	53
17:6	109 (note 6)		
30:1	109 (note 6)	<i>Zephaniah</i>	
37:16–17	52 (note 14)	2:9	53
37:18	143 (note 31)		
38:3	156	<i>Psalms</i>	
40:7	139	31:23	139
45:15	139	102:26	164
48:22	43	119:5	150 (note 46)
49:18	53		
		<i>Proverbs</i>	
<i>Jeremiah</i>		10:7	12
1:19 × 2	109, 110		
2:3	109 (note 6)	<i>Job</i>	
2:9	109 (note 6)	19:4	145 (note 34)
2:12	109 (note 6)	32:8	139
11:5	145	34:12	145 (note 34)
11:11	43		
22:24	53	<i>Ruth</i>	
23:28	146	1:17 × 2	54 × 2
28:6	145	2:1	72
31:34	109 (note 6)	2:13 × 2	46, 47
31:37	109 (note 6)	3:12 × 3	142 × 2, 144
31:38	109 (note 6)	4:7 × 4	95, 96, 164 × 2
33:15	169	4:8	95
46:18	53		
50:4	169	<i>Esther</i>	
50:20	169	2:16	64 (note 29)
		3:7	64 (note 29)
<i>Ezekiel</i>		3:13	64 (note 29)
5:11	53	8:9	64 (note 29)
14:16	53	8:12	64 (note 29)
14:18	53	9:1	64 (note 29)
14:20	53		
16:48	53	<i>1 Chronicles</i>	
17:16	53	12:24	122 (note 13)
17:19	53		
18:3	53	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
20:3	53	6:18	143 (note 30)

## 2. CITATIONS OF BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

Saadya Gaon's Arabic translation		11:5	91
<i>Gen.</i>		18:13	141
1:1–3	72–73	19:16	137
3:3	42	20:12	142
3:9	91	22:16	109



34:18	126	27:7	147
43:20	152	32:17	100–101 (note 78)
45:21	119	<i>Deut.</i>	
50:17	156	13:15	146
<i>Exod.</i>		17:4	146
1:5	79	17:16	82
4:13	152	<i>Josh.</i>	
5:16	72	8:8	106
9:1–5	80	<i>Judg.</i>	
10:22–23	81	2:11	146
11:3	100	4:4	75
13:17	86	11:39–40	94
32:3	148	<i>1 Sam.</i>	
<i>Num.</i>		1:20	58
14:28	109	20:29	44
27:7	147	<i>1 Kgs.</i>	
<i>Deut.</i>		6:12	36
24:3	126	10:9	137
<i>Josh.</i>		13:18	84
5:9	159	<i>2 Kgs.</i>	
8:8	106	20:3	156
9:7	148	<i>Isa.</i>	
<i>Judg.</i>		38:3	156
4:4–5	69	<i>Jer.</i>	
9:15	146	11:5	145
<i>JPS</i>		23:28	146
<i>Gen.</i>		<i>Onkelos</i>	
1:1–3	72	<i>Gen.</i>	
2:11–13	99	1:1–3	73
3:1	74, 75	3:1	42
6:7–8	75	11:5	91
14:3	61	18:24	148
13:12–13	76	19:37	159
18:3	44	20:15	126
18:24	148	22:16	109
19:16	137	24:39	148
22:16	109	43:20	152
24:39	148	50:17	156
28:16	139	<i>Exod.</i>	
32:33	160, 162	1:5	79
33:10	44	5:16	42
47:25	45	13:17	86
50:17	156	<i>Num.</i>	
<i>Exod.</i>		14:28	109
1:5	79	<i>Peshitta</i>	
2:16	68, 75	<i>Gen.</i>	
9:1–5	79–80	1:1–3	73
13:17	86	3:3	42
13:18	100, 100–101 (note 78)	14:3	60
<i>Lev.</i>		14:7	60
10:15	34	18:13	142
<i>Num.</i>		19:16	137
14:28	109		

19:37	60	<i>2 Sam.</i>	
20:12	142	5:7	60
22:16	109	<i>1 Kgs.</i>	
23:2	60	3:17	152
28:16	139	6:1	60–61
36:1	60	6:38	60–61
36:24	60	8:27	142
43:20	152	10:9	137
50:17	153, 154	11:2	140–141
<i>Exod.</i>		13:18	84
1:5	78	<i>2 Kgs.</i>	
4:13	152	19:17	142
5:16	42	20:3	156
13:17	86	<i>Isa.</i>	
<i>Num.</i>		38:3	156
14:28	109	<i>Ruth</i>	
21:16	60	3:12	142
22:37	142		
27:7	147	<i>Targum Jonathan</i>	
33:36	60	<i>Josh.</i>	
<i>Deut.</i>		7:8	152
4:48	60	8:8	106
13:15	146	9:7	148
17:4	146	<i>Judg.</i>	
<i>Josh.</i>		6:13	152
7:20	142	<i>1 Sam.</i>	
8:8	106	1:20	58
20:6	60	1:26	152
<i>Judg.</i>		<i>1 Kgs.</i>	
1:26	60	3:17	152
6:13	152	10:9	137
13:8	152	11:2	140
17:6	70	13:18	84
19:10	60–61	14:11	37
<i>1 Sam.</i>		<i>2 Kgs.</i>	
1:20	58	20:3	156
1:26	152	<i>Isa.</i>	
15:32	140	38:3	156

3. CITATIONS OF OTHER HISTORICAL SOURCES

The book of Ben Sira		Rashi's commentary	
Ben Sira 45:1	12	Gen. 1:1	73 (note 45)
		Lev. 18:5	50

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- address (vocative) 104, 114, 151–153, 151 (note 53), 152 (note 55), 156–158, 156 (note 61), 157 (note 62), 172, 173
- adjectives (adjectival phrase, adjectival role) 4 (note 14), 65 (note 32), 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 145–146, 147
- adjectival verbs 126, 131–132, 133, 134, 135
- adverbs 1–2, 3 (note 12), 3–4  
 adverbs in Biblical Hebrew (also see affirmative particles, time particles) 1 (note 1), 1–2, 27, 103, 109, 125 (note 14), 135, 140  
 adverbs in Modern Hebrew 173
- adverbials (adverbial constructions, adverbial phrases, adverbial units, adverbial) 1–2, 3 (note 12), 4, 6, 9  
 adverbial discourse connectives 3 (note 12)
- adverbials in Biblical Hebrew (also see clauses in Biblical Hebrew, adverbial phrases, time phrases) 1–2, 22, 67 (note 37), 103, 104, 105–106, 122, 125–126, 128, 130, 137, 145–146, 165  
 epistemic modal adverbials in  
   Biblical Hebrew (also see adverbs in Biblical Hebrew) 103, 104, 138–150, 158, 172, 173
- adverbials in Modern Hebrew 10, 11  
 epistemic modal adverbials in  
   Modern Hebrew (also see modality) 11, 173  
   **כנראה, נראה ש** 144  
   **כידוע, ידוע ש** 144
- sentence adverbials 1–2, 3 (note 12), 3–4, 103 (note 1)  
 sentence adverbials in Biblical Hebrew 10–11, 103, 138  
 sentence adverbials in Modern Hebrew 11, 11 (note 42), 173
- appeals and pleas 31, 32, 43–49, 51, 103–104, 150–156, 172, 173
- afterthought 21
- anacoluthon 21–22, 21 (note 97)
- apposition 14, 22, 23, 110, 112
- attributes (attributives) 22, 65, 79, 119
- background (off-the-line information) 10, 10 (note 37), 12, 13 (note 46), 15–16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 31, 66, 66 (note 36), 67–73, 76, 91, 96, 100, 168, 172
- clauses (sentences)  
 general  
   adverbia 4 (note 14), 6  
   content 4–5 (note 16), 6, 40  
   relative 3, 3 (note 11), 4 (note 14), 4, 6
- clauses in Arabic  
 causal 78, 140  
 circumstantial 60, 73 (note 48)  
 relative 60
- clauses in Aramaic  
 relative 79
- clauses in Biblical Hebrew  
 adverbial (also see adverbials in Biblical Hebrew) 14, 64–65  
 appositional (apposition) 14 (note 50), 59 (note 22), 59–60, 62, 63, 83, 85, 93  
 attributive (also see relative) 22, 64, 130  
 causal 37, 51, 75, 83–84, 85, 86, 89, 96, 120, 122, 136–137  
 circumstantial 13, 14 (note 50), 13–15, 15 (note 54), 19, 19 (note 86), 23, 25, 31, 58 (note 20), 64–101, 65 (note 30), 66 (note 36), 68 (note 38), 72 (note 44), 74 (note 50), 172, 173  
 comparative (adverbial comparative) 32, 37, 38, 39  
 conditional (conditional sentence) 43, 53, 110, 110 (note 7), 118 (note 11), 139 (note 22)  
   protasis 43  
   content 52, 53, 94–95, 143  
 contrastive 14 (note 50), 84  
 disjunctive-*waw* 14 (note 50)  
 elliptic 13  
 existential 64, 65, 67, 70, 73, 76, 77, 86, 89, 98  
 nominal (verbless) 13, 13 (note 49), 14 (note 50), 14, 15,

- 17, 17 (note 70), 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 59–60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 65 (note 32), 67, 67 (note 37), 68, 69, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 83, 83 (note 59), 85, 86, 92, 93, 95–96, 97, 98, 99, 99 (note 76), 100, 101, 110, 165, 166
- one-member 114, 115, 144
- participial 13, 64, 65, 65 (note 32), 67 (note 37)
- relative (also see attributive) 21–22, 21 (note 96), 36, 107, 108, 115, 116
- temporal 72, 86
- verbal 12, 13 (note 49), 17, 23, 64, 67, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 96, 98, 100, 119
- clauses in English
- causal 82
- clauses in Modern Hebrew
- content 144
- one-member 11 (note 42)
- relative 11 (note 42)
- clauses in Syriac
- nominal 61 (note 26)
- cleft sentences 3, 7
- co-ordinates (also see particles in Biblical Hebrew, time particles and time phrases in Biblical Hebrew) 9, 9 (note 34), 104, 158, 158 (note 63), 158 (note 64), 172, 173
- complements 2, 4–5 (note 16), 7, 65, 105, 106, 110, 114, 124, 125, 126, 131, 132, 133, 134, 138, 146, 147, 148, 156
- conjunctions
- conjunctions in Arabic
- wāw al-ḥal* (conjunctive *wāw*) 60
- ف (*fā*) 20, 82
- و (*wā*) 20, 78
- conjunctions in Biblical Hebrew
- conjunctive *wāw* (*waw*) 11, 13 (note 49), 14 (note 50), 27, 59, 64, 67, 69, 73, 77, 86, 91, 97, 98, 100
- consecutive *wāw* (conversive *wāw*, *wāw*) 11, 12, 13, 19 (note 87), 74, 74 (note 52), 75, 82, 83, 84, 92
- conjunctions in Syriac
- conjunctive *wāw* 60, 84
- deixis 58 (note 21)
- discourse markers 6
- discourse units 1, 2 (note 2)
- disjuncts 4, 4 (note 14)
- editorial notes (addendum, additions, insertions, remarks, works) 9, 21, 21 (note 96), 21 (note 98), 25 (note 106), 28, 54, 60, 60 (note 24), 90, 91, 92, 159, 172, 168 (note 76)
- ellipsis 22 (note 100)
- etiological 55, 55 (note 18), 57–58
- exegetical remarks (interpolations, techniques, exegetical) 28, 60, 60 (note 23), 91, 142, 173
- exposition (expository information) 25 (note 108), 25–26, 26 (note 111), 26 (note 112), 63 (note 28), 74 (note 49), 76 (note 55), 83 (note 60), 93, 96, 97
- extraposition 22, 14 (note 50), 42, 61 (note 26), 75, 82, 83, 83 (note 59), 100, 101, 156–157, 165
- focalization 65
- foreground 10 (note 37), 13 (note 46), 16, 16 (note 62), 17, 18, 172
- foreshadowing (anticipation) 31, 66, 73–77, 74 (note 49)
- formulas
- introductory, in Biblical Hebrew 47
- laudatory, in post-Biblical Hebrew 11–12, 12 (note 45)
- literary, in Biblical Hebrew 33, 158
- narrative (patterns), in Biblical Hebrew 31, 54–64, 91–92, 103, 104, 158, 172
- thanking, in Biblical Hebrew 43, 46
- gloss 3 (note 12), 21, 21 (note 96), 21 (note 97), 60, 60 (note 23), 60 (note 24), 166
- grammatical theories
- discourse grammar (discourse approaches, discourse considerations, discourse methods, discourse scholars, discourse studies) 1, 2 (note 2), 4–5, 8–20, 9 (note 35), 14 (note 50), 17 (note 68), 18 (note 81), 19 (note 87), 23, 25, 28, 65, 65 (note 30), 171, 174
- functional grammar (functional considerations, functional criteria, functional studies,

- Functional Sentence Perspective, the term 'functional' 9, 18, 18 (note 81), 28, 28 (note 117), 65, 66
- generative grammar (generative trees, generativists) 7, 7 (note 25), 22 (note 100)
- Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar 32 (note 1)
- pragmatics 4–5, 5 (note 17), 8–9, 27, 28, 28 (note 118), 120, 122, 123
- relevance theory 4, 7 (note 25)
- text linguistics 9, 9 (note 35), 18, 65 (note 30), 171
- transformational grammar (transformational grammarians) 5 (note 17), 22 (note 100)
- habitual aspect (habitual past) 70, 85, 85 (note 62), 92, 92 (note 67), 94, 94 (note 71), 95
- logical subject (theme, topic) 7 (note 27), 22, 65 (note 34), 157
- logical predicate 120, 122, 123, 157
- Masoretic system of accents 8
- modality (modal, also see adverbials, epistemic modal adverbials in Biblical and Modern Hebrew) 11 (note 42), 28, 37, 38, 43, 44, 51, 106, 114, 116, 117, 118, 125, 128, 131, 138, 138 (note 18), 145, 146, 147, 148, 148 (note 38), 150, 151, 151 (note 54), 153, 155, 172
- modal verbs 3 (note 12), 40, 153 (note 56)
- negation 7
- non-syntagmatic relations 2 (note 5)
- oath (swearing) 34, 37, 49, 53–54, 57, 108, 109, 110, 118, 130
- oath patterns (oath formulas) 31, 49, 52–54, 109, 110 (note 7), 118, 118 (note 11), 172
- object 36, 40, 58, 96, 113, 167, 169
- objects separated from their verbs 22
- object/adverbial case 146, 147
- parataxis 2
- participles 14, 65 (note 32), 67 (note 37), 70, 85, 85 (note 62), 135
- particles (prepositions, prepositional phrases, also see conjunctions)
- particles in Akkadian El-Amarna *pānānu(m)* 64–165 (note 67)
- particles in Arabic
- qad* 81, 82
- أ 141
- عَلِي 126
- عَنْد 126
- بَيْنَ يَدَيْ 126
- أ 142
- أَمَّا...فَ 75, 100
- أَمَامَ 127
- أَه 152
- فِي عَيْنَيْ 127
- قَبْلًا 165
- قَدِيمًا 127
- لَدَى 127
- مَعَ 78
- affirmative particles
- אֲדֹנָי 139, 140
- אֵיכֶנָּה, יֵקִינָה 139, 140, 141
- וְעָלִי חִקְיָה, וְעָלִי אֶלְחִיקָה וּבְאֶלְחִיקָה 142
- לְעֵל 148
- وَبِحَقِّ بِالْحَقِّ 146, 147
- حَقًّا 139, 140, 142
- رَبَّنَا 148
- صَحِيح 142
- عَسَىٰ أَنْ 148
- فِي الْحَقِيقَةِ 142
- لَعَلَّ 148
- subordinate particles
- أَنَّ 94
- particles in Aramaic
- בְּעֵינֵי 126, 127
- כְּעֵן 153, 156
- מֵא אִם/מֵאִם 148
- עִם 79
- קִדְמָה 126, 127
- subordinate particles
- ד (relative) 79
- דְּלִמָּא 140
- particles in Biblical Hebrew
- אֶהְיֶה 153
- אֶדְ 11
- אֶךְ 145 (note 34)
- אֶל-פִּי 104, 105, 111–114
- אֶת-פְּנֵי 125–127, 130
- בְּעֵינֵי 125–127, 131–136, 136 (note 16)
- גַּם 11

- כִּפִּי 122 (note 13)  
 לִכְּוֹן 11, 55, 159, 172  
 לִפִּי 122 (note 13)  
 לִפְנֵי 125–131  
 עַל-כֵּן 31, 55–58, 91–93, 159, 172  
 עַל-פִּי 104–105, 111–114, 119–121, 121–124, 122 (note 13)  
 affirmative particles (also see adverbs in Biblical Hebrew, epistemic modal adverbials)  
 אוֹלַי 138, 148–150, 147 (note 38), 149 (note 40), 149 (note 41), 149 (note 42), 150 (note 43), 150 (note 44)  
 אֲכֹן 11, 138, 139–141, 141–142, 146  
 אֲמֵן 138, 144–145  
 הַאֲרִי/הַאֲמֵן/אֲמֵן/אֲמֵנָה 11, 138, 141 (note 26), 141–144, 145 (note 34)  
 אֲמַת 138, 145 (note 34), 145–148, 146 (note 37)  
 כֵּן 138, 145–148  
 appeal and plea  
 אַחֲלִי/אֲחִלִּי 150 (note 46)  
 בִּי אֲדַנִּי in בִּי (note 52), 150–155, 151 (note 56), 153 (note 56)  
 אֲנָה/אֲנָא 150–153, 151 (note 52), 154, 155–156  
 לוֹ 150 (note 46)  
 נָא 48, 150–153, 151 (note 52), 151 (note 54), 153, 154–155  
 comparative particles  
 כִּי 32, 37, 38, 39, 105, 124  
 כִּי־אֲשֶׁר 32, 33, 36, 37, 38  
 negation particles  
 אַל 48  
 לֹא 74 (note 52)  
 subordinate particles  
 אִם 52, 53  
 אִם-לֹא 110, 118  
 אֲשֶׁר 11, 13, 36, 38, 58 (note 20)  
 כִּי 11, 13, 37, 51, 52, 53, 58 (note 20), 89, 143  
 פֶּן 42 (note 11)  
 שֶׁ 11  
 time particles (time co-ordinate particles, also see co-ordinates)  
 אֲזַי 67  
 טָרָם, בְּטָרָם 11, 82, 82 (note 58)  
 בְּיוֹם 11  
 וְעַתָּה 11, 110  
 לְעֵת 20  
 particles in Geez  
 -ssa (emphatic enclitic) 68, 69, 74, 75, 76, 79, 81  
 ለ / la 126  
 ለእመ / la'amma (conditional) 148  
 በቅድመ / ba-qadma 126  
 በሐሳብ / bahaba, ሐሳብ / haba 126  
 affirmative particles  
 ርቱዕ / rətu'a 147  
 በአማን / ba'amān 146  
 የገ / yōgi 148  
 subordinate particles  
 እንተ / 'anta (relative) 60  
 kama (content) 42, 42 (note 11)  
 particles in Syriac  
 ܐܘܢ / ʾōn (interjection) 153  
 affirmative particles  
 ܒܥܘܫܬܐ / ba-bā'ū 152  
 ܒܩܘܫܬܐ / b-quštā 142  
 ܕܟܘܢܐ / kēnā'ū 147  
 ܟܘܒܪܐ / kbar 148  
 ܫܪܝܪܐ / šarīrā'ū 139, 140, 142, 146  
 subordinate particles  
 ܘܠܟܘܢ 140  
 phrases  
 exceptive 83, 83 (note 59)  
 speech phrases in Biblical Hebrew (also see speech and particles in Biblical Hebrew) 104–105  
 בְּדַבֵּר 32, 37, 104–105, 108, 110, 114–117  
 בְּדַבֵּר... כֵּן... 32, 106, 117–119  
 בְּדַבְּרֵי 32, 104, 105  
 כָּבֵל אֲשֶׁר/בְּאֲשֶׁר צִוְּה... כֵּן 32, 36–37, 38, 106, 117  
 נָאִים ה' 53 (note 17), 104, 105, 105 (note 4), 108–111  
 time phrases in Biblical Hebrew (time co-ordinate phrases, narrative time co-ordinates, also see co-ordinates) 67, 104, 158–170, 158 (note 64), 172  
 בְּיָמִים הָהֵם, בְּיוֹם הַהוּא (bayyôm hahû') 69, 77, 88, 96, 158, 166–169, 167 (note 74), 168 (note 76), 169, 173  
 בְּעֵת הַהִיא 69, 158, 168–169, 173  
 וְזֹאת לְפָנֵינוּ 95  
 לְדִרְתָּם 93  
 לְפָנֵינוּ 96, 97, 97–98, 98 (note 75), 158, 164–166, 173



- לְרֵאשֹׁנָה 97, 98  
 מִיָּמִים יָמִימָה 94, 158, 169–170,  
 173  
 עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה 56, 92, 95,  
 158, 159–163, 159 (note 65), 163  
 (note 66), 165, 169, 173  
 various phrases in Biblical Hebrew  
 כִּפְתּוּב 106, 124–125  
 presentatives in Biblical Hebrew  
 הִנֵּה and הִנְיָה 11  
 prolepsis 22, 142, 142 (note 28)  
 prosody 8  
 tone units 16
- qatal* verbal forms (suffix conjugation,  
*qtl, qatala*) 12–13, 13 (note 46), 15,  
 16, 19, 46, 64, 65, 66 (note 36), 67,  
 73, 75, 77–78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85,  
 85 (note 62), 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 96,  
 98, 100
- semantic change (semantic shift) 122,  
 122 (note 13), 128  
 speech tense 15  
 speech verbs (verbs of speech) 5  
 (note 17), 20, 33–34, 35, 36, 40, 41,  
 42, 42 (note 11), 43, 53, 58, 83, 83  
 (note 60), 84, 96, 97, 104, 104  
 (note 2)  
 synchronicity 169 (note 77)
- tag questions 4, 4 (note 16)  
 topic shift 65–66, 71, 81  
 topicalization 65
- wayyiqtol* (prefix conjugation with  
 consecutive/conversive *wāw*, also  
 see *yaqtul, yiqtol, yaqtulu*) 12, 13, 15,  
 16–17, 18, 18 (note 78), 18, 64, 65,  
 68, 71, 74, 75, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 86,  
 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 100, 101, 116  
*wəqatal* 16–17, 17 (note 67), 18
- yaqtul* (also see *wayyiqtol, yiqtol*) 15  
*yaqtulu* (also see *wayyiqtol, yiqtol*) 13  
 (note 46)
- yiqtol* (prefix conjugation, also see  
*wayyiqtol, yaqtul, yaqtulu*) 15, 15  
 (note 54), 16, 39, 44, 46, 47, 48, 80,  
 82, 82 (note 58), 92, 92 (note 67), 94,  
 94 (note 71), 95, 157

## INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Alter, R. 25, 25 (note 107), 65  
(note 30)
- Amit, Y. 25 (note 105), 25 (note 106),  
26, 26 (note 113), 26 (note 114), 26  
(note 115), 55 (note 18)
- Andersen, F. I. 14, 14 (note 50), 14  
(note 51), 14 (note 52), 14 (note 53),  
15, 15 (note 54), 65 (note 30), 68  
(note 38), 74 (note 50)
- Aristar Dry, H. 16 (note 62)
- Azar, M. 52, 52 (note 15), 52  
(note 16), 110 (note 7), 118 (note 11)
- Baasten, M. F. J. 60 (note 23)
- Bailey, N. A. 74 (note 49)
- Bandstra, B. L. 18 (note 80)
- Baumgärtel, F. 105 (note 4)
- BDB* 57 (note 19), 101 (note 78), 122  
(note 13), 130 (note 15), 139, 139  
(note 20), 141, 141 (note 25), 144,  
144 (note 32), 145, 145 (note 34), 145  
(note 35), 148, 148 (note 39), 151,  
151 (note 47), 151 (note 49),  
151 (note 50)
- Beentjes, C. P. 12 (note 45)
- Bergen, R. D. 18 (note 78)
- Berlin, A. 25, 25 (note 109), 25  
(note 110), 65 (note 30)
- Biber, D. 3 (note 12), 6 (note 22), 8  
(note 31)
- Blau, J. 3 (note 12), 10, 10 (note 38),  
10 (note 39), 10 (note 40), 11, 11  
(note 41), 138 (note 19)
- Bodine, W. R. 9 (note 35)
- Brin, G. 69 (note 41), 69 (note 42),  
98 (note 75), 159 (note 65), 165  
(note 68), 166 (note 71), 169  
(note 77)
- Brichto, H. Ch. 27, 27 (note 116)
- Brockelmann, C. 20, 20 (note 93), 41,  
41 (note 9), 42, 42 (note 12)
- Brown, G. 2, 9, 9 (note 32), 9  
(note 33), 9 (note 34), 28, 28  
(note 118), 66, 66 (note 35), 158  
(note 63)
- Burton-Roberts, N. 4 (note 14)
- Buth, R. J. 18 (note 81)
- Cook, J. A. 16 (note 62), 18, 18  
(note 82)
- Corum, C. 4, 4 (note 15)
- Crystal, D. 3 (note 12), 4 (note 16),  
9 (note 35), 10 (note 36), 28, 28  
(note 117), 65 (note 34), 138 (note 18)
- Dawson, D. A. 9 (note 35), 17, 17  
(note 74), 17 (note 75), 18 (note 76),  
72 (note 43)
- De Regt, L. J. 13 (note 46), 19, 19  
(note 88), 20, 20 (note 89), 20  
(note 90), 23, 65 (note 30), 99  
(note 76), 159 (note 65)
- Desmets, M. 32 (note 1)
- DeVries, S. J. 159 (note 65), 166  
(note 71), 167 (note 72), 167  
(note 73), 167 (note 74), 168  
(note 75), 168 (note 76)
- Dillmann, A. 68 (note 39), 69 (note 40)
- Driver, G. R. 60 (note 23)
- Driver, S. R. 15 (note 54), 19  
(note 87), 65 (note 30)
- Dubnov (Medvedev), Q. 11, 11  
(note 43)
- Emonds, J. 5 (note 17)
- Eskhult, M. 19, 19 (note 84), 19  
(note 85), 19 (note 86), 65 (note 30),  
65 (note 31), 66 (note 36), 72  
(note 44), 87 (note 63)
- Espinal, T. M. 4, 4 (note 14), 5, 5  
(note 18), 7 (note 26), 22 (note 100)
- Ewald, H. 13, 13 (note 47), 13  
(note 48), 58 (note 20)
- Fassberg, S. E. 151, 151 (note 52), 153  
(note 56), 154, 154 (note 57), 155,  
155 (note 58), 155 (note 59), 156  
(note 60)
- Gesenius, W. 13
- Gibson, J. C. L. 13 (note 46), 15  
(note 54)
- Givón, T. 13 (note 47)
- GKC* 13 (note 47), 52 (note 16), 65  
(note 30), 82 (note 58), 85 (note 62),

- 92 (note 67), 99 (note 77), 110 (note 7), 118 (note 11)
- Goldenberg, G. 29 (note 119), 33 (note 3), 61 (note 26), 73 (note 46), 103 (note 1), 157 (note 62)
- Goldfajn, T. 18 (note 78)
- Gottlieb, H. 151 (note 54)
- Gottstein, M. H. 21, 21 (note 94), 21 (note 95), 22
- Greenbaum, S. 3 (note 12)
- Greenstein, E. L. 13 (note 46)
- Gross, W. 13 (note 46), 17 (note 71), 18 (note 80)
- Haegeman, L. 4, 4 (note 13)
- HALOT* 139, 139 (note 21), 141, 141 (note 25), 144, 144 (note 32), 145, 145 (note 35), 145 (note 36), 148, 148 (note 39), 151, 151 (note 48), 151 (note 49), 151 (note 51)
- Hand, M. 5 (note 17), 104 (note 2)
- Hataf, G. 19 (note 87)
- Heimerdinger, J. 18, 18 (note 79), 18 (note 80)
- Heller, R. L. 18, 18 (note 77), 18 (note 78)
- Herczeg, Y. I. Z. 50 (note 13), 73 (note 45)
- Hoffmann, L. 5, 5 (note 20)
- Hopper, P. J. 104 (note 2)
- Huddleston, R. 5 (note 16), 8 (note 31)
- Hwang, Sh. J. 18 (note 78)
- Jespersen, O. 3, 3 (note 8), 3 (note 9), 3 (note 10), 3 (note 11)
- Joosten, J. 18, 19 (note 83), 76 (note 55), 84 (note 61)
- Jouon, P. 13, 13 (note 46), 13 (note 47), 13 (note 49), 52 (note 16), 65 (note 30), 82 (note 58), 85 (note 62), 92 (note 67), 110 (note 7), 118 (note 11)
- Kaltenböck, G. 6, 6 (note 22), 6 (note 23), 7, 7 (note 24), 7 (note 26), 7 (note 28), 7 (note 29), 8 (note 90), 22, 22 (note 99)
- Kaufman, S. A. 151, 151 (note 53)
- Khan, G. 14, 14 (note 50)
- Kogut, S. 1 (note 1), 141 (note 26)
- Kotze, R. J. 15 (note 54)
- Lambdin, T. O. 14 (note 50), 151 (note 52)
- Leslau, W. 29 (note 119)
- Lewis, D. 9, 9 (note 34), 158 (note 63)
- Livnat, Z. 11, 11 (note 42), 125 (note 14), 148, 148 (note 38), 149 (note 40), 149 (note 41), 149 (note 42), 150 (note 43), 150 (note 44)
- Longacre, R. E. 16 (note 60), 17, 17 (note 67), 17 (note 72), 17 (note 73), 18, 18 (note 78)
- Lyons, J. 40 (note 5), 104 (note 2), 138 (note 18)
- McCawley, J. D. 3 (note 11), 22 (note 100)
- McFall, L. 19 (note 87)
- Mey, J. L. 28 (note 118)
- Miller, C. L. 23, 23 (note 101), 23 (note 102), 23 (note 103), 24, 40, 40 (note 7), 41, 41 (note 8), 58 (note 21), 83 (note 60), 97, 97 (note 73)
- Mittwoch, A. 5, 5 (note 19)
- Muraoka, T. 13 (note 46), 13 (note 47), 13 (note 49), 52 (note 16), 60, 60 (note 23), 60 (note 25), 65 (note 30), 82 (note 58), 85 (note 62), 92 (note 67), 99 (note 77), 110 (note 7), 118 (note 11), 139 (note 20), 141 (note 25), 145 (note 34)
- Myhill, J. 13 (note 46)
- Niccacci, A. 9 (note 35), 16, 16 (note 60), 16 (note 61), 16 (note 63), 16 (note 64), 16 (note 65), 17, 17 (note 66), 17 (note 67), 17 (note 68), 17 (note 69), 17 (note 70), 65 (note 30)
- Nöldeke, Th. 20, 20 (note 92)
- O'Connor, M. 14, 14 (note 50), 21 (note 94), 99 (note 77), 151 (note 52)
- Palmer, F. R. 138 (note 18)
- Peretz, Y. 115 (note 10)
- Peterson, P. 2 (note 5), 2 (note 6), 156 (note 61)
- Polotsky, H. J. 10 (note 36), 15, 15 (note 55), 16 (note 60), 65 (note 30)
- Pullum, G. K. 5 (note 16), 8 (note 31)
- Quirk, R. 8 (note 31)
- Rainey, A. F. 15, 15 (note 56), 15 (note 57), 15 (note 58), 92 (note 67), 165 (note 67)

- Reckendorf, H. 20, 20 (note 91)  
 Reinhart, T. 5, 10 (note 36), 10  
 (note 37), 40 (note 6)  
 Revell, E. J. 18 (note 78)  
 Rouchota, V. 3 (note 12), 21 (note 97)  
 Roussarie, L. 32 (note 1)
- Sailhamer, J. H. 13 (note 46)  
 Sarfatti, G. B. 11, 12, 12 (note 44), 12  
 (note 45)  
 Schlesinger, K. 13 (note 46)  
 Schneider, W. 9 (note 35), 10 (note 36)  
 Seeligman, J. L. 55 (note 18)  
 Sharvit, Sh. 12, 12 (note 45)  
 Ska, J. L. 25 (note 108), 25 (note 109)  
 Smith, M. S. 13 (note 47)  
 Sternberg, M. 25, 25 (note 108), 26,  
 26 (note 111), 26 (note 112), 63  
 (note 28), 74 (note 49), 83 (note 60),  
 92, 92 (note 68), 96, 96 (note 72), 97,  
 97 (note 74), 158 (note 64)
- Taglicht, J. 7, 7 (note 27)  
 Talmon, Sh. 169 (note 77)  
 Talstra, E. 13 (note 46)  
 Tov, E. 60 (note 23)  
 Traugott, E. C. 104 (note 2)  
 Trumer, P. 5, 6 (note 21)  
 Tsumura, D. T. 22 (note 100)
- Urmson, J. O. 3 (note 12), 5 (note 17)
- Waltke, B. K. 14, 14 (note 50), 21  
 (note 94), 99 (note 77), 151 (note 52)  
 Weingreen, J. 21, 21 (note 96), 60  
 (note 24), 92, 92 (note 69)  
 Weinrich, H. 16, 16 (note 60)  
 Williams, R. J. 99 (note 77)  
 Winther-Nielsen, N. 73 (note 46)
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 9 (note 35),  
 13 (note 46), 16 (note 60), 17  
 (note 72), 19 (note 87), 99 (note 77)  
 Van Wolde, E. 13 (note 46), 16  
 (note 62)
- Xing, Z. 13 (note 46)
- Yule, G. 2 (note 2), 9, 9 (note 32),  
 9 (note 33), 9 (note 34), 28, 28  
 (note 118), 66, 66 (note 35), 158  
 (note 63)
- Zakovitch, Y. 73 (note 47)  
 Zevit, Z. 13 (note 46), 15, 16  
 (note 59), 21, 32 (note 2), 74, 74  
 (note 51), 75 (note 54)  
 Zewi, T. 18 (note 77), 18 (note 80), 19  
 (note 87), 22 (note 100), 24  
 (note 104), 36 (note 4), 59 (note 22),  
 61 (note 27), 65 (note 33), 83  
 (note 59), 142 (note 28), 151 (note 54)  
 Ziv, Y. 2, 2 (note 6), 3, 3 (note 7), 105  
 (note 3)